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Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: ____________________________ Apt./Suite No: ____________________________
Street Address: ____________________ City, State, Zip: ____________________________

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your
comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional
comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and
why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane
to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to
you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding
your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height,
draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments: ____________________________

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING RECORD

FROM:  Matt [mailto:58matt26@gmail.com]
SENT: Sunday, July 04, 2010 12:50 PM
TO:  midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
SUBJECT: Please build bridge ASAP Thanks

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.
----- Original Message ----- 
From: pprvhr48@charter.net <pprvhr48@charter.net>
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri May 07 17:11:33 2010
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

With all the delays this bridge construction has experienced over all these years, we have been very lucky not to have had major loss of life during a major storm - merely because we have not been hit by such a storm. We urgently need the bridge as soon as possible because we cannot count on our luck's holding out forever. People on the Currituck banks should not have to travel through Duck and Southern Shores to escape a major storm.

Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge
Date: Friday, June 4, 2010 12:40 PM
From: Harold Adams <haja@comcast.net>
To: <midcurrituck@ntdturnpike.org>

Question 1: I prefer MCB2 because I think it will take the danger and pressure off of the now overloaded Route 12 and 158, there could be a slight modification to widen route 12 through Duck where ever possible thus avoiding areas where the land purchase would be too great.
Question 2: I prefer C2 because it comes into route 12 where there is already commercial traffic and will cut the travel distance for those traveling from the south. Question 3: I prefer mainland approach road design B because it will cost the taxpayers less. Question 4: I prefer reversing the center lane on 158 for Hurricane evacuation. Question 5 No other concerns.
Question 6: I am not a boater therefore do not have an opinion. I am a home owner in Sea Ridge in Duck. Thank you. Harold L. Adams

Harold L. Adams, FAIA
1601 The Terraces
Baltimore, MD 21209
From: Meghan Agresto [mailto:magresto@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 2:51 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge questionnaire

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why? - No bridge.

- Not convinced it will help in hurricane
- not convinced that this isn’t the machine trying to keep Duck and Dare county a little less congested while sacrificing the northern beaches/horses/undeveloped beauty
- not enough infrastructure to support the day traffickers,
- unsupervised visitors take a toll on local economy
- cost of bridge is ridiculous with State budget as it is
- toll to foreign company means that locals/emergency personal/county residents who could work in Corolla instead of international labor would have to pay regardless of residency/purpose of crossing.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why? Reversing center turn lane. If you add another lane, more people come. That’s the problem that contributes to “needning” a bridge, which I’m opposed to. We must reinvest in the golden egg, not fry it.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

- Infrastructure supports
- Environment
- Local needs/desire/opinions

From: Barbara Akley <akley@embarqmail.com>
Date: Sat, 29 May 2010 11:00:22 -0400
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: I Think MCB4 is best!

As full time resident of Duck, I realize that another bridge is necessary for health and safety issues. I think MCB4 is the best plan.
Bridge corridor C1 is best for the bridge corridor. Option B for the mainland approach is good. I think reversing the center lane during an evacuation is appropriate.
Thank you for your consideration.
Barbara Akley
106 Bunting Lane
Duck, NC 27949

tel. # 252-261-8739

--

Barbara
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Sandra Albertson
Street Address: 215 S. Jockey’s Ridge Rd. Apt./Suite No:
City, State, Zip: Shawboro, N.C. 27973

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB4 because I know how badly the bridge is needed.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I would choose C1 because it would not displace any homes or businesses.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A because it leaves Wright Road in place as is.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Rev. The bridge will do it all.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

The only real impact I would be concerned with is if option B were chosen on the mainland it would be devastating to the Odyfleet Community.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

N/A

Additional comments:
We need the Bridge built as quickly as possible

Thanks

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.com

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
I would like to see the mid county bridge built. Put the tollbooths on US 158. Use the Corolla entry that doesn’t disturb the commercial. Put drainage on Hwy 12 immediately. Don’t widen Hwy 12 thru southern Shores, Duck and Corolla.

Please put me on your email list for updates.

Your maps were great at the hearings.

Thanks,

Jean Allen

Kill Devil Hills, NC 27948
From: Doris Anderson <dba107@verizon.net>
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Tue Jun 22 06:00:03 2010
Subject: NC Bridge

PLEASE build the bridge!!!

Doris Anderson

From: Jeff Anderson
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri Apr 23 17:17:33 2010
Subject: In Support of the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge

Ms. Harris,

This letter is in written in strong support of the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge. As a homeowner on the Outer Banks, I have personally experienced the emergency traffic conditions associated with several hurricane evacuations during the last 20 years of home ownership in the area. In addition, the extraordinary strain on the road system going north from Kitty Hawk to Corolla on weekends during the tourist season seems to have reached a critical point. The volume of development up in the Corolla area seems to require a solution such as the sound bridge.

Please relay my support for the proposal to build the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge.

Best Regards,

Jeffrey P. Anderson
123 Shearwater Way
Duck, NC 27949
Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. We are six month residents of the Corolla area. Although we would enjoy the savings of time in reaching our second home in Corolla and the evacuation benefits, we are against the building of the bridge.

Our reasons for our point of view are: 1. environmental impact on the ecological system 2. expense versus value of the bridge benefits 3. explosion of tourist day trippers with inadequate facilities/parking 4. impact on the unique beach community due to traffic pattern changes and 5. questionable need with only 16 weekend days of 365 total days were traffic is a problem or less than 5 % of the total days of the year.

Of the choices offered ER2 would be the most desirable. Thank you.

Paddy & Bud Anderson, 585 Golfview Trail, Corolla, NC 27927  252 453 3004
June 4, 2010

Mr. John Page, AICP, CEP
Parsons Brinckerhoff
909 Aviation Parkway, Suite 1500
Morrisville, NC 27560

RE: Mid Currituck Bridge Study, Aydlett NC

Dear Mr. Page,

The purpose of this letter is to confirm our telephone conversation on Thursday, May 27, 2010. As we discussed that afternoon, we have no desire for there to be a Mid Currituck Bridge or its facilities located in our community of Aydlett, let alone on our property. Having said that we feel it is inevitable that this project will take place in Aydlett.

It is our opinion this project will drastically take away from the quality of life we have enjoyed for over 36 years. The peace and serenity our farm has provided our family will be lost forever. With that being said, if the project is in fact going to take place, we have the following comments regarding the proposed plans received in the mail October 2009:

Option A:

Should the Turnpike Authority choose to proceed with option A it would put the elevated roadway approach to the bridge level with our 2nd story bedroom windows. Clearly one would understand our position that the acceleration of the vehicles going up the incline would disrupt our sleep. Also, our property’s future is ruined by not having direct access to the bridge.

Option B:

This ground level approach to the west end of the bridge is preferred over Option A, especially if there is a heavily vegetated buffer along the new roadway. With that being said, keeping the bridge approach at the existing ground level means our property would be severed by a new road in order to maintain traffic flow on Narrow Shore

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Charles Angus

CC: Jennifer Harris, NC Turnpike Authority
    Eugene A. Conte, Jr., NC Department of Transportation

Enclosures
We believe the Turnpike's objective under Option B can be accomplished without severing our property. We are including the proposed drawing detailing our recommended changes to Option B:

1. Move the toll plaza 1200' to the west. This would minimize the noise to the residence caused by the vehicle acceleration at the toll plaza.
   a. The toll plaza area would have a comfort facility and parking for the toll plaza personal only.
   b. The N.C. Turnpike Authority office, maintenance, and public/private parking would be situated on HWY 158.
2. We recommend the road design provide an ingress and egress from the bridge approach road into Aydlett. We believe this will prove to be a good decision by the N. C. Turnpike Authority and will be utilized by the residents of Aydlett.
3. The Aydlett Road that goes through the Maple Swamp should not be removed. This road gives property owners access to their property and people will want to use this road.
4. We would like to see the cul-de-sac in the southeast corner where Narrow Shore Road parallels the sound and remove the pavement along the sound. The two property owners in the corner are in favor of this cul-de-sac location.
5. Lastly, we would like to see the bridge corridor C1 across the Currituck Sound.

If our property is to be severed by Option B, we request unlimited access to the easterly and westerly portions of our property caused by the creation of any road on our property.

Thank you for your time and giving us the opportunity to voice our concerns. We appreciate your consideration of our suggestions and look forward to discussing them with you further.

Sincerely,

Charles and Mary Ellen Angus

CC: Jennifer Harris, NC Turnpike Authority
    Eugene A. Conti, Jr., NC Department of Transportation

Enclosures
would be severed by a new road in order to maintain traffic flow on Narrow Shore Road, the Turnpike’s objective under Option B can be accomplished without severing the property so severely. Included is a proposed drawing detailing the recommended changes to Option B:

1. Move the toll plaza 1200’ to the west. This would minimize the noise to the residence caused by the vehicle acceleration at the toll plaza.
   a. The toll plaza area would have a comfort facility and parking for the toll plaza personal only.
   b. The N.C. Turnpike Authority office, maintenance, and public/private parking would be situated on HWY 158.

2. It is recommended that the road design provide an ingress and egress from the bridge approach road into Aydlett. I believe this will prove to be a good decision by the N.C. Turnpike Authority and will be utilized by the residents of Aydlett and improve their property values that would otherwise be hindered by the new bridge.

3. The Aydlett Road that goes through the Maple Swamp should not be removed. This road gives property owners’ access to their property and people will want to use this road.

4. I would like to see the cul-de-sac in the southeast corner where Narrow Shore Road parallels the sound and remove the pavement along the sound. The two property owners in the corner are in favor of this cul-de-sac location.

5. Lastly, I would like to see the bridge corridor 1 across the Currituck Sound.

If my parents’ property is to be severed by Option B, we request unlimited access to the easterly and westerly portions of the property caused by the creation of any road on our property.

Thank you for your time and giving me the opportunity to voice our concerns. We appreciate your consideration of our suggestions and look forward to discussing them with you further.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kimberly C. Angus

CC: Jennifer Harris, NC Turnpike Authority
     Eugene A. Coth, Jr., NC Department of Transportation

Enclosure
would be severed by a new road in order to maintain traffic flow on Narrow Shore Road, the Turnpike's objective under Option B can be accomplished without severing the property so severely. Included is a proposed drawing detailing the recommended changes to Option B:

1. Move the toll plaza 1200' to the west. This would minimize the noise to the residence caused by the vehicle acceleration at the toll plaza.
   a. The toll plaza area would have a comfort facility and parking for the toll plaza personal only.
   b. The N.C. Turnpike Authority office, maintenance, and public/private parking would be situated on HWY 158.

2. It is recommended that the road design provide an ingress and egress from the bridge approach road into Aydlett. I believe this will prove to be a good decision by the N.C. Turnpike Authority and will be utilized by the residents of Aydlett and improve their property values that would otherwise be hindered by the new bridge.

3. The Aydlett Road that goes through the Maple Swamp should not be removed. This road gives property owners’ access to their property and people will want to use this road.

4. I would like to see the cul-de-sac in the southeast corner where Narrow Shore Road parallels the sound and remove the pavement along the sound. The two property owners in the corner are in favor of this cul-de-sac location.

5. Lastly, I would like to see the bridge corridor CI across the Currituck Sound.

If my parents’ property is to be severed by Option B, we request unlimited access to the easterly and westerly portions of the property caused by the creation of any road on our property.

Thank you for your time and giving me the opportunity to voice our concerns. We appreciate your consideration of our suggestions and look forward to discussing them with you further.

Sincerely,

Kimberly C. Angus

CC: Jennifer Harris, NC Turnpike Authority
Eugene A. Conti, Jr., NC Department of Transportation

Enclosure
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: JACK W. PROBST
Street Address: 326-62ND STREET Apt./Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: NEWPORT NEWS VA 23607-1914

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB2

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

MCB2 C-2

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

OPTION A
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Jay Arnett
Street Address: 210 Fardenville Dr
City, State, Zip: Yorktown VA 23693

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB2

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US-158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

reverse center turn lane

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: [Signed]

Street Address: 939 Whalehead Dr Apt./Suite No: Corolla NC

City, State, Zip: [Address]

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

[MCB2]

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

[Option C2]

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

[Option A]
This bridge is long overdue. I am a Dare County homeowner, and you just have to visit Southern Shores in the heart of the rental season to see the need for this bridge. Traffic going to Corolla can back up for hours. This results in drivers doing stupid things, such as driving on shoulders and detouring through quiet residential neighborhoods. A bridge would probably get rid of 80% of that traffic. Widening roads is not the answer. Would you have small children cross four lanes of traffic to get to the beach? Even if some roads were widened the Town of Duck bottleneck would negate any other improvements in traffic flow.
NORTH CAROLINA TURNPIKE AUTHORITY
MS. JENNIFER HARRIS, P.E.
1578 MAIL SERVICE CENTER
RALEIGH NC 27699-1578
Re: Mid Currituck Bridge Public Comment
Date: 6-3-10

Ms. Harris,

Please find below two responses from Emily Ausband & Alex LeFevre in regards to the Mid Currituck Bridge Project and alternatives. We are both owners of Banks Land Company whose property is located at 6146, 6150 & 6156 North Croatan Hwy. The businesses located within this property that are also referenced as commenter’s are Islander Flags of Kitty Hawk, Inc., Identify Yourself LLC, The Bean Drop Cafe, Kitty Hawk Kayaks and Surf School and one vacant tenant space.

We prefer MC04 using the center lane as a third outbound lane during evacuations.

You will find Emily’s Comments first and then Alex’s comments following.

COMMENTS ON BEHALF AND BY EMILY AUSBAND

I would like to present the following possible solution to the 158 Corridor in Kitty Hawk proposed widening or hurricane evacuation lane. Without a detailed map on which I could calculate this myself, I can only make the following observation.

Instead of the proposed widened road being straight, I believe some curves could provide a much better outcome. Since I believe the speed limit is to be lowered to 45 mph, I don’t think slight curves would be a traffic danger.

1. Curve to the right from the bridge to Amandas Avenue avoiding the businesses to the north.
2. Curve to the left before Victory Chevrolet and Islander Flags including the bridge over Jean Guite Creek.
3. Curve back to the right in the empty space in front of Kitty Hawk Estates avoiding all the town homes and the Kitty Hawk School property including the much needed ball field.
4. Continue this to the Marketplace.
5. The only structure then potentially impacted would be the ABC store which has an entry on the left rather than facing 158.

It seems to me that this would accomplish the least disruption to existing businesses and would actually improve the frontage at Victory Chevrolet, Islander Flags and Kitty Hawk School, for example – utilizing already ample available space with no structures.

If this plan were feasible, it might mean changing the angle of Jean Guite Creek Bridge and re-establishing setback lines along this corridor. This should be done prior to any work so that property owners would know that any future construction would be affected by new setback lines for highway widening.

I would appreciate a specific answer from your engineers as to the possibility of such a design. Although it might cause some additional road construction expense, I doubt it would be as costly as the expense of buying out existing commercial properties.

This option should be examined even before construction of a hurricane evacuation lane on the north side of the highway so that future planning would be established from the start.

COMMENTS BY AND ON BEHALF OF ALEX LEFEVRE

All my comments are directly related to the corridor between the Wright Memorial Bridge and The Woods Road Intersection.

- UNDERGROUND INFILTRATION

After meeting with N.C. Turnpike representatives at the Open House on May 18th at the Ramada Plaza and after discussion of the potential impact on our property... we discussed the size of the swale in the front of our property and discussed the potential of creating underground storage that could drain to adjacent property minimizing the area needed to widen the road on the south side of 158 in front of our property.

- TURN LANES

If the 6 Lane Super Street is developed as part of this project or a future project; there should be consideration given as to the placement of the proposed ‘U’ Turn Lanes and Traffic Lighting in regards to making business entrances easily accessible by adjusting the turn lanes east or west; in our case westward so that the west bound traffic could have the option of turning into our driveway vs. doing a U Turn – We find it unlikely that once motorists are traveling towards the Wright Memorial Bridge that they will turn around to come back to our property; thus negatively impacting our businesses. Placement of this light and turn lane would be critical to our business.

- NEW GINGUITTE CREEK BRIDGE

The proposal to replace the Ginguitte Creek Bridge will directly impact the business of Kitty Hawk Kayaks and Boaters using the canal that live on the south side of the bridge. Our Tenants, Kitty Hawk Kayaks, use the waterway on a daily basis, and the unimpeded access thru that area is essential to their livelihood. Great care will need to be taken if the bridge is replaced in making sure that the waterway is accessible and safe and completed in an urgent fashion with the best times being October – February.
Also, the construction of the bridge would create huge amounts of equipment activity and debris removal — we would expect this part of the project to be minimized to alleviate potential blocking of our property frontage.

- **FOOTBRIDGE & MULTIUSE PATH**

The existing footbridge and multiuse path on the north side of 158 gets an amazing amount of traffic and is great for the community. If the road is converted to a super street or an outbound lane is added, the bridge and path will need to be replaced. A consideration is to relocate the footbridge and path on the south side of the highway as the expansion with the outbound lane pushes the perimeter/right of way even farther on the north side — to balance the space; consider replacing the footbridge and multiuse path on the opposite side of the road from its existing location.

Depending on the outcome of replacing the sidewalk and foot bridge, we may be interested in acquiring the bridge and moving it to our property as a crosswalk connecting our two properties 6146 N. Croatan with 6156 N. Croatan.

- **GENERAL CONSTRUCTION**

Depending on the final consensus, we would expect our property would remain free and clear of construction traffic and debris during the project. We would also request that we are supplied with a contact name and number if we have any concerns during the construction related to our location.

- **ENVIRONMENTAL**

We would expect that there be the least amount of environmental impact possible affecting Ginguite Creek, Kitty Hawk Woods and surrounding wetlands through mitigation and other alternatives.

- **MEETING**

We would request a meeting on behalf of ourselves and our tenants and potentially our business neighbors in our corridor between the Wright Memorial Bridge and The Woods Road to finalize concerns that may not have been addressed prior to construction of any of the alternatives.

Respectfully Submitted.

Emily Ausband
177 Chichauk Trail
Southern Shores NC 27949
Tel: 252-261-1791 – emily@islanderflags.com

Alex LeFevre
2608 Neptune Way
Kitty Hawk NC 27949
Tel: 252-202-1452 – alex@islanderflags.com

CC:
US Army Corps of Engineers – Wilmington District
Attn: William Biddlecome
Washington Regulatory Field Office
Post Office Box 1000
Washington NC 27889

Senator Marc Basnight – President Pro Tempore – North Carolina Senate
C/O Chris Dillon
1st District
Legislative Building
16 W. Jones Street Room 2007
Raleigh NC 27601-2808
NORTH CAROLINA TURNPIKE AUTHORITY

MS. JENNIFER HARRIS, P.E.
1578 MAIL SERVICE CENTER
RALEIGH NC 27609-1578
Re: Mid Currituck Bridge Public Comment
Date: 6-3-10

Ms. Harris,

Please find below two responses from Emily Ausband & Alex LeFevre in regards to the Mid Currituck Bridge Project and alternatives. We are both owners of Banks Land Company whose property is located at 6145, 6150 & 6156 North Croatan Hwy. The businesses located within this property that are also referenced as commenter's are Islander Flags of Kitty Hawk, Inc., Identity Yourself LLC, The Bean Drop Cafe, & Kitty Hawk Kayaks and Surf School and one vacant tenant space.

We prefer MCB4 using the center lane as a third outbound lane during evacuations.

You will find Emily's Comments first and then Alex's comments following.

COMMENTS ON BEHALF AND BY EMILY AUSBAND

I would like to present the following possible solution to the 158 Corridor in Kitty Hawk proposed widening or hurricane evacuation lane. Without a detailed map on which I could calculate this myself, I can only make the following observation.

Instead of the proposed widened road being straight, I believe some curves could provide a much better outcome. Since 158, the speed limit is to be lowered to 45 mph, I don't think slight curves would be a traffic danger.

1. Curve to the right from the bridge to Amandas Avenue avoiding the businesses to the north.
2. Curve to the left before Victory Chevrolet and Islander Flags including the bridge over Jean Guite Creek.
3. Curve back to the right in the empty space in front of Kitty Hawk Estates avoiding all the town homes and the Kitty Hawk School property including the much needed ball field.
4. Continue this to the Marketplace.
5. The only structure then potentially impacted would be the ABC store which has an entrance on the left rather than facing 158.

It seems to me that this would accomplish the least disruption to existing businesses and would actually improve the frontage at Victory Chevrolet, Islander Flags and Kitty Hawk School, for example—utilizing already ample available space with no structures.

If this plan were feasible, it might mean changing the angle of Jean Guite Creek Bridge and re-establishing setback lines along this corridor. This should be done prior to any work so that property owners would know that any future construction would be affected by new setback lines for highway widening.

I would appreciate a specific answer from your engineers as to the possibility of such a design. Although it might cause some additional road construction expense, I doubt it would be as costly as the expense of buying out existing commercial properties.

This option should be examined even before construction of a hurricane evacuation lane on the north side of the highway so that future planning would be established from the start.

COMMENTS BY AND ON BEHALF OF ALEX LEFEVRE

All my comments are directly related to the corridor between the Wright Memorial Bridge and The Woods Road Intersection.

- UNDERGROUND INFRTRATION

After meeting with NC Turnpike representatives at the Open House on May 18th at the Ramada Plaza and after discussion of the potential impact on our property...we discussed the size of the swale in the front of our property and discussed the potential of creating underground storage that could drain to adjacent property minimizing the area needed to widen the road on the south side of 158 in front of our property.

- TURN LANES

If the 6 Lane Super Street is developed as part of this project or a future project; there should be consideration given as to the placement of the proposed 'U Turn' lanes and Traffic Lighting in regards to making business entrances easily accessible by adjusting the turn lanes east or west; in our case westward so that the west bound traffic could have the option of turning into our driveway vs. doing a U Turn -- We find it unlikely that once motorists are traveling towards the Wright Memorial Bridge that they will turn around to come back to our property; thus negatively impacting our businesses. Placement of this light and turn lane would be critical to our business.

- NEW GINGuite CREEK BRIDGE

The proposal to replace the Ginguite Creek Bridge will directly impact the business of Kitty Hawk Kayaks and Boaters using the canal that live on the south side of the bridge. Our Tenants, Kitty Hawk Kayaks, use the waterway on a daily basis, and the unimpeded access thru that area is essential to their livelihood. Great care will need to be taken if the bridge is replaced in making sure that the waterway is accessible and safe and completed in an urgent fashion with the best times being October - February.
Also, the construction of the bridge would create huge amounts of equipment activity and debris removal—we would expect this part of the project to be minimized to alleviate potential blocking of our property frontage.

- FOOTBRIDGE & MULTI-USE PATH

The existing footbridge and multi-use path on the north side of 158 gets an amazing amount of traffic and is great for the community. If the road is converted to a super street or an outbound lane is added, the bridge and path will need to be replaced. A consideration is to relocate the foot bridge and path on the south side of the highway as the expansion with the outbound lane pushes the perimeter/right of way even further on the north side—to balance the space; consider replacing the footbridge and multi-use path on the opposite side of the road from its existing location.

Depending on the outcome of replacing the sidewalk and foot bridge, we may be interested in acquiring the bridge and moving it to our property as a crosswalk connecting our two properties: 6146 N. Croatan with 6156 N. Croatan.

- GENERAL CONSTRUCTION

Depending on the final consensus, we would expect that our property would remain free and clear of construction traffic and debris during the project. We would also request that we are supplied with a contact name and number if we have any concerns during the construction related to our location.

- ENVIRONMENTAL

We would expect that there be the least amount of environmental impact possible affecting Grapewine Creek, Kitty Hawk Woods and surrounding wetlands through mitigation and other alternatives.

- MEETING

We would request a meeting on behalf of ourselves and our tenants and potentially our business neighbors in our corridor between the Wright Memorial Bridge and Tho Woods Road to finalize concerns that may not have been addressed prior to construction of any of the alternatives.

Respectfully Submitted.

Emily Ausband
177 Chocasih Trail
Southern Shores NC 27949
Tel: 252-261-1791 — emily@islanderflags.com

Alex LeFevre
2608 Neptune Way
Kitty Hawk NC 27949
Tel: 252-202-1452 — alex@islanderflags.com

CC:
US Army Corps of Engineers — Wilmington District
Attn: William Biddlecombe
Washington Regulatory Field Office
Post Office Box 1000
Washington NC 27889

Senator Marc Basnight — President Pro Tempore — North Carolina Senate
C/O Chris Dillon
1st District
Legislative Building
16 W. Jones Street Room 2007
Raleigh NC 27603-2808
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: YVONNE P. ANTRU
Street Address: 392 NARROW SHORE DR, Apt./Suite No.
City, State, Zip: Audley, NC 27916

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I prefer the No-Build Alternative because that would be the least disruptive in the Audley community where I live. I also see no reason to spend that much money for tourists to travel only 26 days a year.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I am opposed to Option B because it would disrupt the heart of Audley. I would prefer Option A if the bridge is going to be built.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I think reversing the center lane makes most sense and is the most cost-effective. Money needs to be spent to upgrade current roads and bridges in NC, not continue to build more.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

I am concerned about the wildlife in Audley and concerned about the pollution issues that will be caused by the bridge (such as emissions from vehicles, noise, and water contamination into the sound and migratory birds).

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

The beauty of this area will be forever ruined if the bridge is approved. This traffic will continue to be congested and crime will increase. Many quality of life of local sound residents will be adversely affected in the community of Audley.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27696-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncnoturnpike.com

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: Melodie Badger [mailto:melodie.badger@gmail.com]
Subject: Information about our preference for the mid-Currituck County Bridge

We are concerned with the Rt 12 Duck as there is no space to do so and would ruin the atmosphere of the town.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2. Displacing commercial businesses is probably easier to take than homes. Many of the businesses in TimBuck II don’t depend on just that ONE store to survive. They have many stores in many locations.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outboard evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

We prefer just reversing the center lane.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
From: MPBaecher@aol.com [mailto:MPBaecher@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 06, 2010 1:19 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Cc: MPBaecher@aol.com
Subject: MCB

To whom it may concern,

You all realize that this bridge will not help those of us who live in Corolla unless you widen NC 12. Without widening the roads, the bridge will bring even more congestion to the north-south route and will make summer weekends even more unbearable for us than they are. Instead of the tieups beginning at Pine Island, which they currently do, the tieups will begin wherever the terminus of the bridge occurs.

Duck will still be impassable and should it rain on a weekend, the traffic jams will be massive. On 158, you can at least alternate into other lanes, up here R. 12 is all we have. You will be guaranteeing massive inconvenience to visitors and residents.

If you place the terminus at TimBuck II and the Fun Park is also built there, the tieups will be unreal. The proposed bridge would ultimately be valuable only if a sudden hurricane looms. With today's advanced weather reports, we would have ample time to evacuate early, just as Ocracoke does.

We wonder if this bridge will bring more trouble than it is worth? Can the NCTA afford to condemn homes to widen 12? How many more millions would that cost?

These are some of the questions to be considered. We will look forward to the May 19 hearing at the Wildlife Education Center.

Sincerely,

Marie and Richard Baecher
506 Meadow lane
Corolla, NC 27927

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.
From: William Balzer [mailto:UPS35@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 8:37 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: MCB4

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E. as manager and owners of Duck Blind Villas 2A, aka The Flying Duckman, LLC since 1985 we have seen the tremendous growth to the Outer Banks.

You have heard all the NIMBY (not in my back yard) rhetoric before, but it seems to me all who live and enjoy the Outer Banks need to give on this issue.

I know you have heard all the pros and cons from evacuation to vendors who maintain rental properties complaining about the traffic and not being able to turn and clean units between the 10 AM check out and 3 PM check in, to simply walking along NC 12 trying to listen to National Public Radio on the headset but having to blast the earphones over the car and truck noise, which could have been rerouted over the MCB.

We support MCB4 proposal.

Warmest regards,

Bill Balzer
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: William Bazel, Duck Blind Villas 2A dba The Flying Duckman, LLC, 134 Plover Dr. Duck, NC
Street Address: 320 Chason Wood Way
City, State, Zip: Roswell, GA 30076

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
    NC Turnpike Authority
    1578 Mail Service Center
    Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

Prefer MCB4 because it gives the most relief to residents of the Outer Banks, commercial vendors doing work on the Outer Banks, and vacationers. It also provides the best and fastest relief for evacuation of the Outer Banks.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you support bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2, it would seem impacting the business makes better sense then physically dividing a sub division.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you support main and approach road design Option A or B and why?

I would side with the Commission and support option A, since A has a lesser impact on the community. The quote is that A will cost more than B—and I am going to assume that the figure $60 million is the excess cost, what is the percentage of the $60 million to the total cost of the project?

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I am inclined to keep cost down by reversing the center turn lane, of course this begs the question how will the center lane be marked during evacuation to prevent head on collision with south bound traffic. The cost of marking the reverse lane has to be substantially less than adding another lane.

The use of the center lanes will only be used in times of emergencies so there is money to be saved by not having to permanently relocating homes, businesses outdoor signs, gravesites etc.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

None at this time

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

NA

Additional Comments:
From: Mike Barclay  
To: Vance Aydlett; Barbie Barclay; Marc Basnight; Owen Etheridge; Gene Gregory; Kay Hagan; Paul Oneal; The Honorable William C. Owens; John Rorer; Dan Scanlon; Janet Taylor; Perdue, Bev; Harris, Jennifer; commissioners@co.curtice.nc.us; fetzer@ncgap.org  
Cc: Mike Barclay  
Sent: Fri May 28 13:37:11 2010  
Subject: Currículum Mid-Country Bridge Project / NCDOT / NCTA

RE: Currículum Mid-Country Bridge Project  
NCDOT and the North Carolina Turnpike Authority (NCTA)  
To whom it may concern,  
After reading the most recent articles involving Ruffin Poole a former aide to former Gov. Mike Easley being indicted on more than 50 federal counts including extortion, bribery and money laundering that he benefited financially while helping expedite coastal developments; one cannot help but wonder what else might be lurking in the shadows from any and all projects being put forth in this state by the NCTA (North Carolina Turnpike Authority) and NCDOT (North Carolina Department of Transportation). To add insult to injury Lanny Wilson the vice chairman of the NCTA and former member of the NCDOT also turned in his resignation letter as well.  
Mr. Wilson apparently had some campaign finance issues and was linked to Cannonsgate; a Carteret County development where former Gov. Easley purchased a waterfront lot at a below-market price. As the articles go on to say that Republican Party Chairman Tom Fetzer was also asking for the resignation of Bob Wilson who sits on a commission that oversees implementation of the Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA). I still have to wonder what is going on here.

Being personally and emotionally involved in one of these proposed projects of the NCTA (The Proposed Currículum Mid-county Bridge) my friends and family of the community of Aydlett have hit the ball out of the park on this one. While I can sit here and list reason upon reason for not going forward on the Currículum Mid-county Bridge Project the current situation with these gentlemen only brings a “Foul Smell” to the already questionable intentions of the NCTA. If you have any questions go to ncturnpike.org and read the bios of the NCTA Board of Directors.  
The NCTA Board of Directors is appointed by our elected government officials. There are supposed to be nine members on the board four of which are appointed by the Governor, two by the President Pro-Tem of the Senate and two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. (4+2+2=8??). Maybe a typo on their website? Go figure. Don’t know where the other one comes from. There are currently only eight listed. Since last looking at the website Mr. Lackey, Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Wilson have since departed. The Board seems to change members like the weather changes in Aydlett.

While far be it from me or anyone else to accuse any one of any wrong doing; questions have to be asked as to how some of these individuals got on the NCTA board? When the Board of Directors include individuals who are currently serving or have served on the NC Real Estate Commission (i.e. Mr. Lackey, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Wilson) one has to wonder where their allegiance lies. Tom Fetzer with his questioning character tried to get answers to some very hard questions; should be applauded. You Mr. Fetzer are welcomed to Aydlett and my home anytime.

The community of Aydlett is bracing for a 2 lane bridge that is being proposed by the NCTA to go right through the heart of our rural community. When you read about people being trusted and put in such positions of power in this state you have to ask yourself a question and that is “What are these peoples true intentions?” I’m a blue collar worker with a blue collar family background and I work hard for my family’s well being. I try to give people the benefit of the doubt, but when you see such greed taking place you just have to take a breath and stand back and try to rationalize the intentions of people and their organizations. This only adds to the anxiety that people have toward the already tarnished opinions of our public and political leaders.

Getting back to my comment earlier about the community of Aydlett hitting the ball out of the park; we have always had our suspicions about the NCTA, the Real Estate Developers and Commission and NCDOT working hand in hand on the proposed Mid-Country Bridge Project and as that goes any project in this state. Articles like I have pointed out only deepen those suspicions. I wonder if there is anyone else out there in this great state of ours that feels the same way me and my comrades in Aydlett do? If so please voice your opinion.

The NCTA is supposed to have its decision by the end of the year as to the fate of the Currículum Mid-Country Bridge. I have an ill feeling where it is headed. We in Aydlett have spoken to anyone that will listen, written letters opposing this bridge project, and talked till we’re blue in the face about keeping this bridge out of our community. It is now up to the “Elite Eight” who sit on the Turnpike Board of Directors to hand down our sentence. They will be judge and jury as to our fate about the bridge. How a group of individuals (i.e. NCTA Board) who come and go like two ships passing in the night can make such crucial decisions is beyond me. I can only say that any project in this state that has the NCDOT or the NCTA stamp of approval on it, you as a tax paying citizen and voter had better get involved and voice your opinions early and often as to avoid the same fate I feel we here in Aydlett are facing.

We are paying these peoples salaries to make huge decisions about our way of life. If that doesn’t scare the pants off you I don’t know what will. A 700 million dollar project and all Aydlett will get out of it is a lot of noise, lights and air pollution. Considering the mounting financial issues this state is facing any money going toward this bridge project could be better spent on education, existing roads and bridges. Whatever happened to the Bonner Bridge Project? Who knows??? Aydlett, I feel will become collateral damage. We have nothing to be ashamed of as our fight has been a long and hard one. As a citizen of Currículum County in particular Aydlett I feel we have done the best we could do. I hope and pray there is someone out there with some sense who will put this bridge project in its grave.

Politics are very powerful bedfellows and with this project it is no exception.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name:  
Street Address:  
City, State, Zip:  
Apt./Suite #:  

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail:  Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.  
NC Turnpike Authority  
1578 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578  

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?
MCB4 - Widening of Route 12 in Kitty is a disceptive & expensive. No-Cost alternative

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why? Wiling to support whatever option is least disceptive to Currituck residents, which may be C1.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why? Option B would be less disceptive, but not sure how many Aydlett residents affected, so would choose the less expensive option B.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reverting the center turn lane during an evacuation and why? Reverse it to be less disceptive to all involved.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft.

JUN 4, 2010

6/3/2010
Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Include pillars of the bridge are artificial reefs which should benefit the ecosystem.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boat that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; to height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number: 

Additional Comments:
- I am a strong supporter of the bridge having committed bit. Elizabeth City/Duck for 10 yrs daily (work/home) 
- Duck home is now a rental property (Duf Dune) 
- I hope there will some discount for Dave Currituck residents/commutes. 
- Project delays have been absurd & I would be naive to think they won't continue.

Thanks for your time & consideration for myself and the Duck community or Business Alliance. Who I fully support.

Charles Street Address: 120 Olde Buck Road  
City, State, Zip: Duck, NC 27949  

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.  
NC Turnpike Authority  
1578 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578  
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCB4: 2 lane mid-Currituck Bridge: I see no advantage in adding a lane to route 158. 
This would just create huge bottleneck at the Coinjock bridge and at the Virginia line. The center lane could be used if necessary. DON'T OVERTHINK THE PROJECT!

Question 2: if you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Have no preference. JUST BUILD THE BRIDGE.

Question 3: if you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option "A": Supposedly has less impact on the Aydlett community.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reverse the center lane if necessary.

A third lane is not necessary. One already exists, the center turn lane, and the
Addition of another lane would create bottlenecks where the lane ended, such as the Coinjock Bridge. In the event of a necessary evacuation, officials could be stationed at key points to keep the traffic flowing.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

No issues or comments for question 5

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Yes, I am a boater. I have a center console boat that I use for recreational fishing and crabbing.

Height: 7 feet
Length: 18 feet.
Draft: 2 feet
252 473 0220

Additional Comments:
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: JOSEPH M BECKETT

Street Address: P.O. Box 423 Apt./Suite #
City, State, Zip: Kitty Hawk NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Question 6: If you are a boater or own boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments:

6/4/2010
To whom it may concern,

If my husband and I had a vote we would like to vote for ER2. We think that would be the best change for us.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Behringer
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: THOMAS BENNETT
Street Address: 218 HILLCREST DR
City, State, Zip: SO. SPURS NC 27944

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

NA

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

NA

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

NA

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

REVERSE THE CENTER LANE - NO.

NA

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

NA

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

NA

Additional comments:

NC 12 SHOULD BE WIDENED TO THREE LANES DEPENDING FROM 158 TO THE SOUTH OR OBIXA TO THE NORTH. THAT IS ALL THAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN.

Thank you

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: frederick berger [mailto:fbobx@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 12:30 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

Dear Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.

Please build the bridge!!!!! Besides helping the traffic flow thru Duck to Corolla, the bridge would expedite the transport of sick or injured citizens to a full care facility such as Elizabeth City or Chesapeake Hospitals from the northern Outerbanks. Thank you for reading my email.

Fred Berger
P.O. Box 8228
Duck, N.C. 27949

From: Marsha Berry [mailto:Marsha_Berry@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2010 11:19 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: 

I would like to register my support for alternative MCB4. It appears to relieve the congestion for those travelling to Corolla while not unnecessarily altering the area below there. I believe the other two options are misguided and will not address the problem. I strongly oppose the other two options. Thank you for considering my point of view. Marsha Berry
Comments: Please build the bridge—it will make money for the investors financing the project, it will be outstanding for Corolla, and it will be the best thing that ever happened to Currituck mainland residents. Some of the opponents forget where all of the revenue to run Currituck County comes from—Corolla property and occupancy tax. Building the bridge is the smart thing to do for all involved.

-----Original Message-----
From: Martin Betts [mailto:mfbjensen@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, May 02, 2010 1:25 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

We have had a house in the Duck area for more than 20 years, and we have experienced the problems exiting the Outer Banks in emergency. We STRONGLY support the MCB4 option for safety reasons, sincerely,
Martin and Jan Betts
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: PETER F. BISHOFF
Street Address: 4239 W. WORTHINGTON LN
City, State, Zip: KITTY HAWK, NC

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB2 - MOST COST EFFECTIVE TO ACCOMPLISH ALL GOALS OF PROJECT + IMPACT LEAST # OF PROPERTIES / BUSINESSES

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2 - LESS TAKE, ABOUT 60% INSIDE CLUTTERED AREA, FUNNELS MORE DOLLARS PAST CURRITUCK BUSINESSES

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

OPTION A - WOULD DRIVE COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT TO THE AYLETT WATERFRONT

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

REVERSE THE TURN LANE

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

ACCESS TO ICW / WORTH GUARD / Cargo / Waterfowl Communities

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

GET THIS THING BUILT!!
THE BEACH AND MAINLAND NEED IT!!

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Ms. Harris,

I am a homeowner in Duck and am very excited about this new bridge for many reasons. I agree with the Draft EIS that MCB4 is the best choice.

Sincerely,
Lorimer Blanton
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reverting the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

We have a very small town. The other 2 lanes were very little traffic. As I work at a local hospital, I drive home from Tarboro when the evacuations were taking place. There was plenty of No traffic going South to the beach areas.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional benefits that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

1. What will become of our neighborhood if the toll is placed in Atlantic?
2. What impact will the gas and oil run-off have on the Currituck Sound?
3. Will the State of N.C. purchase my home at fair market value?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for commercial or recreational use; its length, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Small boat - hedge would not affect our boating.

Additional comments:

Please consider the community of Hertford. Without a toll, no benefit from the bridge but will have to pay a tremendous fee - giving up a beautiful view, an quiet community - the effect on our schools and costs locally.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27690-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Jennifer, I live in Southern Shores and have been a resident here since 1976. I also work in Corolla, as a Real Estate Broker. Having traveled for 16 years back and forth almost every day, I fully support the Mid County Bridge and they can’t build it fast enough for us. It would be nice if they could widen Hwy 12 to support the additional traffic, but I think that deal is off the table.
Dear Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.

I am a property owner in Southern Shores NC. My house is abutting route 12. I support the mcb4 plan. I oppose any widening of route 12 or additional drainage ditches in Southern Shores.

Sincerely,

Michael Bordogna
Property Owner, 25 Thirteenth Ave. Southern Shores NC.

Name: Rebecca Bostick
Address: 1819 Drury Lane
City: Alexandria
State: VA
Zip: 22307
Email: rbarch@mindspring.com
Comments: As a property owner in Southern Shores, I strongly support the Mid-Currituck Bridge. I prefer the MCB2 alternative, C2 corridor, although I would agree with either corridor. I also support the use of the center turning lane for a third outbound lane for hurricane evacuation. As an architect, I don't like dead-end corridors (it's against the building code) and I see route 12 as a very long dead end corridor. This bridge will solve a needed safety issue. Thank you for all your hard work on this project.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Nancy Bowen
Street Address: 567 White Whale Way
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

I strongly prefer the "No-Build" alternative to the Mid-Currituck Bridge, for a variety of reasons:

1. This bridge is designed, at huge cost to the taxpayers, to alleviate traffic conditions for tourists on approximately 15 Saturdays per year, which is not economically viable. Does anyone know what the proposed toll would be? Perhaps the bridge would be built and no one would come!

2. This bridge would be an environmental disaster, both in terms of the physical environment and quality of life for residents on both sides of the sound. The Northern Outer Banks is a narrow, fragile spit of land which is already stretched to capacity. The marsh areas and wetlands support all manner of wildlife and should not be disturbed. The residents of Aydlett would find their community forever changed, and not in any good way since they would not benefit from this bridge (unless they wanted to spend a day at the beach, after paying a hefty toll of course).

3. This bridge would not alleviate traffic problems, it would simply shift them from Southern Shores to Corolla. If everyone going to Duck or any points north took the M-C bridge, there would not be any alleviation of traffic flow at all. Rather, the burden of heavy traffic would simply shift from one neighborhood (Southern Shores) to another (Corolla).

4. This bridge would forever change the character of the Northern Outer Banks, as day trippers from the Norfolk area would find a quick and easy drive to pristine beaches, especially in the 4-wheel drive area where they could park all day on the beach. However, since there are no sanitary facilities, this could be an environmental disaster.

5. The bridge would open our fragile barrier island to further development as the community would become more easily accessible. The very qualities that attract residents and visitors to the Corolla area are the relative lack of development, the clean beaches, and the feeling of "getting away from it all." Once the character changes, and the Outer Banks become just like New Jersey or Maryland, no one will find it compelling to come here.

6. This bridge is not needed for hurricane evacuation. With the current technology, there is ample warning when a hurricane is coming, giving families plenty of time to pack up and evacuate using the current bridge at MP 1, which can be reversed in the outbound direction. With cooperation from the State of Virginia, people in the far Northern beach communities, ALL of whom have 4-wheel drive, could drive north to safety, if necessary.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

N/A, I do not support the building of this boondoggle.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Same as above.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Making the center turn lane outbound would achieve the same effect as building a third outbound lane, in my opinion, at significantly reduced cost.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Quality of life for Currituck County residents and visitors alike; respect for the environment and its fragility; cost to the taxpayers of North Carolina; maintenance of the special qualities that draw people to the Outer Banks in the first place. All of this would be destroyed by the construction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge, whatever alternative would be chosen.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

N/A

Additional Comments:
Is it my understanding then that the bridge project is moving forward with either option 1 or 2, that will have the bridge to the northern part of the Outer Banks and that the decision to expand (option 3) the existing bridge or to do nothing are no longer an options. Thanks

Jeff

Jeffrey Boyle
Partner
PricewaterhouseCoopers Co., Ltd.
Sumitomo Fudosan Shiodome Hamarikyu Bldg, 8-21-1, Ginza, Chuo-ku, Tokyo 104-0061
Tel: 080-1315-3584 6: 03-3546-8471 *Jeffrey.boyle@jp.pwc.com
http://www.pwcadvisory.co.jp/

From: John Boyle
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Mon Apr 12 08:02:19 2010
Subject: Build the Bridge Preserve our Roads

Dear Ms Harris,

I am writing you to tell you that we are strongly in favor of building the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge as soon as humanly possible. Living on the Duck, Southern Shores portion of the Outer Banks in the high season has become increasingly uncomfortable due to the high volume of traffic traveling through our neighborhoods to reach the Corolla beach areas. Please take this email as a resounding yes to build the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge immediately if not sooner.

Sincerely,

John and Carnell Boyle
20 Tenth Avenue
Southern Shores, NC 27949
From: John Boyle [mailto:20toadhall@embarqmail.com]
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Yes to Building the Mid Currituck Sound Bridge

Please use this email as a strong yes vote to building the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

John and Carnell Boyle
20 Tenth Avenue
Southern Shores, NC 27949

---

From: John Boyle [mailto:20toadhall@embarqmail.com]
To: jennifer.harris@ncturnpike.org; midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org; steve.dewitt@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

Please use this email to put us on record that we want the Mid-Currituck Bridge built as soon as possible with the least amount of disturbance to the communities of Southern Shores and Duck which I think is Alternative MCB4. I feel it would be a sin to enlarge the existing road through these two communities with additional lanes and large drainage ditches etc. We desperately need the bridge built to help alleviate the horrendous traffic during the summer months.

Sincerely,

Carnell Boyle
John Boyle
20 Tenth Avenue
Southern Shores, NC 27949
From: Janice Bradley [mailto:jbradley@wastec.org]
Sent: Tuesday, June 15, 2010 1:19 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: FW: support

Janice Comer Bradley • Executive Vice President • Waste Equipment Technology Association
4301 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 300 • Washington, DC 20008 • office/direct: 202.364.3701 • fax: 202.966.4824 • email: jbradley@wastec.org

Subject: support

I am a home owner in Corolla, NC and support the project. A toll of $5 each way would be acceptable.

From: ZerkFitting@aol.com [mailto:ZerkFitting@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 15, 2010 8:21 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: proposed mid-Currituck bridge

I am an owner of a vacation home in Corolla. I strongly support the construction of the bridge.

The current highway system (NC12 from Kitty Hawk to Corolla) is congested on weekends and would be worse in a hurricane evacuation. The bridge would bring more traffic overall, to be sure, but it would cut in half the one-way congested traffic on NC12.

I pay $12 to use the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel and think a similar fare would be appropriate for the new bridge.

In the interim, as a stopgap and possibly an alternative, is there thought to a ferry crossing from Coinjock or similar to Corolla? NC has a great ferry system; seems they could construct two ramps quickly and get traffic moving. The environmental studies already done for each terminus could be used for the ferry system as well. Whatever you do, please do it SOON!

Thanks

Roy Bradrick
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Chris Besswell
Street Address: 305 W. Bache Lane Apt. Suite No:
City, State, Zip: Nags Head, NC 27959

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?  

{ } Traffic commute to north end corridor.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C or C2 and why?

{ } The C2 corridor appears to me to have the largest negative effect on local businesses, while current C would provide less of an impact.

If you prefer NCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

{ } I am indifferent to either option.
Dear Ms. Harris or To Whom It May Concern:

My wife Nancy and I are avid proponents of the new proposed Mid-Currituck County bridge. While we are very sensitive to the environmental and developmental challenges that this project presents, we think that the advantages far outweigh any potential negatives. Those negatives can all be managed thru the proper diligence that has and is being done thru the past 20 years.

We own both a home and a lot in the Currituck Club in Corolla. I grew up in Virginia Beach and currently reside in the Richmond, VA area. My sister and mother both live in Greensboro and Raleigh. We understand this region of the country very well. Please consider these points:

The 3 major bridges that were developed in the Tidewater VA area have been a huge success. The Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel, The Monitor Merrimac Bridge Tunnel and the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel represent some of the best fishing and crabbing in the world today. The safety benefits are enormous as well. People are easily willing to pay tolls and use these facilities as designed. We have the technology to do this right and protect the environment during the process.

The economic stimulus through jobs, tourism and taxes for the State of North Carolina will be un-measurable and highly accretive to the status quo. This bridge will open up improved access to the high income corridors of Raleigh, Richmond, Washington DC, Philadelphia and other major states and cities for investment, tourism and jobs. Eastern North Carolina and the OBX deserve this success. The growth will need to be managed like other major coastal success stories. The safety benefits for disaster and hurricane evacuation are enormous of course are the most important factor of all.
Without being to long winded, we offer our full support and welcome the opportunity to participate in anyway that we can be of service to this very important step towards the future.

Best regards,

Keith D. Brechtelsbauer
Vice President & General Manager
Specialty Films Division; Berry Plastics Corp.
11530 Nicholas Trace Court
Midlothian, VA 23113
(m) 804-301-0749
(e) 804-267-3572
Fax - 715-738-3444

This E-mail (including attachments) is confidential and the property of Berry Plastics Corporation and its subsidiaries (collectively, "Berry"). If you are not the intended recipient, reading, copying, disclosure or any action or forbearance based on the E-mail is prohibited. Berry retains all copyright and other intellectual property rights and objects to misuse. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS E-MAIL IN ERROR, IMMEDIATELY CONTACT THE SENDER TO SO ADVISE OF THE ERROR AND PERMANENTLY DELETE THIS E-MAIL.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: LEE BRIGHouse
Street Address: 8030 Newlands Rd Apt/Suite No. -
City, State, Zip: Columbia, NC 27925

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your
comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional
comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB2

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C1

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane
to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing Center Turn Lane

'NO OUTBOUND LANE'

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to
you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding
your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its length,
craft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Recreational

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Additional Comments:

Many people oppose the bridge. They do not know why it is being built. Go forward with this and all Corolla will be unhappy with the results.
May 16, 2010

Jennifer Harris
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578

Re: Recommended Alternative MCB4

Dear Jennifer:

Yes, Yes, I agree with above recommended alternative MCB4. I am a rental house homeowner in Ocean Sands. So, with selfishness, I would love a Mid-Currituck Bridge to provide a “shortcut” to our rental house.

Also this new bridge would be essential for potential hurricanes which are almost guaranteed based on current forecasts.

My vote is for the C1 option. Seems like less of an environmental impact. BUILD THE BRIDGE!

Sincerely,

Lisa Brinnstool
Laud215@aol.com

Good Afternoon, I am writing this letter to voice my concern as to the location of the terminus of the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. I purchased my property in Monterey Shores in 2004. I chose the location due to its quiet atmosphere and lack of hustle and bustle associated with Kill Devil Hills or Kitty Hawk. I believed that the location would be suitable for my family, guest and renters. A walk to the beach would not be a “harrowing” experience crossing 4 lanes of summer traffic. This atmosphere will come to a halt upon construction of the proposed terminus areas. In addition, it is my understanding that some of the traffic will actually be diverted through the northern area of Monterey Shores, private roads that are maintained by our association. Adding congestion and a reduction in property values. Who is going to protect our investments? Vacationer’s certainly will not want cross lanes of traffic to go to the beach. If they drive there are not enough parking areas in Whalehead to accommodate them. The roads in Whalehead are already a disgrace since they are in badly need of paving. Its bad enough the economy has decreased our property values and we have to fight for every rental dollar, now this will make it worse. Perhaps the bridge should be relocated and terminate on the sound side of Pine Island since there are no homes on the soundside in that area. Thankyou for your time and consideration. R. Brittingham, Monterey Shores Homeowner.
From: mike broderick [mailto:thebrod33@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 8:49 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Comment on bridge

I would like to say as a homeowner in Monteray Shores community, I do feel that a bridge is a good idea for the area. I would hope that the bridge would enter Corolla in the Timbuck 11 entry point. I feel that this area is commercialized already and the disruption of the traffic flow would be minimized. Some traffic would head north and some south. If it enters at The Corolla Bay site most traffic would be moving south which would clog up beach goers trying to cross over route 12 to the beach. It is much to residential up in Corolla Bay to disrupt the natural beauty of the area with such traffic. I hope my comments will be heard and not just a message lost on deaf ears. The entry point seems most prudent at the Timbuck 11 site. Thank you for the opportunity to be heard. Sincerely Michel Broderick 984 Ocean Forest Court Corolla NC 27927
To reiterate, it is my understanding that the NC Turnpike Authority is only committing to the bridge now. The additional road work will come later (if at all). It is my further understanding that there are currently no funds available for any additional road work associated with the bridge in Corolla. Given that the planned northern terminus is currently less developed and would thus create less disruption, the Northern Terminus would make more sense. Disrupting and disturbing the already vibrant commercial area in Corolla (at the proposed southern terminus) would make absolutely no sense as established businesses and employment centers would be in jeopardy and displaced.
As a resident of Corolla, because of the lack of a bridge and the time it takes me to get to the Norfolk airport, I can only spend half the year here as travel for work is extremely difficult and time consuming. I want to express my view that this bridge is needed and the sooner the better. Anyone who spends a Saturday or Sunday on Route 12 knows what a chore driving just a few miles can be.

If the bridge is laid out properly with the entrance and exit on Route 12 having minimal impact to business and homes, I believe that the bridge will be a major benefit to the region in the long term.

Thanks,

Don Broschard
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I THINK A THIRD OUTBOUND LANE WOULD BE BEST. HOWEVER, ATTENTION TO NOT ALLOWING TOURISTS TO COME IN A HURRICANE IS IMMINENT DUE TO STAYING TOO CLOSE TO REACTORS.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

I AM CONCERNED ABOUT BUSINESSES IN COROLLA BEING DISRUPTED OR COST. THE COROLLA BOAT TERMINAL CAN BE RESERVED WITH SHUTTLE, TRAFFIC, LOTS OF PASSENGERS, NOISE AND POLLUTION TO SHOPS IN TOWN WOULD BE SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED WITH THE BRIDGE.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

THE BEAUTY OF THE NORTH COROLLA BEACHES WOULD BE GREATLY AFFECTED BY A BRIDGE TO MAKE IT EASIER FOR TOURISTS TO ACCESS. OF THE YEAR, THEY COME HERE FOR BEAUTY AND I THINK THE BRIDGE WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT THE BEACHES AND ONCE DONE WE CAN NEVER GO BACK!

Please leave your completed Comment Form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1576

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@noturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Morgan Brown
Street Address: 1013 Aquia Dr Apt: Suite: No: Stafford, VA 22554

□ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Would rather not have areas of Corolla torn up!!! C2 would put this back into business distroying a major part of Corolla.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1579 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1579

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@nctTurnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Richard Branner
Street Address: 131 Dunes Bay Road Apt/Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: Elizabeth City, N.C. 27909

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2 [MCB2] MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A
From: marcia
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Sun May 23 12:21:55 2010
Subject: Comments on MCB project

We prefer the No-Build Alternative because:

A. It will adversely affect the natural habit of many species of plant and animals which make the Currituck Sound and Currituck Outer Banks what it is. At the May 19th meeting in Corolla many of our neighbors who are against the bridge spoke of the negative ecological affects of building the bridge—we concur with all their statements.

B. The bridge would take away from the uniqueness both of the Aydlett and Corolla community. It would create noise, pollution, and disturb quality of life for people living in both these communities. To take from a person a home that has been in the family for generations for the convenience of tourist traffic that is present for only three months out of the year is a travesty. A good portion of the renters that come to Corolla become repeat renters. The long hours of travel and traffic do not seem to deter them from coming year after year. We know of families that we’ve met on the beach that come from NY, CN, and NJ who travel for eight to nine hours to get to COROLLA. The hour from the Currituck Mainland to Currituck Outer Banks does not make them pick a closer spot for their summer vacation. SO THEN, WHO IS THE BRIDGE FOR?

C. The groups mentioned above hide under the premise that the Bridge is needed for the evacuation of the Outer Banks in an emergency. As stated in the May 19th hearing by long time residents both of the mainland and beach that there has never been a problem evacuating for a hurricane. Since the National Hurricane Service gives plenty of warning before a hurricane reaches landfall, evacuations are not a problem even if one should occur during peak season. Further, hurricane season is usually during the latter part of September and into October when the tourist season is over.

D. Before a bridge is built into Corolla, Corolla’s infra-structure needs to be addressed. A bridge into Corolla before this happens will create more problems. Who will pay to correct these problems?—the Currituck tax payers that don’t want the bridge in the first place will be the ones footing the bill. What about the bridge to Hatteras? Shouldn’t that be addressed first.

In our opinion a less intrusive and costly alternative to the Bridge would be some overpass at the junction of 158 and Rt 12 in Kitty Hawk and the creation of another lane to the entire portion of Rt. 12 through Southern Shores, Duck, and Corolla. However, even this alternative to deal with heavy traffic that occurs ONLY for 3 months out of the seems foolish.
We also concur with our neighbor Joseph Cassidy who sent you an email outlining his feelings on the MidCounty Bridge.

We would appreciate our comments being addressed in the DEIS.

Thank you for your attention.

Marcia E. Bruce and Robert M. Bruce, 852 Whalehead Dr., Corolla, NC 27927

From: Bugg, Elizabeth [mailto:bugges@jmu.edu]
Sent: Friday, April 09, 2010 1:34 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: support

As property owners in Dare County, we strongly support the construction of the mid-Currituck sound bridge now.

Gary and Elizabeth Bugg

Elizabeth Bugg

Acquisitions

Carrier Library

James Madison University

Harrisonburg, VA 22807

540-568-4513

bugges@jmu.edu
Name: Carole Burchett
Address: 37 Tenth Avenue
City: Southern Shores
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: tlcrburchett@charter.net
Comments: The Mid Currituck Bridge must be built! It is necessary for evacuation. The traffic in Southern Shores on Rt. 12 Duck Road on the weekends makes it impossible for the residents to travel. Most of the traffic is going to Currituck. Please build the bridge for everyone!
Name: Justin L. Burkey, Jr.
Address: 2214 Burgess Rd.
City: Chester
State: VA
Zip: 23836
Email: justin.l.burkey@honeywell.com
Comments: I would like to thank those in the State of North Carolina highway department for helping move this project forward. The only issue which concerns me is the destruction of Southern Shores along NC 12, by placing huge ditches along this scenic stretch of roadway. Please plan on mailing everyone a 20 year supply of mosquito spray to go along with their decreasing property values.

Name: Patricia Burnett
Address: 750 Lakeview Court
City: Corolla
State: NC
Zip: 27927
Email: peaburn@comcast.net
Comments: Please keep me updated. Can't wait for this project to be completed!
From: Kathleen Burns [mailto:burnseyk@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 10:46 AM
To: midcurruck@nctumpik.org
Subject: MidCurrituck Bridge Questionnaire

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

No-Build.

I vacationed in Corolla for 20 years before moving here. People from all over the NE and MidWest come here because it is different.

The trip to Corolla takes hours more than MD/Delaware/NC beaches. People who come here, do so because it is not tacky and dirty. Building the bridge will make Corolla no different from those other beaches, and no longer worth the drive. Corolla will die as a premier destination.

This will not only ruin Corolla and its ecosystem, but also the economy of Currituck County, which uses the occupancy tax revenues to pay for schools, Rec centers, libraries, and the support of the general economy. Currituck will sink into the same economic desperation as the other Eastern Carolina counties like Camden, Pasquotank, Gates, and Perquimans.

Though I do not approve of the way Currituck squanders much of the money generated by the beach, I would hate to see the county sink into the sad poverty and desolation suffered by this part of the state.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

NA

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer main and approach road design Option A or B and why?

NA

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Lane reversal is the only option for the fools who stay too long.

I have evacuated from here before, and if you use common sense (like leave the day before they make it mandatory), evacuation is a snap.

A 2 lane bridge out of Corolla will simply strand folks in Corolla on Rt 12...or they will be stranded in Barco, which has even lower elevation than my house in Corolla. Yeah, that’s a great plan.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

How much did the Draft EIS cost? I would really like an answer to this.

The folks who developed the EIS should be ashamed. One main point EIS makes is it will not increase the number of day trippers. We have no facilities for day trippers here. They defecate and park in our yards and on the beaches. We have no facilities for beach cleanup.

I can only see this as getting worse. Oh boy. More drunk teens in pickups on the beach for the day fishing horses, running over our dogs- Ocean City, MD _______. What are you thinking?

Not to mention the fact of the crime that will increased in Corolla. Minutes from Hampton Roads – do you watch TV?

Million dollar rental homes stocked with goodies and a handful of deputies and 400 old people living in beach shacks. We will be sitting ducks.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

I kayak on the sound occasionally. The sound will become a cesspool...its not too far from that already with the increased development.

Additional Comments:

The state of NC cannot and should not be allowed to tax the citizens $15 million per year (for YEAR5!) so some Spanish Company can make money.

I cannot believe some smart lawer has not looked into the TIFIA loan either. This bridge by no means qualifies as necessary infrastructure.

Spend money on the Bonner bridge...I guess that will have to collapse and injure people before that is fixed.

Too bad the people of Duck and Southern Shores are inconveinced for 26 days per year. The traffic problem could easily be alleviated by the addition of check out days, instead of just Sat and Sunday. We have traffic in Corolla for those days, too. Stay off the road Sat and Sun. You know that when you moved here. Sure, it is OK for Duck to shut down 17 12 over the 4th of July...geez!

Too bad a handful of Dare county residents, rich realtors, and greedy government officials have the ability to ruin one of the last beautiful places on the east coast.

Kathleen Burns
Corolla, NC
A Currituck Resident and NC taxpayer
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Sir Peter Burt
Street Address: 185 Schooner Ridge Drive Apt./Suite #
City, State, Zip: Duck, NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCB2 is the most attractive and offers the best solution for evacuation as well as being the best for day-to-day use

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
C1 because it is Important to maintain a vibrant local business community and C1 best ensures this

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
B. $60million is worth saving

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
3rd lane because it is safer and if there is a hurricane, reversing the center lane is bound to cause problems

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
None

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.
We are not boaters

Additional Comments:
Ms Harris,

We strongly support the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. We strongly favor Option MCB4. Second choice is Option MCB2. We also favor the C1 corridor. We oppose ER2.

We own two oceanfronts on the Outer Banks. Lot 070 in the Pine Island PUD at 433 Kity’s Point Road, Corolla, NC 27927 and Lot 1 Section 13 Whalehead Beach at 840 Lighthouse Drive, Corolla, NC 27927

John G. Burton and Eileen S. Burton
15709 Berkeley Drive
Haymarket, Va 20169

(703) 754-2572

burton2572@comcast.net

Tim Cage
4952 Caratoke Hwy
Culpeck, NC 27922

April 12, 2010

Ms. Jennifer H. Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

RE: Mid County Sound Bridge Project

Dear Ms. Harris,

I have had a chance to read the DEIS for the Mid County Bridge project and would like to make you aware of a few concerns and comments I have. I own Henry’s Gas Station and Currituck Car Clinic, which are located on the same property. My businesses have been here for over 35 years. I am concerned with the impact on my business, my family, my employees, and my community. The Purpose and Needs statement highlights three areas of concern. The traffic congestion on the main thoroughfare of Hwy 158 and NC 12, travel time and distance between the Currituck County Mainland and the Currituck Outer Banks area, and reducing hurricane evacuation times. I am not an engineer, but I have lived here through a mandatory hurricane evacuation, and I have seen first hand what the traffic congestion is like during the summer months. Without any road improvements to Hwy 158 and NC 12, this bridge will not correct those areas. No matter how you look at it, Hwy 158 will still be a 2-lane highway that cannot support the traffic it has on it now. If after all is said and done, and this bridge project gets the go ahead to build, I hope you will take a serious look at which plan is chosen. Plan A or Plan B. Plan A causes the least disruption in my community and my business. I would at least have the opportunity to relocate my business, my customers, and my employees. I have serious concerns about Plan B. Right now I have commercial property with highway access directly on Hwy 158. Changing that structure completely affects the property value of my property. It would not even be salable as commercial property. In addition, my customers would have to pass by my business by several miles to access a service road to reach my business. Anyone that has a business knows if customers pass you by, they will not turn back to reach your business. What sense does that make? You then force my business off the main highway and locate it between a wooded area and the swamp with only a service road to the highway. This will open the doors for security issues for my property and vandalism of my customers vehicles left for repair. What happens if emergency vehicles are called to my business? They also have to pass by my business by several miles and turn back to the service road to reach me. This plan will destroy my business and everything I have built up for the past 20 years. Our local government officials and the community of Aydelott do not support plan B. A letter was already issued to that effect to the Turnpike Authority and Senator Mark Danright. I
hope that money is not the determining factor on whether this bridge project is built.
People's families, businesses, and communities are affected by the decisions that will be made.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my comments and concerns.

Sincerely,

Tim Cage

### Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
### Public Comment Form
### Open House and Public Hearing
### May 20, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Tim Cage - Owner of Harry's Gas Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address:</td>
<td>4952 Carrot Top Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, State, Zip:</td>
<td>Conocol, NC 27933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apl/Suite No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

**Comments**
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, NCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

[Underlined]

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

[Underlined]

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A is the only option feasible for my business, Harry's Gas Station. Option B would not only ruin my business, but render my property worthless.
From: deborah carroll [mailto:dcc1206@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 12:31 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org; marcb@ncleg.net; billo@ncleg.net; vaydlett@co.currituck.nc.us; currituckcommish@hotmail.com; commissioners@co.currituck.nc.us; barryobx@compueasy.com; sponeal@co.currituck.nc.us; john@jrorer.com; jtaylor145@yahoo.com
Subject: MC Bridge Project

Hello Jennifer and Others,

We are very supportive of the bridge being built. We believe that, all things considered, while it’s not perfect, it solves a myriad of problems, not the least of which is it will keep people significantly safer during an evacuation. Plus, as an owner of two homes in the Outer Banks (one rental, one residential), we believe that the area’s economy will be vastly improved by the reduction of vacation traffic resulting from this bridge. We have had a number of renters say that they won’t return to the Outer Banks because of the 2-4 hour delay on 158 on the weekends. No one wants to start their vacation aggravated and since the bulk of the economy is tourism-related here, your choice to build a bridge is admirable.

We do implore, however, a few things:

1. We hope the terminus is at Timbuck II, rather than Corolla Bay.
   This would reduce what will be increased traffic on the Northern Outer Banks to fewer miles of road.

2. We hope every consideration will be given to pedestrians who want to reach the beach on foot from the west side of Monterey Shores, Corolla Bay, etc. If the highway is to be widened to 3 or 4 lanes, it should still be made possible for pedestrians to cross. If the drainage ditches prohibit this, that would adversely affect both residents and visitors. We hope that if the highway is to be widened, there are pedestrian walkways across the drainage ditches at a variety of points. At least, across from Whalehead, there should be a walkway across from each east-west street. This would enable pedestrians to reach the beach from Monterey Shores. As there is already insufficient parking in Whalehead, the more people who can walk to the beach, the better.

3. We very much hope no sound barrier walls will be constructed. Our home is near (almost on) 12 but we are much less concerned about the noise than we are about what such a wall would do to the lovely and natural look of the Northern Outer Banks. So many come here for the views, it would be devastating to destroy them.

Sincerely,
Debby and Ned Carroll

Check out my blog at http://raisingamazingdaughters.wordpress.com
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010
Name: Karen & Mike Carroll  our home location in the Outer Banks (1485 ocean Pearl Blvd in Corolla, NC  27927)
Mailing Address in PA: Street Address: 817 Appletree Road
City, State, Zip: Harding, PA  18643
Please add me to your newsletter mailing list. obxrentals@yahoo.com
Comments

Additional comments: The bridge is definitely needed and as soon as possible. None of the other alternatives would really work. We would like to see the bridge come in at Timbuck II. We don't really know what would work the best for the residence on the other side.
----- Original Message -----  
From: Jane Casey <jcase@infionline.net>  
To: Harris, Jennifer  
Sent: Thu Apr 29 10:47:57 2010  
Subject: in favor of mid-currituck sound bridge

As a property owner in Corolla I am in favor of the mid-Currituck Sound bridge. If there is an emergency evacuation of the the Outer Banks the current bridge will be woefully inadequate to get people out of the danger of a hurricane or other event. Even with the bridge there will be terrible congestion. The bridge will also help with tourism to move renters in and out on the weekends more efficiently and therefore happily. Jane Casey Ocean Sands, Section D, Corolla 757 619 5647
From: Joe Cassidy  
To: Harris, Jennifer  
Sent: Sun May 23 13:57:19 2010  
Subject: Traffic Comments on the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

Dear Ms Harris,

I sent the message below to midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org on Friday evening. On Saturday, one of my friends in Corolla told me I needed to follow it up with an email to you stating I would like the Turnpike Authority to consider my message as a comment on the Draft EIS so the Turnpike Authority can respond to the message in the Final EIS. So, just in case he is correct, here is my request to have my original message addressed in the Final EIS. Thank you very much.

Joe Cassidy

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Joe Cassidy <mailto:casacassidy@earthlink.net>
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 11:12 PM
Subject: Traffic Comments on the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
Raleigh, NC

Dear Ms Harris,

I sent the message below to midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org on Friday evening. On Saturday, one of my friends in Corolla told me I needed to follow it up with an email to you stating I would like the Turnpike Authority to consider my message as a comment on the Draft EIS so the Turnpike Authority can respond to the message in the Final EIS. So, just in case he is correct, here is my request to have my original message addressed in the Final EIS. Thank you very much.

Joe Cassidy
As an individual who has spent some amount of time in the past conducting Traffic and Transportation Engineering studies (with the occasional small Environmental Impact Study thrown in) for an Engineering Consulting firm and for the Federal Government, I would like to compliment the preparers of the Mid-Currituck Bridge EIS for a professional presentation. Having been on the Traffic Engineering Study and EIS preparation side of the fence, I understand the difficult decisions that must be made in selecting which alternatives to present to the public and then to make the final decision on which alternative to build, or not to build, especially when the project is as controversial, and has lasting, major impacts on the lives of the residents of both Mainland Currituck County and the Currituck Outer Banks.

I defer to others on the obvious adverse environmental impacts (both during and after construction) of the increased noise, water, air, light, and visual pollution that residents will have to endure once the builders have come and gone. I would like to concentrate on an area I know a little bit more about, the adverse traffic impacts on the residents of Currituck County.

The EIS acknowledges the traffic issues the bridge project addresses are for 26 days (13 weekends) out of 365 days, or 7 percent of the days in the year (25 percent of the weekends in the year). Major projects such as the Mid-Currituck Bridge typically are undertaken to solve traffic congestion problems that occur at least five of the seven days of every week of the year (71 percent of the days). It should be very difficult for an Engineer or a Governmental Decision Maker to justify the expense for such a large capital project on the basis of solving a traffic problem that occurs only 7 percent of the days of the year (as opposed to the typical project that would relieve congestion 70 percent of the days of the year). Being able to justify such a large expenditure on the supposed basis of significantly improving traffic service 7 percent of the days of the year would be an astounding task I should not like to try to undertake.

No Build Alternative - I acknowledge that a strict no-build option may not be a reasonable choice, but perhaps a minimal build option that would have much less construction than proposed under ER2 should be considered. The major traffic bottlenecks are at the intersection of 12 and 158 and at Route 12 through the Town of Duck. Traffic crawls through Duck because of the lack of foresight on the part of planners by not reserving a wide enough right-of-way through town, thus allowing development too close to Route 12. The EIS discusses the high expense of widening Route 12 through Duck, yet does not flinch at the total cost of road and bridge work elsewhere. This does not make fiscal sense. It would seem the EIS has taken a position to avoid any adverse impact on Duck at the expense of Aydlett and Corolla.

The Root cause of the weekend traffic problem is not addressed in the EIS. This root cause is the traffic flow into and out of the Currituck Outer Banks is concentrated in short time spans. No efforts have been made to spread out the arrivals and departures of visitors over more hours, or even over more days. The concept of reversible lanes is discussed only in terms of hurricane evacuation, not on traffic relief during the peak 13 weekends. All avenues should be explored to see if the congestion can be reduced to manageable levels by non-construction measures before undertaking expensive projects.

MCB4 - The EIS declared MCB4 to be the preferred alternative and takes no position on which of the two bridge alignments, the northern C1 or the southern C2, it supported. Addressing only the C1 versus C2 issue, I propose that C1 would have the least amount of impact on the Corolla community. I realize this is a divisive issue, with residents nearest to the C1 location in favor of C2, and residents nearest C2 in favor of C1. The EIS expresses a concern about C1 dividing the Corolla Bay subdivision, thus affecting community cohesion. I must admit I am puzzled by this statement about community cohesion. The last time I drove by the Corolla Bay subdivision, I remember seeing a subdivision sign, a model home, and construction workers laying out streets, and not much else.

The C1 alternative seems to be in the least populated/developed area of the two alternatives. The C2 alternative places the bridge terminus adjacent to the largest traffic generators (commercial establishments) on the Currituck Outer Banks. Dropping all the bridge traffic into this already heavily traveled area makes no sense from a traffic engineering perspective. Moving the traffic away from the congested area by selecting the Northern, or C1 alternative, would seem to be the best alternative of the two presented.

Thank you for reading and accepting my comments. I am grateful for the opportunity. If you have any questions, please send me an email.

Respectfully,

Joseph F. Cassidy
From: “Nancy P. Cecil” <npeci@verizon.net>
Date: Fri, 28 May 2010 22:26:29 -0400
To: <midcurrituck@acturnpike.org>
Cc: DCBRA <DCBRA@skyatol.com>
Subject: Response to Mid-Currituck Bridge proposal

As owners of property in Duck since 1991, we have been watching and supporting development of a mid-Currituck bridge for many years. We are delighted that the current considerations could possibly be built in the next few years. Unfortunately, we were unable to attend the public hearings, but wanted to relay our opinions for consideration.

Question 1: Which alternative do you prefer and why? We support MCB4 – the 2 lane mid-Currituck Bridge and addition of an evacuation lane on US 158 between US 158 and NC168 and the mid-Currituck Bridge plus an evacuation lane on 158 between Wright Memorial Bridge and NC 12. This plan would greatly assist traffic evacuation in the event of a hurricane. It is currently scary thinking of an evacuation during the summer if a hurricane arose quickly. The area between Southern Shores, Duck, and Corolla would be total gridlock. Currently on a rainy summer day, Route 12 is wall to wall crawling traffic with cars traveling towards US 158, Kitty Hawk or other areas south of the intersection at Southern Shores. It can take an hour to go 5 or 10 miles. I remember one time when it took 3 hours to get from Duck across the Wright Memorial Bridge. It is imperative that there be no modification or four lanes of the roads in Duck and Southern Shores in any alternative, and no linear infiltration strips. Minimal road widening on Route 12 is essential. The travel benefits, cost of design, natural resources, and village design of Duck need to be considered and this alternative offers the most benefits in all of these areas.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why? If would appear that C2 would be the preferable area and cause less disruption to Corolla Bay, but this decision should likely be left to the project team as we do not have all of the specific impacts.

Question 3: Do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why? Option A appears it should be preferable to Aylett property owners, but B’s cost is less. Here too, I defer to the project teams opinion.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why? If funding is available, the third outbound land would be preferable, allowing those needing to turn off for some reason to still have the turn lane. As they are doing in VA, with the interchanges - they are reversing them in emergencies so it must work (but they have bars across the entrances which wouldn’t be feasible). I am concerned that some incoming traffic will not adhere to this and meet oncoming traffic in the same lane – since there are so many areas people can access the road – would be much harder to monitor and perhaps cause more accidents.

Question 5: Boater – no

Question 6: Impacts of particular concern.

Of particular concern is only minimal essential modification of Rt. 12 within Duck, opposed to infiltration strips to address road flooding.

Additional comments: We are very strong supporters of constructing the bridge and have been for many years. We feel this is imperative from a safety standpoint. Without the bridge there could be major problems in a severe storm, unnecessary loss of life, etc. We do not feel that the general public will use the bridge to any big degree – only those going to Corolla and north, or Duck, and Southern Shores. Traffic going to Kitty Hawk, Nags Head, etc. would not want to use the bridge to get there as it would only take them a lot longer and cost more. Thus the concern about traffic expressed by many Corolla people, would appear unwarranted, in our opinion. We only hope there will not be any further delays, and feel people will be happy to pay a toll to have the bridge. Look at the benefits of the toll road at Chesapeake Parkway.

Thanks for the opportunity to respond, and good luck.

Nancy And Richard Cecil
Duck – 139 Quarterdeck Dr., Port Trinitie
Richmond: 11217 Wellesley Terrace Ct., Richmond, VA 23223
Subject: Response to Mid-Currituck Bridge proposal
Date: Friday, May 28, 2010 10:26 PM
From: Nancy P. Cecil <nc Cecil@verizon.net>
To: <midcurrituck@ntcumblike.org>
Cc: DCBA <DCBAsey@aol.com>

As owners of property in Duck since 1991, we have been watching and supporting development of a mid-Currituck bridge for many years. We are delighted that the current considerations possibly could be built in the next few years. Unfortunately, we were unable to attend the public hearings, but wanted to relay our opinions for consideration.

Question 1: Which alternative do you prefer and why? We support MCB4 – the 2 lane mid-Currituck Bridge and addition of an evacuation lane on US 158 between US 158 and NC168 and the mid-Currituck Bridge plus an evacuation lane on 158 between Wright Memorial Bridge and NC 12.

This plan would greatly assist traffic evacuation in the event of a hurricane. It is currently scary thinking of an evacuation during the summer if a hurricane arose quickly. The area between Southern Shores, Duck, and Corolla would be total gridlock. Currently on a rainy summer day, Route 12 is wall to wall crawling traffic with cars traveling towards US 158, Kitty Hawk or other areas south of the intersection at Southern Shores. It can take an hour to go 5 or 10 miles. I remember one time when it took 3 hours to get from Duck across the Wright Memorial Bridge. It is imperative that there be no modification or four laning of the roads in Duck and Southern Shores in any alternative, and no linear infiltration strips. Minimal road widening on Route 12 is essential. The travel benefits, cost of design, natural resources, and village design of Duck need to be considered and this alternative offers the most benefits in all of these areas.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
If would appear that C2 would be the preferable area and cause less disruption to Corolla Bay, but this decision should likely be best left to the project team as we do not have all of the specific impacts.

Question 3: Do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Option A appears it should be preferable to Aylett property owners, but B's cost is less. Here too, I defer to the project teams opinion.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
If funding is available, the third outbound land would be preferable, allowing those needing to turn off for some reason to still have the turn lane. As they are doing in VA. with the interchanges, they are reversing them in emergencies so it must work (but they have bars across the entrances which wouldn't be feasible). I am concerned that some incoming traffic

will not adhere to this and meet oncoming traffic in the same lane – since there are so many areas people can access the road, would be much harder to monitor and perhaps cause more accidents.

Question 5: Boater – no

Question 6: Impacts of particular concern.
Of particular concern is only minimal essential modification of Rt. 12 within Duck, opposed to infiltration strips to address road flooding.

Additional comments: We are very strong supporters of constructing the bridge and have been for many years. We feel this is imperative from a safety standpoint. Without the bridge there could be major problems in a severe storm, unnecessary loss of life, etc. We do not feel that the general public will use the bridge to any big degree – only those going to Corolla and north, or Duck, and Southern Shores. Traffic going to Kitty Hawk, Nags Head, etc. would not want to use the bridge to get there as it would only take them a lot longer and cost more. Thus the concern about traffic expressed by many Corolla people, would appear unwarranted, in our opinion. We only hope there will not be any further delays, and feel people will be happy to pay a toll to have the bridge. Look at the benefits of the toll road at Chesapeake Parkway.

Thanks for the opportunity to respond, and good luck.

Nancy And Richard Cecil
Duck – 139 Quarterdeck Dr., Port Trinitie
Richmond- 11217 Wellesley Terrace Ct., Richmond, VA 23233

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.
From: Frank [mailto:frankcetera@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 02, 2010 4:25 PM
Subject: BUILD THE BRIDGE

To: Ms Jennifer Harris, P.E.

I Frank Cetera is a resident of 1213 windance Ln. Corolla. I like to respond to the six Questions. No. 1 I favor MCB4. No. 2 I favor C2. No. 3 I favor Option A. No. 4 I prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158. No. 5 will not affect me. No. 6 I have no comment to this Question. Yes I am a strong supporter of this bridge, for safety aspect alone this bridge is needed now! Thank You Frank Cetera.

---

From: Chartrand, James [mailto:James.Chartrand@tdopao.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 8:59 AM
To: midcurruck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Comment Form (not previously attached)

---

From: DCBA Secy@aol.com
Sent: 5/30/2010 12:42:33 P.M. Eastern Daylight Time
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Comment Form (not previously attached)

Duck Community and Business Alliance

P.O. Box 8251, Duck, North Carolina 27949

John Wander, President          Ed Brooks, Vice President          Ed Brooks, Treasurer          Lynne Alterman, Secretary

Board Members – Steve Alterman, Jon Brit, Lisa Newbern, Don Ziebe

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: James Chartrand
Street Address: 1226 Indian Trail Drive Apt/Suite #
City, State, Zip__Downingtown, PA 19335__

Note: I am an owner in Ship’s Watch, Duck, NC

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurruck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?
I prefer MCB2 because it would cause the least amount of change to the northern Outer Banks area.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
I prefer C1 as this area would cause less traffic congestion.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
I prefer Option B as it will have less impact on the area.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
I prefer to reverse the center turn lane as it would be the most cost effective and least disruptive solution.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered? I am concerned about heavier traffic through Duck on weekends if the bridge is built. Will there be any type of route guidance on 158 to advise drivers of which route is best for congestion, etc?

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

N/A

Additional Comments:

I am concerned about heavier traffic through Duck on weekends if the bridge is built. Will there be any type of route guidance on 158 to advise drivers of which route is best for congestion, etc?

I am also very concerned that our beach properties will be highly vulnerable to break-ins. There is a satellite Sheriff’s Office in Corolla! However, Whalehead Beach has hundreds of homes! The bridge would provide easy access to and from unoccupied houses for anyone intending to burglarize those houses! A toll will not deter these
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Release Center Lane

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Not AT THIS TIME

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

M/A

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Opinion
Date: Friday, June 4, 2010 5:33 PM
From: clapperca@aol.com
To: <midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org>

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699

Dear Jennifer Harris,

I am writing to express my opinion concerning the Mid-Currituck Bridge. I vote in favor of constructing the bridge. I am not in favor of expanding the roads, especially Route 12 thru the town of Duck, NC.

Sincerely,

Carol Clapper
Dear Jennifer Harris,

I am writing to express my opinion concerning the Mid-Currituck Bridge. I vote in favor of constructing the bridge. I vote not to expand the roads especially 12 thru the town of Duck.

Sincerely,

Harold Clapper
From: steven clarke
To: midcurritucken@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 2:39 PM
Subject: Mid-County Bridge

I am a resident of Currituck Co (Harbinger), and a licensed real estate broker with an office in Dare Co. (Duck).

I am writing in opposition to the Option MCB4 as the recommended alternative for the construction of a mid-Currituck bridge. Writers with far more time, developed arguments, and eloquence have no doubt weighed in with the same opposition, but my basic position is that the proposed benefits do not justify the cost. The construction of this bridge will do little to alleviate the congested traffic found on the Outer Banks approximately 12 Saturday afternoons each year, and during the rest of the time may worsen the traffic and hasten overdevelopment of this fragile coastal area.

Traffic on Saturdays in the summer will still back up west of the Wright Memorial Bridge as no one going to any community other than Corolla will benefit from the MCB. The area around Duck will still be the bottleneck that it is currently. The traffic on the MCB itself will likely experience periodic stoppages due to traffic accidents and emergency vehicles. Weekend "day-trpper" traffic coming from Hampton Roads will likely further congest the areas around the Corolla terminus. Hurricane evacuation will not be assisted as evacuation times and patterns will still be primarily determined by individual decisions about when and by what route to leave the area. Unless the toll-cost is held to a minimum, which might jeopardize financing, many drivers will bypass the toll, eliminating a major justification (worker's time/expense) for the bridge. Funding for the MCB has never been discussed in detail, with officials always hopeful but never disclosing, leading me to believe that ultimately the State of NC will be forced to bear the brunt of the costs.

This MCB seems to work well for a few development interests in Corolla, for the politicians of Currituck who crave an increased tax base, and for the residents of Southern Shores and Duck who tire of the summer Saturday traffic. And they are all for it if someone else is paying the bill. If Currituck County residents were asked to fund this alternative, do you really believe they would be so supportive?

I am opposed.

Steve Clarke
Broker, ABR, GRI, CRS, REALTOR®
the outerbanks4sale team
“opening doors at the beach”
www.outerbanks4sale.com

Resort Realty
PO. Box 8147-Duck Station
Duck, NC 27949
local # 252.261.8686
cell # 252.202.2197
toll-free 1.800.545.3908
internet fax 1.866.233.7259

From: noniworm@aol.com
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri May 14 17:39:06 2010
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

My name is Courtney Clements. I have a cottage in Southern Shores, 23 Porpoise Run. I feel strongly that a second bridge be constructed. The Mid-Currituck Bridge would alleviate traffic to the northern communities (Duck and north of Duck). It will also relieve the traffic congestion in the southern communities from Southern Shores, as well as back over the Currituck Bridge to those communities. The auto noise, auto congestion, fumes would be relieved with a second bridge. I can see this as a positive, to all communities.

I live in Richmond, Virginia. Unfortunately, I have not been able to attend any of the meetings. However, I wanted to voice my opinion on this issue.

Thank you for your consideration!

Courtney Clements
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: [Redacted Name]
Street Address: 1452 S. West End Blvd. Apt./Suite No.:
City, State, Zip: AY 27921

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I prefer the ER2 option as I believe it will be most beneficial to the surrounding communities and the proposed project.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer the C2 option as it will provide a direct link from the mainland to the proposed bridge.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I prefer Option A as it provides a more direct route to the proposed bridge.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I prefer reversing the center turn lane as it is more convenient and efficient during evacuation.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

I am particularly concerned with the impact on existing homes and businesses and the environment.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its length, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

[Redacted]

Additional comments:

[Redacted]

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception tables or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1678 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27605-1679
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@nctrunkpike.com

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: W. COGGIN
Street Address: 7 GINGUITE TRAIL Apt/Suite No:
City, State, Zip: 55312025, NC 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB4 is my best balance of the many options considered. The great costs and local impacts of MCB2 and MC2
against the alternative ER2 is not made.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
No preference - value them functionally related

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
No preference

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Please place a 3rd outbound lane as it will provide an extremely valuable option to move traffic.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

No. This is an extremely difficult DEC.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

N/A.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1679
Or E-mail: mctcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project  
Public Comment Form  
Open House and Public Hearing  
May 19, 2010

Name: Phyllis Cole
Street Address: 1200 Ocean Trail  Apt./Suite No: __________
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB4: Better for the least amount of disturbance to existing residential properties

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2 – Make sense for the trajectory to land in a commercialized area & avoid disturbance to existing residential properties

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

No preference

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

We should utilize the existing paved surface. It's more economical.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

I understand environmental concerns for the construction of the bridge. I feel the relocation of seal colonies as well as the major reduction in safety issues should offset the environmental concerns.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location, where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Due to twenty-five years plus resident, I can't fully express how desperately we NEED this bridge. For safety reasons, we have no access to medical facilities or in way to evacuate during emergencies, especially hurricanes. PLEASE BUILD THIS BRIDGE IMMEDIATELY!

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
* 1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578.

Dear Ms. Harris:

Re: Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge

Please accept this letter as being in support of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. Moreover, I am opposed to alternative ER2 and MCB2 while supporting alternative MCB4.

I support MCB4 due to the fact that it will reduce traffic to and from the Wright Memorial Bridge and points north on Route 12 including: Southern Shores, Duck, Sanderling, and communities in Currituck County. Secondly, it would be totally irresponsible to add an additional lane on Route 12 creating additional impervious coverage. As you are aware, impervious coverage would only serve to exacerbate those conditions which are causing severe beachfront erosion. In addition, Southern Shores has significant challenges on Ocean Boulevard and Duck Road with respect to drainage.

In summary, I totally support option MCB4 and oppose options ER2 and MCB2.

Sincerely,

Kim B. Coleman

cc: Mayor Hal Denny

---

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Jennifer Collier
Street Address: 168 Shackle Lane
City, State, Zip: Aydlett, NC 27916

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you own or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number. Tell us where boat(s) should be located on Hwy 158 and not near the water and not near shore road. Auxiliary road should remain open.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

June 7, 2010

Ms. Jennifer H Harris, P. E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Dear Ms. Harris,

My name is Linda Conklin and I am a homeowner in Southern Shores, North Carolina. I am writing to strongly urge you to make the building of the Mid-Currituck Bridge across Currituck Sound your preferred alternative for road improvements in the area. In addition, there should not be any widening of Route 12 through Duck and Southern Shores as the building of the bridge would eliminate the need for any such improvements.

As I understand it, one of the primary considerations here is the improvement of hurricane evacuation alternatives. Building the bridge is the only way that will be accomplished. Any widening of Route 12 without the bridge will only accelerate the flow of traffic to Route 158 where the traffic will still need to cross a two lane bridge to leave the area. Widening Route 12 will only serve to widen the top of the funnel without doing anything about the narrow end of that funnel.

The building of the bridge is the only alternative that resolves all your issues.

Linda L. Conklin
1 Sandfiddler Court
Southern Shores, NC 27949
June 7, 2010

Ms. Jennifer R Harris, P. E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578

Dear Ms. Harris,

My name is Walter Conklin and I am a homeowner in Southern Shores, North Carolina. I am writing to strongly urge you to make the building of the Mid-Currituck Bridge across Currituck Sound your preferred alternative for road improvements in the area. In addition, there should not be any widening of Route 12 through Duck and Southern Shores as the building of the bridge would eliminate the need for any such improvements.

As I understand it, one of the primary considerations here is the improvement of hurricane evacuation alternatives. Building the bridge is the only way that will be accomplished. Any widening of Route 12 without the bridge will only accelerate the flow of traffic to Route 158 where the traffic will still need to cross a two lane bridge to leave the area. Widening Route 12 will only serve to widen the top of the funnel without doing anything about the narrow end of that funnel.

The building of the bridge is the only alternative that resolves all your issues.

[Signature]

Walter J Conklin
1 Sandfiddler Court
Southern Shores, NC 27949

From: Dave Conlon <dave.conlon@verizon.net>
Date: Fri, 28 May 2010 13:41:29 -0400
To: <midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org>
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

Just a short note to say as a owner of real estate in Corolla and a native of the Norfolk VA area, I can't wait for the new bridge. Please speed up the approval process as much as possible. Remember we have been waiting on this bridge since the mid 70's.

Please keep the toll as low as possible. We currently have the strange situation that most folks that live on the mainland won't make the 2 hour or more unpaid commute to go around the Currituck Sound to work in Corolla for the summer. Therefore we have a huge number of folks from the former Soviet Union and Poland working here for the summer, and living in third world conditions in Corolla.

The bridge will allow low and medium income folks that live on the mainland work in Corolla for the summer as long as the toll is not prohibitive.

This is a win win situation for everyone if common sense is followed.

Sincerely,

David Conlon
24146 Creekview Lane
Carrollton VA 23314
daveconlon@verizon.net
From: BARBARA COOPER  To: Harris, Jennifer  Sent: Thu Apr 22 23:08:07 2010  Subject: Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge

As a property owner in Ocean Sands in Corolla, I would like to give you my vote of support for the bridge. Knowing that there is quick connectively to the mainland in the event of a hurricane or a possible tsunami would be extremely comforting to me. The traffic situation during the summer weekends is horrendis and quick exit is virtually impossible.

Barbara Cooper
748 Mariner Drive
Corolla, NC 27927

From: John Cooper [mailto:cooperquality@yahoo.com]  Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 4:46 PM  To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org  Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

Dear Ms. Harris:

I have received the latest brochure regarding the options for the Mid-Currituck Bridge and the public comment period.

My brother, Ronnie, and I are the developers of Cooper Landing. We are located less than a half a mile north from where the bridge will likely cross Narrow Shore Rd.

I do see the benefit of the bridge build option. In fact, I think it could be a net positive impact on our community. The downside is that our pristine views will now include a bridge in the distance, and depending on which way the wind blows, we may hear vehicular traffic over the water. I cannot guess the potential traffic impact.

That said, the positive impacts may outweigh the negative. We will all enjoy a quick ride to Corolla, a positive impact on our property values (due to shorter ride to the beach), and of course safety in the case of any evacuations.

Some of the proposed bridge options do concern me GREATLY. Please be advised, my preferences are:

The toll plaza should be as close to Hwy 158 as possible. It would be a bold and brazen interruption in our way of life (on a daily basis) to put a vehicular toll plaza near Aydlett Rd or Narrow Shore Rd. The road on fill dirt (Option B) is a bad idea, and I do not support it.

We are in favor of the bridge landing near Albacore St.
on the Outer Banks (C2). The more northern route (C1) not only lands the bridge closer to a residential area on the Outer Banks, but also makes the bridge far more visible to residents on Narrow Shore Rd in Aydlett. The C2 option reduces our visual impact of the bridge.

Thank you for your time, and I appreciate you taking our concerns and opinions into consideration as we have invested everything we have ever earned into developing property on Narrow Shore Rd. We will be impacted by the bridge, and we are hoping that the impact is positive.

John M. Cooper
President
Cooper Quality Construction, Inc.
252-453-8785
252-207-8877
http://www.cooperqualityconstruction.com/

From: sam cortez [mailto:sam_cortez@charter.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 5:14 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: bridge

I am unable to attend the meeting today, however I am in full support of building the mid-Currituck bridge.

I believe the bridge will not only assist the tourist economy of the entire Outer Banks, but it will also allow full time family residents to live in the Currituck Outer Banks, something that is not now possible due to the lack of schools. It will also allow people to live in the Currituck Outer Banks and commute to work in the Chesapeake area.

It appears funding the bridge through an appropriately large toll can be achieved. The tourists that vacation in the Currituck Outer Banks are price insensitive, and full time residents could be issued a coupon book at a discount.

thanks,

Sam Cortez
252-261-6135
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: J Cotterill
Street Address: 3465 Meridian Way, Suite # and 111 Vireo Way
City, State, Zip: Winston-Salem, NC 27104 and Sanderling, Duck, NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and why?
MCB4 saves environment - would allow traffic to get to mainland in a more timely fashion.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
Leave decision to project team.

5/30/2010

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Option B costs less.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Reverse center lane.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
NA.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the Sound; and your phone number.
NA.

Additional Comments:
Get the damn bridge built... we've been waiting for YEARS!

A toll bridge is a great idea... helps to reduce cost of operation. I still don't understand why the Jones/Manns Harbor Bridge was built before this bridge. Have you ever been on NC 12 on a Saturday morning in the summer between Corolla and Duck? What would happen...
You have my encouragement and support for this project. I think it will ease the traffic jam issues and will bring in more tourists because the traffic and drive will not be as long.

Thank you for your hard work!

Kelly Cox
My name is Gwenn Cruickshanks and I live in Point Harbor... and have for the last 31 years. I find it difficult to understand the negative position of the folks in Aydlett about the bridge. In Pt Harbor, we have not one bridge span, but two bridge spans and it has not adversely affected our property values or our aesthetic quality of life.

There are times when it is necessary to make sacrifices for the greater good - and this is one of those times. I would not like to have all the inevitable deaths which would result from people being trapped by the hurricane and unable to leave the area on my conscience....

- and all for the sake of a pretty view.
Some may scoff at our tourists, but may I remind you that they are the fuel which powers our engine and keep our taxes so low...and have enabled us to build our Currituck government complex and, consequently, they have rights too.

As President of Build the Bridge- Save Our Roads, I can state categorically that we have over 22,000 signatures on our petition supporting the bridge.

We have approximately 20 resolutions of support from every municipality in Dare and Currituck – as well as the Dare and Currituck County Boards of Commissioners.
Indeed, The Currituck County Board of Commissioners have passed resolutions of support for the bridge each year for the last ten years.

Four public opinion polls have been taken and the results show that residents and property owners favor the building of the bridge.

(1) - The Center for Social Research at East Carolina University,
(2) - the Currituck Outer Banks Green Poll,
(3) - the North Carolina Toll Authority,
and a (4) follow up Green poll all have shown that no matter how the question was
asked, or by whom it was asked, Currituck Outer Banks residents and property owners favored the construction of the Mid-County Bridge. Not a single study has shown the opposite.

This is an overwhelming endorsement of support for the MCSB – not the minority voices of a few which we have heard. On our petition we have signatures of people both from Aydlett and Corolla.

Hurricane evacuation is a primary consideration for the construction of the MCSB.

I wonder how many here have been caught in the gridlock that occurs when there is a hurricane evacuation. I have and it is not pretty.

Contrary to all the planning in the world, people will not leave unless they believe the
hurricane will hit where they are. Hence the inevitable gridlock.

I would like to thank the North Carolina Turnpike Authority personally and on behalf of BB-PR for their diligence and efforts – and a particular thanks to Jennifer Harris. Your work is much appreciated.

As is the opportunity to speak to you tonight.

Thank you.

Gwenn Cruickshanks
110 Acorn Lane
Point Harbor, NC 27964
252/491-8515
Dear Ms. Harris,

My husband and I reside at 750 Ridge Point Drive in Corolla and are concerned about the plans to expand Route 12 to a four lane road directly next to our neighborhood. This expansion brings far too many cars within very close proximity to the backyards of my neighbors causing a considerable increase in traffic noise and a visual eyesore. The community of Corolla is a small, quaint town and the expansion of Route 12 will ruin the character and living experience of our beach community. All great vacation destinations have traffic problems at times, but increasing traffic flow at the expense of the people who choose to live in Corolla is unfair. Please consider scaling back to a three lane road.

Sincerely,
Linda and William Curran

---

From: Roxy Darling
To: Harris, Jennifer
Cc: v.audlett@yahoo.com; Oetheridge@co.currituck.nc.us; janet.taylor@co.currituck.nc.us; Jroger@co.currituck.nc.us; ogregor1@inteliport.com; commissioners@co.currituck.nc.us; Perdue, Bev; The Honorable William C. Owens; Marisb@ncleg.net; Stan@outerbanksrentals.com
Sent: Wed May 26 20:03:13 2010
Subject: PROPOSED MCB

To All of You who hold our resources in your hands-

To all who DON'T seem too concerned about this proposed bridge: there are many of us who ARE. Granted, we citizens and visitors are not an enormous voice in this quiet little corner of our world, because Currituck County does not have any incorporated towns, but we feel very strongly about this issue nonetheless, and demand to be heard, and respected, in our requests. Has not this ridiculous proposal gone on long enough, tearing at the hearts of our residents, and threatening our rural and quiet way of life? We are a very small corner of North Carolina, we demand little of our government, but we ARE demanding this: REMOVE this proposal from the books once and for all, and concentrate our limited resources on much needed projects-almost too numerous to name, but better pay for our teachers, and a safe bridge to Hatteras Island being two that are desperately needed. This bridge is a self serving project for a few. Of no concern to them is our delicate and fragile ecosystem and environment. Of no concern to them is the future of their children, or ours. Of no concern to them are the reasons that so many visitors come to this part of the Outer Banks-for the undeveloped sanctuary it is-the tiny bit that is left. Please convince us what exactly it is about this project that is worth destroying irreversibly this exquisitely fragile piece of land and body of water. Please explain, and as elected leaders of The people, it is your graven duty, to the humble residents of the small community of Aydellet EXACTLY WHY it is necessary to destroy and/or compromise their homes and roads and night sky. Perhaps you cannot imagine living in a place where at night you can not only look up, but look all around the horizon at a black night sky-filled with stars and planets, some so bright that they reflect off the darkened waters of our beloved Currituck Sound. We do not desire THIS bridge with all its accompanying horrors-flooding and binding light, crime, noise, pollution. Nor is there a REAL need for it. Curiously, we can, and sadly do, destroy, but we cannot rebuild our environment. Look at the Gulf of Mexico, lest you disagree. Roxy Darling of Waterlily, NC
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Rob Davey
Street Address: 902 Emerald Ct., Apt./Suite No.
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Comments: Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to share comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the BR2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

[ ] MCB4, overall, it makes the most sense. Fewer environmental impacts, minor community impact.

If you prefer MCB3 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

[ ] C1, because it is a largely undeveloped area (Corolla Bay), whereas the bridge over the Indian River would cut through and disrupt established businesses and recreate typical Currituck Sound.

If you prefer MCB3 or MCB4, do you prefer mainline approach road design Option A or B and why?

[ ] Option B, because the corridor does not have the same issues as Option A and it is better for the community.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

[ ] Reversing the center turn lane automatically! It would add a 3rd outbound lane, thus allowing people to evacuate. It wouldn’t disrupt the status quo and add unnecessary costs.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that you of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

[ ] Only the congestion that would be created with Center Corridor C2...

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its length, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

[ ] N/A

Additional comments:

[ ] The longer, the better!

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1678 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27606-1678
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdotmail.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: Brad Davis  
To: Harris, Jennifer  
Sent: Sat May 29 10:19:16 2010  
Subject: Mid County Bridge - Currituck  

I wanted to spend a few minutes to express my opposition to the Mid County Bridge in Currituck. The points of my opposition center on the following:

- Poor Location Planning
- Negative Impact to Corolla, NC
- Public/Private Funding
- Evacuation Planning
- Environmental Impact

The Mid County Bridge has suffered from poor planning in regards to its track across the sound to Corolla. The chosen location of the bridge has illuminated the lack of understanding of our county, and ruins several key elements that make Corolla attractive to our guests. As tourists stand atop one of the largest Corolla attractions, the Currituck Beach Lighthouse, their once picturesque view of the Currituck Sound at sunset will now be plagued by a view of a concrete bridge. In addition to ruining the views of Corolla, the bridge also threatens to ruin the quiet ambiance of Corolla as well. What makes Corolla attractive to tourists in the first place? It is a beach that takes an extra hour to get to due to the current road conditions. And yet, countless tourists pass Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck every year to vacation here. I propose this is due to the simple seclusion of the town; the seclusion brings only the tourists looking for peace of mind and a separation between the general hustle of life and vacation. Putting a bridge directly to the town of Corolla essentially makes the town into Kitty Hawk; soon, tourists will pass this beach for another further out of the way of their daily lives, offering the seclusion that Corolla once offered them. The bridge is threatening much more than a beautiful view; it threatens what makes Corolla attractive. The bridge threatens to turn our weekly tourist industry into a daily tourist industry, where day trippers from Virginia pay a toll to flood the beach. Day trippers bring with them much more strain on county resources, such as beach accesses, water and sewage treatment; I fear that Currituck has not properly estimated the strain this will have on the town of Corolla.

By choosing Aydlett as the cross point for the bridge, the State of North Carolina has chosen one of the widest cross points for the Currituck Sound. In doing so, the State has raised not only the cost of the bridge, but also the concerns of our residents. Some have made arguments that the bridge intends to serve the needs of the public, providing an outlet for Corolla residents to have access to Currituck Services. This argument is weak; Knotts Island is home to many more full time residents than Corolla, and has been serviced by a ferry very successfully since 1962. If this bridge served only to meet the needs of residents, ferry services from Corolla would be suitable and less costly.

The next point I would like to address is Public/Private funding through a turnpike authority. One of the responsibilities of North Carolina to its taxpayer base is fiscal responsibility. By building roads without funding, the state is turning a blind eye to those responsibilities. In situations where the State lacks funding for projects which are time sensitive and essential to the health and safety of our residents, private funding may be appropriate. When the state seeks private funding because of public backlash or lack of foresight and planning, taking private money only provides an increase in potential conflicts of interest. There are potential conflicts
of interest in who the funding is ultimately coming from, developers seeking to make money on the new bridge and their relation to public officials. Private industry seeks to cut cost in order to increase revenue; therefore, there are potential conflicts of interest in the development of the bridge, like how many steps are being taken to protect the environment versus the cost of bridge. Additionally, as I have stated, this bridge has been marketed by the state as “good for residents”. If this was truly targeted to the needs of the residents, charging residents for something the state considers “necessary to the core resources” seems ludicrous. Having a toll on the bridge alone illuminates, in my opinion the true motivator of this bridge: $5 money $5.

The State has also suggested evacuation as a key motivator behind the bridge. The safety of residents and tourists is key after all. However, the location of the Mid County Bridge does not alleviate the burden of evacuation **at all**. Evacuation can be seen as a simple formula, where a volume of people need to leave an area. The volume of people need to pass through a limited pass [like a funnel] to completely leave the Outer Banks. When people currently evacuate Corolla, they are forced to drive through Southern Shores on Highway 12, where they are connected to Highway 158, taking this north to the funnel points of Virginia, or breaking off in Barco, NC to head west towards Elizabeth City, NC. So, in the end, Barco and Virginia are the endpoints for Corolla residents. By building the Mid County bridge, the endpoints for the evacuating residents will be Barco, NC and Virginia. There has been no alleviation of total number of cars to the road. And therefore, the traffic moving through the two end points will not be alleviated. Now, instead of evacuates potentially being stuck on Highway 12 during a storm, we have them pinned to Highway 12 and a bridge.

Lastly, the environmental impact for the Mid County Bridge will be extreme; the planned bridge will cut through Maple Swamp. Maple Swamp is home to many species of wildlife which would be undoubtedly harmed by another road cutting through the north side of the swamp. The road will undoubtedly impact the natural flow of the swamp, both in regards to the water drainage and wildlife movement. In addition to the effects on the swamp, the bridge’s proposed route will harm the Sound, as runoff from the bridge will drain directly into the water. The Currituck Sound is a delicate environment which will now be burdened with additional motor oil run off and noise from cars; I believe this will be detrimental to both fish and subsequently migratory birds which rely on these waters for sustenance.

I have been blessed to grow up along the beautiful waters of the Currituck Sound. I have sat in screened porches and have listened to the rain move over the Sound during the evening summer thunderstorms. I have felt the crisp winter air, while sitting on our pier with my eyes closed, listening to the calls of the migratory birds. I have watched the sun rise over the Outer Banks, its red haze reflecting over the water. Nothing will be more heartbreaking then when I wake up to the sounds of traffic, horns and engines, the sight of gray and black asphalt replacing the once vibrant canvas of our morning sunrise over the Sound. Once this bridge is in place, it will set into motion a number of changes that can never be undone. It will forever change our home, the destinations of our tourists, and the beautiful, serene ambiance of the Northern Outer Banks.
Re: DEIS Comments – Currituck M’d-County Bridge

Ms Harris:

My comments are divided into three sections. First, a general summary of main points. Second, general dissenting comments, and third, specific comments on the DEIS. Please take the time to review this document. I would appreciate your consideration of all of its points.

I. Main Point Summary

1. I support the No-Build Alternative.
2. Traffic is not congested 98% of the time. (Actually less than ~12 hours of 15 Saturdays per year. 8580/8760 hours = 98%). Therefore, the expenditure of $700,000,000+ is unwarranted for this minor hindrance, especially to benefit so relatively few North Carolina residents.
3. The current traffic problems could be alleviated by expanding check-in and checkout times for rental properties to Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, and extended for more than daylight hours, instead of the current 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday schedule.
4. Modification of two intersections, one at Southern Shores, NC (Hwy 158 / Hwy 12) and the other at Barco, NC (Hwy 158 / Hwy 168) with flyover left turns at each are the only modifications, and expenditures, that could be justified by the lack of traffic congestion during the vast majority of time.
5. It is horrendously unfair to burden the majority of NC taxpayers with this huge cost, at anytime, but especially during an economic recession. Benefiting a small portion of the population by burdening the majority is absolutely ludicrous, un-American, and bordering on criminal.
6. I have sailed, and would like to be able to continue to sail, in the Currituck Sound in the area of the proposed bridge. The type of bridge proposed is a major hindrance to that activity. I have noticed several sailboats traversing and crossing the sound off Aydlett, recently. In addition to sailboats and sailboards, there is a large amount of powerboat activity throughout the year in this area. Some waterfowl hunting craft and commercial fishing vessels have extended cabins that...
require eight to ten feet of clearance. The sailboats I have seen extend to as much as 25-30 feet above the water. One raised section of the proposed bridge is inadequate, and any bridge at all runs what is one of the best sailing venues I have ever had the pleasure of enjoying.

7. The instance of John Page falling asleep in front of the gathered audience at the Currituck Extension Office presentation was highly unprofessional, insulting, and obviously representative of the attitude of the consultants, the NC Turnpike Authority, and the NC DOT.

8. One general comment regarding the Environmental Science portion of the DEIS. The evidence presented is admittedly presumptive, as stated in many places, highly speculative, and based on extrapolation of studies performed on areas that may, or may not be, representative of the Currituck Mid-County Bridge, and its alternatives. There is only one incontrovertible, unquestionable fact related to the impact of the environment of these proposals. The impact will in some measurable, and possibly highly measurable amount, and to a currently unknown extent, be most assuredly and unfortunately, unnecessarily, negatively affected.

II. General Comments

I would like to express my extreme opposition to the option of construction of any mid-Currituck County bridge. Therefore, I prefer the No-Build Alternative first, with a second preference of ER2.

My reasons are related to the entire premise for the mid-county bridge being flawed by inane, unsupported logic, affected by collusion that borders on what is in my opinion, possibly criminal activity by political office holders, developers, the NC Turnpike Authority, and the NC DOT. The activities of the aforementioned groups are egregious enough, as I see it, to warrant investigation by the Attorney General of the State of North Carolina.

First, the bridge project’s cost exceeds what any citizen should consider as a reasonable expenditure, especially related to a two-lane bridge, which would obviously become immediately inadequate based on the so-called projections of “need” related to any hurricane evacuation, and to be funded by the vast majority of NC taxpayers, for the benefit of a miniscule percentage of the state’s population. There is no possible way that tolls can be levied that would pay for this project, and completely fund its construction.

The bridge option, and likely the entire road expansion project, could completely be eliminated as a necessity, with one minor adjustment. If the developers and real estate agents (and their only slightly removed paid-for-politicians) would simply stagger the check-in / checkout times for some portion of the weekly rental properties in Dare and Currituck Counties, no bombastically grandiose action, such as what will easily become a $750,000,000+ expenditure, would be needed. This would save precious funding, during this significant economic downturn, for more important considerations, such as education of a future generation of hopefully more intelligent politicians, developers, and real estate agents.

It is ludicrous to consider such an outlandish expenditure, with its related negative affect on so many people, when it could be so simply mitigated. The stubborn people that stand to benefit from a bridge (the developers and real estate agents that see this as a way to expand the population of the Outer Banks) have purposely refused to make any adjustment to the days and/or times of scheduling, holding those that have loudly complained for so many years, as literal hostages. This is simply an example of “means justifying the ends”, increased development at any cost, utilizing the public as the voice that drives the intended action. The re-scheduling of check-in times could occur on at least two, and maybe three days of the week and for that matter, any hour of the day or night. That adjustment would generate a real boon to the economy. The hiring of additional staff to accommodate multiple days, and evening check-in and checkout. Obviously, if tourists are willing to pay $50+ or more for a toll to cross the bridge, they certainly could absorb any costs related to extending or adjusting the check-in times. The clever but cruel plan by developers is admittedly beyond the imagination, but history and these current events are proving it true.

Simply having one-third of the current renters change on Friday, one-third on Saturday, and one-third on Sunday, would alleviate the back-ups that currently occur on only approximately 15 Saturdays per year. This type of scheduling is common throughout the resort / tourist industry, literally, all over the world. Nowhere have I traveled has such a staunchly strict narrow window of check-in and checkout. This practice is obviously contrived as the ulterior motive, to create a problem that developers will ultimately address. Flexible scheduling works perfectly everywhere else that I know of, such as Myrtle Beach, Orlando, Caribbean resorts, Europe, and with major timeshare groups such as Interval International. There are multiple change-out days that occur at each of these more sophisticated destinations.

Additionally, modifications of the Southern Shores Hwy 168 to Hwy 12 interchange, with a north bound, left hand turn fly-over, and the Barco Hwy 168 to Hwy 158 interchange with a west bound, left hand turn fly-over, would eliminate bottlenecks that cause traffic congestion throughout Currituck County. Synchronization of traffic signal timing in Moyock would alleviate congestion in the north in Currituck County.

The refusal to pursue these types of solutions is apparently intentional, as the delay in doing so extends to a period prior to the most recent Hwy 168/158 widening, when physical modifications to interchanges could easily, and more economically, have been performed. Along with the DOT establishment of a development industry-heavy “Authority” to use taxpayers’ monies to meet the self-serving goal of increasing population, the appearance of the proposed bridge and the alternatives appear highly suspicious.

The entire idea of placing what will be the longest bridge in North Carolina at one of the widest portions of Currituck Sound is absolutely the most ridiculous idea any sane person could imagine. Even small children and those with mental deficiencies traverse a mud puddle at its narrowest point, certainly not at its widest. The alternative to utilize the
existing NC Highway 12 right-of-way from the Virginia state line to Corolla was immediately discounted as impossible, without proper investigation into the reasons that make it so sensible. Road improvements and relatively minor construction from Highway 168 north of Moyock, to a short high rise bridge across the Intracoastal Waterway (crossing the northern portion of the North Landing River) from Gibbs Woods to Mackey Island, then surface roads across Knotts Island to a short bridge to Carolla, joining the existing right-of-way toward Corolla, would be so much more reasonable if the goal was to simply “get people to and from the Outer Banks”. Construction of roads in National Parks and Seashores happens, if it is pursued, planned, and presented properly. Utilization of extended, raised wildlife passages would prevent negative impact in those areas. It could even serve to provide a spectacular vantage point for viewing the birds and wild areas. Additionally, this action would eliminate the “dead end” nature of the current situation at Carova, which will not be remedied by a mid-county bridge.

Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), the recent presentations by the Turnpike Authority, and the calculatedly purposeful actions related above, literally made me ill, and frankly, the audacity of its presentation was an insult of my intelligence.

The presentation of maps, and the computer-generated illustrations included in the DEIS are cheesy, confusing, one-sided, and purposely misleading. Illustrations of the highway exchanges show little-to-no traffic (a true panacea, but unrealistic), the computer-generated view of the bridge as it extends from the Aydelott shoreline eastward to Corolla, simply fades away, like it disappears about one-half mile from shore, and the changing orientation of the maps presented, surely confused all but the experienced topographers. One map shows the Corolla area bridge landing from an eastern vantage point, with Highway 12 heading north, then switches, according to the presenter, to “the same view”, but oriented with a western vantage point, and Highway 12 still extending to the north, with the explanation of “still looking at the same approach...”. This was highly confusing. The maps contained small, or no orientation clues, such as labeling of the Atlantic Ocean versus the Currituck Sound, no compass rose, and no label indicating “Eastward facing” or “Westward facing” orientation. Those illustrations appeared intentionally misleading and confusing, especially considering they were generated by consultants hired by the Turnpike Authority, whose Board of Directors is rife with representatives of the development and real estate industry, and whose very existence depends on spending public funds, and whom did spend public funds, to provide a second class presentation, and a clearly biased DEIS.

The most disgusting portion of the May 20, 2010 Turnpike Authority public presentation that took place at the Currituck County Extension Office was related to the sheer lack of respect provided to speakers by the male presenter, I believe to be John Page, of Parsons Brinckerhoff, as he could not see fit to keep himself awake while a member of the audience (at least the anti-bridge supporters) spoke. He had no problem being actively attentive while the pro-bridge developers and real estate agents blathered on. How insulting that he sat in front of the audience and literally fell asleep. He could not see fit to stand up and refresh himself, but amazingly appeared wide-awake and interested when he desired. This was the epitome of unprofessionalism. His presentation of the maps was completely confusing, and was a boringly worthless waste of my time. His condescending attitude was evident, with his smarmy demeanor and lack of enthusiasm. He showed no real interest in educating anyone of the proposed routes, and with the helter-skelter orientation of the maps (as referenced above), I would have left the public hearing more confused about them than prior to arriving, had I not briefly studied the maps in the adjoining exhibit hall for 5 minutes prior to his presentation. His amateurish behavior was appalling and absolutely disgusting. I refrained from openly engaging him only because I desired to maintain a congenial, polite, proper Currituckian-nature in a public setting. Anyone paying a company to perform as Mr. Page did on that evening is being short-changed, and the worst part about that is that it is again, with public funds.

It was requested that information regarding boating in Currituck Sound be provided. I have in the past, and plan to again, sail a Prindle catamaran in the area of the proposed bridge. The mast on that boat is 18 feet long, and when mounted on the boat, it extends to 20+ feet above the water line. It is unthinkable that one of the most suitable sailing venues on the east coast could be ruined by placement of a bridge across its middle. In addition to myself, I know of several sailboard enthusiasts, and even some taller sailing vessels that use the area of the proposed mid-county bridge. One portion of high-rise is not sufficient to prevent the runation of such a fine body of sailing water. I have also hunted on that body of water using “gas” boats that had cabins that approached ten feet from the water line. I have water skied, boated, and swum in that area of Sound, and the thought of a bridge bisecting it disgusts me. Again, other alternatives are more logical.

III. DEIS Specific Comments

The DEIS is flawed in many areas. I will outline them below.

1. The cover sheet.

   The flashy cover page is unnecessary. No grand pictures are needed on an official document. This immediately sets the tone of this document as a cheap sales pitch with obviously too much funding. That type of graphic artistry is suitable for a sales brochure, not a document of this type. It is highly disappointing that again public funds were wasted in this manner. It does however uncover the attitude and personality of the writers. All flash, no substance. It demonstrates that the document is completely bourgeois. This kind of presentation does not fool anyone, and is insulting in so many ways.

2. Section 1-2, page 1-3. Purpose of and Need for Action Section “Question – What needs is the project trying to meet? Bullet point Three. The need to reduce substantially hurricane evacuation times from the Outer Banks for residents and visitors who use US 158 and NC 168 as an evacuation route.”

   This determination of “need” is questionable and flawed in several ways. The premise that simply building a bridge that will get people off the Outer Banks, does not eliminate the hazards related to a hurricane, nor does it automatically evacuate the people from the...
potentially hazardous area. Without substantially improving the mainland roads, all the way to Interstate 95, the volume of people being evacuated along existing Hwy 168 and the improved Hwy 158 corridors, along with the local residents that will be fleeing, will bottleneck at Elizabeth City Causeway Bridge, and in Moyock. This is especially true, and magnified exponentially, when the Virginia DOT closes the northbound Hwy 168 passage into Virginia, as has happened in the past evacuations. Therefore, many people will be trapped in their vehicles in an approaching hurricane, possibly even onto the proposed bridge.

Additionally, the increased transient and permanent population that the bridge will bring negates any initial net traffic flow improvement, especially in an evacuation.

One of the most ludicrous aspects of the bridge relates to the construction of a two-lane facility. I know of no two-lane bridges or highways, nor any four-lane bridges or highways, which were not considered inadequate in size almost immediately upon opening. The expenditure of mobilizing a construction company twice versus once justifies the extra cost of a four-lane bridge. A future expansion to four lanes will be unable to utilize the current bridge foundation structure, requiring a second round of pile driving, and the grade surface approaches will require a second roadway site work project, at a most likely, doubled expenditure. If a bridge is to be built, spend the extra money now to expand it to four lanes. A two-lane bridge makes no sense to anyone, except construction contractors. It guarantees the contractors will have work in the near future. What is the difference when you consider spending $750 million? Add another $250 - $500 million and do the thing right, or do not do it at all. (In ten years, that $250-$500 million expansion to four-lanes will cost an additional $325-$650 million+ at a 4% annual inflation rate, which is a conservative inflation rate.)

3. Section 1-2, page 1-3. One paragraph below third bullet point.

The project area’s main thoroughfares (US 158 and NC 12) are becoming increasingly congested, and congestion will become even more severe in the future. This statement supports my reasoning in Item number 2 above. The bridge will obsolete immediately upon completion.

5. Section 1-2, page 1-4 “Increasing congestion is causing travel time between the Currituck County mainland and the Currituck County Outer Banks to increase, especially during the summer.”

The travel time to the Outer Banks is absolutely uncumbered during 98% (8580 hours / 8760 hours) of the year. On 13 Saturdays, and for only 12 hours of those days, drive time between the Virginia-North Carolina State line to the Southern Shores Hwy 12 and Hwy 158 intersection, and north to the Currituck Outer banks is “extended” only because of the check-in / check-out times are not sufficiently staggered. On Saturdays immediately prior to Memorial Day, and Immediately after Labor Day, there is absolutely no more delay in this trip that on any other open road in the United States. Additionally, during the timeframe of November through March, the road is virtually deserted. You are able to drive for miles without seeing another car during almost any time of the day. It is outrageous to consider the action of building a bridge at the predicted cost (which no one should believe is liberal enough to cover inherent cost overruns and inflation).

Additionally, the disruption of so many innocent peoples’ lives, to accommodate the few days per year when the mismanagement of scheduled check-in and check-out times, along with short-sighted highway planning related to the Southern Shores and the Barco intersections, is highly illogical. The only justifiable reason, considering the facts stated above, is pure greed by developers, real estate agents, and politicians.

6. Section 1-2, page 1-4. “The uncongested travel time for this representative trip, allowing for stops at signalized intersections, is approximately 1 hour. Under base year (2006) conditions, this trip takes approximately 1 hour and 8 minutes on a summer weekday, and approximately 1 hour and 42 minutes on a summer weekend. In 2035, travel time for this trip is expected to be just over 2 hours on the summer weekday and more than 3 hours and 53 minutes on the summer weekend. Increases in travel time would result from increasing peak period congestion. These travel times would be even longer when accidents occur or if backups occur at signalized intersections.”

This entire example cited above is completely irrelevant, if the scheduling of check-in and checkout times were staggered to three days, instead of one, and extended to evening hours instead of only during daytime hours. Additionally, modification of the Southern Shores and Barco intersections could mitigate traffic much more economically than a bridge.

7. Section 1-2, page 1-4. “Hurricane evacuation times for residents and visitors who use US 158 and NC 168 as a hurricane evacuation route far exceed the state designated standard of 18 hours.”

I have the same response to this statement as in my Item number 2, above. The inherent population increase caused by a bridge will out-weight the short-term traffic relief. Another shortsighted action, designed to garner future development and ruination of what was once a beautiful place. With a bridge, the expansion of what Corolla has become will spread farther, furthering the ruin. What a shame.
8. Section 1.3, page 1-5. “What purpose will the project serve?”

As with my Item number 2 above, the use of the word substantial is subjective, therefore “substantially” irrelevant in convincing me of its importance, and its use in multiple places in the answers to the question serves to support the bombastic hyperbole presented with this entire endeavor. Using your definition, this document is a “substantial” waste of funds and effort on the part of many people, and it “substantially” creates “substantial” ill will when considering the “substantially” real reason for the proposal is to provide “substantial” financial gain to people who do not know how to make a living in any other manner than to “substantially” ruin peoples’ lives. Does it work for you?

9. Section 2.0, page 2-1. “Alternatives”

The alternatives presented do not include modification of the Southern Shores and Barco intersections, nor do they address the deliberate and unwavering rental property scheduling, so this entire section is verbose and misleading. The presented bridge option is obviously the only choice of the Turnpike Authority, and its presentation as an “alternate” is insulting.

10. Figure 2-2.

How ironic. This photo intends to show the added hurricane evacuation lane. However, it mistakenly, I am sure, shows the exact circumstances that support the No-Build alternative. Please note the tremendous amount of traffic present on the road, as is the case 98% of the time. One, or maybe two, cars are within view on a five-lane highway, over the distance of, conservatively, approximately one-quarter of a mile, maybe even one-half of a mile. Oh, the humanity of such a horrible traffic jams. People may perish sitting in that tremendous delay.

Once again, the evidence on NO NEED presents itself. There is simply no need for the type of expenditure, and disruption, which is being presented. Please, recognize the true reality of the situation and stop this nonsense.

11. Figure 2-5. Upper right photo of the “Existing/No-Build Alternative”.

Thank you, once again, you support the entire argument against the need to build a bridge. The amount of traffic that picture is representative of the situation 98% of the time.

11. Figure 2-6, Bridge Corridor C-1 Photo Simulations and “Existing/No-Build Alternative” Photos.

Where is all the traffic that would be stopped at the intersection, if there is such a great need for this bridge? This, calculated rendition of a nice, unfettered traffic flow, along with the lack of a traffic signal (how’s that supposed to work?), supports the bourgeois nature of this document. A slimy sales pitch for something few want, and no one truly needs. Typical sales drivel.

Are you seriously trying to depict a multi-lane intersection with our traffic signal lights, or are they on there, but one would need a magnifying glass to see them? They obviously do not extend over all lanes of traffic, and their omission, since you must perceive them to carry a negative connotation, is evidently purposeful. This is insulting, especially considering this document was written by the supposed gurus of transportation, The Turnpike Authority. If this were not so highly serious, it would be spectacularly humorous.

Again, the “Existing/No-Build Alternative” Photos show the reason a bridge is not needed. There is the typical situation of NO TRAFFIC in either of the photos.

12. Section 2.1.2.3, page 2-10. With Option B, the US 158 interchange would not include the toll plaza (see Figure 2-9). The approach to the bridge over Currituck Sound would be a road placed on fill within Maple Swamp. Wildlife passages would be incorporated into the fill. The preliminary design developed to assess impacts includes five wildlife passages: two bridges with 180 foot spans at the east and west sides of the swamp, a 12 foot by 8 foot box culvert at the center of the swamp, and two 43 inch by 68 inch pipes for passage of reptiles and amphibians. Exclusionary fencing along the road also is assumed.

Fences and passageways remind me of zoos, not real natural habitat. I somehow get song lyrics like, “They paved paradise and put up a parking lot”, or “Don’t fence me in” in mind when I see these contrivances. This is the typical automatic response from people that want to get around an issue, not really address it. The absolute best response is no response. No changes should be made, because they are not needed for the vast majority of people. This entire action is beneficial to only a small portion of the population, but the majority of taxpayers will fund this monstrosity. It reeks of political corruption, and approaches communist ideals. DON’T TREAD ON ME, with that snake, also is appropriate here.

13. Figure 2-10, Option A, Aydlett Area Photo Simulation

How convenient. The bridge appears to fade away, out-of-view, out-of-sight, and intentionally, out-of-mind. How can that be? You can easily see the Corolla Lighthouse, The Whalhead Club, and numerous houses along the Outer Banks from Aydlett. How would the bridge that is much closer, and directed southeastward across the sound simply disappear from view? Again, another example of people trying to persuade others of a situation that is completely different from reality, by using trickery and attempted subtle calming modifications to make the proposal somehow more palatable. This is a type of subliminal persuasion, which as I understand, is illegal. That, however, is unsurprising.
14. Regarding the “environmental science” portion of the DEIS, I have made comment in my Summary portion above, and maintain that the basis of the claims and facts included in the DEIS are highly speculative, subjective, and unfound. It is only with the most liberal extrapolation that any of the conclusions presented can be considered as factual, and applicable to a future project.

Please consider that the Gulf of Mexico BP oil spill is predicted by computer models to have a devastating affect on beach tourism, to points north of North Carolina, as announced today. It appears highly likely that there may be no need to manage traffic when this occurs. This possibility carries more certainty than most of the conjecture your DEIS predicts. The oil spill is occurring now. It is not only something that just may occur, although, like your speculation, it is only considered a possibility, and that the environmental effects that are predicted will happen.

The point is that the true affects on the environment, by the bridge and its alternatives, are an even larger unknown possibility than the spilled oil.

This is the conclusion of my comments on the subject DEIS. I hope that you can see the folly in the entire presentation of the bridge and its alternatives, and begin the process of using more common sense and more reasonably priced alternatives, such as the few I have proposed. There is so much wrong with the proposed actions, especially related to inequities and unfairness, and the negative affect on the majority of persons involved, that it amazes me that we have advanced to the point of actually considering these unthinkable and idiotic actions. I had more faith in the Government of North Carolina, more trust in the industry of development and real estate, and more naivety regarding the length of effort that people would reach, to make money. I truly consider this activity as organized rape of what is good, fair, and natural.

Sincerely,

G. B. Davis
Gary B. Davis, CHMM
574 Cooper Garrett Rd.
Moyock, NC 27958
232-435-6561
From: Joe Davis [mailto:joe.davis@symmetryx.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:26 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Please Build the Bridge - MCB4 Corridor C2

Hi,

My wife and I own a house between Duck and Corolla, near Sanderling. We do not venture out on Saturday or Sunday during the vacation (hurricane) season because of the hours we know we will spend in traffic. Outbound traffic backs up past our house towards Corolla and inbound traffic backs up past the Wright Memorial Bridge on both days. Since check in/out days are split between Saturday and Sunday each of those days represents approximately half of the vacation traffic. During an evacuation all of those people are on the road at the same time! Then add to that the people that live in the area and you've got a real mess. The Mid-Currituck Bridge is sorely needed.

In our opinion MCB4 is the correct alternative, with the C2 corridor the best corridor option since it could best serve people in Duck and Corolla, and those of us in between. We do not have enough information on the Maple Swamp crossing to have an opinion to share.

Thanks very much for listening.

Regards,
Joe & Debbie Davis
107 Acorn Oak
Duck, NC
Regarding the Mid-Currituck Bridge

I am writing to express my opposition to the Currituck Mid-County Bridge project which is currently in its final comment period. I have attached a copy of comments regarding issues found in the DEIS. In summary of those comments, it is my position as presented by the DEIS that this bridge fails to meet the objectives set forth in the DEIS.

- Specifically, the DEIS states that the bridge will make traffic at the eastern terminus of the bridge (south of Corolla) worse.
- Per the DEIS, traffic will improve if Rt 12 is widened between Duck and US 158.
- The DEIS does not analyze impact of current widening and improvement to US 158 from Belcross to Camden and on to RT 17 (Project #034430.3) therefore, clearance time is likely to be overstated.
- Traffic counts of possible volumes of usage of the MCB are overstated based on observation, that many of the cars passing the Dare/Currituck county line are originating in Dare, are service vehicles (up to 25% of vehicular traffic on a non-summer weekday) that will continue to travel Rt 12 and not utilize the bridge, or, are Dare tourists (another 25% of traffic) that are making day trips to the attractions of the northern beaches such as the Wildlife Museum, Whalehead Club, and/or wild horses in the off-road portion of the beach—they will return to Dare via Rt 12. The traffic that will be alleviated by this bridge represents a small fraction of the traffic that currently crosses the Wright Memorial Bridge. And, an even smaller fraction of that traffic will cross the Dare/Currituck line to travel into Currituck County. This Dare County tourist and service vehicle traffic is traffic which will not be impacted by building a bridge and will not provide any revenue in the form of tolls to assist in paying for the bridge. It will however, continue to congest Rt 12.
- Projected impact of economic development on mainland Currituck is overestimated. You only have to look at the impact that the Wright Memorial Bridge, which has been in place for at least 40 years, has had on economic development in lower Currituck. It is almost non-existent—and the Wright Memorial is a free bridge.
- One of the major “surveys” used by the North Carolina Turnpike Authority to judge traffic was actually conducted well south of Duck on Rt 12 at the intersection with Chocowinity. It is of no value in determining a bridge’s impact on Rt 12 traffic.
- Congested summer weekend traffic represents only 9% of total yearly travel days. On Saturday May 29th (Memorial Day weekend) at 11:30 am, I drove from Aydlett to the third stoplight south of the Wright Memorial Bridge at highway speeds in 25 minutes. I don’t think this travel time is unbearable. I observed a traffic survey car sitting at the intersection of Rt 12 and US158 near the stoplight for the Rest Area. I noticed that there was a traffic survey car at the intersection sitting in the corner of the rest area. I would like to have a copy of the results of the traffic count, and any other traffic survey information taken over the Memorial Day weekend. Please send that information to this address.

June 1, 2010

At the public hearings on the DEIS, the vast majority of individuals speaking, spoke out against the building of any bridge. It was the business community and more specifically, the real estate business, which overwhelmingly supported the bridge. At least two of the individuals who spoke for the bridge (but did not identify themselves as such) at the Barco meeting were realtors. You have to ask yourself—what is the real purpose of this bridge and whether it is needed, or merely “wanted” by those with real estate developmental interests.

The preliminary estimate of the cost of the bridge is up to $750,000,000. This amount represents $18.75 million per year and will be partially funded by a commitment of $15 million per year—for 40 years—from the State of North Carolina. At $18.75 million per year and a $12.00 per vehicle toll, it would take 4,281 cars every day of the year to pay for this bridge. This volume is not remotely possible and is ridiculously wasteful of taxpayer funds in this economically challenged environment. How many teachers, policeman, and fire trucks can $750 million a year buy?
The solution is not a bridge, the solution is to widen RT 12 south of Duck to the US 158 intersection, build a flyover at the Rt 12 US 158 intersection in Southern Shores, improve US 158 south of the Wright Memorial bridge. The DEIS makes it plain that these are the solutions to the traffic issues in this project area. The expense of building an ineffective bridge—one that is essentially wasteful of taxpayers' funds in order to accommodate real estate developmental interests—will not stand up to the scrutiny of the Citizens of North Carolina.

The need to exact the environmental and economic costs of the Currituck Mid-County bridge on Aydlett and North Carolina residents is not supported by the DEIS. I respectfully request that you please join the individuals who expressed their opposition to the bridge and not support any option which builds a bridge. The bridge does not accomplish its stated purposes as put forth in the DEIS.

- It makes traffic worse in Corolla,
- It doesn’t improve hurricane evacuation,
- It does not substantially improve travel time from mainland Currituck to the Currituck Outer Banks,
- It does nothing to address congested traffic in Duck, Southern Shores, and Kitty Hawk,
- It fails to recognize that the traffic problem it seeks to address represents only 9% of total travel days in a year.

Sincerely,
Wallace E. Davis, III
143 Sandy Ln.
Aydlett, NC 27916

May 20, 2010

Comments related to Currituck Mid-County Bridge Public Hearings

My name is Wallace Davis. I live at 143 Sandy Ln, Aydlett, NC.

I am here tonight to express my concern regarding the choice of the MCB4 alternative as the recommendation by the NC Turnpike Authority. It is my belief that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has made an ill-advised decision to sign off on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) being discussed at this public hearing. This is based on a number of incorrect conclusions which resulted from improper and/or slanted analysis of backup reports; use of old, dated information; dismissing or ignoring key issues/impacts; and, allowing blatant distortions by biased interpretation of favorable comments toward the building of the Mid County Bridge.

The Purpose and Need section of the document (pgs. 7&8) states that the project will be analyzed based on its ability to meet the following needs:

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

I contend that the conclusion of the DEIS fails to adequately achieve any of these three stated needs.

The substantial improvement of traffic flow on the project area’s thoroughfares fails to be met by the DEIS’ and the backup documents analysis.

Regarding this item, Tables 1, 2 and 3 of the 2035 traffic alternatives report (pgs. 10, 13, 14) measure vehicle per day (vpd) traffic volumes including actual (I presume) 2006 versus 2035 without bridge and with MCB4 with 2/3 lanes on RT 12. These tables represent that the traffic south of Corolla will actually get worse if the bridge is built. Related to this is my belief that the estimates of 2006 traffic (dated data) and future volumes are routinely inflated at an abnormal rate in order to better justify the bridge. I base this on my actual observation and counts of traffic at random times and adjusting these for the increase expected in the DEIS for seasonality and probable traffic that will not utilize the bridge due to origination in the Dare county area—principally service vehicles. I also come to this conclusion on the statement in NCTA’s Alternative Screen Report which states on pages 4-5 ... is not forecast to occur on US158 in Currituck county on summer weekdays in 2035, but only the summer weekends.”

In the 2035 Traffic Alternatives Report 6.1.2 on page 77 concludes “On US 158 north of the new bridge, traffic volumes are the same with or without a bridge.” It says, the two mile section of US 158 between the Wright Memorial Bridge will have extreme congestion by 2035 if the road is not widened. If a new bridge is constructed, this roadway would require a combination of six and eight lanes.” The intersection of NC 12 and US 158 should be upgraded to “an interchange or similar improvement.” On NC 12 in Dare, widening to four lanes would resolve congestion problems with or without a new bridge.

The DEIS fails to adequately address the acceleration of traffic issues due to the build out of remaining unimproved lots on the COBX. This negatively impacts traffic congestion along the problem areas of Dare Rt 12 and NC 158. Most service vehicles—construction and building trades in particular—will be traveling from Dare and will not utilize the proposed bridge. Increased permanent residents will also increase the volume of traffic.
This was mentioned in workshops as early as 2004 and is not adequately addressed in this DEIS.

The conclusion should be obvious, widen RT 12, create a flyover at Rt 12 and NC 158, widen and limit access on NC 158 south of the Wright Memorial Bridge. Reconsider your recommendation and choose a no build alternative.

The second item is to substantially reduce travel time from the mainland to the Currituck Outer Banks.

Wednesday, I rode from the end of Aydlett Rd. to the Dare/Currituck County line in 45.5 minutes at or below the stated speed limit due to floods roads on RT 12. Thursday, I drove to the wildlife center from my home (.5 miles from bridge site) in 56 minutes. I did have to stop for one stop light each day. My times were greatly improved because my wife was not along and I did not have to stop at any roadside markets or craft shops along the way. At the Duck Pier, there was a roadside radar sign that indicated that the nine cars in front of me were driving 30 mph on what was then a clear dry road in a 35 mph zone. I have no suggestions as to how the DEIS should analyze that problem.

Travel time can be measured for comparison. But a cost versus benefit analysis has to be included in making decisions regarding each of these stated goals. Therefore, it is important that we look at accurate times for traveling the routes under normal circumstances—not worse case scenarios. Additionally, those times should be analyzed based on a weighted average which takes into account frequency of congested days. Because the worse travel times are only 26 summer weekend days per year, estimated times within the DEIS overemphasizes the times required to make this trip for 93% of the total travel time. Summer weekdays add only an additional 65 days, so 91 of 365 equals 24.9% of total traffic days which would have abnormal traffic conditions.

This is essentially a 13 weekend a year problem. Expenditures of $685 million including $15 million per year for 40 years are unjustified. The dollar cost/benefit of this project cannot be completely determined because the cost won’t be finally determined until the design is determined. I’m not willing to buy a pig in a poke.

This issue is a matter of perception for those traveling. What is substantial to mainland Currituck residents? It depends on from where you are traveling in the county. For those of us in Aydlett, a bridge would allow us to be at the beach access in about 20 minutes given our need to travel to Coinjock to get on the toll road, travel across the bridge, take a drive to the beach access. So my decrease in time traveled would be 36 minutes—a decrease of 180%. A driver from Moyock to Currituck Outer Banks (COBX) access would see a decrease from 86 minutes to 45 minutes with a bridge. This is a 41 minute decrease but represents only a 91% savings in time traveled. It’s relative to the total time currently travelled. It’s approximately 21 miles to the Wright Memorial Bridge from Aydlett Rd and 158. It is reasonable to expect that those residents of Currituck who are closer than half way (approximately south of Jarvisburg) to the Wright Memorial Bridge will use Rt 12 and drive the (at most) 36 miles to get to the bridge terminus rather than drive thru 3 stop lights in Grandy, pay a toll and travel further to get to a beach with limited resources. With only 30 spaces for beach goers on Currituck beaches, most Currituck beachgoers will need to travel to Dare. These scenarios do not meet the substantial reduced travel time standard required. Again, a bridge fails to meet the standard set by the DEIS.

The last purpose and need is to substantially reduce hurricane clearance time for residents and visitors who use NC 168 and US 158 during a coastal evacuation. Regarding the Hurricane Evacuation Improvements in the Alternative Screening Report on pg 12 states “without improvements in the outbound capacity of this portion of US158 (from NC 168 to NC12) future hurricane evacuation clearance times would not decrease, even if NC 12 was widened, or a Mid-Currituck Bridge was built.” Additionally, the failure of the DEIS to analyze the impact of the current widening and improvement to NC 158 from Belcross to Camden and on to RT 17 (Project #34430.3) likely causes the evacuation time to be overstated. Lastly, during his comments at the Wednesday night DEIS public hearing in Dare, Mr. Page described the use a 3rd lane along NC 158 as an impractical (uncontrollable) solution to Hurricane evacuation, yet is an integral part of the plan to make the goal obtainable—and it’s been done before.

The vast majority of hurricane evacuation traffic leaving the Outer Banks will be leaving Dare county and travelling up NC 158 rather than using a Mid Currituck County (MCC) bridge. Given the greater population of Northern Dare County and its proximity to the Wright Memorial bridge, the need improve RT 158 rather than build a MCC bridge should be the highest priority for hurricane evacuation. There are no estimates in the DEIS as to expected volumes from Dare versus the MCC. The need to merge traffic from any outbound MCC bridge lanes will create a bottleneck south of the JP Knapp Bridge. Both of these presume there will be a backup at the Barco intersection. If there is no backup, there is no need for a bridge. If there is a backup, the bridge will accelerate the problem. Lastly, a bridge will likely encourage residents and visitors to remain on the COBX longer because of a misguided overconfidence and an aversion to wasting time for their vacations.

The conclusion of the MCB4 substantially improving hurricane evacuation is premature and illogical.

To summarize, the MCB4 alternative, along with all other bridge alternatives, fail to resolve the stated needs of the DEIS. Resolution of these needs is best accommodated by the No-Bridge or the ER1 alternatives.

Additional shortcomings of this DEIS

Toll plaza analysis needs to be included in 2035 Traffic Alternatives Report and DEIS. Its potential community impact is substantial. Water quality, air quality, community impact, and noise pollution are all impacts that need to be included in this analysis.
Biased commentary related to where public commenter in previous meetings lived should be removed. Alternative Screening Report Pg 66 under Public Comments section “Many of the comments of these alternatives came from persons who would be personally affected by a particular corridor, as well as people concerned about potential impacts on their community in general. (And those in favor of the bridge aren’t personally affected?) This statement marginalizes the opinion of those who object to the bridge.

Illogical analysis? “a four lane bridge was assumed as a potential worst-case scenario when considering potential environmental impact of the bridge” –and a 2 lane bridge is substantially better environmentally? Table 2 of ASR Air Quality Report 1/2010

No analysis of impact of day trippers encouraged by the bridge. Adversely, widens the areas impacted by air pollution. FHWA included disclaimer that impact is undetermined. NCTA analysis admits increases in MSATs in populated areas at the bridge. Populated or not, air pollution will occur. States Currituck County has no zoning regulations. Does not mention burning permits required in Currituck. (based on old info???)

Community impact report 11.09

States no access to and from the Mid county bridge into the Aydlett. Potential of Option B not recognized and discussed. DEIS doesn’t resolve the issue of accelerated growth because of the addition of the bridge.

First to Substantially Improve traffic flow

I have compiled some Details and quotes found in Traffic Alternatives Report

“Traffic on Rt 12 South of Corolla will actually get worse if the bridge is built.”

Widening US 158 in Currituck was not considered because congestion is not forecast (thru 2035) on summer weekdays but only on summer weekends.

On US 158 north of the new bridge, traffic volumes are the same with or without a bridge.

The two mile section of Dare US 158 will have extreme congestion by 2035 if the road is not widened. If a new bridge is constructed, this roadway would require a combination of six and eight lanes.

The intersection of NC 12 and US 158 should be upgraded to … an interchange or similar improvement.

On NC 12 in Dare, widening to four lanes would resolve congestion problems with or without a new bridge.

The DEIS fails to address the traffic issues resulting from acceleration of build out of the remaining unimproved lots on the Currituck obx.

Conclusion: Fails to substantially improve traffic flow, fails to solve Dare county RT 12 traffic problem. Worsens Corolla traffic. Has no impact on Curruluck US 158 or Dare’s traffic on US 158—they are the same with or without the bridge.

Better solution is obvious

Widen RT 12,
Create a flyover at Rt 12 and US 158,
Widen and limit access on US 158 South of Wright Memorial Bridge.

Second item to substantially reduce travel time from Currituck mainland to Currituck Outer Banks.

I drove from Aydlett Rd to the COBX line with Dare on Tuesday at or below the speed limit in 45.5 minutes. Wednesday it took 56 minutes to drive to the wildlife center in Corolla. I did have to stop for one stoplight on both trips. At Rt 12 and Duck Pier, there was a radar sign on Tuesday. It was clear and dry at that time.

The DEIS bases many conclusions on summer weekend traffic volumes.
Summer weekends represent 26 days—7% of the days in a year. With Summer weekdays included, represents 24.9% of total traffic days.

This is a 13-weekends a year problem. Cost of a bridge is undetermined until the design is completed but estimated at as up to $750 million. NC is committed to spending $15 million per year for 40 years for shortfall of any tolls.

I am not confident in accuracy of these estimates.

It is not worth an expenditure to help traffic 26 days.

What is substantial to Currituck residents? The improvement depends and is relative to where you live in the county.

20 minutes from Aydlett over bridge. My time reduced 36 minutes if I was driving to the terminus bridge would improve time 180%.

Moyock 45 minutes to terminus, improves from 86 minutes but represents 41 minute reduction representing only a 91% savings.

South of Jarvisburg (more than half way to Kitty Hawk) will probably drive across Wright Memorial to avoid 3 stoplights in Grandy and paying a toll.

The truth is, I wouldn’t use the bridge to get to Corolla if it was there. Not because I don’t like Corolla, not because I don’t like the people, but because of the lack of facilities and access to an open beach.

The need to substantially shorten travel time to Currituck OBX is bogus. And given a choice, I would more likely use the Dare beach instead. Given the high cost in dollars and environmental/community detrimental effects, this fails to be a valid need.

The DEIS does not analyze impact of current widening and improvement to US 158 from Belcross to Camden and on to RT 17 (Project #33430.3) therefore, clearance time is likely to be overstated.

Mr. Page described in the Dare meeting Wednesday that use of a 3rd lane along US 158 as an impractical (uncontrollable) solution to Hurricane evacuation for 26 miles, yet this is an integral part of the plan to make this goal obtainable—and it has been done before.

Vast majority of hurricane evacuation traffic leaving Outer Banks is leaving Northern Dare County and traveling up US 158 rather than using MCC bridge. Given the greater population and proximity to Wright Memorial Bridge, the need to improve US 158 rather than to build a bridge should be the highest priority.

Merging outbound traffic from any MCC will lead to a bottleneck south of JP Knapp bridge. These scenarios presume a backup at Barco. If there is no backup, no MCC bridge is needed. If there is a backup a MCC bridge will likely exacerbate the problem.

A bridge will likely encourage tourists, and some residents to wait until the last minute to evacuate in order to avoid losing part of their vacation.

The conclusion that the MCB4 substantially improves hurricane evacuation is premature and illogical. A bridge has little positive impact on the identified need.

To summarize, the MCB4 alternative, along with all other bridge alternatives, fail to resolve the stated needs of the DEIS. This DEIS uses incomplete information to form the opinion.

Resolution is best accommodated by the No Build or ER1 alternatives.

Third need: To substantially reduce hurricane clearance time for residents and visitors who use NC 168 and US 158 during a coastal evacuation.

Alternative screening report states: “Without improvement in the outbound capacity of this portion of US 158 (NC 168 to NC 12) future hurricane evacuation clearance times would not decrease, even if NC 12 was widened, or a Mid-Currituck Bridge was built.”
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Wallace E. Davis, Jr.

Street Address: 197 Courthouse Rd. Apt./Suite No.

City, State, Zip: Currituck, NC 27929

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No Build Alternative — MCB4 Doesn't Solve Traffic Problems

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reverse Center Lane — Will Not Affect Land Owners

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Water Pollution

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27695-1878

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Greetings Ms. Harris:

I am writing to voice my support for the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge.

I have been a resident of the Outer Banks since 1987, and have been a property owner in both Southern Shores and Kitty Hawk since 1995.

I believe the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge needs to be constructed as soon as possible.

Please add my list to those who support the project, and feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thank you.

Denise Deacon

66 E. Dogwood Trail
Southern Shores, NC 27949

---

THE TIME HAS COME TO BUILD THE BRIDGE! DO IT!!!
From: speardivers@aol.com
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

Hello,

I just got in the mail your brochure/information for alternatives on this project and we wanted to let you know how we feel.

We like the idea of the MCB2 draft, the other two options are not the way to go for this area!

Thank you,

Andres Del Villar Jr.

Pond Island, Nags Head, N.C.

-----Original Message-----
From: jdenkler@cox.net
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Bridge

Attn: Jennifer Harris, P.E.

I'm sending this Email in the hope of lending support to the construction of the Mid-Currituck County bridge. The motivation for my doing so stems largely from the experience my family had at the mercy of hurricane Bonnie in 1998. My Family of children and grandchildren had gone for a beach vacation at Corolla in August. We packed up and left when an evacuation was ordered. The notion of an approaching and reportedly destructive storm generated some considerable anxiety and even fright among our small children. The evacuation was even scarier especially as it did little to dispel the notion that we were trapped. What deepened our anxiety was the realization of how easy it would be for a terrorist to indeed seal off the Outer Banks with the simple weapon of a disabled vehicle. It seems to us that the potential for this type of large-scale disaster still exists. Even though the likelihood of such a thing actually happening is probably low, considering the number of lives that could be lost, it would seem that the rational decision maker should be willing to go to considerable expense to keep this likelihood as low as possible. Consider, for example, how many personal tragedies there are today among those who could had prevented the disastrous oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. I don't think that a mid-county bridge will solve the problem of hurricane-evacuation, but it seems irrefutable that it will reduce the likelihood of a terrible disaster. No doubt my objectivity on the issue is influenced by the fact that my family has a vacation home on the northern Outer Banks. We were attracted to the area because my wife's heritage lies in Currituck County. Our home would obviously be more accessible if there were a mid-county bridge. Just as we would probably use our home more often in the summer were it not for the horrendous traffic problems, it would seem that many would-be vacationers would likewise be more inclined to the North Carolina Outer Banks were it not for the widely-known problem of accessibility. In this sense, if the state of North Carolina is interested in promoting the cause of increasing tourism, the bridge would seem to give it a big boost. As to the alternatives being considered for bridge terminations and for road configurations, I have no proprietary interests; therefore I would encourage those that cause the least commercial, environmental and personal disruptions. I believe that the
importance of the bridge itself transcends the importance of all other ancillary arrangements, and that any controversy over the choices that are being considered should not be allowed to sidetrack the construction of the bridge. On the contrary, I recommend that work on the program proceed as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely,

John M. Denkler 4106 Faith Court Alexandria, VA 22311

Many hours after we started out, we eventually found refuge at different spots in Virginia.

Name: Edwin and Elizabeth Dietel
Address: 69 Spindrift Trail
City: Southern Shores
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: jedend2@msn.com

Comments: It is imperative that we save the Outer Banks from the horrendous traffic generated by the uncontrolled growth of contruction in the Currituck County Section of the Outer Banks. Our beautiful town cannot sustain the horrendous traffic that these residents and renters generate from June 1-Sept. 15 each year in northern Dare County. It is dangerous for our children, and adults, to have to cross Route 12 in Southern Shores. We are unable to leave our homes in the summer, especially on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Evacuation in case of a hurricane is nearly impossible and dangerous for all of us. Please approve construction of the Mid-Currituck bridge immediately.
To Jennifer Harris or concerned party, I would like to make my opinion known on the potential Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. I am FOR building the bridge as soon as possible. I would choose the MCB2 option if given my choice. The bridge would help me personally and professionally. The third lane would not, but it appears to me that in an emergency the addition would keep more people safe. Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

Keith Dobie  KJ Construction & Remodeling Co.
Post Office Box 242  Kitty Hawk, NC 27949
Ph 252.207.6589  Fax 252.453.4721

---

To whom it may concern,

For years we heard the bridge is coming but it never happened. I am one of the oldest residents living on the outer banks full time. I totally in support of this bridge being built. We do not need to have a tragedy occur to let us realize that we must build this bridge as soon as possible. I am sure your employers know this and know the best route.

In my humble opinion, the roads should not be widened but used as a third outbound in times of evacuation. There is no reason not to use the swamp as a road. Some people will object to anything but they all knew a bridge would be built one day. The longer we wait the more it will cost.

Respectfully yours
Dr. Elizabeth Dodd
1214 Bismark Drive
PO BOX 193
Corolla NC 27927
dredodd@embarqmail.com
I wish to make some comments on the draft EIS for the Mid-Currituck bridge project.

While I live in New Jersey, I own a second home at 747 Seahorse Court in Corolla, Ocean Sands, Section M. I support the building of the Mid-Currituck bridge and my only comments are on the options on the recommended option of MCB4.

Option C1 would terminate near the Corolla Bay subdivision and Option C2 would terminate near the Timbuck II shopping area.

I feel that the C1 option is the best choice for the following reasons:

- There would be no real impact on the Corolla Bay subdivision since it is a new subdivision with little or no houses yet built. This subdivision started after the plans/studies were already underway to possibly place the bridge terminus in this area.

- Having the terminus in this area would have the least traffic impact during heavy summer usage. Vehicles would go north or south depending on their final destination. This traffic would have less of an impact near Timbuck II since only the cars going south would approach the area.

- Option C2 would have all the bridge traffic exit in the area of Timbuck II and other businesses across highway 12. This will create huge traffic delays in this area based on the following:

  - cars travelling north from the Duck/Kitty Hawk area
  - cars traveling from the north and south to go shopping in the Timbuck II area
  - cars exiting the bridge in the Timbuck II area going shopping

Thank You

William Dondarski
30 Ten Eyck Place
Edison, NJ 08820
732-494-1576
May 18, 2010

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
27699-1578

Re: Mid-Currituck Bridge Project – supporting MCB4

Dear Ms. Harris:

We are writing to register our strong support for the project, specifically, the recommended alternative, MCB4, which includes the bridge and the improved connection between Roads 158 and 12.

The need for improved travel to and from this section of the Outer Banks is clear. Development that has been permitted over the past decades has overburdened the existing roadways to the point where the delivery of emergency and other basic services is compromised. Likewise, the ability to meet the basic transportation needs of residents and visitors is in jeopardy. The bridge will provide a long-overdue “relief valve.” Without it, the congestion along Route 12 and the bottleneck at the intersection of 12 and 158 in Kitty Hawk and Southern Shores is increasingly dangerous to a growing number of residents and visitors.

Construction of the bridge is the only practical alternative and, compared to other plans, it will make the most significant and long-term improvement. This project will alleviate the travel and traffic along a significant stretch of the Outer Banks, while preserving the environment and the character of communities from Southern Shores to Corolla, and from south of Coinjock to Kitty Hawk.

We urge you and the State of North Carolina to move ahead with this important and much-delayed project this year.

Sincerely,
Thomas A. Dorsey and Janie K. Dorsey

Dorsey and Dorsey, 9791 Greensboro Drive, Charlotte, NC 28270-0291 (704) 841-8840
Lot 99, Carolina Dunes: www.soundbanker.com

-----Original Message-----
From: Tom Dorsey [mailto:tdorsey@carolina.rr.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 16, 2010 6:41 PM
To: midcurrituck@ntturnpike.org
Subject: Currituck Bridge Project - supporting MCB4

May 16, 2010

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
27699-1578

Re: Mid-Currituck Bridge Project - supporting MCB4

Dear Ms. Harris:

We are writing to register our strong support for the project, specifically, the recommended alternative, MCB4, which includes the bridge and the improved connection between Roads 158 and 12.

The need for improved travel to and from this section of the Outer Banks is clear. Development that has been permitted over the past decades has overburdened the existing roadways to the point where the delivery of emergency and other basic services is compromised. Likewise, the ability to meet the basic transportation needs of residents and visitors is in jeopardy. The bridge will provide a long-overdue “relief valve.” Without it, the congestion along Route 12 and the bottleneck at the intersection of 12 and 158 in Kitty Hawk and Southern Shores is increasingly dangerous to a growing number of residents and visitors.

Construction of the bridge is the only practical alternative and,
compared
to other plans, it will make the most significant and long-term
improvement.
This project will alleviate the travel and traffic along a
significant
stretch of the Outer Banks, while preserving the environment and
the
canoeing of the Outer Banks, while preserving the environment and
the
care of communities from Southern Shores to Corolla, and
from south
of
Cape Hatteras to Kitty Hawk.

We urge you and the State of North Carolina to move ahead with
this
important and much-delayed project this year.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Dorsey and Janis K. Dorsey
Owners of a residence in Duck, NC
Mailing address: 9701 Grasmere Drive, Charlotte, NC 28270-0291
Name: Jane Dowrick
Address: 102 Blue Heron
City: Duck
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: dowhite@verizon.net
Comments: I support the MCB4 option for the mid-Currituck bridge project.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 139 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

DUMB TOURISTS SHOULD LEAVE
EARLIER

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

OPTION B as stated EARLIER

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Sneak boats 16 – 20 footers

Additional comments:

I see TRAFFIC Data Collection & KIT-VALUE
open on Memorial Day Weekend. THATS NOTHING!
Come on Weekends in July & August & get this past picture

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27690-1578

Or E-mail: ncturnpike@ncdot.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
In addition I would like to address the impact on our local community. By directly crossing the round at Aydlett would cause all local businesses to suffer because of the loss of summer tourist traffic that would be routed away from them. These small businesses and eating establishments depend on the tourist season business. Without the bridge would deprive them of this.

As this economy growth the loss of that percentage of business would cause the loss of businesses that would cause these local eating establishments to go out of business. This would not only hurt them but the community that depends on them for services.

Fact the environmental impact on this community would destroy the way of life. People choose to live here because of the tranquility and beauty of our area. Outside sources from out of state could care less about what this would do to us. It is not fair and it is not justified. If the only ones that benefit from this bridge are local and out of state cottage owners and the company who wants to destroy the area with a toll bridge. This bridge will destroy the economy in our area, and our way of life. We won't have first, to lose it then and we will fight
To Z. Carlin
Dept of Transportation

From Shirley J. Bailey
106 Lighthouse View
Asheville, NC 28804
262-453-0339

Dear Sirs,

Do you realize that we are petrified of your "great idea!" Air pollution and noise level will be disastrous for Asheville. What about benefits of this bridge when it is finished? We are losing our homes because of the construction. I have allergies. Not only that but because I am a realtor I know my property value will decrease. I have my inheritance tied up in this house, I am 75 years old and cannot afford to lose money on my investment. I know for a fact local residents are not in favor of this bridge, nor are any of our Commissioners. How can you build a bridge that we are not to except the money-guzzling company who is building the bridge and the rest of state. We want our cottages or "mansion" for nothing. (price)

Sincerely,

[Signature]
I lived in Hatteras Island for 23 years before moving to Aiglett 11 years ago. People have plenty of time to evacuate during hurricanes. Every hurricane & lightning in plenty of time before the storm. To use this as a reason for this bridge is shoddy.

The other reason for the few children that have to be educated form Croatta is not adequate. A reason for deterring a whole community.

If the company wants to build a bridge - a necessary bridge is needed from Aiglett to Hatteras Island. That is, when any fast money is D.C. should be devoted.

I will guarantee you, the local residents will lose the bridge if it is erected.

People, like tourists, stop coming to D.C. years ago because of all the toll roads. You charge $5 to go across the bridge and you will hear many complaints.

This bridge is not being built to help any North Carolinians - it is being built to "make money" for out-of-state money grubbers.

There are many businesses part of Aiglett who have their life savings in these concessions. They stay in business for the local community during the off-season months because they can survive with the Associated Purchasing. These small businesses will not be able to stay when their tons of dollars are taken away. They will suffer and so will we when we have no restaurants, no store stores, etc. Already we are empty places where people have left. Just go to Hatteras Island. There are a lot of empty shops.

They do not cancel the concept of a bridge. They do not listen to North Carolinians and out-of-state money-hungry speculators. Tell them to stay in Virginia. Have some courage and send your own money. This is a mess up.

CC: %re Raiting

[Signatures]
From: jay.dunlap@milliman.com
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri May 14 18:34:41 2010
Subject: Build Mid Currituck Bridge Option MCB4

Hello.

I will be traveling the week of May 17 and cannot attend the Open House on the Mid-Currituck Bridge, but wish to have my opinion added to the public discourse on this project.

Build the bridge. Build it now. It is needed. No build is not an option.

As a resident of Southern Shores and former tourist, I see the traffic jam for several hours Saturday and Sunday each Summer outbound in the morning and inbound in the afternoon and sometimes into the night. The traffic woe cuts into our quality of life and that of the tourists this area is dependent upon.

Several proposals are being floated on how to build the bridge and I believe MCB4 to be the most beneficial to Outer Banks residents and tourists and least detrimental to Duck and Southern Shores. As I understand it, ER2 and MCB2 would require massive rebuilding of NC 12 in Southern Shores and US 158 in Kitty Hawk. The 158 corridor is commercial and could accommodate the widening. But Southern Shores is residential and any widening would destroy the live oak tree barrier along NC 12. Widening in Southern Shores would not improve traffic in any meaningful way without widening the road to 4 or more lanes all the way through Duck to Currituck county. The 4 lane option was rejected early on as too disruptive and too expensive. From the Draft report, MCB4 is the lowest cost option that actually has a chance of improving traffic flow.

I do not have an opinion on the various options within MCB4, but would think given the lower density of housing on the Currituck mainland, NCT could find a path for the bridge that does not cause such a negative impact on Adylett or other mainland communities.

Thank you for you consideration.

Jay Dunlap
24 North Dune Loop
Southern Shores, NC 27949
From: Eber, Trina [mailto:Trina.Eber@argonst.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 1:29 PM  
To: midcurrituck@ncutmilk.org  
Subject: No Mid-Currituck Bridge

Dear Ms. Jennifer Harris,

This letter is in response to the proposal to construct the Mid-Currituck Bridge. After reviewing the plan set forth, I strongly oppose the building of this bridge and the widening of Route 12 in Currituck County.

It does not seem feasible for the State to need to spend such an enormous amount of revenue for this purpose. It is a mere 12 weekends, 24 days, that our island experiences traffic. Even on the weekends, by the time a vacationer heading north reaches Pine Island, they are sailing along at the safe speed limit. There seems to be no logical reason we should destroy the natural beauty and wildlife haven by constructing a four lane highway through this region. I have not seen a study for the recouping of this cost with tolls, but I cannot imagine the tolls would ever cover the cost and maintenance of the project that is planned. As for the need for a additional emergency hurricane evacuation route, modern technology affords us early warning in the event of a threat. We should all heed these warnings and make it mandatory that vacationers and residents leave as early as possible when a hurricane is predicted.

Additionally, as a homeowner of a Vacation Rental in Monterey Shores, I am profoundly disgusted by the proposal to bring four lanes of traffic through this development as opposed to bringing the bridge access south of here at the Tim Buck II shopping area if there must be a bridge. To cut through this neighborhood seems to be an extraordinarily more expensive and unnecessary proposal. The neighbor road belongs to and is maintained by the homeowners of Monterey Shores. There is not enough land spanning North Harbor View Road to accommodate three or four lanes without knocking down houses.

Is the state prepared to purchase these properties or face lawsuits from the residents who would now be losing their homes and incomes from these homes?

In addition to destroying the pristine quietness that is Corolla, the bridge would change this area forever. It will threaten the wildlife once again, and with the influx of travelers heading to the four-wheel drive area, this will prove to be the last straw for our precious wild horses. They will not survive and will be gone forever. This seems to be an exact opposite of what the state claims when speaking of protecting the area.

My family and friends have traveled to the Corolla area for years particularly to experience the unique beauty and serenity that is its signature. No one really minded the longer drive. It is worth the trip once you get here. Vacationers looking for a shorter trip and more activities have chosen to stay in Duck or Kitty Hawk.

If you ever visited Corolla in the “Off Season”, you would quickly realize that three or four lanes Route 12 through Currituck County would only be a burden on the County to maintain. There is absolutely no traffic in Corolla for the nine months of the year, and in the summer months it is busy, but not what could be called congested.

We also sympathize with the residents and Aydlett and the impact on their land and the wildlife. I am sure the additional traffic through your area will change it forever.

So in closing, I strongly suggest the plan be denied. In these challenging financial times, the State should use this revenue on much more important needs for the taxpayers of North Carolina.

Please work to overturn the proposal to build the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

In doing so you will help to save Aydlett, Corolla and the Northern Beaches for ourselves, our children and generations to come.

Thank you for reading this letter.  
Trina and Robert Eber  
952 Sea View Court  
Corolla, NC 27927
From: Trina & Bob Eber [mailto:eber2@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 12:58 PM
To: midcurrituck@nc-turnpike.org
Subject: Response to NC Turnpike's Proposal for the Mid-Currituck Bridge

Dear Commissioner John Rorer,

As a homeowner whose house sits on North Harbor View Road in Corolla, I am submitting this letter to voice my opinions on the NC Turnpike Authority's Proposal for building the Mid-Currituck Bridge and the surrounding infrastructure. After reviewing the proposal and the bridge concept, it is obviously apparent that it will cause irreparable harm to the Corolla environment and the Corolla way of life.

The proposal states 3 main reasons for considering the mid Currituck Bridge.

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

Since 1994 NCDOT has spent Millions of Dollars conducting studies of the traffic condition on NC12 and US 158, and it appears they still do not understand the problem. On Saturdays and Sundays between Mid June and early September, a total of 10 Weekends or 24 days out of the year, visitors flock to the Northern Beaches. However to get there they must sit at a left turn light on US 158 after entering the island. This traffic light causes the traffic to back up over the Wright Memorial Bridge and on to the Mainland. To eliminate this problem build a jag hand/flyover from the Visitors center on US 158 to NC 12 north. Backup problem resolved, traffic flow substantially improved, cost is minimal in comparisons to Turnpikes Proposal.

Today weather reporting and storm tracking has improved dramatically. We have more than a week of notice to prepare for a hurricane. No amount of roads or bridges will reduce hurricane clearance times without proper planning. Each town, along with each county needs to have an orderly evacuation plan in effect. Since the majority of the people being evacuated are vacation renters, these plans need to be discussed/implemented with the rental companies. All the rental companies offer hurricane vacation interruption insurance, so it’s not an economic issue anymore. The rental companies need to inform the renters when to evacuate. When handled correctly, evacuation times will be reduced dramatically without building any bridges or widening any roads.

The Corolla Wild Horses are the last truly wild horses on the east coast. They are an integral part of what draws visitors to the northern beaches every year. Nowhere else can you see wild Mustangs walking along the beach and grazing among beach homes. As development encroaches, the horse's natural habitat is being destroyed. The herd is now threatened with inbreeding from out dated policies governing the amount of horses allowed (60). The NC Interior Department believe the Corolla's wild herd cause damage to the natural environment on the Outer Banks, because they are not native to the Outer Banks. The wild horses of the Currituck Outer Banks have survived nearly 500 years of fierce Nor’easters and hurricanes, but probably will not survive the laws and rulings of the NC governments. They will no longer exist.

The same fate will also fall on the tourists now flocking to Corolla. Once the tourists leave Corolla, it will become a ghost town. Currituck County will lose their largest source of tax revenue. The beauty of the Natural Environment of the Outer banks will be destroyed if the mid-Currituck bridge is built and NC 12 is widened to accommodate 24 days out of the year of heavy traffic.

According to the proposal, traffic will be diverted through North Harbor View Road, right next to my house. Large drainage ditches (12 to 21 feet across and 6 to 10 feet deep) will be placed on both sides of NC 12. Dune Areas and trees will be removed in this process. This alone creates an enormous environmental impact to the area. Not to mention that residents and guests on North Harbor View Road (beach side of Monterey Shores) as well as the Sound side of Monterey Shores will be required to cross the highway when going for a day at the beach or for use of the club house and the amenities, including the pool, tennis courts, boat launch, playground and piers.

Rental Incomes and Real Estates Sales are going to suffer greatly. This is not just our residence it is also a business. During the summer months, we rent our house to help offset some of our cost. The widening of NC 12 is going to make it impossible for me to rent my house. Who is going to want to purchase a house next to a highway? My home/ business now has no value at all. Who is going to compensate me for the loss of income and the loss of my investment?

In 1999, my wife and I made our first trip to Corolla, and immediately fell in love with the natural beauty, the peace and quiet, and slow life style of Corolla. We purchased a piece of land in 2000. We choose a lot In Monterey Shores, because of the amenities that the community offered, and we picked the Beach Side so we would not have to cross NC 12 to go to the beach. We also picked the east side of North Harbor View Road so that we would not have NC 12 in our back yard. We hired BDA Home builders to build our dream house. In May of 2001, our home was complete. We named it "A Pirates Paradise". For 10 Years my family, my friends and countless vacationers have enjoyed it. We hoped that one day we would retire here. Now all that is about to be changed with the Turnpikes proposal.

I implore you to NOT build the Mid-Currituck Bridge and widen NC 12, in order to save Corolla for future generations to enjoy.

Sincerely,

Trina & Robert Eber
952 Sea View Court
Corolla, NC
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Ronald Eckert
Street Address: 80 Poppy Grove Rd 307
City, State, Zip: Duck NC 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB4
The bridge addresses traffic needs most effectively

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2
Interferes with less residential property

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reverting the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Prefer 3rd lane
Less confusion

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: Vascev@aol.com
To: sjvnetscape@netscape.net ; Dewitt, Steve; Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Wed May 26 12:35:53 2010
Subject: Thank you for effort - complete the Mid-Currituck Brid...

Steve and Jennifer,

Thank you for continuing to work hard to complete the Mid-Currituck Bridge as soon as possible. This toll bridge is both a priority and necessity for the OBX. Residents and visitors alike are counting on you.

Christine Eckloff-Vassos, CPA
Licensed Maryland and North Carolina
vascev@aol.com
301-251-1020 X102
301-251-0716 (fax)

From: Vascev@aol.com
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri Apr 09 13:27:03 2010
Subject: Please build the bridge

The County of Dare and Currituck desperately need the bridge. Please support this much needed project. We have been waiting long enough, please please let us wait no longer.

Christine Eckloff-Vassos, CPA
Licensed Maryland and North Carolina
vascev@aol.com
301-251-1020 X102
301-251-0716 (fax)

Please include your last name or company name as the first item in the subject line. This helps us to better manage our incoming emails - thank you in advance.
June 7, 2010

Ms. Jennifer Harris, PE
North Carolina Turnpike Authority

Dear Ms. Harris,

My wife and I are property owners in North Swan Beach on the Outer Banks. We attended the May 19th open house and public hearing and would like to offer the following comments:

We are in favor of building the bridge and specifically the MCB4 plan with the C1 corridor and option A. The bridge offers convenience to visitors who come to the north beaches as well as critical hurricane evacuation support. The C1 corridor seems to have the least impact on existing residents, businesses and roads and option A seems to have the least impact and be most supported by the residents of Aydlett.

Many residents in the Corolla to Corova area object to the building of the bridge and we respect their positions. The bridge will ultimately result in more visitors to the beach and impact existing infrastructure and services. These impacts need to be addressed in the county’s long term services plan.

Thank you for taking my comments.

Regards,

Erik & Jennifer Eden
1925 Sandfiddler Rd.
Corolla, NC 27927

Mark J. Edsall
Maureen A. Edsall

May 26, 2010

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578

SUBJECT: MID-CURRITUCK BRIDGE - DEIS & ALTERNATIVES
PUBLIC COMMENT

Dear Ms. Harris:

Thank you for including me in your mailing with notice regarding the status of the subject project DEIS and the associated request for public comment. I previously wrote you on February 26, 2008 following receipt of the workshop notice for the project Study Team (I attach hereto a copy of that initial letter for convenience and record).

First, as in my previous letter, I will first identify my standing regarding my interest in the project and my individual qualifications which support my comments contained herein. I am a Southern Shores property owner, member of the Southern Shores Civic Association, and member of the “Build the Bridge - Preserve Our Roads” organization. Also as background, I am a professional engineer, professional planner, volunteer firefighter now for 35 years, and elected public official in New York State (12 years). I have been visiting the Outer Banks since 1974 and have been a property owner for the last twelve years. I have personally experienced the growth of the Outer Banks, most recently the northern beaches above Kitty Hawk. I have witnessed the development of the “bypass” from a real bypass, to a multi-lane retail/residential corridor. I have seen the highways “feeding” the Outer Banks evolve from two lane local roads to multiple lane highways with uncountable traffic signals. There have been a lot of changes in the last 36 years.

Adequate access to and exit routes from the northern beaches served by Route 12, and the critical need for emergency egress from the northern beaches in the event of a hurricane or other emergency are a clear concern (as identified in the DEIS). As with all DEIS documents, there is a “no build” alternative as an option. The reality is that this is not a legitimate option. Clearly, the need currently exists for some improvement.
Ms. Harris, P.E., NCTA

26 May 2010

As the DEIS views the issue (and it should), there is an obligation to look at current conditions and future needs, and identify/undertake appropriate improvements to mitigate current conditions and address the future. I believe the DEIS has done more than an adequate job in meeting this obligation.

To be more specific in my opinion and recommendation to your Authority, I hereby state that I agree with the “Recommended Alternative” of the DEIS, specifically MCB4. It is my opinion that this alternative provides the framework for a long-term solution to the northern beaches traffic problems, leaving the possibility for further/future improvements to the Rt. 12 corridor between 158/12 at Kitty Hawk and the eastern terminus of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. I firmly believe that components of the NC-12 3-lane widening will be needed over the years to come, but it is not necessary that these improvements be undertaken concurrent with the MCB. I do object to the 4-lane widening as I believe this alternative will have a significant impact on the character and quality of life for the impacted areas. In short, I agree with the DEIS Recommended Alternative/MCB4. The bridge should be built.

For the record, I also wish to make comment on the US 158 improvements noted in the DEIS with regard to the 6-Lane or 8-Lane “Super-Street”, proposed for the segment of US 158 between the Wright Memorial Bridge and US 158/North Carolina 12. I have serious reservations with this configuration being introduced into the area. The concept of the mandatory right turns with associated U-turn movements in lieu of signalized full movement intersections is, in my opinion, the wrong (and potentially a dangerous) approach. I believe this will likely cause further potential for traffic incidents (accidents and congestion) at the U-turn locations or other secondary locations where unusual movements will be undertaken as a result of the elimination of the full movement intersections. I am pleased that this improvement is not part of the recommended alternative.

I wish the Project Team continued success with this effort and look forward to further communication as the project proceeds. If you have any comment or questions regarding my opinions above, please do not hesitate to contact me at my New York address above, or e-mail me at mje@omaha.com. Thank you for your consideration of my input.

Very truly yours,

Mark J. Edsall, P.E., P.P.

cc: Hon. Hal Denny, Mayor, Town of Southern Shores (via email)
Jennifer Harris, P.E., NCTA (via email)

Mark J. Edsall
Northern Residence
19 Clark Avenue
Cornwall-on-Hudson, N.Y. 12520

Southern Residence
1 Soundfiddler Court
Southern Shores, N.C. 27949

27 February 2008

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

SUBJECT: US 158/NC 12 CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

Dear Ms. Harris:

I am writing this letter pursuant to the workshop notice posted mailed to me by the Authority in connection with the subject matter. I am unable to attend any of the workshop meetings, and am therefore providing this letter as input for the Study Team reviewing the potential corridor improvements.

First, I would like to identify myself as a Southern Shores property owner, member of the Southern Shores Civic Association, and member of the “Build the Bridge – Preserve Our Roads” organization. As background, I am a professional engineer, professional planner, volunteer firefighter for over 30 years, and elected public official in New York State. I have been visiting the Outer Banks since 1954 and have been a property owner for ten years. I have personally experienced the growth of the Outer Banks, most recently the northern beaches above Kitty Hawk. I have witnessed the development of the “bypass” to a real bypass, to a multi-lane retail/residential corridor. I have seen the highways “feeding” the Outer Banks evolve from two lane local roads to multiple lane highways with uncountable traffic signals. There have been a lot of changes in the last 34 years.

Now we find ourselves in the dilemma of adequate access to and exit routes from the northern beaches served by Route 12, not to mention the critically needed emergency access from the northern beaches in the event of a hurricane or other emergency. As an elected public official and local/regional municipal engineer in upstate New York, I have personally experienced the balance of proper and sustainable growth vs. adequacy of the infrastructure to support that development. That is the current dilemma on the Outer Banks, northern area. It is my opinion that the development has outpaced the infrastructure. Clearly there is the need for the County and the local municipal governments to adequately control growth to avoid over saturation. It is also important that the State, via the NCTA, undertake the necessary improvements to provide the transportation infrastructure to reasonably support the current development and (reasonable) future growth.
Ms. Harris, P.E., NCTA
27 February 2008

My husband and I have owned a home on NC12 since 1971 and lived here permanently since 1981 so we are very well-versed on the traffic on that road. It has been apparent for many years that the road is woefully inadequate for evacuation should the need arise due to a hurricane or, even worse, a new inlet be cut through due to storm action.

I am sorry but I cannot feel sorry for the possible increase of people in the Corolla area if the bridge is built. This project has been on the books for years and the powers that be should have had a wake-up call a long time ago and done some planning. NIMBY --- not in my backyard --- just does not resonate with us---we have lived with all their traffic here in Southern Shores since before the road north was opened to the public. If they anticipate future problems, perhaps they should start making plans NOW to deal with them now instead of sticking their heads in the sand and hope the bridge does not come into fruition.

Bob and Elsa Edwards
28 Periwinkle Pl.
Southern Shores
Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a home owner in the Carova Beach area, (2241 Sandfiddler Rd.). I am writing to voice my total support for the building of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. It is vitally needed in light of the steadily increasing traffic into the area, and because it will decrease the travel time from the mainland area to the Northern Outer Banks by at least 90 minutes!

Sincerely,

Morry El-Badry, MD
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Ken Elliott
Street Address: 202 Elliott Road, PO Box 6
City, State, Zip: Aydlett, NC 27910

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I prefer the ER2 option because a bridge will impact our scenic view of the historic Currituck Lighthouse in Corolla as well as create a visual barrier for the residents of Aydlett. However, if a bridge is constructed, I prefer the MCB4 option.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer the MCB4 option, if a bridge is constructed with bridge Alternative C1, because it creates the least visual barrier to the scenic view of the sound from our home.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I prefer the MCB4 option, if a bridge is constructed, with mainland approach road design Option A due to the following:

- Option A would not adversely impact the wildlife habitat, such as the loggerhead turtle and the eastern black bear, or significantly impact the flood plain or alter the hydrology of Maple Swamp as would Option B.
- Option A creates the least amount of Total Permanent and Total Wetland Impacts.
- Option A allows existing Aydlett Road through Maple Swamp to remain open for use by the residents of Aydlett and Option B would not.
- Option A locates the Toll Plaza at the Route 158 interchange and allows Aydlett Road to remain open and Option B does not.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Larry Ellis
Street Address: 2508 Howard Rd, Apt/Suite No:
City, State, Zip: Richmond, VA 23236

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I prefer MCB4. This alternative would minimize costs and therefore tolls, but still provide an adequate evacuation route from the Corolla Recreational Club areas. It would also minimize the impact on the unique characteristics of the town of Duck.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer C2. It would provide equal access to areas both north and south of the landing point.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I prefer Option A. It would lessen local opposition to the road and increase its chances of being built.
Ms Harris,

While I suspect the views of my wife and I are very similar to many who have commented on the proposed Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge, we thought it important that you hear from as many property owners as possible.

We built our home in Southern Shores in 1992. We were looking for a community that limited commercial zoning, emphasized single family residences, and shared a commitment to the environment by identifying many areas where no building would occur. It is this mix that makes Southern Shores a special place to live and sets it apart from most resort communities.

Without question, the rapid development along the northern beaches has created a serious traffic problem on North Carolina highway 12, one that is exacerbated both during the summer vacation season and hurricane evacuations. The inability to plan for and control development has led to this problem, one which we believe lies squarely at the feet of our elected officials. As with most holes, it's a lot easier falling in than climbing out. From our perspective, there are only two viable alternatives. The preferred alternative is to build the bridge, the other is to do nothing. Widening highway 12 is unacceptable and should not be given serious consideration.

For many of us, the correct decision is obvious. It's on matters like this that we look to our elected officials for both insightful leadership and strength of character. They have the opportunity to do the right thing. We expect them to step forward and do it.

Jim and Sheri Elwood
Dear Ms. Harris:

As a property owner at 633 Gannet Court, Corolla, N.C. I would like to go on record as opposed to the Mid-Currituck Bridge. My basic reason is and the rationale for them are provided in the attached document.

This is a critical decision effecting people on the Outer Banks and taxpayers across the state. Thus far groups from the independent towns of Duck and Southern Shores have been successful in organizing support for the bridge for their multiple reasons. People in Corolla were denied independent town status and often have difficulty getting their voices heard and requests objectively considered. Please seek out representatives of the Corolla Civic Association during your deliberations.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Edward B. English

SUBJECT: OPPOSITION TO MID-CURRITUCK BRIDGE

I am opposed to the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. I base my objections on my experience as a financial analyst for a multi-billion dollar organization; a former Town Manager; an MBA and CPA; and Director of a Transportation Engineering organization which included a traffic engineering branch. My opposition is based on the following which are discussed in corresponding subsequent paragraphs.

a. Long term negative impact on N.C. tax payers.
b. Merging traffic from a Mid-Currituck Bridge could impede OBX evacuation
c. Modern weather forecasting technology improves OBX evacuation
d. Cottage renter hurricane insurance improves OBX evacuation
e. Less than critical need for additional hurricane evacuation improvements
f. Better and less costly evacuation alternative to Mid-Currituck Bridge

g. I am concerned about the long term potential negative impact on N.C. tax payers and the real potential that they may have to bail out the project above the apparent current $15 million annual payment to the private construction company. It is inconceivable to me that the $15 million plus tolls visitors would be willing to pay during basically three summer months for three days each week (cottage turnover days) could earn enough for the Spanish company to cover construction, long term operation and maintenance, and adequate return on investment. Toll revenue from northern Outer Banks residents would be negligible. This could turn into a very bad deal for N.C. in the years ahead. In my experience people often “best case” the numbers to seemingly prove their case. My sincere suggestion is that numbers be “worse cased” by a truly independent and competent analyst (out of state?) as part of the bridge final review process.

b. I challenge the perceived critical need for a new bridge to resolve hurricane evacuation traffic flow concerns. Please consider the following. An evacuation plan I would encourage based on current capacity would create 4 west bound lanes on state Route 158 using the current 2 west bound lanes, plus the center lane, plus the center-most east bound lane. Similarly, I would convert 1 east bound Wright Memorial Bridge (WMB) lane to west bound. This leaves 1 lane for east bound emergency vehicle traffic. The 3 west bound WMB lanes would feed 4 west bound Route 158 lanes and probably keep them full as inland traffic issues and towns slowed traffic flow. Any traffic from the proposed northern (Mid-Currituck) bridge would merge into Route 158 evacuation traffic adversely slowing it. Police presence could slow traffic further given the way Interstates slow even when lanes are otherwise clear when a police car is stopped by the side of the highway.

The over arching evacuation goal is to get cars off the Outer Banks regardless of where they start. I have no doubt that 4 west bound Route 158 lanes from WMB would keep moving most easily and quickly if there is no interference from merging traffic from a new Mid-Currituck bridge. The only way to avoid merging/slowing traffic would be to build a new additional far right Route 158 west bound lane just for Mid-Currituck bridge traffic where the bridge feeds on to Route 158.

c. Modern weather forecasting technology makes it increasingly probable that evacuation will commence sooner rather than later reducing the need for an additional bridge.

d. The real estate management company program of offering and encouraging renters to buy “hurricane insurance” also promotes visitor willingness to evacuate earlier rather than later since they will not loose their rent money. This also reduces the need for an additional bridge.

e. “Hurricane evacuation” appears to be the rallying cry used by lobbying groups to promote Mid-Currituck bridge construction in order to achieve the real goal of reducing auto thru-traffic in the towns of Duck and Southern Shores according to the Summer 2010 issue of North Beach Sun Real Estate. The article also points out that the best hurricane evacuation improvement alternative included both the Mid-Currituck bridge plus widening state Route 12 through the towns of Southern Shores and Duck.

Interestingly, the Route 12 widening portion was apparently discarded based on local zoning rules and additional cost considerations. If better hurricane evacuation is truly the critical need as promulgated by lobbying groups, it appears that all recommended associated road widening is also critical. The question has to be asked if N.C. tax payers and the environment are being asked to take on this burden and risk primarily so that Duck and Southern Shores might benefit from some reduced auto thru-traffic?
I understand that newer more recent studies available to you apparently now indicate that a new Mid-Currituck bridge would not appreciably lessen auto thru-traffic through those towns. I also understand that newer studies are available to you which suggest that a new Mid-Currituck bridge would not produce the evacuation benefits forecasted earlier. Please ask for and review those new studies.

f. If we assume just for argument sake that additional bridging is critical, certainly adding a span to the WMB is a far lower cost alternative based on length alone. And certainly there is also plenty of room right now for two additional traffic lanes between the bridge and Home Depot. This would also have far less overall environmental impact than a new bridge with supporting highways on the northern Outer Banks and the mainland town where the bridge would originate.

Again as previously discussed, it does not matter where cars are coming from during an OBX evacuation. The simple goal is to get cars off the OBX quickly from everywhere including the north and south OBX which have about the same driving time to WMB for the cars in the south that want to use WMB. Adding a single span to WMB thereby creating the potential for 4 west bound bridge evacuation lanes with 2 new roadway traffic lanes on the OBX side could further speed evacuation but should be considered only if it is considered a true necessity and it would not overload the 4 west bound evacuation lanes on Route 158 to the point that 3 bridge lanes would have been adequate in the aggregate.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Edward B. English
g. Mid-Currituck Bridge not needed to encourage visitors to Corolla area

a. I am concerned about the long term potential negative impact on N.C. tax payers and the real potential that they may have to bail out the project above the apparent current $15 million annual payment to the private construction company. It is inconceivable to me that the $15 million plus tolls visitors would be willing to pay during basically three summer months for three days each week (cottage turnover days) could earn enough for the Spanish company to cover construction, long term operation and maintenance, and adequate return on investment. Toll revenue from northern Outer Banks residents would be negligible. This could turn into a very bad deal for N.C. in the years ahead. In my experience people often “best case” the numbers to seemingly prove their case. My sincere suggestion is that numbers be “worse cased” by a truly independent and competent analyst as part of the bridge final review process.

b. I challenge the perceived critical need for a new bridge to resolve hurricane evacuation traffic flow concerns. Please consider the following. An evacuation plan I would encourage based on current capacity would create 4 west bound lanes on state Route 158 using the current 2 west bound lanes, plus the center lane, plus the center-most east bound lane. Similarly, I would convert 1 east bound Wright Memorial Bridge (WMB) lane to west bound. This leaves 1 lane for east bound emergency vehicle traffic. The 3 west bound WMB lanes would feed 4 west bound Route 158 lanes and probably keep them full as inland traffic issues and towns slowed traffic flow. Any traffic from the proposed northern (Mid-Currituck) bridge would merge into Route 158 evacuation traffic adversely slowing it. Police presence could slow traffic further given the way Interstates slow even when lanes are otherwise clear when a police car is stopped by the side of the highway.

The over arching evacuation goal is to get cars off the Outer Banks regardless of where they start. I have no doubt that 4 west bound Route 158 lanes from WMB would keep moving most easily and quickly if there is no interference from merging traffic from a new Mid-Currituck bridge. The only way to avoid merging/slowing traffic would be to build a new additional far right Route 158 west bound lane just for Mid-Currituck bridge traffic where the bridge feeds on to Route 158.

c. Modern weather forecasting technology makes it increasingly probable that evacuation will commence sooner rather than later reducing the need for an additional bridge.

d. The real estate management company program of offering and encouraging renters to buy “hurricane insurance” also promotes visitor willingness to evacuate earlier rather than later since they will not loose their rent money. This also reduces the need for an additional bridge.

e. “Hurricane evacuation” appears to be the rallying cry used by lobbying groups to promote Mid-Currituck bridge construction in order to achieve the real goal of reducing auto thru-traffic in the towns of Duck and Southern Shores according to the Summer 2010 issue of North Beach Sun Real Estate. The article also points out that the best hurricane evacuation improvement alternative included both the Mid-Currituck bridge plus widening state Route 12 through the towns of Southern Shores and Duck.

Interestingly, the Route 12 widening portion was apparently discarded based on local zoning rules and additional cost considerations. If better hurricane evacuation is truly the critical need as promulgated by lobbying groups, it appears that all recommended associated road widening is also critical. The question has to be asked if N.C. tax payers and the environment are being asked to take on this burden and risk primarily so that Duck and Southern Shores might benefit from some reduced auto thru-traffic?

I understand that newer more recent studies available to you apparently now indicate that a new Mid-Currituck bridge would not appreciably lessen auto thru-traffic through those towns. I also understand that newer studies are available to you which suggest that a new Mid-Currituck bridge would not produce the evacuation benefits forecasted earlier. Please ask for and review those new studies.

f. If we assume just for argument sake that additional bridging is critical, certainly adding a span to the WMB is a far lower cost alternative based on length alone. And certainly there is also plenty of room right now for two additional traffic lanes between the bridge and Home Depot. This would also have far less overall environmental impact than a new bridge with supporting highways on the northern Outer Banks and the mainland town where the bridge would originate.

Again as previously discussed, it does not matter where cars are coming from during an OBX evacuation. The simple goal is to get cars off the OBX quickly from everywhere including the north and south OBX which have about the same driving time to WMB for the cars in the south that want to use WMB. Adding a single span to WMB thereby creating the potential for 4 west bound bridge evacuation lanes with 2 new roadway traffic lanes on the OBX side could further speed evacuation but should be considered only if it is considered a true necessity and it would not overload the 4 west bound evacuation lanes on Route 158 to the point that 3 bridge lanes would have been adequate in the aggregate. And if the additional MCB span was deemed absolutely critical it the final analysis a local bond issue with a tax on tourist related items would be the effective and fair way to pay for it while keeping N.C. in control of its finances and assets.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Edward B. English
To Whom It May Concern;

I do not agree with your arguments on evacuation. If evacuation were a primary issue the bridge to Currituck would hardly be the best way to spend $700 million. Out of the estimated 250,000 persons per week that filter on and off of this wonderful area weekly during the summer, how many are Currituck bound? 30,000? 40,000? It seems a disproportionate waste of monies considering that with 40,000 individuals and if the bridge cost $10 per vehicle it would take upwards of 70,000,000 vehicles to recoup expenses before any upkeep had to be done. Also, "The need to substantially improve traffic flow on the project area’s thoroughfares (US158 and NC12)" and "The need to substantially reduce travel time for persons traveling between the Currituck Country mainland and the Currituck County Outer Banks," according to whom does this need to urgently be done? Traffic is a pain, for two days a week, three months of the year. Reduce travel time? That’s a major concern? I don’t understand how a state that is in a poor fiscal shape as this one should be worrying themselves about the added hour and a half travel time for someone on their vacation.

Furthermore, it appears as though your Environmental Impact Statement fails to mention the impact these projects would have on bird life in the area. I think that is a serious miscalculation. Marshes are homes to these animals and specifically Currituck has some of the best numbers of night, green, and tri-colored Herons I’ve seen out here. It appears to be an environmental disaster for not just fish but birds, wetlands, and people who used to enjoy the beauty up there. Now the beaches of the sound will be littered with broken glass, headlights, and various debris from vehicle travel. I for one am not looking forward to sacrificing the beauty of a region so that someone can get to their rental sooner.

It also seems as though once the bridge goes in, there will be a tremendous amount of development around it and in the end it will lead to the same type of overcrowding that you think is the issue up there right now. Is there a plan in place for expanding NC12 after the bridge goes in? Could you designate NC 12 a historic road so that no widening could take place and jeopardize the lives of thousands of people who walk and ride their bikes along the road? I’m picturing a stretch of road from Southern Shores up to the beach that will, without much effort, soon resemble 158 through Kill Devil Hills and Nags Head.

This is a clear case of priorities misplaced. The goal should be getting North Carolinians back to work in good, long term employment; not spending $700 million on short term projects that will aide someone’s vacation.

Thank you very much,

Dave Facenda
Columbia Sportswear
1718 Sea Swept Rd
Kill Devil Hills, NC 27948
252.256.2787/Cell
503.350.7170/Fax
From: Mary Farrell  To: midcurrituck  Sent: Fri Apr 23 07:24:58 2010  Subject: BUILD THE BRIDGE

As a long term property owner on the Outer Banks, I have watched traffic increase to the point of seriously being concerned. With the popularity of the Outer Banks growing, the Mid-Currituck Bridge has become a necessity - for safety reasons alone. Evacuations alone will prove this to be true.

I support the bridge - please build it

Mary Farrell
Duck Community and Business Alliance
P.O. Box 8281, Duck, North Carolina 27949

John Warner, President
Ed Brooks, Vice President
Secretary
Ed Brooks, Treasurer
Lynne Allmann, Director

Board Members - Steve Alteman, Jon Fink, Lisa Moreland, Don Zarba

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Nancy Fassett
Street Address: 131 Chaos Jenkins Lane, APT/Suite #
City, State, Zip: Duck, NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCB4 Because it widens Rt. 12 the least but does include the bridge.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I have no preference.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

No preference.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing center turn lane - no additional construction.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

My main concern is that the town of Duck be as affected as little as possible.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments:
Dear Jennifer Harris, I hope for just a few minutes of your time. I am a concerned resident of Corolla who is seeing his way of life and dreams for a peaceful retirement enjoying the beauty of OBX go up in smoke. I hope you can help.

When people come to enjoy the OBX they come to "get away from it all". It is a place were families across generations can spend quite time in a peaceful, relaxing atmosphere. This is what Corolla has to offer. The thought of massive bridges, 4 lane highways, and all that brings to our community is an exact opposite of what we so treasure in the Northern OBX life.

I am not one to stand in the way of progress, but there are exceptions to all rules. No one would want speedways built into Yellowstone national Park, Grand Canyon, etc. I feel we should be treating our OBX the same way. They are a national treasure that should be preserved. We have enough tacky resorts, and flashy getaways that are loud and busy. We need more thoughtful uses for our true treasures.

As I sit watching the tragedy of the gulf of Mexico I can't help but wonder when will our OBX be ruined. I own a small house on the sound side of Corolla. I take my kids on Kayak trips and watch the beauty in all its splendor. We sit on our back deck and see the most amazing sunsets. Now with the bridge being considered I get to sit and watch a monstrous ugly piece of concrete that brings loud honking cars all hours of the day and night, et al.

I ask you, when you go to the beach with your family what is it that you most look for? Quiet walks on the beach? Sunsets? or do you prefer 4 lane highways, monster bridges, and all they have to offer. Before we destroy our OBX please help us fight this bad decision.

Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Tomer Feldman

if you need to contact me I can be contacted at TSLFELDMAN@aol.com

---

From: Ken Fischer [mailto:ken@kenfischer.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 9:37 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Comments on EIS Study

Hello.

First, I would like to thank you for keeping me informed by mailing me information on the bridge Study. I appreciate that these things are complex, and that you have many differing opinions to deal with.

I receives the 1-page glossy sheet with the description of the various study options, and the note that the study recommends alternative MCB4. I would like to register my agreement that I think this is the best of the 3 options. Option ER2 really does nothing to resolve the issue that all the homes south of the existing 158 bridges have to evacuate using the same route that all the homes North of the bridge would have to use. I think MCB2 is not necessary, and would just involve extra expense. As an owner of 2 homes north of the intersection of US 158 and NC 12, I fully support this recommendation.

Ken

Permanent Address: Ken Fischer
10125 Quarry Hill Pl.
Parker, CO 80134

NC Addresses: Ken Fischer
7 Seventh Avenue
Southern Shores, NC 27949

256 Wax Myrtle Trail
Southern Shores, NC 27949
Subject: FW: Mid-Currituck Bridge Comment Form (not previously attached)

Name: Ronald Fisher_______________________________________

City, State, Zip: ____________________________Apt./Suite #____

Email: ____________________________________________

Question 1: Do you prefer the BRZ, MCBS, or MCSA or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCBS is my preference because I provide an alternative evacuation route in an emergency in the southern part of the county.

Question 2: If you prefer MCBS or MCSA, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer corridor C1 because it is closer to the homes and businesses in the area.

Question 3: If you prefer MCBS or MCSA, do you prefer mainline approach and design Option A or B and why?

I prefer Option A because it is more cost-effective.

Question 4: Any hurricane evacuation impact? Do you prefer adding a third outbound lane or do you prefer adding a third outbound lane and a second inbound lane? Why?

I prefer adding a third outbound lane because it will reduce congestion and provide additional capacity.

Question 5: Any additional issues or comments you would like to add and why?

I believe it is essential to add capacity to US 158 with a third outbound lane and keep the option of adding a second inbound lane if needed.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional Comments: Please see my response to question 5. Thank you for reviewing these issues.

To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Ron Fisher [mailto:ronjfisher@cox.net]

Additional Comments: Please see my response to question 5. Thank you for reviewing these issues.
From: Katie Flanigan [mailto:kakakakatie14@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 05, 2010 2:08 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

Dear Ms. Harris,

My husband and I own a soundfront home in Monterey Shores on the Outer Banks. The more I study about the Mid-Currituck bridge, the more I favor the No-Build alternative. I feel that the bridge will destroy the most important thing about the northern beaches—its relative isolation. I also worry about crime that will inevitably follow the easier access. I have also been very discouraged about the damage and change that the bridge will bring to Aydlett.

It seems that the bridge is really more for the short tourist season than the year-round residents. I don’t think the cost of the bridge and the negative impact on the communities justifies the expense or the inevitable changes it will bring. I am also not willing to pay the $12-$20.00 toll to cross the bridge.

Sincerely,
Katie Flanigan

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: ____________________________
Kathy Flannely

Street Address: 5711 Dryfuss Street Springfield VA 22151
Beach property – own a home at Schooner Ridge, in Duck, NC

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?
MCB4 – helps with traffic

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
No preference

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
No preference

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Reversing center lane – less cost, no destruction of properties needed to make the 3rd lane

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.
**Addition Comments:** My main concern is helping the flow of beach traffic and having the least impact to the town of Duck. Building a bridge will take some of the traffic away from the 158/12 area and might be another alternative for me to get to Duck from Northern Virginia.

---

**BARBARA Fletcher**

From: <DCRAJency@nol.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 12:42 PM
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Comment Form (not previously attached)

**DUCK COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS ALLIANCE**

P.O. Box 8281, Duck, North Carolina 27949

John Wonder, President
Ed Brooks, Vice President
Lyman Allman, Secretary
Ed Brooks, Treasurer

Board Members – Steve Allman, Jon Bilt, Lisa Nembn, Don Zerbe

**Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form**

Name: Barbara Fletcher

Street Address: 131 Charles Jenkins Apt./Suite 
Lane West

City, State, Zip: Duck NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ntturnpike.org

**Question 1:** Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

**MCB4** because it has the least impact on Route 12 through my community

**Question 2:** If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

No real preference
Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Again I'd leave this choice to the bridge planners.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing the center lane - additional lane construction on 158 seems an unnecessary expense.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

My primary concern has always been to impact the Town of Duck, as little as possible.

The charm of our community could be destroyed by widening Route 12.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments:

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Dondie E. Fleen
Street Address: 430 Curracoa Highway Apt./Suite No. 
City, State, Zip: Moyock, NC. 27958

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

The MCB2 Design is very good - clean- to the point.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

The MCB4-C3 Bridge Corridor Alternative is the best plan.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

MCB4/C3 Option A mainland approach road design is simple to the point - less disruption to area.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

HURRICANE EVACUATION I prefer using THE CENTER LANE. NOT ADDING A THIRD LANE

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

No.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@nctturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: FRANK H. FLEET JR.
Street Address: 460 CARIJOTE Highway Apt./Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: Moyock, NC 27958

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
The MCB4 Design outstanding design.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
C4 bridge design corridor more effective.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
MCB4/CA/Option A mainland approach road design is simple - less disruptive to the area.
From: randy floyd [mailto:randyfloyd2@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 05, 2010 11:56 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: currituck mid county bridge

I am against the bridge. And 95% of the people I have talked to are also. I have talked to owners, tourists and locals on both sides of the bridge. And most of the tourists I have talked to say they come to Currituck due to the isolation. The Locals will not be able to afford to use it. So it will only be for tourists and county workers. Dare county does not like the traffic but they sure like the money spent there. It will not help the vacating of the beach, it just shifts the back up from the beach to Barco during a hurricane evacuation. The money would be better spent repairing the bridge at organ inlet. And a foreign company should not be allowed to build and own the bridge.

my whole family feels the same way
baxter r. floyd jr
Katinia h floyd
Darnelle floyd
hampton ballance
jesse ballance
Karista ballance
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: [Redacted]
Street Address: 1403 Pinewald Rd., Cofrollek
City, State, Zip: Christiansburg, VA 24073

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

- MC4
  - less impact on NC 68 north of the C2
  - Rinal Construction 133 generally good
  - evacuation from C2

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2: the right choice

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Not preferred

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing center lane because it must

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

RD

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Thank you

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27695-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Marcia Anne Frazier
Street Address: 135 Maple Court, 4B
City, State, Zip: Duck, NC, 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB32, MCB43, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
I prefer the No-Build Alternative, simply because the bridge will cause traffic delays in the Corolla area. People will not take the bridge as easily as they do now. It will be a lot easier to use the bridge as it is now.

If you prefer MCB32 or MCB43, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C or D and why?
If I had to choose one of the other, I would prefer A. I have been to the Corolla area before, and it is a beautiful place.

If you prefer MCB32 or MCB43, do you prefer maintained approach road design Option A or B and why?
I disagree with both options, neither seem reasonable.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane in US 158 or diverting the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
I would prefer diverting the center turn lane during an evacuation simply because it would be the only reasonable alternative. It would be a waste in expensive to create a third lane, expensive and completely unnecessary.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
There are several types of impacts that are of particular concern to me. My family, my friends, and my neighborhood are all close to the beach and would be affected. It would be very difficult to keep the beach clean and maintain the environment for the beach. I am concerned about the environment and the safety of the beach.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its size, draft, and location.
My family has been boating for many years, and we have experienced how important it is to have a clean and safe environment.

I agree with the current plan. The bridge is necessary and will not cause any harm. The bridge will be maintained and kept in good condition.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27696-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Cindy Francis
Street Address: 1700 Mount Carmel Rd Apt/Suite No:
City, State, Zip: Parkton Nc 21120

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
I prefer MCB2 or MCB4. They will reduce the number of boats going through the town, reduce boat collisions, and potentially reduce the amount of pollution entering the sound.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
I am completely opposed to C1 alternative as it would completely change the neighborhood. The bridge would need to cross a main highway to get to the community pool, playground, clubhouse, and activities. We can’t even keep our houses safe from speeding cars and we have to move them up north. You are sure to be convenient so you can safely cross our children over a four-lane highway.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer main approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1576
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
I am a motion with elementary school age children, to had the opportunity to come down for a Scan Spring break in month to visit with my own parents. In the way down I said to my daughter, "Do you want to have some tea today?" So I was able to sit on our back porch and see wild horses wandering thru our yard as we were eating breakfast. What happened then why can't the horses still wander free? Well I don't think we can because speeding cars were killing them. On that thought ... what will my daughter be able to tell her children ... will it be another DL and? Because the residents of our town didn't preserve their Community. All residence in DL need to consider the pollution impact. I live in DL, we have a state wide tax, this tax is applied to our septic systems its call the flush tax. It's rates we on all pay as a result of our polluted waterways because no one stood up to preserve them. This place is special, still untouched by our growth. That too will change with the bridge. The effect of the bridge will be felt state wide as the pollution will be a state problem as it is in DL. Your towns will rise and so will crime.

If the bridge comes in at the CI alternative a 4 lane highway with speeding cars will be coming thru the Monterey St. community. If we couldn't even keep horses safe how are you proposing to keep my children safe. As they will now need to cross a 4 lane highway to get to their community pool and playground. Are you looking at the CI alternative to save or cost. But at what cost the cost of children's lives.

Don't let our pollution strap more debt on the backs of our children with little fiscal responsibility. Leaving the green space that we live in a better place for them to live on or are we.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Matthew Franklin
Street Address: 1200 Old Corridor Rd Apt/Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: Chesapeake VA 23320

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No Build - The safety of our children with crossing a 4 lane road to get to their school house is the biggest concern. The other, it will cause massive pollution and environmental damage.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

[Space for comments]

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

[Space for comments]

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Yes, to be the least costly and most effective.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@nc turnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Augustus E. Feicker Jr.

Street Address: 353 Sea Gull Ter

City, State, Zip: Kitty Hawk, NC 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB4 - it's the most common street to use

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

No opinion on either; I like the MCB2

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why? Each one is acceptable to the resident of the area.

Additional comments:

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Using the Center Lane

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you would prefer to return form by mail, please provide the following:

Additional comments:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
I am in strong support of the Mid-Currituck Sound bridge. This study has gone on for far too long. What else needs to be studied? This bridge will greatly relieve traffic congestion through Southern Shores and Duck and greatly assist in emergency evacuation. Let's move on and get this done.

Richard J. Furioni
49 Skyline Rd.
Southern Shores
The principals of Smart Growth and future growth that the document states the DOT/FWHA has no interest in, have not kept pace with the current approaches. USEPA and DOT/FWHA have entered in a joint policy to consider consequences of future growth when funding future transportation projects and are currently holding webinars on this issue to inform the public of the new policies.

The environmental justice impacts are far from adequately addressed in MCB 2 and 4 options. Many minority and poverty level inhabitants commute to work in Corolla. Not only will these two options destroy the cultural resources of Auylett but it will clearly discriminate against the minority and poverty residents by forcing them to commute the longer distance to advantage tourists who visit seasonally.

I am unalterably opposed to MCB 2 and 4 as this document is currently written.

My detailed comments follow.

Page xiv—The need for the project section states that there is a need to reduce travel time and improve flow but who has established this need? It is never explained. It is also never explained how the need to reduce evacuation times was established given that all three (3) options contain the same recommendations for hurricane evacuations.

Page xiv—The text states in the second bullet that the bridge would offer substantial travel time savings for many travelers. It has been estimated that this travel time savings is approximately 35 minutes. This time savings does not logically meet the definition of substantial and would only accrue to those traveling directly to Corolla. It would not benefit those going to Pine Island, Sanderling or Duck. The document throughout makes an assumption that no person using the bridge is traveling to Southern Shores or Kitty Hawk. I believe this is a false assumption. Many residents have offices south of Corolla and this would require visitors to pickup keys south of Corolla and then have to return up NC 12 to move into their tourist rental housing. In addition, backups of traffic from those traveling south will likely occur where the four (4) lane widened NC 12 narrows to two (2) lanes. Most critical of all is the key question related to how you determined that this was a "need".

Page xiv—The text states in the third bullet that a third outboard lane is the only approach which would alleviate issues with hurricane evacuation. Many experts who have worked with contingency planning throughout the nation, including those in South Carolina and Florida have experience in directing the reversal of traffic flow at considerably less cost than lane construction. With extraordinarily constrained resources on the part of the State, it seems that a least cost approach would make the most sense. This would require unprecedented cooperation between Dare, Currituck and State police. Because hurricane evacuation is the same approach across all three options, I maintain that this consideration should have no bearing on the build or no build approach for this bridge.

Page xiv—The text states that in all circumstance MCB 2 and 4 have the most impact on clearing wetlands, shading of open water and impacts on Maple Swamp. There are no statements made as to mitigation efforts for these impacts. Are there mitigation measures, and if so what are they?

Page 2-24—Regarding the drainage along NC 12, note the use of Infiltration strategies. It is difficult to see how infiltration is appropriate when NC 12 will be widened in the precise area that currently floods with stormwater during heavy rain events. There appears to be no room for 21 foot buffer zones, if NC 12 is widened to four (4) lanes in the areas noted without displacing far more residents (specifically Ocean Sands) than the 6 or 10 noted in your report. Nor does there appear to be room for the additional two (2) acres of stormwater detention basins without additional impacts to neighborhoods. In addition, I wish to note for the record that the northernmost section of Ocean Sands, which contains the most permanent and part-time residents, will be the most heavily affected by these choices.

Page 2-26—The additional cost of catch basins for storm water is presented as an option with a cost of $10 million. Is this cost factored into MCB 2 and 47? If so and the runoff is piped to catch basins, is the runoff then assumed to filter through the ground? In the discussion on pages 2-27 and 2-28 how will the petroleum and other hydrocarbons generated by the vehicles traveling on bridge be handled to prevent further degradation to the wetlands?

Page 2-32—In the third bullet, it states that 27 miles is not a realistic option for the reversal of traffic flow. This is routinely done in other coastal areas in hurricane events without it being considered unrealistic. The Florida Keys do it for their evacuations. Why is the conclusion based upon? Would not it be expected that the onslow flow of traffic during an evacuation would be reduced to a mere trickle? What basis is there for these conclusions, other than hearsay?

Page 2-36—It is clear that ER2 is the least cost alternative other than "no build". Why does the DEIS not weigh cost as a critical factor in your analysis?

Page 2-42—Given the current state of the NC budget, why are bonding issues not considered a liability? You propose doing what the bonding market has mistakenly done for the last several
decades, pushing debt into the future and weighting (present v. future costs) flows in the state deficit in ways not yet fully understood. What mechanisms will be available to service this debt, should revenues from tolls fall short?

Page 2-42 What leads the writer to conclude that there will be substantial reduction in time and congestion? What constitutes substantial, given it is a saving of 35 minutes travel and only for those tourists who can pick up their keys in Corolla?

Page 2-43 Why does the conclusion that MCB 4 results in the fewest relocations, given the widening of NC 12, the insertion of storm water buffer areas and the impact on the proximity of Ocean Sands residents in NC 12? This conclusion does not seem to be factually based.

Page 3-14 The text states that no alternative meets each of the local land use plans. What leads to the conclusion that MCB 2 or 4 is preferable, given this fact?

Page 3-29 The text states that turbidity levels would be negatively affected during the construction periods. Please explain how the revegetation would occur post-construction? How will the increased algal growth be mitigated? In addition, given the biodegradability of the contaminants from runoff, especially metals, how can you prevent persistence in the fish population? How will you prevent the consumption of such contaminated fish and/or shellfish and what will this do economically to the environmental justice-related residents of the communities, especially those residing on the mainland who sustains off fish and/or shellfish?

What contingency exists for hazardous response should a spill incident occur on the bridge or its approaches, given Currituck County’s limited hazardous capabilities? The closest USCG response unit is in Elizabeth City, an hour away and the EPA field office is in Atlanta. The State hazardous response is based out of the Raleigh area.

Page 3-48 The mitigation approaches are not well delineated, given the reliance upon groundwater for drinking purposes in these areas.

Page 3-62 The text and table show a mean reduction of approximately 80 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT). This is based on the assumption that those persons using the bridge will be landing and staying in Corolla. This is a false assumption. It fails to factor in tourists who must pick up keys south of Corolla, and day visitors from the Hampton Roads area (a latter statement says they will not come to Corolla because they have Virginia Beach). Many visitors and part-time residents reside in the Hampton Roads area. Corolla and Virginia Beach are in no way equivalent and do not offer the same attractions.

In addition, where are idling time emissions factored into the bridge for toll payments? A later statement in the text says that in the future all tolls will be paid electronically. If this is so, it discriminates against the environmental justice community who are least likely to use credit cards and most likely to take day trips. More likely any emissions reductions will result from EPA’s increased fuel efficiency standards.

Page 3-72 How was it determined that those potentially contaminated sites are low to negligible risk, especially the old URI?

Given the already problematic storm water management during flood events, how does additional paving of the bridge, its approaches and NC 12 get mitigated?

Page 3-87 Who wrote the third bullet? Many of us internet routinely both on and off season, this bullet makes us sound like the ugly stepchildren of Currituck.

Page 3-89 The text states for the nonroad accessible communities, no reasonable change can be seen in the foreseeable future. Local real estate folks are selling future clients of these areas that the paved road will come as soon as the bridge is built and that Carova, Swan Beach, etc. are the next big development areas on the Outer Banks. In addition, the Currituck County Commissioners are currently weighing the option of allowing commercial development in these areas. Again, these issues are not reflected. Who was consulted on this section?

Page 3-90 The residents of Aydlett may well disapprove with the statement that no reasonably foreseeable difference of note can be found, as stated in the last paragraph. Given that small businesses are the backbone of the American economy, there is little to recommend moving and disrupting their lives or those of the residents, especially those most impoverished. The document as a whole is astonishingly insensitive to both the culture and the sense of community of current residents of Aydlett and the other small mainland communities.

Page 3-91 The text notes that cumulative effects would be felt on future development irrespective of the bridge. However, this statement while true as far as it goes, does not truly analyze the growth trends resulting specifically from the bridge nor the very nature of what brings folk to the Corolla area. The very wildness and undeveloped quiet of the area is what attracts most visitors and current residents. Many of my family’s acquaintances hope to retire in this area, however, if its very nature is changed, they will no longer be interested.

Page 3-99 Please revise section discussing FHWA. Its policy on cumulative impact and future growth has changed.

Supporting documentation comments

Page 4-27 Second paragraph. Please specifically factor the noise and wetland disruption on tundra swan habitat. MCB3 4 and 2 both include their winter habitat. In addition, observed
species include ruddy ducks, as well as those noted. My husband and I have also observed Eagles in the Estuarine Reserve just north of MCB 4. We have also seen rails in this area. In addition, in the last month we have observed pileated woodpeckers there. The removal of habitat of these rare animals is difficult at best to understand.

Page 4-31 Fragmentation of the Maple Swamp wetlands will affect both nesting ducks and wading birds. These species are highly unlikely to walk through a below grade bridge. Your analysis recognizes many of the negative effects on wildlife that will likely occur but says nothing in the conclusion to justify their destruction.

Page 4-33 Traffic noise will especially disrupt the tundra swan and duck populations that arrive in the fall. How is this to be justified?

Although a mention is made of LED lighting no firm commitment to its use occurs. Nor is there a firm commitment to the bike lane.

Page 4-34 Although nesting turtles are not directly impacted by the bridge's presence, the island is very narrow and increased noise and auto lights have been shown to have an impact. Sanibel in Florida has regulations in this regard to street lighting. The street widening of NC 12 does not address this.

Pages 4-37 and 4-38. See previous comments with regard to dredging, turbidity, contaminations and metals persistence.

Page 4-39 There is nothing to address what occurs with dredge spoils after the construction is complete. Do you plan on simply dumping them back in the sound adding to the turbidity and contaminations issues?

Also you state that these are minor and temporary impacts. What leads you to this conclusion?

Page 4-40 Shading and permanent loss of habitat are major issues. You will completely change the aquatic ecosystem in what is already a fragile area. What can mitigate this?

Summary Conclusion

As you can see from these detailed comments, my view is that this was a project conceived in "gogo '90s" by pro-real estate and development factions. I think Governor Perdue would be ill-advised to use scarce state resources, put bond ratings at risk and betray the current Administration's approach to both environmental justice and smart growth to line the pockets of a few individuals. I think you were given a task of heroic proportions but the simple fact is that the justifications of saving tourist commute time, hurricane evacuations and congestion will not be cured or even really addressed by the construction of this bridge.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Linda Garozzo
765 Sea Mist Ct.
Corolla, NC 27927

June 4, 2010

cc. Governor Perdue
William Bidwell, USACE
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: [Handwritten] - [illegible]
Street Address: [Handwritten] - [illegible]
City, State, Zip: DUCK, NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

**MCB4**

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Leaves up to project team

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or

Leaves up to others (another option is proposed)

http://usng204.mail.yahoo.com/de/launch

5/30/2010

---

Bend why?
(Seems A is preferred by residents)

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

— reversible center lane —

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments:

— Strong for bridge
— Shyly oppose widening at 12
— Through Ducks and Sanderson

— Patricia V. Hilds

5/30/2010
------Original Message------
From: Charles Gilmore [mailto:cgilmore@gwu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 9:26 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: bridge

I am writing to support the building of the mid Currituck a bridge option MCB4. I have a home in Duck, NC at 125 Windsurfer Court. The traffic to and from Corolla on weekends during the summer makes travel around Duck impossible at these changeover times. The bridge should significantly reduce the traffic through Duck making the widening of NC 12 unnecessary. This is why I support MCB4.

Charles Gilmore
MCB4 is the only viable alternative

Duck, Southern Shores, and the Wright Memorial Bridge cannot handle the already existing heavy volume associated with development of the northern outer banks in Currituck County and these areas south of the Currituck Outer Banks from a residential and tourist viewpoint would be significantly harmed by any expansion of existing roads.

Selecting MCB4 is a no brainer to those of us south of the Currituck Outer Banks.

Robert J. Glatz
From: Sandy Goldberg  [mailto:sgoldberg@ujft.org]
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 10:50 AM
Subject: Build the bridge. Double the evacuation routes.

The need for the mid Currituck bridge is striking when you see the traffic on 12 of a normal day in Corolla. It scares me to take my 5 grandchildren to our house near Timbuck II in August, during the beginning of hurricane season. The evacuation route across the new bridge is sorely needed.

Sandy Goldberg
M. 757 286 3920
P.757 965 6135
F. 757 965 6102
sgoldberg@ujft.org

---

From: Richard & Debra Gonzalez  To: Harris, Jennifer  Sent: Fri Apr 23 08:14:01 2010  Subject: Currituck Bridge

Hi Jennifer,

I am owner of a beach house in Corolla. I wanted you to know how much I am looking forward to the currituck cty bridge being built.

This would cut my trip in half. I am willing to pay a toll (within reason) to be able to get to my house without having to go all the way around.

I never go to the house in the summer because of what I have heard about the traffic and how long it takes to get to Corolla.

North Carolina has good roads and this bridge would definitely be a bonus for us.

Please continue the good work in getting this bridge built.
-----Original Message-----

From: Nancy Goodrich [mailto:nogoodj@embargmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 6:33 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: The Bridge Project

May 18, 2010

Dear Ms. Harris,

Thank you for the recent mailing detailing the three options for the Mid-Currituck Bridge. We have reviewed the material carefully, and would like to register our preference for MCB4, the recommended alternative. It seems to be the least intrusive into the fragile and very narrow section of the Outer Banks from the Bridge in the north down to Southern Shores.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond on this exceedingly important issue which affects us all who have property in the affected area. We built our Sanderling home 27 years ago as a family gathering place. Over the years it has become a treasured retreat, much loved by three generations of Goodriches. Thus we care a great deal about the Bridge issue, hoping it can be built with as little change to the quiet beach life of the Sanderling community.

Sincerely,
Nancy and George Goodrich
2600 Barracks Road C-9
Charlottesville, Va. 22901
From: Francis J. Gorman  
Sent: Sunday, May 09, 2010 2:54 PM  
To: midcurrituck@nctturnpike.org  
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge -- Build It Now

As a long-time vacationer on the Outer Banks of North Carolina, I support the construction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. I travel frequently from Maryland to vacation in North Carolina. Over the years, the summer traffic has become very heavy, tending to discourage the trip to North Carolina. The Mid-Currituck Bridge would relieve the congestion by giving those owners and vacationers residing north of Duck a shorter and quicker route to their destination from the north via the Mid-Currituck Bridge rather than the longer and slower route via the Wright Brothers Memorial Bridge, which is way over-capacity during summer weekends.

Moreover, the suggestion of widening the beach road is not a good one – it would destroy the character of the Outer Banks region.

So please proceed and start building the Mid-Currituck now.

Francis J. Gorman
Mid Currituck Bridge DEIS Comments—John Grattan May 19, 2010

It is a pleasure to be able to testify today and I thank the Federal Highway Administration and the North Carolina Turnpike Authority for coming to Corolla to let us offer our opinions in person. It was also very gracious of those organizations to host an open house prior to this public hearing.

Let me introduce myself. My name is John Grattan and I live about four miles down the road at 740 Maritime Drive Corolla, less than a quarter mile from proposed Mid Currituck Bridge Terminal C2.

My wife and I moved here from California three years ago. In California I was an energy and environmental attorney. I also had served in State Government as an Assistant Secretary of the Resources Agency and also as an Assistant Secretary to the Business and Transportation Agency. I also was a State Coastal Commissioner. In these various capacities I either helped write, edited, provided legal adequacy review, challenged or defended literally hundreds of EIS’s or EIR’s (the California equivalent of EIS’s). This is not my first rodeo.

At the outset let me say that I have a great deal of respect for the credentials and professionalism of those that have contributed to this DEIS on the proposed Mid Currituck Bridge and attendant road improvements. With a few important exceptions, on which I will later provide written comments this professionalism shows in the sections of the DEIS which address the direct impacts of the proposed Mid Currituck Bridge in its discussed alternative forms.

However this is somewhat akin to saying “Other than that, how was the play, Mrs. Lincoln?” You see the direct impacts of the Bridge itself are pretty straightforward, avoid the wetlands in Maple Swamp, don’t mess with the little Aydelott Community, minimize the visual and noise impacts, avoid the ridiculous EIR option and there you have it. The real issues are the Indirect and Cumulative impacts, the Growth Inducing Impacts. This means that those impacts will be significant and will be felt in the Corolla and Carova Communities. In that regard this Draft EIS is fatally flawed and legally insufficient.

Just to give an idea of the total lack of focus on the most important issue associated with the proposed Bridge, the DEIS in the all important Chapter Three spends 81 pages discussing the direct impacts of the Bridge and the associated road widenings. It spends a grand total of 18 in discussing the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, the bulk of which address the new businesses which will relocate to the 188-Bridge approach on the Mainland. This leaves about 10 pages devoted to the impacts on the Outer Banks—Corolla-Carova, right here. To use a biblical expression, this DEIS “strains at gnats and swallows camels.”

I will enter detailed, page by page written comments on behalf of myself and members of the community tonight and reserve the right to supplement and extend these before the end of the comment period June 26th. Let me point out a few of the major problems with this DEIS and its total whitewashing of the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.

**Increased Growth in the Currituck County Outer Banks**

The first issue is the Bridge induced growth that will occur in the Currituck County Outer Banks. The DEIS is legally inadequate in that it fails to quantify and consequently does not recommend mitigation for the substantial adverse impacts associated with this Bridge induced growth. The DEIS states at p. 3-89 that:

> "The introduction of a Mid Currituck Bridge...would substantially reduce travel time from points North of the Mainland to the Currituck County Outer Banks. As such, the order on which available lots on the NC 12 accessible Outer Banks would develop in response to market demands would likely change with more Currituck County lots developing before Dare County lots."

I submit to you that this statement acknowledges a potentially substantial adverse impact as a result of Mid Currituck Bridge Construction. One only needs to compare the nature and degree of development at the locations nearest to the existing Wright Brothers Memorial Bridge at Kitty Hawk with which we saw out your trip out here to Corolla, Kitty Hawk is a cluttered, amorphous, quasi-urban environment. This is not the case for the Currituck County Outer Banks. The setting here is relatively undeveloped, largely aesthetically pleasing, and not overrun with commercial development.

The Bridge will change all of this.

The DEIS attempts to paper over this failure to acknowledge a clearly substantial adverse environmental impact with statements such as is found on p. 3-89 that the area is “largely developed”. Nowhere is there any quantification or other support for this conclusion.

The DEIS also states, also on p. 3-89 that, “The types of development called for in the land use plans of Currituck County, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck are similar.” Nowhere is there a justification for this conclusory and misleading statement.

The DEIS also states at p. 3-89 that:

> "Current development regulations and past trends associated with implementation of these (land use) plans are indicative of the local jurisdictions’ commitment to implement these plans as they stand."

Nowhere is there an analysis or justification for this statement. I might add that this has not been the experience of many of the citizens here who have had land use issues before the Currituck County Board of Commissioners. In fact just this Monday (May 17) the Board of Commissioners approved a Special Use Permit for a 12.75 multi-family, hotel, restaurant and retail store development in an Oceanside area designated as Natural
Heritage. This was in clear violation of the County Land Use Plan and consequently its Uniform Development Ordinance, and was done in the face of the County Planning Commission’s recommendation to deny the permit.

The DEIS repeatedly states but never justifies or quantifies its conclusion that the Currituck County Outer Banks is “built out.” It is not built out. Myrtle Beach is built out. Even a casual observer could notice the open space in the Currituck County Outer Banks. This will be targeted for development if the proposed Bridge is allowed to be built.

Thus the DEIS has identified, even though it does not acknowledge it, a potentially significant environmental impact, namely Bridge induced development in the Currituck County Outer Banks (Corolla). Having done so it has an obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the North Carolina Environmental Policy Act (SEPAct) to first adequately analyze the type of these impacts and to recommend feasible mitigation measures. It does not.

The DEIS Ignores the Potential for Project Induced Vacation Rental Growth

For instance in attempting to analyze the types of indirect impacts the DEIR on p. 3-86 through p. 3-88 looks at two possibilities, increase in the number of permanent residents, and increase in the number of day trips. It totally ignores the potential for increasing numbers of the current dominant use, the one and two week vacation rentals.

In its attempt to analyze the possibility of increased number of day trips induced by the Bridge the DEIS in effect dismisses this possibility. It reaches this conclusion because of a number of errors. It uses for the baseline travel time reduction from the Hampton Roads area a decrease from 156 to 80 minutes (nearly an hour and a half) during the non-congested hours (p. 3-88), and cites this as not enough of time savings to encourage more trips. First the savings of one and a half hours is for most people a significant time savings, one that would certainly encourage vacation trips and more daytrips. Second, since Chapter 1 stresses the project’s purpose and need to be the reduction of travel time and congested hours, a more fair baseline to calculate the potential for increased day trips should be during congested hours, in which case the time savings and resultant trip induction would be even more.

The DEIS Ignores the Potential for Project Induced Increase in Day Trips

Further the DEIR cites as fact that day trips to the Currituck County Outer Banks will not result is more than “some potential for increased day trips” (p. 3-84) because of “the closer and comparable options in Virginia” (presumably Virginia Beach). With all due respect to our good neighbors in Virginia Beach, the only conclusion a responsible person could make is that the author of that statement has never been to either Virginia Beach or the Currituck County Outer Banks. There is no comparison. Virginia Beach is an urban experience. The Currituck County Outer Banks currently is not. This, of course, will change if the Bridge is allowed to be built.

The DEIS states that the lack of beach access, parking and amenities here will limit new visitors, particularly in comparison with Virginia Beach. The DEIS has got it backwards. Lack of parking, access and amenities are not currently discouraging day trips, which are increasing. A check with the Sheriff’s Department or the Corolla Wild Horse Fund would confirm this. What the DEIS should have acknowledged is that the proposed Bridge will increase an already significant burden as result of day trippers, and it should have, therefore, recommended mitigation that includes creation of these visitor serving facilities and provision of increased public access.

Had the DEIS fairly analyzed the potential impacts from greatly increased numbers of vacationers and day trippers, and had its analysis visited here recently, they would have noticed the remarkable erosion of the dunes due to the two major nor’easters of the past winter. These dunes are vital to wildlife resources and to protection of residences. The bridge generated increased visitors would significantly impact this already troubled resource.

The Impact of Increased Development in and Day Trips to the Off Road Area (Corolla) and Resultant Substantial Adverse Impacts on the National Wildlife Refuge, the National Estuarine Reserve and the Wild Horse Herd Are Not Addressed.

The next major inadequacy of this DEIS is its clearly erroneous conclusion with respect to the development and increased numbers of day trippers that the Bridge will induce in the roadless area.

With respect to permanent development, the DEIS concludes at p. 3-90 that there will be “..., no reasonably foreseeable change in the location, rate or type of development...” It further states that the “...lack of accessibility both makes it attractive and helps limit development.” These two statements totally ignore the nearly one and a half hours in time saving (during the uncongested hours) from Hampton Roads that the Bridge will result in. The Bridge will substantially affect that very inaccessibility that the DEIS cites as the reason that development will not increase.

Perhaps the most egregious lapse in the DEIS is its total failure to acknowledge the significant increase in day trippers that the bridge will bring to the road less area and the irreversible impacts this will have on resources that are already undergoing significant stress. The DEIS at p. 3-89 does acknowledge some increase in day trips to the road less area, but dismisses any potential for significance (“...the number of increased trips is not expected to be notable.”). One of the reasons cited is the fact that “This is a specialized type of beach experience that would require a four wheel drive vehicle...” Did the drafter of this statement ever pause to consider that widespread use and availability of four wheel drive vehicles? It is not as if they are rare. The DEIS also mentions lack of bathroom facilities in concluding that:
“There is no evidence that there is a significant unrealized demand for this form of rustic beach trip.”

Let’s look at some of the fallacies involved in these conclusions. First the DEIS never even looks at the existing numbers of day trippers to the road less area. It never bothered to establish a baseline. If it had, by checking with the Sheriff’s Department, the Beach Marshall, or the Corolla Wild Horse Fund, it would have found that the amount of day trippers in the summer season far exceed the area’s capacity. It is no longer the “rustic” experience so blithely cited in the DEIS. Further research would have shown that the numbers are increasing each season. The major reason for this increase is the closing of the Hatteras National Seashore to four wheel traffic, and that much of this traffic now goes to the Corova road less area.

Additional research would show that even the current levels of traffic are adversely affecting the continued health and visibility of the Wild Horse Herd. Harmful interactions of visitors with the Wild Horses are occurring on an almost daily basis in the summer. The significant additional day trips which the Bridge will induce will exacerbate this condition. The Corolla Road Area has been designated a Wild Horse Sanctuary. Legislation which would declare the Outer Banks Wild Horse to be the State Horse is pending in the North Carolina State House. The DEIS itself in Table 3-17 lists the Wild Horses as a “Notable Ecosystem Feature.” Its total failure to take into account the potential significant damage to an already threatened resource as a result of significantly increased day trips induced by the proposed Bridge is unfathomable.

The road less area is also home to the Currituck Banks National Estuarine Reserve and the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge. There are in turn home to the Maritime Forest (which the DEIS also lists at Table 3-17 as a “Notable Ecosystem Feature”) and several important fish and wildlife species. The DEIS does not address the potential damage to these resources that will result from the traffic induced by the proposed Bridge.

The dunes system is also listed as a “Notable Ecosystem Feature in Table 3-17. Nowhere in the DEIS is there any mention of the potential damage to this resource resulting from increased Bridge induced traffic. It the DEIS had addressed this it would have noted that the two major Nor’easters of the Winter of 2009-2010 have severely eroded both the shoreline and the dunes. The four wheel drive vehicles have less beach to travel on and are now traversing and further eroding the dunes. The dunes protect property and are home to wildlife species the additional traffic induced by the proposed Bridge will further contribute to the erosion of the dunes in the road less area.

The Proposed Bridge Will Not Just Alter the Patterns of Growth in the Outer Banks, It Will Result in Increased Overall Growth.

As I have noted above, the DEIS states that the Bridge will shift the rate and pattern of development from Dare County to the Currituck County Outer Banks. I have stated early that this in itself is a substantial adverse environmental impact which needs to be addressed and mitigated for. However the DEIS’s conclusion that it will not affect growth only the rate and pattern is not supported by any evidence and, in fact, is counter intuitive. The discussion in Chapter One shows that the Bridge will significantly alleviate congestion and travel time on Routes 158 and 12. This will improve the ease of access to the entire Outer Banks, including Dare County and will result subsequent growth on this barrier island. Growth on this Barrier Island is not the zero sum game the DEIS seems to think.

If the Bridge would merely relocate growth from Dare County to the Currituck County Outer Banks one would anticipate opposition to the proposed Bridge from entities such as the Dare County Chamber of Commerce and the Dare County Board of Realtors. I believe the opposite is the case.

Conclusion

There is one statement in the DEIS that sums up its totally misconceived focus and conclusion and its subsequent failure to recommend mitigation for obviously substantial and significant environmental impacts. On P. 3-89 the DEIS states, "...Transportations improvements have little effect on the demand for and rate of development." This statement contradicts decades of land use and transportation experience, as well as Federal and North Carolina case law. No wonder this entire DEIS fails the “Red Face Test”.

I leave you with this conclusion:

The DEIS is fatally flawed and legally inadequate because of its total failure to identify and mitigate for the Substantial Adverse Indirect and Cumulative Impacts resulting from the growth inducement caused by the Bridge.

This central inadequacy cannot be corrected by publication of a revised Final EIS. The DEIS must be withdrawn and a totally reconsidered and rewritten Draft EIS re-noticed and recirculated.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

John Grattan.
May 26, 2010

Ms Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1587

Re: Mid Currituck Bridge Draft EIS Comments

Dear Ms. Harris:

I previously submitted initial comments in writing and an oral summary at the Public Meeting on the DEIS held at the Wildlife Center in Corolla on May 19, 2010. At that meeting I reserved the right to supplement those comments prior to the close of the comment period. I have done so below. In order that you might see my DEIS comments in their entirety I have begun these comments with the comments I gave on May 19. The North Carolina Turnpike Authority and the Federal Highway Administration need only respond to these combined comments herein.

Mid Currituck Bridge May 19 DEIS Comments—John Grattan

It is a pleasure to be able to testify today and I thank the Federal Highway Administration and the North Carolina Turnpike Authority for coming to Corolla to let us offer our opinions in person. It was also very gracious of these organizations to host an open house prior to this public hearing.

Let me introduce myself. My name is John Grattan and I live about four miles down the road at 740 Maritime Drive Corolla, less than a quarter mile from proposed Mid Currituck Bridge Terminal C2.

My wife and I moved here from California three years ago. In California I was an energy and environmental attorney. I also had served in State Government as an Assistant Secretary of the Resources Agency and also as an Assistant Secretary to the Business and Transportation Agency. I also was a State Coastal Commissioner. In those various capacities I either helped write, edit, provided legal adequacy review, challenged or defended literally hundreds of EIS's or EIR’s (the California equivalent of EIS’s). This is not my first rodeo.

At the outset let me say that I have a great deal of respect for the credentials and professionalism of those that have contributed to this DEIS on the proposed Mid Currituck Bridge and attendant road improvements. With a few important exceptions, on which I will later provide written comments this professionalism shows in the sections of the DEIS which address the direct impacts of the proposed Mid Currituck Bridge in its discussed alternative forms.

However this is somewhat akin to saying “Other than that, how was the play, Mrs. Lincoln?” You see the direct impacts of the Bridge itself are pretty straightforward, avoid the wetlands in Maple Swamp, don’t mess with the little Aydelott Community, minimize the visual and noise impacts, avoid the ridiculous ER option and there you have it. The real issues are the Indirect and Cumulative impacts, the Growth Inducing impacts, if you will. Those impacts will be significant and will be felt in the Corolla and Carova Communities. In that regard this Draft EIS is fatally flawed and legally insufficient.

Just to give an idea of the total lack of focus on the most important issue associated with the proposed Bridge, the DEIS in the all important Chapter Three spends 81 pages discussing the direct impacts of the Bridge and the associated road widenings. It spends a grand total of 18 pages discussing the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts, the bulk of which address the new businesses which will relocate to the 158-Bridge approach on the mainland. This leaves about 10 pages devoted to the impacts on the Outer Banks—Corolla-Carova, right here. To use a Biblical expression, this DEIS "strains at gnats and swallows camels."

I will enter detailed, page by page written comments on behalf of myself and members of the community tonight and reserve the right to supplement and extend these before the end of the comment period June 7th. Let me point out a few of the major problems with this DEIS and its total whitewashing of the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts.

Increased Growth in the Currituck County Outer Banks

The first issue is the Bridge induced growth that will occur in the Currituck County Outer Banks. The DEIS is legally inadequate in that it fails to quantify and consequently does not recommend mitigation for the substantial adverse impacts associated with this Bridge induced growth. The DEIS states at p. 3-88 that:

"The introduction of a Mid Currituck Bridge...would substantially reduce travel time from points North of the mainland to the Currituck County Outer Banks. As such the order on which available lots on the NC 12 accessible Outer Banks would develop in response to market demands would likely change with more Currituck County lots developing before Dare County lots."

I submit to you that this statement acknowledges a potentially substantial adverse impact as a result of Mid Currituck Bridge Construction. One only needs to compare the nature and degree of development at the locations nearest to the existing Wright Brothers Memorial Bridge at Kitty Hawk with that which we saw out your trip out here to Corolla, Kitty Hawk is a cluttered, unesthetic, quasi-urban environment. This is not the case for the Currituck County Outer Banks. The setting here is relatively undeveloped, largely aesthetically pleasing, and not overrun with commercial development.
The DEIS attempts to paper over this failure to acknowledge a clearly substantial adverse environmental impact with statements such as is found on p. 3-89 that the area is "largely developed". Nowhere is there any quantification or other support for this conclusion. The DEIS also states, also on p. 3-89 that, "The types of development called for in the land use plans of Currituck County, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck are similar." Nowhere is there a justification for this conclusory and misleading statement.

The DEIS also states at p. 3-89 that

"Current development regulations and past trends associated with implementation of these (land use) plans are indicative of the local jurisdictions' commitment to implement these plans as they stand."

Nowhere is there an analysis or justification for this statement. I might add that this has not been the experience of many of the citizens here who have bad land use issues before the Currituck County Board of Commissioners. In fact just this Monday (May 17) the Board of Commissioners approved a Special Use Permit for a 12.75 multi-family, hotel, restaurant and retail stores development in an Oceanic area designated as Natural Heritage. This was in clear violation of the County Land Use Plan and consequently its Uniform Development Ordinance, and was done in the face of the County Planning Board's recommendation to deny the permit.

The DEIS euphemistically states but never justifies or quantifies its conclusion that the Currituck County Outer Banks is "built out". It is not built out. Kitty Hawk is built out. Even a casual observer could notice the open space in the Currituck County Outer Banks. This will be targeted for development if the proposed Bridge is allowed to be built.

Thus the DEIS has identified, even though it does not acknowledge it, a potentially significant environmental impact, namely Bridge induced development in the Currituck County Outer Banks (Corolla). Having done so it has an obligation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the North Carolina Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) to first adequately analyze the type of these impacts and then to recommend feasible mitigation measures. It does neither.

The DEIS Ignores the Potential for Project Induced Vacation Rental Growth

For instance in attempting to analyze the types of indirect impacts the DEIR on p. 3-86 through p. 3-88 looks at two possibilities, increase in the number of permanent residents, and increase in the number of day trips. It totally ignores the potential for increasing numbers of the current dominant use, the one and two week vacation rentals.

In its attempt to analyze the possibility of increased number of day trips induced by the Bridge the DEIS in effect dismisses this possibility. It reaches this conclusion because of a number of errors. It uses for the baseline travel time reduction from the Hampton Roads area a decrease from 150 to 80 minutes (nearly an hour and a half) during the non congested hours. (p.3-88), and cites this as not enough of time savings to encourage more trips. First the savings of one and a half hours is for most people a significant time savings, one that would certainly encourage vacation trips and more day trips. Second, since Chapter 1 stresses the project's purpose and need to be the reduction of travel time and congested hours, a more "all in" baseline to calculate the potential for increased day trips should be during congested hours, in which case the time savings and resultant trip inducement would be even more.

The DEIS Ignores the Potential for Project Induced Increase in Day Trips

Further the DEIR cites as fact that day trips to the Currituck County Outer Banks will not result in more than "some potential for increased day trips" (p.3-84) because of the "closer and , comparable options in Virginia" (presumably Virginia Beach). With all due respect to our good neighbor in Virginia Beach, the only conclusion a reasonable person could make is that the author of that statement has never been to either Virginia Beach or the Currituck County Outer Banks. There is no comparison. Virginia Beach is an urban experience. The Currituck County Outer Banks currently is not. This, of course, will change if the Bridge is allowed to be built.

The DEIS states that the lack of beach access, parking and amenities here will limit new visitors, particularly in comparison with Virginia Beach. The DEIS has got it backwards. Lack of parking, access and amenities are not currently discouraging day trips, which are increasing. A check with the Sheriff's Department or the Corolla Wild Horse Fund would confirm this. What the DEIS should have acknowledged is that the proposed Bridge will increase an already significant burden as result of day trippers, and it should have, therefore, recommended mitigation that includes erection of these visitor serving facilities and provision of increased public access.

Had the DEIS fairly analyzed the potential impacts from greatly increased numbers of vacationers and day trippers, and had its analysts visited here recently, they would have noticed the remarkable increase of the dunes due to the two major nor'easters of the past winter. These dunes are vital to wildlife resources and to protection of residences. The bridge generated increased visitors would significantly impact this already troubled resource.

The Impact of Increased Development in and Day Trips to the Off Road Area (Corolla) and Resultant Substantial Adverse Impacts on the National Wildlife Refuge, the National Estuarine Reserve and the Wild Horse Herd Are Not Addressed.
The next major inadequacy of this DEIS is its clearly erroneous conclusion with respect to the development and increased numbers of day trippers that the Bridge will induce in the Roadless Area.

With respect to permanent development, the DEIS concludes at p.3-90 that there will be "...a reasonably foreseeable change in the location, rate or type of development." It further states that the "...lack of accessibility both makes it attractive and helps limit development." These two statements totally ignore the nearly one and a half hours in time saving (during the unseasoned hours) from Hampton Roads that the Bridge will result in. The Bridge will substantially affect that very inaccessibility that the DEIS cites as the reason that development will not increase.

Perhaps the most egregious lapse in the DEIS is its total failure to acknowledge the significant increase in day trippers that the bridge will bring to the Roadless Area and the irreversible impacts this will have on resources that are already undergoing significant stress. The DEIS at p. 3-88 does acknowledge some increase in day trips to the Roadless Area, but dismisses any potential for significance ("...the number of increased trips is not expected to be notable."). One of the reasons cited is the fact that "This is a specialized type of beach experience that would require a four wheel drive vehicle." Did the drafter of this statement ever pause to consider that widespread use and availability of four wheel drive vehicles? It is not as if they are rare. The DEIS also mentions lack of bathroom facilities in concluding that:

"There is no evidence that there is a significant unmet demand for this form of rustic beach trip."

Let's look at some of the fallacies involved in those conclusions. First the DEIS never even looks at the existing numbers of day trippers to the road less areas. It never bothered to establish a baseline. If it had, by checking with the Sheriff's Department, the Beach Marshall, or the Corolla Wild Horse Fund, it would have found that the amount of day trippers in the summer season far exceed the area's capacity. It is no longer the "rustic" experience so blithely cited in the DEIS. Further research would have showed that the numbers are increasing each season. The major reason for this increase is the closing of the Hatteras National Seashore to four wheel traffic, and that much of this traffic now goes to the Corova road less area.

Additional research would show that even the current levels of traffic are adversely affecting the continued health and visibility of the Wild Horse Herd. Harmful interactions of visitors with the Wild Horses are occurring on an almost daily basis in the summer. The significant additional day trips which the Bridge will induce will exacerbate this condition. The Non Road Area has been designated a Wild Horse Sanctuary. Legislation which would declare the Outer Banks Wild Horse to be the State Horse is pending in the North Carolina State House. The DEIS itself in Table 3-17 lists the Wild Horses as a "Notable Eco-System Feature." Its total failure to take into account the potential significant damage to an already threatened resource as a result of significantly increased day trips induced by the proposed Bridge is unfathomable.

The road less area is also home to the Currituck Banks National Estuarine Reserve and the Currituck National Wildlife Refuge. These are in turn home to the Maritime Forest (which the DEIS also lists at Table 3-17 as a "Notable Eco-System Feature") and several important fish and wildlife species. The DEIS does not address the potential damage to these resources that will result from the traffic induced by the proposed Bridge.

The Dune System is also listed as a "Notable Eco-System Feature" in Table 3-17. Nowhere in the DEIS is there any mention of the potential damage to this resource resulting from increased Bridge induced traffic. If the DEIS had addressed this it would have noted that the two major Nor'easters of the Winter of 2009-2010 have severely eroded both the shoreline and the dunes. The four wheel drive vehicles have less beach to travel on and are now traveling and further eroding the dunes. The dunes protect property and are home to wildlife species the additional traffic induced by the proposed Bridge will further contribute to the erosion of the dunes in the road less area.

The Proposed Bridge Will Not Just Alter the Patterns of Growth in the Outer Banks, It Will Result in Increased Overall Growth.

As I have noted above, the DEIS states that the Bridge will shift the rate and pattern of development from Dare County to the Currituck County Outer Banks. I have stated early that this in itself is a substantial adverse environmental impact which needs to be addressed and mitigated for. However the DEIS's conclusion that it will not effect growth only the rate and pattern is not supported by any evidence and, in fact, is counter intuitive. The discussion in Chapter One shows that the Bridge will significantly alleviate congestion and travel time on Routes 158 and 12. This will improve the ease of access to the entire Outer Banks, including Dare County and will result subsequent growth on this barrier island. Growth on this Barrier Island is not the zero sum game the DEIS seems to think.

If the Bridge were to merely relocate growth from Dare County to the Currituck County Outer Banks one would anticipate opposition to the proposed Bridge from entities such as the Dare County Chamber of Commerce and the Dare County Board of Realtors. I believe the opposite is the case.

Conclusion

There is one statement in the DEIS that sums up its totally misconceived focus and conclusion and its subsequent failure to recommend mitigation for obviously substantial and significant environmental impacts. On p. 3-89 the DEIS states, "...Transportation improvements have little effect on the demand for and rate of development." This statement contradicts decades of land use and transportation experience, as well as Federal and North Carolina case law. No wonder this entire DEIS fails the "Red Face Test".

I leave you with this conclusion:
The DEIS is fatally flawed and legally inadequate because of its total failure to identify and mitigate for the Substantial Adverse Indirect and Cumulative Impacts resulting from the growth induction caused by the Bridge.

This central inadequacy cannot be corrected by publication of a revised Final EIS. The DEIS must be withdrawn and totally reconsidered and rewritten Draft EIS re-noticed and recirculated.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

John Gritton

Supplemental Comments

The DEIS Ignores Potential Harm to the Threatened Piping Plover (Charadrius melodus).

Table 3-11 of the DEIS lists the Piping Plover (Charadrius melodus) as a Federally Protected Species found in the Project Area. The DEIS erroneously concludes that the Project (Options MCB 2 and MCB 4) "may affect but is not likely to adversely affect" that Threatened Species.

The Piping Plover nests in the dunes of the Currituck County Outer Banks such as those found in the Roadless Area. The increased Bridge induced day tripper traffic to this area will result in serious harm to this nesting grounds. As noted above the recent winter storms of 2009-2010 have both significantly eroded the dunes and decreased the beach area that can be ridden on. This is bringing four wheeled riders up to and on the dunes. This factor is totally ignored in the DEIS. The DEIS’s conclusion that the Project is not likely to adversely affect the Threatened Piping Plover is incorrect.

The DEIS Erroneously Concludes That The Project (MCB 2 and MCB 4) Is Unlikely to Affect Crime Rates.

The DEIS states at P. 3-17 that:

"Crime rates are not expected to increase with an of the detailed study alternatives including MCB 2 and MCB 4."

It cites as a rationale for this conclusion that:

"None of the detailed study alternatives would introduce new population or activities in the project area or affect existing patterns of land use or human activity." (P. 3-18).

It states in more detail that:

"The uncongested (emphasis added) travel time between Norfolk, Virginia to Kitty Hawk (emphasis also added) (the nearest point on the Outer Banks) is approximately 163 minutes. With the Mid Currituck Bridge the uncongested (emphasis added) travel time from Norfolk to Corolla (emphasis added) (the new nearest point on the Outer Banks) would be 80 minutes, as 23 minute savings." (P. 3-18)

The DEIS then assumes that the 23 minute travel time savings would not increase the likelihood that criminals would target crime in the area.

This analysis and the conclusion that the Project would not introduce new populations or activities in the Project Area are flawed for the following reasons:

The analysis is based only on what appears to be planned criminal activity. It ignores crimes such as vandalism and alcohol or recreational drug related behavior. These are exactly the types of crimes that will result from the increased day trips that the Bridge will induce.

The stated 23 minutes time savings is based upon uncongested times. Since a major project purpose is to relieve congested travel times, a fair analysis would have to consider the travel time savings.

The 23 minute time savings are based on travel times to Kitty Hawk (without the Bridge) and to Corolla (with the Bridge). An honest analysis would compare travel times to Corolla in both instances. This would result in uncongested time savings of over an hour, namely 90 minutes, to introduce new population or activities in the project area.

The DEIS’s Treatment of Noise Impacts Is Inadequate.

The DEIS purports to address project related noise impacts in Section 3.4.1. It seems to identify, depending on the option selected, approximately 400 sensitive receptors (residences) most of them in the Currituck County Outer Banks and some of them on the Mainland for which the Project would exceed Federal Noise Abatement Criteria. Nowhere does the discussion indicate a specific decibel level and nowhere does the discussion address in layman’s terms what the Project’s noise levels would be equivalent to at what distance.

The DEIS has identified what is clearly a potentially significant noise impact. What it does not do is recommend adequate mitigation for the impact. It leaves the extent and effect of the mitigation measures for future decision. This is not what was intended by the National Environmental Policy Act.

The DEIS Does Not Adequately Address the Trade Offs Between Local Short Term Uses of Man’s Environment and the Maintenance of Long Term Productivity.

The Project (MCB 2 or MCB 4) proposes to expend approximately $800,000,000 to build a new bridge to a Barrier Island to relieve peak congestion on 26 days (13 weekends) a year. If ever a project deserved to have the "short term uses of man’s environment"
balanced against "the maintenance of long term productivity" as required by the National Environmental Policy Act, it is this one.

What we get, however, in Section 3.7 is two paragraphs of boilerplate discussing travel time improvements and compatibility with Dare and Currituck County Plans. The proposed project raises more significant issues than that and the decision makers and the public deserve a thoughtful, detailed and honest discussion of the tradeoffs involved.

The DEIS Does Not Adequately Address The Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources Occasioned by the Project.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires the DEIS to evaluate the "irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources" associated with a project. The project will induce significant numbers of additional visitors and attendant growth. It could substantially increase the current carbon footprint of Currituck County Outer Banks. In order to adequately address this mandate of NEPA, the DEIS in Section 3.8 needs to do a life cycle analysis and comparison of greenhouse gas emissions with and without the project.

As noted earlier, the Project proposed to expend over $800,000,000 in public and private funds to build a bridge (and associated highway improvement) to a barrier island to relieve congestion occurring on 26 days a year. This, particularly in these economically troubled times, represents an irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources. This also needs to be addressed in Section 3.8

Conclusion

As stated in my comments on May 19th, the DEIS is fatally flawed and legally inadequate. The depth and breadth of this inadequacy is such that it cannot be cured in a final EIS. The DEIS needs to be withdrawn, redrafted, reissued and recirculated.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

John Grattan
740 Mariner Drive
Corolla, NC 27927
(jgrattan27@yahoo.com)

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: FRANK GREENE
Street Address: 700 WAYER EDGE Apt./Suite No.
City, State, Zip: COROLLA, NC 27927
Comments

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

[ ] will help with the traffic - will help
[ ] will help with congestion so that there is more space for shopping
[ ] will help

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
[ ] a corridor that does not have as much pedestrian traffic as a corridor.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
[ ] I prefer the options that keep backpacker road more accessible.
Hi,

I live in NY but own a home in Corolla. Even though a new bridge would shorten my long trip by an hour, I'm totally against the building of one. First of all it makes no sense economically. Although estimated at 600 million one only has to be aware of many other projects this size that doubled in cost before being finished. It is unsettling to have a foreign country, in this case Spain, build and manage a bridge in the US. What if they go bankrupt (European economy is looking very weak right now) in the middle of it? Who is going to finish the bridge or can afford to take on a $600 million plus project that is used only three months of the year.

My second reason is the fragility of the Outer Banks especially the Corolla area. Much of Currituck County comes from the somewhat uncluttered beautiful beaches and relaxed comfortable atmosphere of the OBX. Build a bridge and yes they will come but soon the outer banks will be just like any other crowded beach in NJ, DE, or SC and people will stop coming. Crime will rise and so will the ensuing problems that come with it.

I believe a turning lane in Duck would do much to alleviate the traffic we have for only 3 months out of the year.

Please do not build the bridge.

Thank you,

Joan Green

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized
Looking at the maps in the brochure that we received in the mail we must concur that MCB4 as recommended in the Draft EIS is the correct choice. The Banx needs a 3rd bridge to keep traffic moving efficiently in Hurricane Evacuation. It doesn't make sense that thousands of visitors up in the Corolla area must drive 40 miles to reach a point on 158 that could be reached by a bridge. Nor does it make sense to drive an additional 40 miles to get to the same point on 12 that can be reached by a bridge to begin ones vacation. We seem inclined that people must die in this country before transportation issues get resolved. Let's not let this happen in NC on the Banx.

sincerely,

Ken & Melva Greenwood

73 Gravey Pond Lane
Southern Shores, NC 27949
PH 252-261-6563 / cell 252-489-0166
Thanks for all your work. I own a home in Monterey Shores in Corolla. I will pay any toll required.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: George L. B. Grinnan
Street Address: 106 Quail Way
City, State, Zip: Duck, N.C. 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2 MC84 or the No-Build Alternative and why?

- Remove turn over traffic to northern outlets on weekends that make travel up/down Duck Rd.
- Hurricane evacuation
- Climate cost of sending children to school w/Jamie County

If you prefer MCB2 or MC84, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C or C2 and why?

- Less impact on local community of Addie

If you prefer MCB2 or MC84, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

- Faster & easier mode of travel

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Third outbound evacuation lane. Safer

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

LE NCULA SLIP 252 261 921

- Do not need to have a high bridge.
- Keep it similar to Wright Memorial Bridge

Additional comments:

- Outline of Purpose & Need for Project highlights the importance of moving forward with this plan & MCB4, using C1 - Option A in addition connecting outer banks with mainland for shorter, less cost for movement of school children, emergency fire, medical services, easier supply of water

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1079

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: Deargus@aol.com
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Mon May 10 15:06:43 2010
Subject: Mid Currituck Sound Bridge

I have lived in Southern Shores NC for 18 years and have witnessed the traffic jam on NC12 every weekend during the season. I have also seen the backup all the way to Coinjock during hurricane evacuations (people sitting outside their stationary cars). The delay in building this bridge is inexcusable, we are extending the opportunity for a major catastrophe.

Emory Gross
5 Sandfiddler Ct

---

Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge
Date: Friday, June 4, 2010 10:52 AM
From: Jeffrey Gutzman <jeffrey.gutzman@sparrow.org>
To: <midcurrituck@nturnpike.org>
Cc: Renee Gutzman <RcGutzman@landolakes.com>

Ms. Jennifer Harris,
This e-mail is to voice my support for the Mid-Currituck Bridge and alternative MCB4. I am a property owner in the Northern Beaches (Carova) and feel this bridge is necessary and long overdue. This will shorten our commute (we travel from Michigan every year) time and, in the case of a hurricane, allow a quicker evacuation route.

In addition, I think this would increase tourism to the area and increase the property values for both homeowners and vacant land owners.

Thanks for your attention to this e-mail.

Jeff Gutzman
6711 Highland Drive
Laingsburg, MI 48848
-----Original Message-----
From: David Haas [mailto:haasdp@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 12:24 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Vote

Dear Sir,

As a year-round Southern Shores resident, I support the Bridge. The Bridge will provide much needed relief to the traffic headed North on weekends and provide us with a nice alternative when traveling North bound towards Virginia on weekends. We'll create jobs with this project and build a revenue source with a Toll system.

Thank you,

--
David Haas
252-261-2694 office
252-305-3884 cell

-----Original Message-----
From: marcia hall [mailto:uville_19348@yahoo.com]  Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2010 5:11 PM To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org Subject: Vote

Dear Sir:

I would like to cast my vote for MCB4

Property owner: Marcia Hall
115 Waxwing Lane
Duck, NC 27949

uville_19348@yahoo.com
Dear John,

I vote for MCB4 bridge proposal

Richard Hall
115 Waxwing Lane
Duck, NC 27949
uville_19348@yahoo.com

From: GREGORY HAMBY <cypressmoaninn@mindspring.com>
To: Dewitt, Steve
Sent: Sun, Jun 06 20:19:24 2010
Subject: mid currituck bridge

Hello Steve: As a resident of Kitty Hawk I am in favor of the bridge to Corolla. We here in Northern Dare county have endured this traffic to Corolla since it opened up in the early 1990's. We derive no benefit from taxes collected by Currituck County on all of the premature development permitted there by Currituck County in their zeal to improve their tax base. One would have to ask, where was the State when only a two lane road existed to that area when all of this development was proposed.

The were far less people in Dare county when the Wright Mem. Bridge was built than there are now in Corolla for six months of the year. It is time to get real. The Corolla Area has been developed and the main commercial area there is within five miles of US 158. To drive 50 miles to get there is absurd and a great inconvenience and inconsideration to the residents and visitors to Northern Dare Co. A bridge is only logical. Sincerely, Greg Hamby

GREGORY HAMBY
cypressmoaninn@mindspring.com
EarthLink Revolves Around You.

Hello, Please build this bridge. We in Northern Dars Co. are tired and fed up with all of the excess traffic we must endure. This situation wastes fuel, increases pollution and noise and is a safety hazard to our residents and visitors. Development took place in Corolla before there was adequate access and Corolla is now a mid sized town. It is time to access this community with a bridge. This should have been done 15 years ago.
sincerely, Greg Hamby
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Paul Hanson
Street Address: 1114 School House Lane
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927 - 0480

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

[ ] ER2. There is no justification for the bridge. It has been politically motivated and will only hurt the real estate industry while destroying the environment and beauty of this fragile sand bar.

[ ] MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

[ ] MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainline approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

[ ] Reversing center lane - what is the hurry - the evacuation route (which is Elizabeth City) is only a two lane road.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

[ ] Overseas (span) company will not help our unemployed, tourism, depletion of sand, 30A provision for Duck, Beach Martins, erosion, beach losses along the approach.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

[ ] The sad reality is that the bridge will not save the community in Duck or southern shore. Gaynor residents are questioning so vocally for the bridge.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mid Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27690-1788
Or E-mail: mcdouglas@ncdot.gov

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Name: Cynthia Harris  
Address: 92 S Dogwood Trail  
City: Southern Shores  
State: NC  
Zip: 27949  
Email: cindyharris@charter.net  
Comments: I am very much in favor of the building of the Mid-Currituck Bridge in order to alleviate the terrible traffic congestion on Rte 158 in Currituck and roads coming into Southern Shores/Kitty Hawk and Duck/Corolla/Corova. I live on S. Dogwood Trail which is a residential street in Southern Shores (speed limit 25). I have counted more than 100 cars per hour on Saturdays and 50-60 cars per hour on Sundays going past my house. The traffic is so bad in Southern Shores/Kitty Hawk that I do not even try to go anywhere on Saturday. Congestion on Rte 158 in Currituck Co. coming to OBX has caused many accidents. There needs to be a new way to cut down on the congestion and time it takes to get to Corolla/Corova. It is a public safety concern also when there are so many cars trying to get somewhere on one and two lane roads.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Matthew Rockett
Street Address: 202 W Elm St
City, State, Zip: Greenville, NC 27858
Apt/Suite No:

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

[Response]

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

[Response]

Would cause dramatic change in Timbucttt
Not well defined to the area.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

[Response]

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

[Response]

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

[Response]

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

[Response]

Additional comments:

[Response]

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
----Original Message----
From: Herb Haskin [mailto:bchaskin@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 11:15 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Support of bridge

As this great county of ours get grows and it's citizens move into isolated areas. The need for their becomes paramount. This project has been needed a long time. There are many good reasons for it, the biggest being the safety of the people that live in the area. I highly support this bridge as a tax payer and property owner of currituck county.

Jennifer Harris P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority

We are owners of a home in Corolla which we use as a 2nd home and as a rental property. We feel strongly that a 2nd bridge is necessary.
We understand that many of our Corolla neighbors feel differently and we are sympathetic to their concerns relating to overdevelopment and the preservation of the wonderful maritime environment which exists on the northern Outer Banks.

We do believe, however, that the cat is out of the bag in terms of development and that the traffic situation getting to and from the Outer Banks is often close to gridlock-- a situation which could become dangerous during a storm. We hear of plans for a large multi-use development being planned for the Pine Island area and have no doubts that, as the economy improves, home construction will resume in earnest.

We personally have been stuck in traffic which made the 12 mile drive from Corolla to Duck take 4.5 hours following a rainstorm. We once spent 10.5 hours on the road from Corolla to Chesapeake during a hurricane evacuation. We recently observed a traffic backup from Duck to the mainland and continuing 12 miles on Rte,158.

We do share concerns about how roadway improvements are carried out. Much of the popularity of the northern Outer Banks is dependent on the charm of the small town feeling of the area. A roadway that looks like Rte 158 through Kitty Hawk and Nags Head would go a long way towards decimating the communities (and values) in the area. Can the Turnpike Authority do scenic byways?

Yours truly,

Lee and Gerry Hassig
874 Welk Court
Please move forward with the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge. Ultimately an emergency evacuation will create a crisis in the event of a hurricane evacuation comes quickly. I personally have witnessed a storm manifest from nothing to hurricane force in 12 hours. This bridge is a must for the safety of visitors to the northern Outer Banks.

Once an evacuation came to a total stop with vehicles stopped on the Wright Memorial Bridge while a hurricane passed over the sound, and over the stopped traffic on the bridge. Check the records for verification.

Mike Hayes
Southern Shores NC
252-261-0404

From: Mike Hayes
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri Apr 09 18:29:39 2010
Subject: Greetings from the Outer Banks
----- Original Message -----
From: Carol Hayhoe <chayhoe@embarqmail.com>
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri May 07 15:01:04 2010
Subject: mid-currituck bridge

Despite being a real estate broker who sells in the Corolla area, I must speak as a resident of Southern Shores. I am NOT for the bridge as I feel it will bring the crime and development that the Outer Banks has long lived without. The Outer Banks will become too accessible - next come the high rises, McDonalds and away with the wild horses - roads in the wild horse area will not be far behind. Let’s keep the Outer Banks the quiet getaway it is now - it won’t be long before there is no place left that is scourged by development and the almighty dollar. Isn’t that worth an extra hour of travel time!

Carol Hayhoe
Southern Shores, NC

---

Subject: Bridge Project
Date: Sunday, June 6, 2010 10:46 AM
From: Donna Hedrick <dhedrick@cox.net>
To: <midcurrituck@ntturnpike.org>

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority

Dear Ms. Harris,

As a Southern Shore property owner I strongly endorse alternative MCB4 and construction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. Alternative MCB is the only solution to many current problems, that has the least negative impact on the communities involved. I oppose any modifications of NC 12 through Southern Shores and duck.

Sincerely yours,

Donna M. Hedrick
To Senator Marc Basnight, Representative Bill Owens, County Commissioners, and Jennifer Harris,

I am a home owner of 874 Drifting Sands Drive in Monterey Shores, Corolla, NC.

I am aware of the alternatives you are currently considering, along with a no build alternative, regarding travel between Currituck Mainland and the OBX along route 12 north of Southern Shores.

If you are going to decide to build the mid-Currituck bridge, I want you to be aware of the strong negative impact the C1 corridor terminus has along with the 4 lane road (vs the C2) on the community of Monterey Shores which is situated on the west side of Route 12, (north of Albermarle and the commercial buildings there), and the alternative C1 terminus. This sprawling community travels east across to the beach during the summer... and will have to cross a 4 lane road by bicycle or foot, or travel south by car and make turnoffs to access the beach. It will also be more difficult to travel to the north. If one is decided on building the bridge, one should minimize its impact on the communities that exist and that would be done by utilizing the C2 terminus alternative to the South... It is already proposed that they have 4 lanes in that area... but there are no communities on the east side there until the Currituck Club, coming on to rout 12 from Hunt Rd... Also by avoiding creating a 4 lane road north of Albermarle, there would be less of a negative flow impact on Whalehead residents traveling south and wanting to cross this highway to make a left turn... Furthermore by choosing the location to the south C2 terminus, there would be less of a visual impact on all the homes situated on the sound in Monterey Shores and Corolla Bay... There are fewer, if any, homes close to the terminus of C2 on the east side of the road... as the Currituck Club is farther south. The C2 terminus would have less of a negative impact on existing homeowners... and would exist very close to an already commercial area, of Timbuck II and the Food Lion. There is no need to bring increased traffic farther north, to utilize the bridge via an alternative C1 entrance to the bridge... C2 is a better choice, in my opinion.

(It makes more sense to me to have the terminus closer to the mid portion of the land north of Southern Shores, where there would be the least traffic affect on residents... of course that would be south of the Currituck Club and would be in the land owned by the Audubon Society... where there are no homes on the east side of route 12...)

If the bridge is to shorten travel to that segment of the OBX, and facilitate removal during hurricanes, while also maximizing traffic flow along route 12... I would think the most central location of a terminus would accomplish this... ie what is the difference if 10,000 cars entering route 12N from 158 in Southern Shores or from the very north of Corolla... it is the same traffic flow of cars... if they entered in the middle, 1/2 would travel north and 1/2 would travel south on 12 if the housing distribution were equal. In anycase there was no alternative that far south, but C2 is more south than C1.

I question the need in general for 4 lanes on route 12... If the bridge is to be one lane in each direction, what is he need to have a small stretch of route 12, one or two miles, 2 lanes in each direction (4 lanes)... if the rest of the roads to the north and south are now one lane, (2 lanes)...?

Lastly, in my opinion, I question the cost benefit of the bridge... it brings problems as well; day trippers, the visual disturbance of structure and traffic etc. The 1hr or so of time savings coming and going on a regular basis might not be worth the problems it creates. Today’s weather predictions of hurricanes gives plenty of time to evacuate... and perhaps just widening to 3 lanes along parts of 12... and more of 158 on the out bound would be sufficient (as alternative ER2 suggests) to 1) facilitate removal during hurricanes... 2) increase travel flow in general to points farther south from 12 to 158, like Kill Devil Hills and Nags Head. (I realize that does exist in alternative MCB2). One of the problems during the summer is...once vacationers get to the northern OBX, north of Duck, there is loads of traffic trying to travel south on the roads on a daily basis... as opposed to the day of entry and departure... the $400,000,000 savings with ER2 might be justified... if evacuation is covered, and there is also increased traffic flow.

Sincerely,
Harry Heller

PS I am also a homeowner in Pine Island, and have been vacationing/owning property in this part of the OBX for 20 years plus... and remember when there was no food lion in Corolla, and when the horses ran wild.

PPS I don’t think there would be that many pedestrians or bikers utilizing the bridge to justify the added expense of adding area for that use... there should be enough road use on route 12 for that.

PPPS I am not sure there will be double the volume of cars in 2035 in that segment of the OBX that we are considering... I am unaware of there being that much undeveloped land that would increase the volume of cars to that level.
information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: DEANE HELMS
Street Address: 47 DUCK WOODS PRIVE Apt/Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: KILTY HAWK, NC 27949

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why? MCB 4 with Comments - INTERCHANGE @ MC FLRIST A MUST - although not on the left (as in MCB2) for those who live your county. Dune Road doesn't currently exist but it is easy to live with.(NEW ROAD) only, with daily movement of tourists north/south & south/north.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Ms. Jennifer Harris,

We would like you to support the building of the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge and prevent the widening of NC 12 and US 158. We would rather see the center lane of US 158 be used as a third outbound lane during an evacuation. My husband and I built our home in Corolla, N.C. in 1994 after spending three summers vacationing there. My family chose this area of the Outer Banks for its quaint scenic beauty and beautiful beaches.

Over the past two decades that we have been spending our summers in Corolla, we have seen a building boom in new homes and businesses north of Duck, N.C. It really started with the development of Pine Island; the growth of houses has been exponential after this phase. This has concerned us greatly because I was vacationing with my two young children in Corolla (my husband, CEO/Founder of the Discovery Channel, had a Board Meeting) when Hurricane Bob hit the Outer Banks. By the time I was informed that Hurricane Bob was indeed going to be a hurricane of substance, it was too late for me to leave. If I had left at the time I decided it was time to go, I would have been stuck on NC 12 when the hurricane hit. Friends of mine from MD who have a house across the street from me in Corolla left two hours earlier than the time that I was going to leave and said that it took them five hours to find a place to stay; it took them three hours just to get to the Kitty Hawk Bridge and another two hours to find an available hotel near Norfolk. And this incident happened before the explosion of home building just north of Duck.

The most compelling case for a Mid-Currituck Bridge was Hurricane Isabelle. The Outer Banks was very, very lucky. Usually an area has a three-day warning that a hurricane is approaching but with Hurricane Isabelle, there was a five-day warning. Hurricane Bob had hit in August, the high rental season (but was a mild hurricane) whereas Hurricane Isabella hit in September. Hurricane Isabella was a devastating storm. North Carolina sustained significant damage both to coastal areas (wind and floods) and inland areas (floods). Our main residence at that time was in Potomac, MD and we lost five trees on our property and power was out all around the Washington D.C. area for days from Hurricane Isabella. If Hurricane Isabella had hit the Outer Banks (with the usual 3 day notice) in July or August when the population of the Outer Banks is probably five times as many people due to vacationers, the causalties would have been in the thousands. The vacationers north of Duck would NEVER have gotten off the peninsula in time. The CURRENT evacuation plan ONLY worked with ONE
Bridge that time because there was such advanced notice and there were not as many people as full rental capacity would have generated due to it being the month of September.

We do not believe that the solution to the problem is to widen US 158 and NC 12. The cost alone of buying all that property along NC 12 would be prohibitive and it would ruin the beautiful charm of the Outer Banks not to mention destroying all those businesses that have been there for years. In addition, you would still face the possibility that many cars would be still on NC 12 when the hurricane hit, no matter how many lanes you had. A new bridge gets people above the Duck area OFF the Peninsula more quickly.

Please support the building of the bridge. Vacationers would gladly pay a $10 - $20 - $30 toll fee and locals could pay a reduced toll using a special pass or use the other bridge at Kitty Hawk (this would also provide many needed jobs for workers in Dare county that live across from Corolla who could now work there). Vacationers would have peace of mind that there was an adequate evacuation plan in case of a hurricane. Right now the Kitty Hawk Bridge cannot handle the amount of traffic that would be involved in a Hurricane evacuation of the northern Outer Banks.

Please do not let the environmentalists stop what is the best solution to the problem. This is just too important.

You must move forward MCB4 which calls for a Mid-Currituck Bridge to be built. There are just too many lives at stake now in the upper part of the Outer Banks.

Sincerely,
John and Maureen Hendricks

Primary Address Corolla Address
7110 45th St 1121 Franklyn St
Chevy Chase, MD 20815 Corolla, NC 27927
301-654-1598 home 301-807-3014 cell
301-654-1598 home 301-807-3014 cell

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the $B, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A - Keeps the road off of Maple Swamp and does not disrupt current travel on Duck Road.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Option A - Keeps the road off of Maple Swamp and does not disrupt current travel on Duck Road.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 198 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@noturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: [Signature]

Street Address: 125 Soundview Dr.

City, State, Zip: Avon, NC 27915

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
ER2 WOULD NOT BENEFIT ME.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Option A would not affect travel.
Raymond Herzinger  
150 Spinnaker Ct  
Duck, NC 27949  

#1 We prefer MCB4. Diverts traffic, congestion and pollution from Duck and Southern Shores.  
#2 Prefer C-2. Gives more access to the heavier Duck population.  
#3 Option A. Seems less environmental damage.  
#4 Prefer Reverse center lane. Prevents more property destruction and grading.  
#5 Widening Hwy 12 and increasing traffic through Duck and So. Shores would be more damaging to the narrow banks. Also, hurricane evac. would be slower, funneling all traffic south to the Wright Bridge.
I wanted to encourage you folks to proceed with this project. The outer banks has grown to the point that the bridge has become a necessity to prevent a disaster in the event of a hurricane evacuation. For that reason alone as well as the many other reasons the bridge needs to be built—and for all the folks who might not agree I would point them in the direction of the oil spill in the Gulf and say—an ounce of prevention is much better than the pound of cure. Thanks.

From: ghines1@cox.net [mailto:ghines1@cox.net]

Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 9:58 PM

To: MarcB@ncleg.net; Billo@ncleg.net; vaydlett@co.curtuck.nc.us; curtuckcommish@hotmail.com; commissioners@co.curtuck.nc.us; barrydox@compuesasy.com; sponeal@co.curtuck.nc.us; john@jrorer.com
Cc: jltaylor145@yahoo.com; midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org; ghines1@cox.net

Subject: The Mid-County Bridge Project

Open attached Letter

---

May 29, 2010

William Biddlecome
Washington Regulatory Field Office
Post Office Box 1000
Washington, North Carolina 27889

Subject: Public Comments on Corp Action ID # SAW-1995-02242

Dear Sir:

I would like to comment on the proposed plans for building the new bridge near the old Village of Corolla and the other unneeded and unwanted changes to Route 12 and other changes that will greatly impact the quality of life in what is now the most pleasant and peaceful area in the Outer Banks.

We had looked for several years in other areas and at many houses as far down as Nags Head. We were never pleased with any of them due to the commercial areas, noise and traffic. We had almost given up until our realtor took us to 963 Sunset Crescent. It is a neat little house on a cul-de-sac facing North Harbor View Dr. We fell in love with it and it’s peaceful neighborhood. We made an offer on the spot. It has been our “retreat” for the past eleven years. We do not rent it, but offer it to family and friends for their getaway.

We would like to express our deep anguish at the possible changes to not only the neighborhoods north of us, but especially what is proposed for our Monterey Shores area and particularly North Harbor View Drive. What is now a quiet street with a small amount of traffic, wonderful for bike riding and easy access to the recreation area will be turned into a constant flow of traffic exiting and entering onto Route 12.

Please, we beg you to reconsider the location of the bridge if it MUST be built. We would like to our voices to those who feel that it is totally unnecessary to have this financial burden on North Carolina and a disruption to our present lifestyle just to
appease a few folks like us who only would use it on a few occasions and may not relish the idea of paying a heavy toll to save an hour driving time.

Sincerely,

Garland and Dorothy Hines

---

Ms. Jennifer E. Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC. 27699 - 1578

May 8, 2010

Dear Ms. Harris:

Recently, I received, in the mail, a publication regarding the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. Having written a number of letters on the subject during the early period of its discussion, and having a vested interest in the outcome, I was appreciative of the opportunity to comment.

It should be a fundamental point in the discussion that those of us who purchased homes in Southern Shores prior to the deeded of the estates that served, essentially, as a wildlife preserve on the northern portion of the island, did so with no inkling that the subsequent development in the Currituck area would take place. In particular, the zoning in Southern Shores that precludes commercial enterprises and requires lots for building to be of a certain size was a determining factor in my wife's and my decision to purchase a home there. Our home's access to Route 12 at the front, and Circle Drive at the back, gave convenient highway and beach access that made the property a commodity for both rental and our own use. Ours is one of many such properties.

Enter the explosion of construction of, essentially, mini-hotels upon the side and subdivision of the northern end of the island, with the predictable - though emotionally planned for (or conveniently ignored) impact on traffic past our front door, the subsequent, reasonable conclusion that a bridge was needed to relieve the congestion, and the also predictable result that the owners of the properties whose development had created the new problem wanted no parts of proximity to a bridge from the mainland to their area of the island - one that might be unsightly or interfere with their view or that of their renters. And so after the lobbying of state government that such interest groups do, the notion of widening Route 12, and thus expropriation of the property of those of us who bought there long before Currituck was ever developed, was proposed.

Fortunately, counter-lobbying has taken place and, to some degree, more rational, objective minds have prevailed, and so the bridge is to be built. However, there remains the proposal that Route 12 be widened in addition to the bridge being constructed, to three or five lanes, depending on the version in question.

Our home is one with more land at the front than at the back, and would, no doubt, suffer less than many others from the effect of such widening. And yet, the
From: Lynn Hoffmann [mailto:lynn@allspicecatering.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 10:02 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Vote FOR MCB4 Mid Currituck Bridge

My husband and I will be homeowners there shortly. We have been coming to Duck and the Outer Banks annually for 20+ years. We have strong SUPPORT for MCB4 alternative. Something needs to be done for better evacuation and traffic management. A toll road that pays for itself is practical and fiscally sensible.

We OPPOSE MCB2. There is no need for extra road construction between Corolla and Duck and the sensitive naturalized areas around Pine Island once the bridge is built. The extra expense and disruption to the environment is indefensible.

ER2 is no option; its burying your head in the sand and its short sighted denial that a situation exists that should be addressed.

The quality of life, as well as the area in general, will improve for many, many people with MCB2.

Thank you,
Lynn Hoffmann
As the owners of 65 Ocean Boulevard in Southern Shores, we would like to express our support of Option MCB4. We believe that building a bridge across the Currituck Sound and adding an outbound lane for the Wright Memorial bridge will alleviate most of the traffic issues that affect both Southern Shores and Duck without having to add additional lanes in these areas. This appears to be the least disruptive solution to these issues.

Sincerely,

L. Joseph Hogue
Susan Smith Hogue
(757) 595-1316
Good Afternoon,

I have written previously expressing my support for the bridge but wanted to add that after spending last weekend at my house and viewing the landing alternatives of C1 and C2 I will only support the bridge if C1 is chosen. While I understand the possible environmental impact differences C2 is too destructive to the existing housing and commercial developments. Also, due the proximity to some of the most dense housing in Corolla I believe that property values will drop. This, at a time when the values are finally stabilizing.

This is the classic man vs. the environment and in this case I believe the only wise choice man. With a very viable alternative to C2 it should be time to put politics aside and do what is best overall and choose C1. I do not support the building of the bridge any other way. I talked to many residents and business owners who also feel this way. Again, I am sensitive to the environmental issues but to stand behind them to choose C2 is a bit hypocritical considering the Audubon Society sold of donated land for money and no other reason. This land will now make parts of Corolla look Myrtle Beach once the development is done. Let’s not allow the bridge to make another section of Corolla, the very nice Timbuck II, turn into on and off ramps.

Sincerely,

Jeff

Jeffrey S. Hollander
(484) 732-8432 Office
(302) 545-9537 Mobile
JHollander@comcast.net

---

Afternoon all!

I wanted to write a quick note of encouragement & support for this project. This will provide dramatic improvements in traffic flow for the entire expanse of the outer banks.

I do not know if a decision has been made as to tolls... but I would expect a reasonable toll to be established to help offset the construction & ongoing upkeep of this vital beach conduit.

Thx for the hard work!!

Dan Hudson
I am a property owner in Ocean Sands South Section C. I have the following summary comments on the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project:

- **Build the two lane bridge!** This will have a tremendous impact on the traffic and evacuation times especially in the summer vacation months. It will change traffic patterns and better utilize the existing NC 12 WITHOUT widening NC 12!

- **Do not widen NC12 beyond the minimum!** The bridge is two lanes. No one has been able to explain why that necessitates widening NC12 to four lanes. The existing NC 12 will be better utilized once the bridge is in place. The benefits of widening NC 12 over that for MCB4 seem very minimal when the cost of construction and the reduction of the quality of life along NC12 are considered. 10 dB is a significant amount of sound! It is TWICE the current level. The current level is just barely acceptable. Loud trucks will be TWICE as noisy.

Janine Hunsberger, CPA

The New Bus is not the too busy. Combine all your e-mail accounts with Hotmail. Get busy.  
We agree with the recommended alternative - MCB4 since its construction would result in the least negative impact, i.e., less disruption of traffic flow, fewer expenditures for property acquisition, moving utilities, etc.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
No preference.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Despite the increased cost factor, community preferences should be considered.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Preference is reversal of center turn lane. With appropriate signage and extended signal flow, evacuation should not require a specific additional lane.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.
N/A

Additional Comments:
Since the original proposal in 1987, we have continuously believed the bridge from Currituck mainland to Corolla was a necessity to alleviate traffic congestion, both for evacuation purposes and normal flow safety. We strongly support building the Mid-Currituck Bridge and believe MCB4 is the best option - as previously stated because it presents the least disruption before, during and after construction.
From: speculation1203
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 4:42 PM
Subject: Currituck Mid County Bridge

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Ed Ish
Street Address: 1203 Bismark Dr.
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCB2
A mid county bridge to Corolla would make a 4 lane through Duck, NC unnecessary.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C1
Would be the least driving distance from North beaches and town of Corolla to Norfolk.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Whatever the people of Adylett can live with.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Add the lane

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Reduced toll for off-season and for local residents. Easy Pass.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

My boats are too small to be impacted by this bridge.

Additional Comments:
I prefer the bridge from Adylett to connect to NC 12 at the northern most point.
From: OBXISH
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 2:35 PM
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Survey

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: ____Karen Ish______________________________

Street Address: __1203 Bismark Drive____________Apt./Suite #____

City, State, Zip: __Corolla, NC 27927____________________________

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: mid.currituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCB2 -- we need the bridge but not a 4-lane through Duck

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer C1 to reduce congestion at the intersection in Whalehead

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I prefer which ever option would best preserve and have the least impact upon the community of Adylett

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reverse the center turn lane, would have less environmental impact than paving another lane

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Preservation of the wetlands and character of Currituck sound is of particular concern

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

23’ sea pro deck boat, recreational use only, kept on a lift in Coinjock Bay at summer residence at 112 Teal Drive, Currituck, 27929 252-232-0394

Additional Comments:

There is a small but very vocal group in Corolla that opposes the bridge – they are quite adamant and have forced bridge supporters into the silent majority to avoid unpleasantness. Please understand, most of us want the bridge, and the sooner the better!!

Karen
North Carolina Turnpike Authority  
Attn: Jennifer Harris, P.E.  
1376 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578  

Subject: Army Corp of Engineers Action No. SAW-1995-02242, Mid Currituck Bridge Project  

Gentlemen,

As owner of the property at 861 Capri Crescent in Corolla NC 27927, in close proximity to NC Route 12 and potentially affected by the Mid-Currituck Bridge project, I have the following comments for the public comment section of the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) of March 2010.

Regarding construction of the proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge and upgrades to NC Route 12 to support hurricane evacuation route improvements:

I **support** the MCB2/C2 option. This is the preferred option.

I **support** the MCB4/C2 option. This is secondary to MCB2/C2.

I support both MCB2/C2 and MCB4/C2 options for the very positive impact it would have to the Corolla community, such as promoting new businesses in the Buck Island / Tumback II Shopping area, facilitating supply truck traffic to those businesses, a positive impact to property values in the area, etc.

I **oppose** both MCB2/C1 and MCB4/C1 options.

The reasons for my opposition to both MCB2/C1 and MCB4/C1 options include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Adverse impact to properties in the Monterey Shores development.
- Disruptive traffic patterns, especially to go north when entering from the west, out of Monterey Shores.
- Adverse impact to property values in the Monterey Shores area.
- Impact to the many homeowners whose properties are directly affected.
- Loss of the quiet environment and relaxed pace of life in the north of the island.

In addition, I have the following questions regarding the project:

Subject: Army Corp of Engineers Action No. SAW-1995-02242, Mid Currituck Bridge Project

**Question:** Regarding the proposed upgrades to NC Route 12, in reviewing Sheet 14 of 16 of the Corridor Design Public Hearing Map, Mid-Currituck Bridge Study, STIP Project No. R-2376, Currituck and Dare Counties, March 2010, I see that the Town of Duck has no proposed Route 12 upgrades planned in any of the study variants.

I would like to understand the rationale behind the lack of NC Route 12 upgrades in Duck. Performing no NC Route 12 upgrades would make Duck a choke point for travel north and south. More importantly, this would impede orderly evacuation in the event of an emergency from points north of Duck. I see this as a public safety matter.

**Question:** Were any Native American Tribes contacted in a government-to-government consultation, particularly pursuant to impact on any usual and accustomed areas? Who were those discussions with and what were the outcomes of those discussions?

Lastly, I request copies of the following documents be mailed to me when available:

- the final EIS (full copy, not a summary)
- applicable NEPA required Biologic Opinions from NMFS and other organizations
- the Record of Decision
- the answer to my question, above.

My mailing address is:

Stephen Iwanowicz  
P.O. Box 878  
Keyport, WA 98345

Thank you,

S. E. Iwanowicz
favor MCB4

disfavor MCB2 due to widening of roads and deadlock in Duck

disfavor ER2 due to widening of roads and deadlock in Duck and no northern bridge.
From: Eric Jenkins  
To: Harris, Jennifer  
Sent: Mon Apr 26 12:05:17 2010  
Subject: mid-currituck bridge

Hello:

I see that you’re accepting comments about the Mid-Currituck Bridge project. I just wanted to let you know that I’m very much in favor of having the bridge built. We are property owners in Duck, North Carolina who would like to see this built in the very near future. I have personally been trapped in hours of traffic during a hurricane evacuation and believe that this new bridge would certainly add another necessary outlet from the outer banks.

Thank you, and please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss this further.

Eric Jenkins  
103 Blue Heron Lane  
Duck, NC  
252-255-5086

---

From: Carol and Larry Jepson  
Sent: Sunday, April 11, 2010 1:00 PM  
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org  
Subject: Currituck Sound Bridge

We are in favor of the southernmost entrance in Corolla, C2, between the water facility and Timbuctu Shopping.

Carol and Larry Jepson  
993 Lighthouse Dr.  
Corolla
----- Original Message -----  
From: Bill Johnson <bjejob@earthlink.net>  
To: Harris, Jennifer  
Sent: Sat May 15 08:07:44 2010  
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

We strongly support the construction of a bridge over the mid-Currituck Sound for the many reasons you know already, one of which is maintaining the present width of NC 12. The stability of the Outer Banks, fragile at best, cannot be served by widening NC 12 and destroying the present rural charm that attracts all those tourist dollars. Not to mention the increased ability of a bridge to evacuate people in the event of hurricanes. The time is NOW to build the bridge.

J.W. Johnson  
Nan H. Johnson  
Southern Shores, NC

---

Subject: BUILD THE BRIDGE!!!!  
Date: Sunday, July 11, 2010 8:26 PM  
From: Martha Johnson <nathan.johnson12@verizon.net>  
To: <midcurrituck@nturnpike.org>

PLEASE, BUILD THE BRIDGE!!!! We own properties in the 4-wheel drive area and we vacation every year in a rental in Corolla. (Whalehead Beach). We spend LOTS of money in North Carolina but after this year we are wondering if it's really worth it anymore. My husband and I came from a business trip in Raleigh and got there with no delay until we hit the intersection for Route 12 North.

On the other hand, our poor children came from Central and No. Virginia and it took them all day and half the night. Our little grandchildren were in and out of their minivan for 14 hours! To our family, who has loved the Outer Banks for more than two decades, this is just not acceptable. We may as well board a plane and fly to a far off beach than endure this kind of traffic.

I know many people from Northern Virginia who refuse to come to this area anymore for this very reason. We also discussed this year what a safety hazard it is for so many, residents and tourists alike. If you want our continued ownership and seasonal dollars, build the damn bridge! We will be happy to plop down $ to cross over and cut of at least an hour of our time. The flow of traffic East would help to remedy the bottleneck at Route 12.

We can't believe that between the state of N.C., the Federal Govts “surplus money” that is suppose to be for projects like this and/or private enterprise that this project can't be started and completed. We understand the environmental concerns but that has dragged on for years. Like I stated earlier, we will gladly pay a toll to cross this “promised bridge”, if someone out there would just build it. The Outer Banks needs and deserves it and so do we.

Martha Johnson  
439 Devon Dr.  
Warrenton, VA 20186  
nathan.johnson12@verizon.net

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments (“this message”) may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized...
From: Chris Jones  [mailto:chris@christopherhjones.com]
Sent: Monday, May 17, 2010 7:56 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Cc: Sally Jones
Subject: Bridge Project

Dear Ms. Harris, My wife, Sally, and I are the owners of a cottage in Ocean Sands, Section A in Corolla, NC. We would like to be recorded as strongly IN FAVOR of the construction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. We believe that either the C1 or C2 options would be acceptable and a major improvement to the area in terms of public safety and economic development. Thank you for the opportunity to make our support for this bridge known. Chris Jones

CHRISTOPHER H. JONES
ALANERRA, VIRGINIA
757-391-8727  694-7942-9518
Ms. Harris,

My wife and I own a house on Duck Road in Southern Shores. I am writing to let you know our strong support for building the mid-Currituck bridge and doing it as soon as possible.

I will not elaborate on the many positive reasons to build the bridge, you already know them. Please feel free to contact me if you need further information.

Thank you for all your hard work on this project.

Sincerely,

Paul and Becky Jones
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boat or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: mdcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
I would like to express my opposition to the mid county bridge in Currituck County. I believe spending that much money on a 2 lane bridge to alleviate traffic for approximately 14 weekends out of the year is irresponsible to the environment and to society. There is a reason this area is beautiful and it should be preserved not exploited. There are more pressing needs in our community, state, and nation than a bridge for developmental gains. This area is already stretched to its sustainable level.

I am also concerned about lights, noise, litter, and the disruption to small communities. Hastening development and year round populations on the barrier islands will be detrimental to the environment.

The other reasons proposed - facilitating evacuation and joining the people on the mainland with the outer islands - are false. Evacuation will be worse because there will be more people. They will idle on the bridge for hours trying to feed into the road which will be closed at the Va. border (which is the home state of many of them). Also the cost of the toll will prohibit its use by most of the ordinary citizens of Currituck. I doubt many will add $8-$15 or more to a day trip to the beach, to the grocery store, to the movies, to a school event, etc.

I hope you will be able to devise an alternate plan.

--
Sophie Jordan

D-210
I hope you will be able to devise an alternate plan.

Sincerely, Sophie Jordan
To whom it may concern:

We are writing today to ask that you do not continue with the Mid-Currituck Bridge construction. We are concerned that this project will irreparably harm our safe and family friendly community. The widening of NC12 by itself is promoting more traffic flow which endangers our walking citizens. Our community economy needs summer vacationers and we fear that the increase of traffic will keep future renters away since they appreciate our community as it is today. Please do not build the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

Sincerely,
Lisa and Touraj Kamali
Home owners in Monteray Shores

________________________________________________________________
NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

Our family supports your recommended alternative, the mid-Currituck Bridge across Currituck Sound, MCB4.

Joyce and Karl-Erik Karlsson
7005 Martin's Pt. Rd.
Kitty Hawk, NC 27949
May 6, 2010

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
Director of Planning and Environmental Studies
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Dear Ms. Harris,

As a recent Duck business owner, long-time Southern Shores resident, and current property owner, I wish to express my strong support for building the Mid-Currituck Bridge, alternative MCB4, and my very strong opposition for widening Route 12 and constructing general ditching for stormwater runoff.

Thank you for the numerous opportunities we have had to express our support for building the bridge.

Sincerely,

George Keene
As a humane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I prefer reversing the center lane because it would be cheaper and evacuation would be very fast.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

No. I just hope the mid-county bridge is finally built.

I own a property in North Swan Bank, and I'd like to see the material on the side of the road that passes by, and also a home that passes by.

My property is located on 1931 Sand Fiddler Road, North Swan Bank.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; your phone number.

NA

Additional comments:

I also hope it gets started. I think it would really help the community. I think it would improve the economy of the area.

Please email me that you received this. Thank you.

Mike Scott

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1573 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or Email: midcurrituck@nctransit.com

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Daniel Keiger
Street Address: 777 Bayberry Ct.
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

1. I prefer the No-Build option. Corolla is remote, and it is that uncommercialized serenity that attracts so many of our visitors.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

1. I prefer C1 because it is the heart of Corolla. Many long-standing businesses contribute very significantly to the economy of Currituck. It does not make sense to destroy businesses when the alternative is only a few small, brown residential lots.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I think the reversing of the center lane is a more reasonably economic decision.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Not worth mentioning.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

N/A

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Contact Information

Name: Earl Keiser
Address: 157 Clamshell Trl
City: Southern Shores
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: duke_keiser@yahoo.com

Comments: I enthusiastically endorse the construction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. I have been sorely needed for almost a decade now to insure the safety of our large numbers of visitors in the event of a major storm and to reduce the heavy volume of traffic on summer days at the beach. I also believe that highway user tolls have become a way of life in most areas of our Country and would be very acceptable to finance this project.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Carolie Kimmel
Street Address: 79 Wild Swan Lane Apt/Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: Southern Shores, NC 27949

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Services Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1576

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdotturnpike.org
Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: John Kish
Street Address: 1206 Coral LN
City, State, Zip: Corolla NC

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your
comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional
comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No-Build ALTERNATIVE —
RT-12 WILL REMAIN ONE-WAY EVEN WITH ANY
ALTERNATIVE. BECAUSE MOST PEOPLE WILL COME — THIS IS
A RECREATION WOODS ROAD — THE ONLY THING THAT KEEPS
DOWN THE NOISE IS THE sound.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane
to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to
you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding
your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height,
draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
We have lived in this home for over 16 years and have seen the difference in traffic. We are very much in favor of getting this bridge built - both for safety reasons and traffic control. We do own a rental in our same zip code. I am not sending this letter to increase tourism - I am sending it because we feel so strongly about traffic without it. We have been in the process of readying our rental for a hurricane when the folks from north of us are trying to exit the Outer Banks. God help them and us if and when a big storm hits!

adding to my previous comments we are strongly in favor of MCB4!
I am a property owner in Carova Beach just north of Corolla. I will be unable to attend the public comment sessions, but wanted to pass along that I strongly support this bridge project and will pay any toll necessary.

I wish you luck as you move through the public hearings and then funding.

Sincerely,

Martin Klingel
2393 Sandfiddler Road
Corolla, NC
Dear Secretary Ross:

Our home at the above address is located on North Carolina Route 12, approximately one mile north of its intersection with U. S. 158 in Kitty Hawk. Based on direct, continuing, and personal observations of the conditions and circumstances here on the Outer Banks, we are writing to support the immediate design and accelerated construction of the “Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge” connecting the Corolla area with mainland Currituck County. This would certainly be preferable to widening NC Route 12, for a variety of reasons set forth below.

The Bridge is Urgently Needed For Storm Evacuation Purposes.

It’s less than 12 months since Hurricane Isabel made it all too clear that the Outer Banks are not immune to catastrophic weather events. Nature will not be so kind every year as last year and allow several days of warning before striking. Presently, even a mild thunderstorm renders Route 12 a minimally passable one lane road for much of its length, even here in Southern Shores.

We can all too readily visualize a catastrophic event: the making, arising, and striking of a violent storm like Isabel. In fact, there is a dreadful risk that the beach communities from Corolla south will not be able to evacuate in time. Literally thousands of men, women, and children could be forced to stay in the open, with no protection from the elements and storm surge, and perish. Should that event take place, the after-action inquiries (witness the present 9/11 Commission) will not be pleasant to behold, and those responsible for the delays in building absolutely essential life-saving evacuation facilities are not likely to be dealt with kindly. Today, the northern beaches are like another Tiante, functioning without enough lifeboats in terms of evacuation capacity.

Moreover, in choosing between the Bridge and widening Route 12, two facts should be kept in mind. First, by our “eyeball observation” of the very heavy traffic that goes past our driveway, a large majority of the visitors to the north beach communities come from places like Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Ohio. Second, most storms that would call for an evacuation come from the South, or the sea. Were the Bridge in place, evacuation could take place toward the North and West, away from the storm and toward the home destinations of these people.

Today, or with a widened Route 12, evacuation must take place first toward the South, directly into Hatter’s Inlet. Evacuees from the Corolla area directed first South down Route 12 then back North on U.S. 158 must drive some 60 miles “up and down” (most likely in horrendous weather) to reach the same point on the mainland that they could arrive at by driving 10 miles West from Corolla over the proposed Bridge. This is madness.

We implore the public officials concerned to act with foresight. Please don’t wait for a disaster to occur — and then suffer through the agonizing probes into who should be held responsible for such a foreseeable calamity.

The Bridge Will Foster Energy Efficiency And Be Environmentally Friendly

Based on our observations of the sources of local traffic, tens of thousands of vehicles are now needlessly driven all the way down to Kitty Hawk on U.S. 158 and back North on Route 12 to reach the north beach communities. This means that on the way in and the way out each of these vehicles must travel a total of some 100 miles further than would be necessary if the Bridge were in place. It does not take a genius to recognize the vast amounts of fuel needlessly burned — and pollutants needlessly emitted into the air and deposited on local land and waters — through this completely unnecessary travel.

Our reading of local journals indicates that concerns have been expressed by some about aquatic environmental damage that might arise near the Bridge itself. To date, though, we have not noted any where near enough attention to the foregoing and very real environmental benefits that the Bridge would provide.

Widening Route 12 Is A Poor Alternative

Although we might personally lose a strip of our land, we would support “three-laning” of Route 12 for much of its length, to provide a local turning lane and thus relieve traffic congestion. However, widening Route 12 to four or more lanes would literally destroy the towns of Duck and Sanderling as a minimum: there just isn’t enough room to put the lanes in unless much of the commercial heart of these communities is ripped out — and there’s no where else to put it.

Furthermore, such a four-or-more lane expansion of Route 12 north of U.S. 158 would present a serious public safety hazard. Every summer, we read of several lives lost and many persons badly injured on the 158 “bypass” in Kitty Hawk, Kill Devil Hills, and Nags Head because pedestrians — often children and youth — attempt to cross the miles of roadway where there are no traffic lights. This sad toll would inevitably extend northward with a widened Route 12 — and be worsened. Here in Southern Shores, for example, the great majority of homes are West of Route 12 — which must be crossed for their residents and guests to reach the beaches. In Duck, crossing a four lane plus Route 12 would be fraught with risk for most area shoppers; and fatal to many, we expect. And who will be held accountable for such predictable carnage?

Note that this “environmental risk to humans” would not apply to the Bridge and its access roadways, which would not be constructed in locations that families and children must cross to reach the Outer Bank’s beaches and retail centers.

The Bridge Can Be Built Without Burdening North Carolina’s Taxpayers

We strongly support the concept of a toll facility and roadway. Indeed, a very successful example of this approach can be witnessed in the toll road that now carries traffic safely to and from North Carolina through the City of Chesapeake, Virginia — and has eliminated the difficult bottleneck that old two-lane Virginia 168 used to be between I-264 and the North Carolina line. Given the origin of most north beach traffic, why not let all those folks from Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey pay for the Bridge? If they’re saving hours of time and many, many gallons of
Jennifer - We have not communicated in a long time, but just wanted you to know that I am still against the bridge. I attended the meeting on May 19 concerning the bridge in Corolla and was one of the many speakers against the bridge. Out of the 40 or so people who spoke only two supported the bridge and they were from Dare Co. I just don't believe you and the staff understand that we in Corolla don't want the bridge. Dare Co. wants the bridge not us. Take the money the State has set aside for the Mid-Currituck bridge and give it to Dare Co. to help replace the bridge over Oregon Inlet. If the powers to be must have a bridge in Currituck Co. then why destroy the world around us? If you choose the C2 route then it is my understanding that you will destroy nine business in TimBuck II. You also want to widen Hwy 12 south to four lanes for three miles (WHY??). You will destroy our neighborhood! Ninety percent of the traffic that would come across the C2 route in the summer if it were the chosen option would head north due to the location of the rental companies. Why destroy the homes and views of the owners to the south?? You and others need to listen to tax payers and voters who live and reside in Currituck County.

Dave Knoch
573 Hunt Club Dr.
Corolla, NC 27927
252-256-0962

---

Jennifer - We have not communicated in a long time, but just wanted you to know that I am still against the bridge. I attended the meeting on May 19 concerning the bridge in Corolla and was one of the many speakers against the bridge. Out of the 40 or so people who spoke only two supported the bridge and they were from Dare Co. I just don't believe you and the staff understand that we in Corolla don't want the bridge. Dare Co. wants the bridge not us. Take the money the State has set aside for the Mid-Currituck bridge and give it to Dare Co. to help replace the bridge over Oregon Inlet. If the powers to be must have a bridge in Currituck Co. then why destroy the world around us? If you choose the C2 route then it is my understanding that you will destroy nine business in TimBuck II. You also want to widen Hwy 12 south to four lanes for three miles (WHY??). You will destroy our neighborhood! Ninety percent of the traffic that would come across the C2 route in the summer if it were the chosen option would head north due to the location of the rental companies. Why destroy the homes and views of the owners to the south?? You and others need to listen to tax payers and voters who live and reside in Currituck County.

Dave Knoch
573 Hunt Club Dr.
Corolla, NC 27927
252-256-0962
From: ronkrablin@comcast.net
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 9:05 PM
Subject: bridge

I am completely against the bridge. It will ruin the sound that we have a home on (Monterey Shores) A wonderful peaceful beautiful place will be gone forever. Any thought to all of us with homes on the sound that will be a highway instead for many miles? We have owned a home there for > 10 years and have never had traffic difficulty. It occurs only on weekends and adding more form 158 can't help that. Hurricanes? We have been there at warning times. Days to leave. Not an issue for anyone who will plan a little. Cost is crazy. Toll is hideous expense. Why allow this? Just throw us out. Why not? How would you feel if your favorite place with a home turned into a beautiful view of a long concrete roadway, about which you had no coice rammed down your throat? Think of your home with a roadway out the back door!

Ron Krablin
948 Sunburst PT.
Corolla

From: Bill Kramer [mailto:whkramer@juno.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 05, 2010 4:10 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Cc: Bill Kramer
Subject: mid-currituck bridge project

Dear Sir:

I have a beach house in Ocean Sands and I am very anxious to get a new bridge before we have a major loss of people trying to get out during a major storm. It takes almost 8 hours to get off in a major storm in Summer. I prefer MCB2 with C-2 option.

Please do something before we have a major loss of life.

Thank you,

William H Kramer
11431 Rolling Brook Rd.
Chester, Va. 23831
Ms. Harris

I am a property owner in the northern part of the Outer Banks. I am writing to you today since I am unable to attend the meetings to discuss the bridge on May 18, 19, 20th. However, I do want to take a moment to provide my complete support for the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge.

If you have ever spent time in the Outer Banks during June, July, or August, then you know about the extreme congestion that occurs during the high season. You must also know that due to the nature of the current roadway system on this barrier island getting off the island in an emergency is quite difficult. Providing a bridge to the northern part of the island will greatly reduce both of these burdens. Northern visitors would therefore not be crowding the one bridge closest to the Corolla area. If people need to get off the island in a hurry they will now be able to do so in the event of a strong hurricane. Travel times for many visitors coming from the northeast can be cut by as much as 45-50 minutes of travel time. This is good for our visitors and good for our local economy. There are so many reasons a Mid-Currituck County bridge is needed. Please move forward on this endeavor.

Thank you,

Miles Krieger

Miles Krieger
Vice President
Regional Lending Officer
(410) 568-6125 (office)
(410) 568-4515 (fax)
mkrieger@easternsavingsbank.com
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Ed + Phyllis Kurzmar
Street Address: 179 Duck Trail Apt Suite No: A
City, State, Zip: Southern Shores, NC 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB 4. There is only one reason for a Bridge at this time and that is to keep the boat traffic out of the harbor. In the past, boats have blocked the harbor from being used for emergency, recreational, or commercial use. It is time to stop allowing the boats to block the harbor and start using the harbor for its intended purpose.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why? (Continued from above)

The locals have to recognize that the situation is not, what it once was economically and safety wise. People are not as careful and safety wise. We have been told for many years, that the bridge has created a problem. People must be addressed now and correctly. No other option will correct the situation.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I have no preference.
We need this bridge so badly! I do hope the approval will be coming soon!

Janis Kuykendall
11th avenue
Kitty Hawk, NC
Dear Ms. Harris,

I represent over 22 properties in the Corolla, NC. We think the Mid-Currituck bridge is vital to our area. We are in total support of the EIS recommendation for MCB4. As far as C1, or C2, we have no opposition to either one. We are in favor of building the bridge at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely,

Nils Ladenburg

President, Christi Construction, Inc
4721 N. Croatan Hwy.
Kitty Hawk, NC 27949
252-261-7400 (O)
252-261-2955 (F)
From: Spencer Lambert [mailto:spencer@spencerlambert.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 01, 2010 10:53 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Plan MCB4 is the only feasible solution

As I understand it, the essential purpose of the Mid-Currituck Bridge is to create a safe, easy way for people to access the north beaches of Currituck County, while avoiding the bottlenecks and delays caused by this traffic to the current and future residents of the south beaches of Currituck and Dare.

Plan MCB4 is the only plan that supports the growth of the north beach area of Currituck county, while protecting the communities south of the proposed bridge.

As a longtime Southern Shores homeowner, I urge you to adopt the MCB4 plan and abandon plans to widen routes 158 and 12, which will have a disastrous impact on current residents, and will dramatically alter the tranquility of the Outer Banks as we know it.

Spencer Lambert
300 Sea Oats Trail
Southern Shores, NC 27949-3202

From: Mcorby47@aol.com
To: midcurrituck
Sent: Sun May 16 15:43:29 2010
Subject: plans

My name is Marianna Landrum. I live at 106 Pudding Pan Lane in Southern Shores and I have reviewed your proposed plans and support MCB4. The other two choices are hideous and would destroy this area. I come from New Jersey and I know what it is like to see a beautiful place ruined by poor planning and greed. I can’t even imagine why you would consider either of the other two options. I certainly would be upset if I saw my tax dollars being spent to ruin the area in which I live. If either ER2 or MCB2 is decided upon, I would have to wonder who is getting the big payoff in return for the destruction of this part of the Outer Banks.

I am a member of the Chickahauk Property Owners’ Association, and as such, am the liaison from our Association to the Southern Shores Town Council. I attend meetings for both, and when our citizens discussed the proposed plans at the CPOA and during the public comment section of the Council Meeting, I can honestly say nobody had a good thing to say about either ER2 and MCB2. One property owner pointed out the stupidity of making NC12 a four lane road here in Southern Shores when Duck would remain two lanes. Another citizen responded by pointing out that the next move of the DOT would be to take over land in Duck once they had finished taking land in Southern Shores. The idea of the overly large drainage ditches here is seen as a sneaky way to work in that four lane road that nobody wants in our area if either ER2 or MCB2 can’t be foisted upon the citizenry at this point because of the strong opposition against the two plans. The DOT can later move right in and make those very, very large drainage ditches the other two lanes of the highway. Nobody has been fooled by the drainage ditch plan.

Our government is supposed to be a representative government and if that is the case, do your job and represent the citizens of this area, not the few people who will be granted monetary gain from the destruction of the natural landscape here. If any plan other than MCB4 is decided upon, I will begin to organize our citizens to oppose the construction here in Southern Shores. I am sure that the destruction of this beautiful area would be of interest to many groups, including wildlife preservation groups and television news people, among others. People are disgusted enough with our government and the way it doesn’t always work for the good of the people. Don’t give us another reason to be angry.

Marianna Landrum
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: **Dane Lane**

Street Address: **1240 Duck Road Apt/Suite #10**

City, State, Zip: **Duck, NC 27949**

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or Go-Build Alternative and Why?

- **No Build - Safety**. With a 4-LANE ROAD, 2 IN EACH DIRECTION, A MULTIPLE VEHICLE ACCIDENT WILL FORCE EMERGENCY PERSONNEL TO EXIT AT BRIDGE END. **Environment**. THE GAS AND WIC.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge counter alternative C1 or C2 and why? **RJRC** WILL MAINTAIN ECOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE AREAS.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

**Silly Question - unless via let NC drivers into the state, then the question is moot.**

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

**Local (Corolla) Environment does not make the infrastructure is, parking, restrooms, etc to accommodate daytrippers.**

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments:
**Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form**

Name: **Lynn Lane**

Street Address: **1049 Corolla Dr. Apt. Suite 8**

City, State, Zip: **Corolla, NC 27927**

**Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:**

**Mail:** Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.

NC Turnpike Authority

1578 Mail Service Center

Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

**Email:** midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

**Question 1:** Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

- Environmentally unsound
  - Run off + exhaust
  - Satisfactory cost for 25% of your potential usage

- Destruction of environment

**Question 2:** If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

**Question 3:** If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

**Question 4:** As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center lane during an evacuation and why?

- Third lane unacceptable
- Reversing center lane would be acceptable if it does not cause a bottleneck to Elizabeth City and points beyond.

**Question 5:** With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

---

**Question 6:** If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

---

**Additional Comments:**

*Hurricanes are forecast well in advance of the actual landfall. Evacuation traffic snarls can be avoided through early warning systems. Tourists come to the Outer Banks because of its natural beauty. Building a bridge for crowds(?) for such a short time and destroying the peaceful, natural environment and wildlife habitat is unacceptable.*

*We do not want to become another Myrtle Beach!!*
Dear Ms. Harris

My family has been vacationing in Duck for more than 20 years, and on several occasions have had to leave the outer banks because of threats of, and actual hurricanes. We have been stalled on Route 12 through Southern Shores for many anxious hours concerned as to whether we were going to successfully evacuate to a safe area. The proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge will greatly alleviate this problem for all people who live and vacation in the outer banks and I want you to know that I strongly support the proposed MCB4 Alternative, and ask your help toward getting it approved and construction started as soon as possible. Thank you

Robert J Lanoue PE, 125 Dianne St. Northpoint, Duck NC 27949
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: DANIEL LARUE
Street Address: 510 OAKVIEW COURT Apt./Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: COROLLA NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
NO BRIDGE, NO BUILD.
A BRIDGE WILL DAMAGE OUR BEAUTIFUL UNCORRUDED BEACHES, IT WILL MAKE THEM TRASHY AND NOT ENVIROMENT FRIENDLY. IT WILL RAISE THE COSTE, ACCIDENTS AND LOWER OUR QUALITY OF LIFE. BEING FAR AND AWAY IS ONE OF COROLLA'S MAIN ATTTRACTION.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
NO BUILD OF A BRIDGE, BUT THE SAFEST ONE IS C2 FOR PEDESTRIANS. STILL I AM AGAINST IT ALL.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
I CAN'T GIVE AN OPINION BECAUSE I DON'T LIVE THERE.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
1. SAFETY OF FAMILIES CROSSING 2. MORE ACCIDENTS 3. NO JOY RIDERS + NO BACK PAY 5. CONSIDER THE NATURE (TREES, GRASS, PLANTS) AND THE WILD LIFE (DEER, RABBITS, FOX, CATS, ETC)

If you are a boater or rent boats, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:
WE DON'T NEED A BRIDGE FOR EVACUATION, 5 DAYS WARNING IS ENOUGH TIME WE DON'T NEED A BRIDGE FOR 210 DAYS OF TRAFFIC DURING SUMMER.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Haines, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.gov

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Maria Jones, M.D.
Street Address: 2402 Corvair Ct
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I prefer no bridge, no build! We have a beautiful place, far away from it all. It has been working so good, ask the residents!

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer no bridge keep the safest one to fully accommodate all and people on route 12. But I am against the bridge.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I can't talk for them, I don't live there.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?


With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Wildlife, ocean life, safety of families, I need one we have ports. If we all ride, no one walks and we all run or walk there, more accidents are going to happen there is unsafe.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additonal comments:

we don't need a bridge to evacuate the warning of 5 days makes it easy enough. summer has traffic, but is only 2 days ago. and we know when to leave. with it, we are still here.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@sbcglobal.net

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Lafe F. Lafe
Street Address: P.O. Box 427
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No Build Alternative - Corolla will not be the same beautiful coast area if a bridge is built. The bridge will bring crime, accidents, and traffic congestion. Corolla will no longer be accessible by land and its beaches will be used for the construction of the bridge. The bridge will also make people lose their homes, which make Corolla unique and special with no longer exist.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

My bridge corridor preference but C2 would be safer than C1. The families and children to cross RR to go to the beach & the stores. This is a lot of traffic congestion. I would love less congestion & be safer.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

None

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing the center turn lane

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

None

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

More

Additional comments:

Sandimas is a big area with a lot of people. The traffic congestion is a lot of traffic. I think if we have less traffic congestion on Corolla the environment will be better. I would love less traffic congestion and be safer.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ntturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Sandra LaRue
Street Address: PO Box 428, 835 Whitehead Ave., Corolla, NC 27927
City, State, Zip:

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No Build. A bridge would change our beautiful pristine desolate unspoiled beaches. A bridge would change why tourists desire to vacation in Corolla why residents choose to live in Corolla. A bridge will negatively impact the quality of life - CAME Accident, drowmers, closed beaches, increase pollution, litter, etc. Corolla will be changed forever. Vacations + Residents come to Corolla because it's secluded. The exclusion makes Corolla unique + a preferred destination.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer the No-Build. Why? C2 would be safer for pedestrians crossing Rt 12 to go to the Beach + Shops because the 4-lane would be a shorter distance & in a less congested area in an area where pedestrians usually do not cross. Rt 12 to go to the Beach. C2 would be safer for families + children. Further south than C2 would be the safest.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I do not live here. It is not my job to give my opinion.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Family Safety crossing 4 lanes to walk to beach. There will be more deaths in Corolla from accidents on Bridge than from death due to hurricanes in Corolla in the last 20 years. Blinding storm-driven algae or R. B. No sidewalks for bike path. Bridge would add traffic jams on 158 to Virginia on weekends.

SAFETY - there will be more accidents - pollution + vehicles.

If you are a boater or rent boat that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments: MCB study states that a bridge is needed. Public input is critical. A bridge is not needed for hurricane evacuation. Delaying work is plenty of time to evacuate. I have not evacuated in 10 years. Traffic = most congestion is 8 days a week during the 13 weeks of the summer. 3 days X 13 weeks = 39 days. We do not need a bridge for 39 days a year Traffic congestion.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
My husband and I own a home in Sea Pines in Duck. We want to voice our objection to widening Route 12 through the northern Outer Banks. We prefer option MCB4 which includes building a Mid-Currituck Bridge, but not widening the roads or adding a third lane on Route 12. We feel that widening the roads would only ruin the ambiance of the Outer Banks and make it seem even more commercialized. A Mid-Currituck Bridge would relieve the traffic congestion especially during an evacuation, but not damage the atmosphere of the Outer Banks as much.

Thank you,

Vicki A. LaTorre
Anthony LaTorre
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?


With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?


If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location, where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.


Additional comments:

Keep Corolla, Duck, and Southern Shores un-commercialized and secluded


Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1579

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ndtnc.gov

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 1, 2010.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Adding a Third Outbound Evacuation

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

In the event that this is in Aydlett, do the project pass Aydlett? If not, how far south is the next village along the road and what are the alternatives?

Aydlett would deserve this road so much and appropriate funding the funds for this road expansion during 158 is not enough.

If you are a boat or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

The Currituck Sound needs to not be disturbed.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1575 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27698-1678

Or E-mail: midurient@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

May 18, 2010

Mid County Bridge:

As a property owner in Currituck County in the community of Aydlett, I do not want to lose the quality of life this community now offers. If you place the toll booths in Aydlett and it be the last exit before crossing the mid county bridge most of these travelers will only continue through Aydlett and Poplar Branch to continue to the Outer Banks joining highway 158 at Grandy not wanting to pay the toll. Leave your toll booths on highway 158 if this bridge has to be built and we are more than willing to travel the "Swamp Road" to get to the bridge for traveling to Corolla. The "swamp road" has never flooded and offers no damage to the environment or flood plain.

Currituck County is very fortunate to have its northern beaches, which supports the largest tax base for the entire county. Because of the quality of life this beach offers to its guest this is why we choose to vacation there and this same quality of life is why its approximately 500 permanent residents also choose to live and pay taxes to Currituck County. Why would you want to destroy the goose that has given you the golden eggs? Each of you know the easier it is to get somewhere; the more people will be definitely coming to an area. You now have the highest clientele and you want to open this area to day trippers which will only increase daily population causing additional cost for law enforcement to meet the demands of a more diverse audience. And be detrimental to a serene, beautiful, vacationer's paradise.

This bridge cannot be self supporting and will bubble up state funding. Let's support a much needed bridge by replacing the Bonner Bridge. Put your toll facility to the best candidate, it being the Bonner Bridge. Let us maintain the same quality of life, not disturbing a primary nursery area for various species of fish and taking care of our natural resources.

Where a tourist spends his time is where he spends his money. You have this now please let it continue and remain the same for its residents, its tax payer and its vacationers.
Please find below two responses from Emily Ausband & Alex Lefevre in regards to the Mid Currituck Bridge Project and alternatives. We are both owners of Banks Land Company whose property is located at 6146, 6150 & 6156 North Croatan Hwy. The businesses located within this property that are also referenced as commenter’s are Islander Flags of Kitty Hawk, Inc., Identify Yourself LLC, The Bean Drop Cafe, & Kitty Hawk Kayaks and Surf School and one vacant tenant space.

We prefer MC84 using the center lane as a third outbound lane during evacuations.

You will find Emily’s Comments first and then Alex’s comments following.

COMMENTS ON BEHALF AND BY EMILY AUSBAND

I would like to present the following possible solution to the 158 Corridor in Kitty Hawk proposed widening or hurricane evacuation lane. Without a detailed map on which I could calculate this myself, I can only make the following observation.

Instead of the proposed widened roadway being straight, I believe some curves could provide a much better outcome. Since I believe the speed limit is to be lowered to 45 mph, I don’t think slight curves would be a traffic danger.

1. Curve to the right from the bridge to Amandas Avenue avoiding the businesses to the north.
2. Curve to the left before Victory Chevrolet and Islander Flags including the bridge over Jean Guite Creek.
3. Curve back to the right in the empty space in front of Kitty Hawk Estates avoiding all the town homes and the Kitty Hawk School property including the much needed ball field.
4. Continue this to the Marketplace.
5. The only structure then potentially impacted would be the ABC store which has an entry on the left rather than facing 158.

It seems to me that this would accomplish the least disruption to existing businesses and would actually improve the frontage at Victory Chevrolet, Islander Flags and Kitty Hawk School, for example – utilizing already ample available space with no structures.

If this plan were feasible, it might mean changing the angle of Jean Guite Creek Bridge and re-establishing setback lines along this corridor. This should be done prior to any work so that property owners would know that any future construction would be affected by new setback lines for highway widening.

I would appreciate a specific answer from your engineers as to the possibility of such a design. Although it might cause some additional road construction expense, I doubt it would be as costly as the expense of buying out existing commercial properties.

This option should be examined even before construction of a hurricane evacuation lane on the north side of the highway so that future planning would be established from the start.

COMMENTS BY AND ON BEHALF OF ALEX LEFEVRE

All my comments are directly related to the corridor between the Wright Memorial Bridge and The Woods Road Intersection.

- UNDERGROUND INFILTRATION

After meeting with NC Turnpike representatives at the Open House on May 18th at the Ramada Plaza, and discussion of the potential impact on our property… we discussed the size of the swale in front of our property and discussed the potential of creating underground storage that could drain to adjacent property minimizing the area needed to widen the road on the south side of 158 in front of our property.

- TURN LANES

If the 6 Lane Super Street is developed as part of this project or a future project; there should be consideration given as to the placement of the proposed 'U' Turn Lanes and Traffic Lighting in regards to making business entrances easily accessible by adjusting the turn lanes east or west; in our case westward so that the west bound traffic could have the option of turning into our driveway vs. doing a U Turn – We find it unlikely that once motorists are traveling towards the Wright Memorial Bridge that they will turn around to come back to our property; thus negatively impacting our businesses. Placement of this light and turn lane would be critical to our business.

- NEW GINGUITE CREEK BRIDGE

The proposal to replace the Ginguite Creek Bridge will directly impact the business of Kitty Hawk Kayaks and Boaters using the canal that live on the south side of the bridge. Our Tenants, Kitty Hawk Kayaks, use the waterway on a daily basis, and the unimpeded access thru that area is essential to their livelihood. Great care will need to be taken if the bridge is replaced in making sure that the waterway is accessible and safe and completed in an urgent fashion with the best times being October – February.
Also, the construction of the bridge would create huge amounts of equipment activity and debris removal – we would expect this part of the project to be minimized to alleviate potential blocking of our property frontage.

- **FOOTBRIDGE & MULTIUSE PATH**

The existing footbridge and multise path on the north side of 158 gets an amazing amount of traffic and is great for the community. If the road is converted to a super street or an outbound lane is added, the bridge and path will need to be replaced. A consideration is to relocate the footbridge and path on the south side of the highway as the expansion with the outbound lane pushes the perimeter/right of way even farther on the north side – to balance the space; consider replacing the footbridge and multi use path on the opposite side of the road from its existing location.

Depending on the outcome of replacing the sidewalk and foot bridge, we may be interested in acquiring the bridge and moving it to our property as a crosswalk connecting our two properties 6146 N. Croatian with 6156 N. Croatian.

- **GENERAL CONSTRUCTION**

Depending on the final consensus, we would expect that our property would remain free and clear of construction traffic and debris during the project. We would also request that we are supplied with a contact name and number if we have any concerns during the construction related to our location.

- **ENVIRONMENTAL**

We would expect that there be the least amount of environmental impact possible effecting Ginguite Creek, Kitty Hawk Woods and surrounding wetlands through mitigation and other alternatives.

- **MEETING**

We would request a meeting on behalf of ourselves and our tenants and potentially our business neighbors in our corridor between the Wright Memorial Bridge and The Woods Road to finalize concerns that may not have been addressed prior to construction of any of the alternatives.

Respectfully Submitted.

Emily Ausband
177 Chicahauk Trail
Southern Shores NC 27949
Tel: 252-261-1791 – emily@islanderflags.com

Alex Le Fevre
2608 Neptune Way
Kitty Hawk NC 27949
Tel: 252-202-1452 – alex@islanderflags.com

CC:
US Army Corps of Engineers – Wilmington District
Attn: William Biddlecome
Washington Regulatory Field Office
Post Office Box 1000
Washington NC 27889

Senator Marc Basnight – President Pro Tempore – North Carolina Senate
C/O Chris Dillon
1st District
Legislative Building
18 W. Jones Street Room 2007
Raleigh NC 27601-2808

D-240
From: Alex LeFevre
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Cc: William J. Biddlecome@usace.army.mil; marcb@ncleg.net
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 10:20 AM
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Project

Ms. Harris,

Please find attached our comments in regards to the Mid Currituck Bridge Project.

This is also addressed to Mr. William Biddlecome in response to the Public Notice we received; ID # SAW-1995-022-42 issued April 21st 2010.

And is also addressed to Senator Marc Basnight - C/O Chris Dillon in response to a conversation we had with Mr. Basnight and at his request; we are copying the Senator’s office as well.

Thanks in advance. If you have any questions about our comments; our contact information is included in the attachment.

We will also fax a copy to each recipients fax number today.

NC Turnpike Fax: 919-671-3015
US Army Corps Fax: 252-975-3716
Senator Basnight’s Office Fax: 919-733-8740

Sincerely,
Alex LeFevre
800-253-3524
alex@islanderflags.com
www.islanderflags.com
PO Box 432
Kitty Hawk NC 27949
Tel: 252-261-6266  Fax: 252-261-4082

Senator Basnight’s Office Fax: 919-733-8740

From: Robert Leonard
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Sat May 15 14:34:46 2010
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Project

We would like to express our support of the Mid-Currituck Bridge project Option MCB4.

Robert & Susanne Leonard
22 1st Ave
Southern Shores
I am a property owner at 1143 Morris Drive, Corolla 27927. Following the work you’ve done lately, including a detailed read of the DEIS, I strongly recommend you consider option MCB4, with terminus at Timbuk2 in Corolla.

Thank you for your consideration,

Barry J. Lerner
Senior Director
Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)
1710 SAIC Drive
McLean, VA  22102
(O) 703.676.4064; (C) 571.268.2257
barry.j.lerner@saic.com

"The mind of a bigot is like the pupil of the eye. The more light you shine on it, the more it will contract." Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
Dear Sir/Madam:

I hope to be able to reinforce my written concerns at the public forum scheduled for May 2010. However, since work-related travel is unpredictable, I would like to take this opportunity to have my concerns about the proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge and related road improvements on record.

Public Health & Safety:

The erection of a two-lane bridge for a span of 7 miles, I believe, is fraught with potential hazard. Any incident on the bridge from minor breakdown to major single or multi-vehicle accident not only would cause significant back up congestion in both directions, but would create a significant challenge to both Corolla and mainland rescue teams. Unless there were opportunity for helicopter or ferry landings, I would be concerned about the challenge to effectively transfer critically ill victims to regional health centers within ‘the golden hour’, especially from the perspective of the road widening and narrowing on the available maps. With limited rescue resources and local trauma centers, if the rescue units are involved in a bridge accident, Corolla, at least, would be in peril for the time rescuers were on the bridge call. This concern is not to be interpreted as lack of confidence in our superb responders, but is a concern for building the bridge without consideration of funds to expand rescue operations and published planning documents that detail accident scene management and victim export (not to mention getting the wreckers in and out).

Also the language used seems to be about vacationers in their cars and perhaps SUVs. I see no document that says tractor trailers, even those hauling fuel and other hazardous materials would not use the bridge as well. And I see no reference to noise and other pollutions from these rigs.

I appreciate the above can happen on the Wright Memorial Bridge, for example—but it’s design provides options and it is not 7 miles long.

In a public-private partnership it is unclear to me and I would like clarification of who is ultimately responsible for not only public safety but would be held accountable for any liabilities incurred traversing the bridge and access roads. Thank you.

Traffic Flow

Thank you, Nancy Lewars
After reviewing available documents I have traffic flow concerns. The maps show areas where road widening on rt 12 and 158 collapse back to the original lanes (i.e. along Rt. 12, in/near Duck, and on the mainland). From my experience as a driver, when lanes collapse that often creates significant congestion and increases the number of accidents both at and approaching the lane collapse. Likewise similar conditions occur when roads converge. These backups, especially on the mainland and within the short range of road widening in Corolla would contribute to backups on the bridge creating congestion and increasing peril.

I do not at this point in time see a direct relationship between the problems expected to be solved and the proposed remedies. For example, 2010 or 2035 I do not see how the two-lane bridge and interrupted road widening will solve traffic problems for Southern Shores and Duck. Not all the cars those towns are concerned about are heading to Corolla. Southern Shores, Duck and points south have their own volume during the summer months and the congestion I experience is often the result of the allowable left hand turns. This congestion has increased since building Winks, for example, and lately when there are events in the Duck town park. Southern Shores not only has a shopping center with an immediate left-right across from the entrance and exit of a gas station on the right— but within yards visitors require a left hand turn into a high volume rental agency. These poor development and traffic planning decisions also impact the traffic heading south to Kitty Hawk, Kill Devil Hills, etc.

Overall visitor volume can be handled in more efficient and cost/benefit ways. For example, rental agencies could move to 7 day per week check ins to alleviate the flow of visitors on Saturdays and Sundays during the high season. To launch ‘change’ these companies could offer various perks to both property owners and vacationers to opt for weekday arrivals and departures. In these modern times, a workers vacation request is more flexible. Restaurant owners, I believe, would embrace this as well. They would have more consistent customer flow cutting down on those nights where they cannot adequately handle the number of diners and as well enhance those nights were business is slower. Traffic specialists could design flow patterns with/s without signals to address the existing obstacles to smooth flow (i.e. examples noted above) and reasonable planning by both Dare and Currituck County officials could take these items into consideration before allowing permits for future construction.

Environmental Impact

In addition to the stated visual pollution, I am concerned about any additional impervious surface overlaid on the northern Outer Banks. Although I am not an engineer, I do read the various reports on file for those developers seeking special permits—and their numbers suggest all is or will be well. Yet there is significant evidence (a picture worth a thousand words) of increased flooding resulting from new development and the addition of impervious surfaces, from parking lots to private driveways. For those of us living in Corolla for a long time, we are the oral historians of these events—we may not articulate mathematical formulas expressing our concerns, but we know a flood when we see one, and we can recall similar periods of rain/snow/overwash etc. in the past that did not have the current immediate and lasting impacts. Each flood or area of standing water eventually leaches into the ground water contaminating wells and impacting the water table. The square footage of impervious surface for the bridge landing and proposed road widening, I believe would be catastrophic. The road widening north of the bridge on Rt. 12 could also impact septic fields.

And note I have not even addressed the aquatic impact nor birds and other wildlife, from noise to disruption of habitat to increased potential for spill and fuel and oil leaching from the bridge surface to the sound and wetlands.

At minimum further investment in the bridge planning should be put on hold until the existing flooding and drainage issues of the north Banks, especially Whalehead Beach and along Rt. 12 north of Albacore Street are corrected. At that point any bridge studies would be more accurate in terms of the topography and related design decisions.

Evacuation

Evacuation as we all know is not an annual event. In fact the northern Outer Banks, unlike our southern neighbors, is more often in peril from winter storms than summer hurricanes. Although plans suggest that there would be an improvement in evacuation by building the bridge (though if I read the slide presentation correctly, so would non-bridge alternatives), the attendant road improvements in some ways decreases the expected effectiveness of the bridge. Note again areas of lane collapse and convergence. Sooner or later that traffic backs up as vehicles need to ‘take turns’ and realign to the space available in the areas where roads are not widened. Also, final evacuation routes can be determined in the final 36 hours or even closer to storm landfall. If all evacuation is to head north, then the bridge traffic would be converging with the Wright Memorial and Rt 158 mainland evacuees—creating a new challenge in emergency management. Again I am not a professional but I’d think having a single flow of traffic provides more predictability and easier management— from traffic signal alterations to actual people directing vehicles. On those occasions that evacuation would be directed toward Elizabeth City—there would be two opposing lines of traffic that must converge and turn on to an unimproved/unwiden road.

Investment

I question the overall investment rational for this project, especially with a private company. The private sector is not beholden to the public interest and it’s mission is revenue generation and profit. If I read correctly, the state in these risky economic times, would float bonds to recoup its investment on a project that when you think about it—could generate reasonable revenue for about 10-12 weeks per year, and in that timeframe peak usage in the current traffic volume model for 2 at most 3 days per week. My math says we’re talking about 36 days per year for high volume traffic/tolls on the bridge. Even for Corolla residents who support building the bridge, I’d ask from a fiscal standpoint how often do you go to the northern Currituck mainland and/or southern Virginia? Even if once a week year round, I believe there are about 200 fulltime
residents (mostly retirees)—again doing the math even if everyone took a weekly trip—I don’t see the return on investment no matter how high the toll. And, of course, if the toll is high most folks won’t use the bridge anyway. I would be concerned both from an investment and community quality of life issue that the bridge would be a fallow monolith like so many of the shopping centers during the off season. And my guess sooner or later the bad investment would trickle down to taxpayers.

I’m also not sure that mainland businesses, if they consider a cost benefit analysis, would embrace the bridge. Many vacationers stop at the farmstands, cotton gin, and host of other tourist related businesses on their way to OBX. I can relate an incident where I was heading home on a June weekend and foolishly needed gas—there was none! I had to turn to the northbound lanes to find a gas station with fuel still in the tanks. Maybe not a good thing for the visitors, but sure a good thing for the businessman. I’d rather run out of sold gas than have my pumps idle. So too, I’d think would the recipients of the gas taxes. The Mid-Currituck Bridge will encourage fill ups in Virginia.

Community Impact

There is so much to consider here, I will leave these concerns to my neighbors. But I would like to briefly note that the bridge would cut Corolla in half—pretty much preventing the development of a sustainable, multi-generational, year round community. I also think there is an ethical responsibility on the part of government agencies. Land, homesites and homes have been sold ‘aggressively’ to people now living or owning property in Corolla. From my perspective there was an implicit promise when one is sold a view, local flora and fauna, a lifestyle and quality of life. Yes, development happens, but responsible development considers the hard and soft impacts and clearly someone should be the advocate for the community’s quality of life. I am aware I am saying should…an ideal word.

So from the community perspective I ask— is this bridge really necessary? is it the answer to the posed problems? If yes, is it proven irrefutably? and then if yes, can the proposed design and plan be modified for the least impact on one-of-a-kind historical, nautical community? Or could we invest in other services that mitigate the need for the bridge as proposed? A 24/7 urgent medical care facility, satellite campus of a NC community college or university, a K-12 charter school—if new construction, could be built to withstand storm forces and serve as a safety center, collective creative, critical problem solving by local business on how to maintain revenue and preserve the north Dare and Currituck communities and enhance public safety…

If you are not the people who can place my comments into the public record, please either redirect this email or provide me with the correct contact.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Lindemann

From: YL Lin [mailto:yllin04@optonline.net]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 11:29 AM
To: midcurrituck@nctturnpike.org
Subject: comments re MCB

I have attached as well as pasted into body of this email to assure you can open and submit for file. Thank you.

DUCK COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS ALLIANCE
P.O. Box 8251, Duck, North Carolina 27949
John Vander, President Ed Brooks, Vice President Ed Brooks, Treasurer Lynne Alterman, Secretary
Board Members – Steve Alterman, Jon Britt, Lisa Newbern, Don Zerbe
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form
Name: ____________________________

Street Address: __1032 Corolla Drive__________________________ Apt./Suite R_________________________
City, State, Zip: __Corolla, North Carolina 27927__________________________

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@nctturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why? No-Build Alternative. The plans as presented to not adequately address the stated reasons for building the bridge; there is no independently audited financial plan for construction as well as return on investment with timeline.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why? If a bridge as proposed is a done deal, the only reasonable Corolla landing is C2, but this needs further review to assure direct access to public health and safety services and does not impact residential traffic on Corolla, Whalehead or Lighthouse drives.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why? As noted above, if the state continues to pursue another ill-conceived and costly project it appears option B would be the lesser of the evils.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why? Actually an additional lane on RT 158 and span on the Wright Memorial Bridge with no MCB would be a more feasible alternative and would more adequately address the rationale for improving access and egress to OBX; this is not a toll bridge, it is ‘shorter’ than the proposed, would have less environmental and ecological impact; would be a reasonable accommodation for OBX residents and mainland businesses year round (other than the proposed which would only be useful to visitors and of limited value for 26 days a year); NB: many mainland businesses serving OBX Currituck are located near the
Wright Memorial Bridge; would maintain sense of community for entire county; the MCB further alienates Corolla from mainland Currituck as using the bridge residents and visitors alike would bypass the communities and businesses on the mainland.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered? Of particular concern are three: the long term effects on environment, community and quality of life for residents and state loss of a treasured pristine tourist area; potential cost of the project with state commitment to fund so that the private investor can recoup investment when, as a taxpayer I'd like to see that kind of money spent on projects and services that address needs of North Carolina residents; the bridge will be the 'excuse' to force residents to seek a wide range of necessary community empowering services elsewhere, including out of state - ie medical care, higher education - etc. Oh and here's another - how can one embark on a project of this magnitude and not even know and publish the toll rate?

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments: A 'think tank' I am sure could critically analyze the stated issues for both mainland and OBX Currituck and come up with less costly and more community centered solutions. For example, the 26 days of high volume traffic work with rental agencies and tourist relations and begin to develop 7 day check in/check out options. This would spread out traffic and also solve some of the peak and trough issues of local business; develop and implement eco-friendly transportation systems that could serve year round residents, get workers to OBX from nearby counties and OBX folk 'out' and encourage visitors to plan vacations around air/steam travel because there would be a direct connect to OBX; upgrade infrastructure that realistically addresses evacuation issues (e.g. role of state of Virginia access from 158 to Eliz. City, etc.); help the residents of Duck and Southern Shores see the error in their development practices and make meaningful changes - especially those shopping areas, rental offices etc that require left hand turns when arriving to OBX.
Ms. Jennifer Harris
North Carolina Turnpike Authority

Dear Ms. Harris:

We are homeowners in Southern Shores for several years now, and renters before that. We have always had to endure the creep of traffic on Rt. 12 as cars made their way to a built-up Corolla that features large houses with many cars at each house. That traffic is a cause of great frustration to residents and renters of Southern Shores and Duck, resulting in a sense of imprisonment on heavily traveled weekends. It also presents a safety factor as people try to cross Rt. 12 to get to the beach, as well as the potential for serious delays should the island need to be evacuated.

The proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge is a reasonable solution to easing this traffic for the villages along the route. The owners and renters of Corolla should bear some of the traffic burden; after all, these cars are destined for Corolla and offer no benefit to Southern Shores or Duck, and the bridge would shave considerable time off their travels.

We strongly urge the approval of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. It's a fair solution and one that would allow all residents of the Outer Banks to enjoy the beauty and fun
the island has to offer.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards

Monte and Nancy Lorell
14 13th Ave.
Southern Shores, NC 27949

---

**Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form**

**Name:** Marie and Chuck Lowe

**Street Address:** 8599 Springs Drive Apt./Suite #

**City, State, Zip:** Warrenton, VA 20186 Phone: 540-349-1895 Email: melowes28@comcast.net

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

**Mail:** Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

**Email:** mldcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

**Question 1:** Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

We prefer the MCB4 choice. We think it would have less impact on the hundreds of property owners on Rt 12 through Southern Shores, Duck, etc.

**Question 2:** If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

We prefer C2. We think the businesses can relocate easier than the homeowners.
From: Stephen Lutenberg  
To: Harris, Jennifer  
Sent: Sat May 15 18:40:09 2010  
Subject: Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge  

Ms. Harris,

My wife Karen and I are strongly in favor of the plan to build the Mid-Currituck bridge with the MCB4 option and not the other alternatives.

We feel the bridge with this option is the best plan for providing the fastest and safest evacuation route with the least impact on natural resources and existing development. It also appears to be the best choice should future development occur in Corova region.

Sincerely,

Steve Lutenberg  
Karen French
Senators, Representatives, Commissioners, Ms. Harris,

The Mid County Bridge in Currituck County will forever change what Corolla is. Yes, more residential houses are still to be built, some commercial space is still available, but to see roads widened in Corolla to four lanes is the biggest eye sore on the face of the earth. One must fight very hard to keep Corolla as quaint as possible.

A 4 lane highway running for 4 miles from the bridge completely ruins this resort community. The sandwich boards signs was a drop in the bucket on the description of ugly. Ugly will be a 4 lane highway in Corolla.

Evacuation from a hurricane in summer is handled by the National Weather Station. Vacationers know 3 days in advance it is coming. State authorities begin evacuations as early as three days before the storm. There is no reason for anyone to be in a heavy traffic if they heed the instructions.

Reality sets in when you see the pictures of the future widening of the roads.

What is needed is 158 and Route 12 to be worked out for a better flow. Left turning lanes into side streets on Route 12.

Jacqueline MacKenzie, Corolla, NC
Cc. Senator Burr
U.S. Representative Jones
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

A picture is worth a thousand words - you showed years widening Route 12 - destroying the slow pace

Vacationers want

This bridge is a want - not a need for vacationers.

By a government agency

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.state.nc.us

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

May 11, 2010

Ms. Jennifer H. Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609-1578

RE: Mid Currituck Bridge

Dear Ms. Harris:

I understand that hearings are being held during May to solicit public input regarding the alternatives being considered for the Mid Currituck Bridge project. I am writing to convey my support of option MCB4. I believe this is the only real alternative for solving the congestion that has plagued our roadways for too many years now. I urge the Turnpike Authority to move forward with this project as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

J. David Mackey
218 Ocean Blvd.
Southern Shores, North Carolina
Comments: We have a house in Southern Shores and are counting on the Mid-Currituck Bridge to help the town in many ways. 1. Alleviate the terrible traffic problems particularly on weekends during the summer months - June through September. 2. Give the Outer Banks another possible route during a Hurricane Evacuation. All residents for 20 miles north of us up to Corolla have to drive through Southern Shores to get off the island because there is only one road. This is a very dangerous situation.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reverse center turn lane

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

None

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Services Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: DANIEL MAKITA

Street Address: 125 AUSTIN ST

City, State, Zip: CROWE, NC

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the EF2, MCB2, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

THIS IS THE SOLUTION FROM MY PERSPECTIVE. IT ALLOWS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE BRIDGE WHILE MINIMIZING THE IMPACT TO LOCAL ROAD AND THE OVERALL BEAUTY OF THE AREA.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?


If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainline approach road design Option A or B and why?

I DO NOT HAVE A PREFERENCE AND WOULD DEPEND ON THE PROPERTY OWNERS IN THAT AREA.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I would prefer to reverse the center lane to minimize the impact on the current road.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

None that have not been addressed.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

NA

Additional comments:

NA

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Na. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

From: wmarsh@mindspring.com  [mailto:wmarsh@mindspring.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 16, 2010 4:24 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: The Bridge

As long term residents of Duck, we have attended many meetings and heard many proposals. If it is necessary to remediate 10 weeks of heavy road use and plan for the future, it is in everyone’s best interest to choose a bridge over other alternatives (road widening). To ever increase the number of lanes into Duck and out of Duck would make for a bottleneck of immense proportions and defeat the purpose entirely. To widen NC 12 would destroy the very environment that draws people to our area for vacations, second home retreats or a new place to live. We do not support any changes to NC 12.

We do support MCB4 and the mid Currituck Bridge.

Bill and Ronnie Marsh
112 Quail Way
Duck, NC 27949

Bill and Ronnie Marsh
Brindley Beach
wmarsh@mindspring.com
www.outstandinginthemashes.com <http://www.outstandinginthemashes.com>
252-261-2222 (O)
252-202-5551 (C)
From: Barbara H. Marzetti [mailto:marzetti@msn.com]

Sent: Wed 6/2/2010 8:35 PM

To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org; jennifer.harris@ncturnpike.org; Vance Ayldeett; Owen Etheridge; Janet Taylor; John Rorer; ggregori@mediacomb.net; BOC; Bev Perdue; Bill Owens; Sen. Marc Basnight

Subject: NO MCB

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Barbara Marzetti

Street Address: 609 Sea Oats Ct.

City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1:
Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

NO BRIDGE - it's a waste of money we don't have, for a bridge we don't want or need & will not solve the traffic or evacuation problems. It's criminal to even consider building this while Bonner Bridge crumbles & it's the ONLY way in & out, whereas this a convenience for visitors on 13 weekends out of the year, and it will destroy what's left of one of the most beautiful & fragile stretches of barrier island.

Question 2:
If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Question 3:
If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Question 4:
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Third outbound lane will help the most.

Question 5:
With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Where to start ... you missed the ancillary impacts on the communities of Aydlett, Corolla & Carova. The environmental impact of construction alone will be unfathomable, and if constructed the runoff alone will destroy the Sound. The bridge would divide many communities in Corolla, yet the DEIS only discussed the newest, barely constructed one of Corolla Bay. How about, Corolla Light, Monterey Shores, Ocean Sands? How about traffic cutting through Whalehead to avoid traffic back ups on Rt. 12? Where's the funding for ancillary road improvements to support this bridge and money for parking, bathhouse, restrooms etc. for people using the bridge particularly daytrippers?

Question 6:
If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments:
This has to be one of the most ill-conceived projects ever ... driven by political and real estate interests and NOT by the needs and wants of the people. Even the visitors who think they might want the bridge, if the impact on the community and the changes it will bring are explained to them, most will say NO because then it will be like every other beach community!
Dear Ms Harris,

As an individual who has spent some amount of time in the past conducting Traffic and Transportation Engineering studies (with the occasional small Environmental Impact Study thrown in) for an Engineering Consulting firm and for the Federal Government, I would like to compliment the preparers of the Mid-Currituck Bridge EIS for a professional presentation. Having been on the Traffic Engineering Study and EIS preparation side of the fence, I understand the difficult decisions that must be made in selecting which alternatives to present to the public and then to make the final decision on which alternative to build (or not to build), especially when the project is as controversial, and has lasting, major impacts on the lives of the residents of both Mainland Currituck County and the Currituck Outer Banks. I defer to others on the obvious adverse environmental impacts (both during and after construction) of the increased noise, water, air, light, and visual pollution that residents will have to endure once the builders have come and gone. I would like to concentrate on an area I know a little bit more about, the adverse traffic impacts on the residents of Currituck County.

The EIS acknowledges the traffic issues the bridge project addresses are for 26 days (13 weekends) out of 365 days, or 7 percent of the days in the year (25 percent of the weekends in the year). Major projects such as the Mid-Currituck Bridge typically are undertaken to solve traffic congestion problems that occur at least five of the seven days of every week of the year (71 percent of the days). It should be very difficult for an Engineer or a Governmental Decision Maker to justify the expense for such a large capital project on the basis of solving a traffic problem that occurs only 7 percent of the days of the year (as opposed to the typical project that would relieve congestion 70 percent of the days of the year). Being able to justify such a large expenditure on the supposed basis of significantly improving traffic service 7 percent of the days of the year would be an astounding task I should not like to try to undertake.

No Build Alternative - I acknowledge that a strict no-build option may not be a reasonable choice, but perhaps a minimal build option that would have much less construction than proposed under ER2 should be considered. The major traffic bottlenecks are at the intersection of 12 and 158 and at Route 12 through the Town of Duck. Traffic crawls through Duck because of the lack of foresight on the part of planners by not reserving a wide enough right-of-way through town, thus allowing development too close to Route 12. The EIS discusses the high expense of widening Route 12 through Duck, yet does not flinch at the total cost of road and bridge work elsewhere. This does not make fiscal sense. It would seem the EIS has taken a position to avoid any adverse impact on Duck at the expense of Aydlett and Corolla.

The Root cause of the weekend traffic problem is not addressed in the EIS. This root cause is the traffic flow into and out of the Currituck Outer Banks is concentrated in time spans. No efforts have been made to spread out the arrivals and departures of visitors over more hours, or even over more days. The concept of reversible lanes is discussed only in terms of hurricane evacuation, not on traffic relief during the peak 13 weekends. All avenues should be explored to see if the congestion can be reduced to manageable levels by non-construction measures before undertaking expensive projects.

MCB4 - The EIS declared MCB4 to be the preferred alternative and takes no position on which of the two bridge alignments, the northern C1 or the southern C2, it supported. Addressing only the C1 versus C2 issue, I propose that C1 would have the least amount of impact on the Currituck community. Realize this is a divisive issue, with residents nearest to the C1 location in favor of C2, and residents nearest C2 in favor of C1. The EIS expresses a concern about C1 dividing the Corolla Bay subdivision, thus affecting community cohesion. I must admit I am puzzled by this statement about community cohesion. The last time I drove by the Corolla Bay subdivision, I...
remember seeing a subdivision sign, a model home, and construction workers laying out streets, and not much else. The C1 alternative seems to be in the least populated/deserted area of the two alternatives. The C2 alternative places the bridge terminus adjacent to the largest traffic generators (commercial establishments) on the Currituck Outer Banks. Dropping all the bridge traffic into this already heavily traveled area makes no sense from a traffic engineering perspective. Moving the traffic away from the congested area by selecting the Northern, or C1 alternative, would seem to be the best alternative of the two presented.

Thank you for reading and accepting my comments. I am grateful for the opportunity. If you have any questions, please send me an email.

Respectfully,
Joseph F. Cassidy
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 154 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1576

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Evie J. McCarthy
1216 Coral Lane
Corolla, NC
27927

19 May 2010

I am writing to support the NO BUILD option for the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project.

12 years ago, I retired to Corolla because I found a relaxed, comfortable life style which I wanted to practice and help maintain.

I believe this Mid County Bridge, if and when it is built, will be a death knell for this life style.

One of the avowed reasons for this project is ease of hurricane evacuation. In 12 years of being a resident of Corolla I have had NO problem with evacuation in the threat of a hurricane.

My last concern is related to the financial fund availability to ensure the completion of such a large effort. If the proposed bridge is to be operational by 2014, I do not believe the proposed road changes can be done in that time frame. If not what are the guarantees that with today's world financial crises the roads will ever find enough funding to be finished?

Will we end up with a half finished evacuation route that results in even bigger and better bottle necks?

Thank you for listening.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: EDWIN McCARTHY
Street Address: 1216 CORAL LANE
City, State, Zip: COROLLA, NC 27927

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No BUILD - I RETIRED TO COROLLA 12 YEARS AGO HOPING TO LIVE IN AND MAINTAIN A CERTAIN LIFE STYLE - I BELIEVE THIS BRIDGE WILL DESTROY THIS LIFE STYLE WITH OUR GIVING RESIDENTS ANY POSITIVE BENEFIT - I HAVE NEVER HAD A PROBLEM LEAVING FOR

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative G1 or G2 and why?

A HURRICAN EVACUATION -

With the current world wide financial problems how can you guarantee that enough long term money will be available to complete this project -

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location, where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@nturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Subject: Comments Regarding the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

My comments are offered from the perspective of a cyclist who rides many thousands of miles each year, who promotes bike riding for citizens of the Outer Banks for recreation and good health.

From previous presentations it appears the preliminary bridge design will be bicycle friendly in respect to wide shoulders (10 feet both sides) regardless of what route is chosen. Although I can find nothing on the rail heights, I assume they will be similar to the height of the rails on the Virginia Dare Bridge that connects Roanoke Island to the NC mainland.

I also hope the Mid-Currituck Bridge will have another attribute of the Virginia Dare Bridge. That is, at about the mid-way point there are bicycle pull-off areas on both the eastbound and westbound lanes. This feature is much appreciated as it provides a safe area for bicyclists to rest and also to enjoy the scenic beauty. Since the Mid-Currituck Bridge will be even longer than the Virginia Dare Bridge pull-off areas on the eastbound and westbound will certainly be a desirable attribute.

I am convinced the new bridge will be an engine for increased bicycling activity and thus increased economic activity in the Outer Banks of both Currituck and Dare Counties. I anticipate many thousands of bicyclists will ride the new bridge every year, and further, as the Outer Banks continues to promote sporting events such as triathlons and in the future both competitive and non-competitive bicycle events involving thousands of cyclists the popularity of the Outer Banks as a destination for cycling will increase significantly and bring with it significant and sustained economic activity.

It is my hope and request to the turnpike authority’s and NCDOT that bicyclists not be charged a toll to pedal the bridge. In fact, to do so would dampen and severely limit bicycle activity and the resultant economic benefits that would occur if bicyclists had to pay a toll to ride the bridge. Further, I hope and request the approaches to the bridge, both at the west and east terminuses include a “gateway” so cyclists can transit onto the bridge without having to stop, and this gateway be at least 10 feet wide so that it equals the 10 foot shoulders of the bridge. Moreover, the turnpike authority should have adequate room at the terminuses, particularly the west terminus, for parking as it’s almost certain many people will want to drive to the bridge but use their bikes to cross it.

Jack McCombs
Chairman of the Pedestrian & Bicycle Committee of the OBSTF when that organization was operating
jackdols@embarqmail.com
252-216-7580
252-460-9263
917 Cedar Dr.
Kill Devil Hills, NC 27948
Ms. Jennifer Harris,

I have participated in NC Turnpike meeting with respect to this bridge for almost 10 years.

The idea for this bridge goes back around 1978, then again in the 80's and the again in the 90's. Here we are into the 21st century, some 32 years later and still there is no final decision.

Maybe this is because it is not a good idea to begin with, since 32 years have not proven what the state should do.

The whole problem stems from Duck, NC, in Dare County, and NC12 which runs through Duck.

Our very influential state rep. Mr. Marc Basnight has been pushing for this bridge for years, because to widen NC12 through Duck would "ruin its quaintness".

Well to put this bridge through Currituck's Aydlett and Corolla would ruin our "quaintness" as well as our environment.

To use $700,000,000 for a structure to accommodate non residents of NC, for 24 to 30 days a year is ludicrous.

Furthermore it will be the taxpayers of NC that will be footing the $15,000,000 a year promised by the NC legislature for the maintenance of this "monster".

If something must be done by NCTA, then correct the congestion at NC158 and NC12 and then widen NC12 through Dare County as well as in Currituck County...show fairness to both entities.

Or better yet, study this option for more years and in the meantime repair or rebuild the Bonner Bridge in Dare County which serves both a full time population and tourists four months a year, before a major mishap occurs and part of this bridge collapses.

Again I stress...Don't Build a Bridge for 30 Days of Usage.

Sincerely.

Alicia McDonnell

Corolla resident and NC taxpayer
From: Alicia McDonnell
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Thu May 27 10:24:23 2010
Subject: MCB terminus

Ms. Harris,

Please consider this bridge as a Commercial entity, and have the terminus come into a Commercial area.

The businesses in Tim Buck I I are only open from May to September. Their patrons will hardly see the bridge.

Whereas if you decide to use the Corolla Bay terminus the local residents in Monterey Shores will be looking at this bridge 365 days a year.

The South terminus is the BEST!

Thank you.
Alicia McDonnell
965 North Harborview, Corolla NC
Monteray Shores full time resident
From: Alicia McDonnell
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Sat May 29 10:10:47 2010
Subject: Fw: I received this e-mail this morning...

Please read...thank you.

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Corolla Civic Association
To: Corolla Civic Association
Sent: Saturday, May 29, 2010 7:58 AM
Subject: I received this e-mail this morning...

Re: I received this e-mail this morning...

Do I have this right? Put the bridge in Corolla for the convenience of traffic in Corolla. Talk about elitism......

Plus we are vocal but by no means a minority. They should have included reasonable setbacks on Route 12 to allow for future growth. Whose Kool-aid has this organization been drinking?

Susan Taylor

From: Yili Lin  Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 7:23 PM To: 'Corolla Civic Association' Subject: RE: I received this e-mail this morning...

Here is a copy of my request to NCtp- if I do receive I will submit to the list for anyone else who wishes to complete. Although I submitted written comments, now that I know this form exists, I think a good back up—

Wonder if a new alternative- bridge landing just north or south of Duck? Okay attempting to be more reasonable, Duck residents and business owners apparently do not understand, bridge or no bridge that will not correct traffic in their town or Southern Shores- they should have been more vigilant with constructions like WINGS with a left hand turn for arriving visitors, for example....as well the new park on performance nights/days.

For me the significant flaw in the plans submitted is the inconsistent lanes- it just not make 'engineering' sense to have 4-6 lanes to collapse to two and believe that would alleviate traffic jams or facilitate evacuation. I cannot believe these planners have never driven on roads that have this flaw- especially peak times- and not know the bottlenecks increase as well as risk for accidents.

I’d think ‘thinking’ Duck residents and businesses would vote ‘no bridge’ in response to the alternatives- if NCTA et al come up with a smarter plan, I think we are all well served to review it impartially- but the alternatives presented- well for me- don’t make sense.

Elizabeth Lindemann

From: Susan Taylor  Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 4:27 PM To: Corolla Civic Association Subject: Re: I received this e-mail this morning...

Do I have this right? Put the bridge in Corolla for the convenience of residents of Duck. This is incredibly dumb. They want to get traffic out of their neighborhoods by spending a boatload of taxpayers dollars to put the traffic in Corolla. Talk about elitism......

Plus we are vocal but by no means a minority. They should have included reasonable setbacks on Route 12 to allow for future growth. Whose Kool-aid has this organization been drinking?

Susan Taylor

From: Daniel Lane  Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 1:28 PM To: CorollaCivicAssn@embarqmail.com Subject: I received this e-mail this morning...

(I do not support the bridge. I thought it was worth reading what some bridge supporters are up to.) Dan Lane --- On Fri, 5/28/10, DCBASecy@aol.com <DCBASecy@aol.com> wrote:

From: DCBASecy@aol.com <DCBASecy@aol.com>

Subject: Urgent Request for Comments on Mid-Currituck Bridge
To: Date: Friday, May 28, 2010, 9:40 AM
This past week, the NC Toll Authority Project Team held 3 public hearings in Dare and Currituck counties to review the draft Environmental Impact Statement and alternatives being considered for the Mid-Currituck Bridge. Small but very vocal groups of residents from Aydlett and Corolla attended all sessions and spoke out against the bridge. It is important that we do not let a vocal minority overshadow the benefits of a bridge to Duck, and the negative impact widening of the road would have.

If you were unable to attend the session and have not yet sent a letter or survey form to the Toll Authority, we are requesting that you submit a response form or letter to the project team. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P. E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

EMAIL: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Attached is a blank submission form that you can complete and submit. Following is some basic information that you can use to complete the form.

A copy of the presentation materials presented at the workshops is supposed to be available on the website at:
http://www.ncturnpike.org/projects/Mid_Currituck/documents.asp

A complete copy of project materials is also available at this location Information for completing: Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

ER2 – Existing roads widening; adds additional lane to 158 on mainland and route 12 north through Southern Shores & Duck to Hunt Club Drive. Above Hunt Club Drive, becomes 4 lanes to Albacore in Currituck County. Widens route 12 to 6 lanes from Wright Memorial Bridge to Cypress Knee Trail then to eight lanes to Home Depot Drive and adds an interchange at intersection of route 12, route 158 and Aycock Brown Welcome Center.

MCB4 – 2 lane mid-Currituck Bridge and addition of an evacuation lane on US 158 between NC168 and the mid-Currituck Bridge plus an evacuation lane on 158 between Wright Memorial Bridge and NC 12.

MCB2 – changes to existing roads per ER2 plus addition of 2 lane mid-Currituck Bridge described in MCB4.

No-Build Alternative – do nothing.

Although there is no 4 laning of route 12 through Duck and Southern Shores in any alternative, the three laning proposed in ER2 and MCB2 would have a significant impact since there would be linear infiltration strips (or ditches) constructed on both sides of the road. Along Ocean Boulevard, with a 120 foot right of way, these strips would be between 12 and 21 feet wide. From the Duck Road intersection through Duck, these strips would be 4 feet wide and would require purchase of easements along both sides of the road from property owners.

The bridge alternative being recommended by NECTA and FHWA is MCB4. This recommendation is made taking into account cost and design considerations, travel benefits, community, natural resources and other impacts, including public involvement comments.

The BBPR Board supports MCB4 which includes a bridge with minimal road widening on route 12.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB3 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C1 would land in the Corolla Bay subdivision and would physically divide it. C2 would land across from Albacore street in the commercial area and would displace several businesses and change some driveway and
street accesses in the TimBuck II area.

If you do not have a preference, indicate that the decision should be left to the project team.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A would place a toll plaza within the US 158 interchange and include a bridge over Maple Swamp. Aydlett Road would continue as an access for Aydlett property owners.

Option B would place the toll plaza in Aydlett, feature a road placed on fill across Maple Swamp, eliminate Aydlett Road and provide Aydlett property owners with an exit on the new road before the toll plaza.

Option B is supposed to cost $60 million less than Option A. Currituck County Commissioners and Aydlett residents are opposed to Option B, as it has the highest impact on the community.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

For ER2, MCB2, and MCB4, some homes, businesses, outdoor advertising signs, and gravesites would be relocated if a third outbound lane is added for hurricane evacuation along US 158.

Question 5: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Self explanatory

Question 6: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statements.

Here you can identify any issues that are of particular concern to you, e.g., opposed to infiltration strips (ditches) to address road flooding, minimize removal of vegetation.

Additional Comments:

Here you can add your own personal comments. Are you a strong supporter of the bridge? Are you concerned about project delays? Do you support the project team’s recommendation? Do you have any other concerns?

---------------------------------------------------------

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distributi
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Gayle Griffin
Street Address: 201 Beardslee Drive
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your
comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional
comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No-Build: This will eliminate the bridge. The NC 12
improvements will deteriorate the traffic on this
road for locals and visitors. The bridge would be
left only 10-13 weeks/year on an annual basis.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach roadway design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane
to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

There is usually plenty of hurricane warning
time for all prudent people to evacuate.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to
you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Ordering of NC 12 would hinder traffic year-round.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding
your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height,
draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1575 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
I prefer MCB4 since I believe this alternative would improve our chances of evacuating the OBX in the event of a hurricane and it would maintain the integrity of the OBX. Increasing the number of lanes proposed in ER2 and MCB2 would tarnish considerably the image and charm of the OBX.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
I prefer C2 since this would put most of the traffic very close to the commercial area of Corolla. I believe that this location would have the least impact on the environment and on the charm of Corolla.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
I prefer option A since I believe it is important to accommodate the Aydlett residents as much as possible.
I prefer the option that would reverse the center turn lane during an evacuation. This is a minimal option that appears to have the least disruption to the local community.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

I have no particular concerns at this time. I hope that the building of the bridge would be done in a manner to minimize the removal of vegetation and would help maintain the ambiance and charm of the towns in and around the bridge.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

I am not a boater.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1576

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Comment Form

Name: David & Mary Anne McKernan

Street Address: 130 Olde Duck Road Apt./Suite #

City, State, Zip: Duck, NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCB4. We do not want Route 12 North widened through the Town of Duck

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

No preference; the decision should be left up to the project tea.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A as it has less of an impact on the community.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation. Less costly and less disruptive to the existing infrastructure.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

We are opposed to infiltration strips (ditches) to address road flooding, we want to minimize removal of vegetation, and we want to maintain the small town character of Duck.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

N/A

Additional Comments:
April 28, 2010

Ms Jennifer H. Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1378

To Ms. Harris

As a homeowner in Corolla NC, I am writing to support option MCB4 as the best and optimal solution for the issue of easing congestion onto the Outer Banks.

My residence is located at the following address and I feel strongly that a completely separate route off the island would provide the safest route to evacuate the island in the situation of an emergency situation.

William and Cathy McKinney
650 Ocean Front Arch
Corolla, NC

Please support the MCB4 option as the best option to pursue as it is in the best interests of all involved to have multiple access routes onto and off of the Outer Banks.

Questions, please call me on 972-473-2568

Sincerely,

William McKinney
Cathy McKinney

May 15th, 2010

Fox Rise Farm
241 Branch Lane
Boyce, VA 22620

Jennifer Harris P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1378

Dear Ms. Harris,

As a native of the area, part time resident and property owner on the Outer Banks I have personally witnessed the explosion of development that has taken place. It is clear that the expansion has dangerously outstripped the ability of the existing road structure to accommodate emergency evacuation procedures. My continuing awareness of the situation has led me to conclude that (1): The Mid-Currumbuck Bridge is essential and should be replaced in the most environmentally friendly manner (MCB4 - either C1 or C2) and (2): The road US 158 from the Wright Memorial Bridge north to its intersection with Rte 168 should be expanded in some manner to accommodate evacuation of communities south of Kitty Hawk.

We kindly appreciate the NC Turnpike Authority devoting its attention to this lingering disaster potential.

Sincerely,

William P. McLean Jr.
We will not be able to attend the May 18th meeting concerning the bridge. We are very much in favor of building the bridge. Living in Southern Shores we see our town being adversely affected. Highway 12 is at a stand still on weekends. Our street, Hillcrest Dr., has become an alternate 12 with speeding traffic. Most of this traffic would not be going through our area if the bridge were built.

John and Shirley McPherson
268 Hillcrest Dr.
Southern Shores, NC 27949
252-261-6406
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name:  JOHN & SALLY MEAGHER
Street Address:  30 N. Dune Loop  Apt./Suite No:
City, State, Zip:  SOUThern Shores, NC 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
WE PREFER MCB4 - BECAUSE IT PASSES LESS IMPACT ON DUCK RO (NC-13) THROUGH SOUTHERN SHORES & DOCK.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
NO OPINION

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
NO OPINION

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
REVERSE THE CENTER TURN LANE. IT WOULD BE MUCH QUICKER (THE LANE IS THERE!) THAN CONSTRUCTING ANOTHER LANE. CHEAPER, TOO!

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
WE SEE NO IMPACTS OF GREAT CONCERN TO US.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number:

NA

Additional comments:
IT IS WELL PAST TIME TO GET THIS DONE!

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
I am writing concerning the Currituck Bridge project. My family owns and operates Corolla Water Sports from the pier behind the Flagship Shopping Center. We have not become actively involved in the past as the possibility of the bridge putting us out of business seemed like a "nail in a haystall". Now it appears Route C-2 will go almost directly across the bay of our pier and put us out of business and into bankruptcy. We have operated here for many years and have over $200,000 invested in buildings and equipment and mortgage commitments for over $200,000 over the next ten years plus loss of our yearly income for these reasons and others, we strongly request you use Plan C-I. In the event you do not use Plan C-I and decide to use Plan C-2 you can save our business and livelihood by running the bridge 200 yards off the end of our operations pier. This would also eliminate the need to cross a large amount of wetland (marshes) to the southeast of the pier.

Thank you,

Andrew Merrieth

Enclosed sketches of route and possible route

The Flagstaff Shopping Center also opposes this "C-2" route. It spoils the ambiance of the area and access to view the Currituck Sound and sunsets from the pier.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Michael Meredith / Corbin Watkins Inc. - Corbin Watkins
Street Address: 4805 Virginia Lane
City, State, Zip: Kitty Hawk, NC 27949

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please feel free to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbounding evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boat or rent boat that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Dear Jennifer,

Cc: The NCDOT and NCDOT Bridge

Since this topic first came up in conversation, I have been against it. As a company of a similar project on Midtown Bridge, I can offer some perspective on the issues:

1. The eastern part of Cape 12 will destroy property values along North Harbor View Road and other areas that will experience an increase in traffic.
2. Midtown Bridge has been in service for over 25 years, complete with a clubhouse, pool, playground for young children, tennis courts, boat ramp and dock.
3. Peachtree II, which has also been under consideration for partial destruction to accommodate the removal of the new bridge. This group of residents should offer another option to the “gym” at the area. It offers something for every family regardless of the part of the Outer Banks. Furthermore, if they can come up with a better location, they could be preserving this treasure.
4. The water problem which has caused no one any grief.

Perhaps it is time to stop building new ones from Cape Hatteras to the end of Cape 12. The best solution in my opinion is to buy back the land from Cape Shore north of this bridge up to Lighthouse. Since it is next undeveloped it would be possible to win the approval through the EPA, one up to Cape 12. Unfortunately, it would still again, destroy the eastern shoreline habitat of birds, which will further the Midtown Bridge circumstance.

Therefore, one of the best options would be to establish a park, with recreational facilities, for all to enjoy and to preserve the beauty of the Outer Banks. This would also attract more tourists to the area. With day trips for everyone who would enjoy.

It has been ten years since I first visited the Cape Hatteras. My daughter and I had been looking for a place that we could call home. Having been used to spending our summers in Savannah, Georgia, it was a tough challenge. We found Cape Hatteras to be a place of beauty. The day we turned left on Cove Road, we knew we were finally on the right track. After 2 days, we found Outer Banks, we knew we would stay.

Please don't destroy the upper part of the Outer Banks with this new bridge. It would be devastating to see the beauty of the area disappear. Seriously,

I'm happy we can count on your support to Jim Mylroie who did the study.
Comments: We have been property owners in Duck for twenty years, stay often, and pay North Carolina state taxes. We would be in favor of MCB4 but no project which widens route 12.

sally meyers

---

From: Anne Michelini [mailto:afmichelini@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 02, 2010 9:58 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

Attn: Jennifer Harris

Thank you for keeping us so well informed about the progress of the project as well as information about the public hearings.

My husband and I are in favor of both MCB2 and MCB4. We feel that a bridge makes sense not only for the safety of residents during an evacuation, but also because of the importance we have to reduce gasoline consumption. The thousands of vehicles that drive "up and around" daily consumes much gasoline and we must do our part when faced with local projects to consider oil dependency. We have a slight preference for MCB2 as the roads up from Duck are not in good condition to handle rain and are poorly drained. A project such as this provides an opportunity to upgrade road conditions and reduce traffic and flooding. Distinction between C1 and C2 are best left to cost basis to complete the entry to Oceanside.

Thank you for your consideration.

Eugene and Anne Michelini
653 Oleander Court
Corolla, NC
To Whom It May Concern:

As homeowners on the Outer Banks, we are in favor of option MCB4. Thank you Sarah and Andy Mika

From: Andy Mika [mailto:ajmika@juno.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 1:25 PM
To: midcurrntuck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Bridge Project

To: midcurrntuck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: RE: Northern beaches

To: midcurrntuck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Northern beaches

To NC Turnpike organization,

I want to encourage your efforts and thank you for your support for this project. This will provide dramatic improvements in traffic flow for the entire region of the Outer Banks. And provide for a more expedite evacuation during hurricane emergencies.

A reasonable toll is expected to offset the construction and ongoing maintenance of this project.

Thank you for your efforts on this project.

Ray Miles
Whalehead Beach
Corolla, NC 27927
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Frank Miletto
Street Address: 681 Oyster Catcher Court Apt/Suite No.
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927
Comments: Please add me to your newsletter mailing list or email list.
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
Prefer MCB4 has community impact

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4 do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
C1 is less disruptive.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4 do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Option B is less intrusive to the adjacent community.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Reverse center lane for evacuation. Cost impact to bee
and 1/12 both.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
Try to preserve local environment and make the beach more accessible especially for hurricane evacuation.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Malt Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.com

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Sandra Mileto
Street Address: 681 Oyster Catcher Ct. Apt./Suite No.:
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC. 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or the No-Build Alternative and why?

- Prefer MCB4
  - has less Community Impact

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

- Prefer C1 because has less effect on natural environment

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

- Option A - less intrusive to Community

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

- Reversing center lane for evacuation
  - less impact on area

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

- Try to preserve local environment but make the area more accessible esp. for hurricane evacuation

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Hamie, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: millerbsears@aol.com
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri May 14 22:28:45 2010
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

I have been going down there to Kitty Hawk, since 1960.

I like the plan you have: MCB4 and C2.

Thank you.

Barbara S. Miller
Waxmyrtle Trail
Southern Shores, NC

From: charles miller [mailto:chuckstlv@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, June 21, 2010 4:47 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: C1 vs C2 - midcurrituck bridge

Mid currituck bridge site, C2 vs C1
6/21/10

I believe that the C2 Timbuck II site is the best choice. The C1 proposal includes a 4 lane highway expansion and drainage ditches for rte 12. Currently there are 8 lanes now: Route 12 plus the 3 very straight roads in Whalehead; Corolla, Whalehead and Lighthouse Drives. Any of these roads could be made one way in an evacuation. Another Whalehead cross connector road from rte 12 to Corolla Dr is currently being built close to the C1 site. Route 12 was originally put in with aesthetic character in mind; sinuous path, scenery, etc. Remember the song in the 70's, "Pave paradise put up a parking lot". With 8 lanes now, there is more than ample road from Food Lion to C1 now. Road expansion from C1 to C2 is not needed currently and would waste public money and destroy scenery and wildlife habitat.

The proposed drainage ditches from the Food Lion north to C1 are also unnecessary. Drainage canals have been installed this spring in Whalehead from the 900 block south which will alleviate obvious flooding there. There has been no flooding from the 900 block to C2. There currently is a big canal in the backyards of 942 Corolla Dr going north approx. 6 houses. The canal is big, deep and approx. 20 feet wide and is not noticeable on your aerial photos. It is full of sedges and willows. I have been there during heavy rains and the ditch is never full. Water could be piped to it, but haven't seen the need for it. Hence, more drainage between C1 and C2 would be wasted money at this time.

A bridge on the extreme edge of a populated area will cause more congestion than one more centrally located. This is obvious with the Southern Shores bridge trying to serve the 20 miles north of it. Hence, the bridge would be better located below Timbuck II (C2)

I am a property owner in Whalkehead and appreciate the opportunity to relay these fact to you.

Charles Miller
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Debbie Millis <eawoman@earthlink.net>
To: Harris, Jennifer 
Sent: Fri Apr 09 18:31:40 2010 
Subject: The Outer Banks 

Hello Out there In Raleigh Land!

If you ever come over here to the Outer Banks YOU MUST COME Via, Pennsylvania, Ohio, or maybe as close as Virginia. Then and ONLY then will you understand the true feeling of frustration, HOPELESSNESS and ROAD RAGE the poor people have to endure who come to visit, the only way to get here, and that is by car. Please don’t leave us with a densely over populated northern beach area (Currituck Co.) with so many developments, too many to remember, in CAROVA, CAROLLA, DUCK, with ONLY 2 EXITS MILES SOUTH. If there were an emergency no one would be able to MOVE. Just look at the amount of Currituck Co. is worth. That wealth isn’t from the farm land on the mainland. It’s from the many tourists at the northern beaches! The taxes are big. You would even help global warming! People wouldn’t be going 1/2mph for hours and hours. PLEASE PUT IN A TOLL ROAD!!! THE SOONER the better. 

I’m speaking out for all the people with their kids in their cars saying,”are we there yet?”

Deborah Millis
A lover of this dune

---

From: Miller-Yancey, Deborah J [mailto:deborah.milleryancey@merck.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 22, 2010 4:05 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Cc: Richard Macher; Richard Yancey
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

To whom it may concern:
I am a home owner in the Ocean Sands area of the Outer Banks. I know there has been much debate about the possibility of a bridge connecting the north beaches with the mainland. I am in favor of a bridge accessing the northern beaches. I have traveled Route 12 to the 158 bridge for many years in good weather and in bad. The traffic during high season is tremendous, as I am sure you are aware, so I feel a bridge at the northern end would assist in relieving that traffic without impacting

Thank you
Debbi Miller
247 Fairway Drive
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801


From: Hank Mollenhauer [mailto:hmollenhauer@comcast.net]
Name: John Minnich
City: Southern Shores
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: jwmnich@gmail.com

Comments: I wanted to take a moment to voice my support for the Mid-Currituck Bridge project. Our road serves as a "cut-through" for many vacationers and we are concerned about the high traffic volume on weekends.

Dear Ms. Harris

This is just a short email to let you know of our very strong opposition to the Mid-County Bridge on the Outer Banks.

As permanent residents we will be impacted in many very negative ways. I will not list all of the environmental concerns as I am sure that you have had many emails covering this – we live there and with the bridge life will never be the same.

We live on Ocean Forest Court in Corolla which is very close (within yards not miles) of the northern most proposed terminus of the bridge. If the bridge goes in there we will not be allowed to make a left hand turn out of our street onto NC12. We would have to drive over 2 miles south to find an approved turnaround. We do not have mail delivery and the post office is north of us as well as our church and I do not think it fair or proper to force us into this situation.

I cannot imagine the noise outside of our house as the bride is being built - it might be uninhabitable. The reason we moved to Corolla centered on a special way of life, slow, uncomplicated and peaceful all of this will change with the bridge. That special way of life is what draws thousands of tourists each year and that will change with the bridge. I am sure that you have heard of the studies that even question its benefit as an extra evacuation route.

Finally I do not know how this could be considered fiscally responsible – why build a $700 million bridge that is not wanted and not needed when other useful bridges are desperately in need of repair?

Long story short – the MCB is not needed, not wanted and should not come to pass if you want to maintain the character of the Outer Banks as a treasure of North Carolina.

Sincerely

Henry L. and Sherry A. Mollenhauer
983 Ocean Forest Court
Corolla, NC 27927
This is just a short email to let you know of our very strong opposition to the Mid-County Bridge on the Outer Banks.

As permanent residents we will be impacted in many very negative ways. I will not list all of the environmental concerns as I am sure that you have had many emails covering this – we live there and with the bridge life will never be the same.

We live on Ocean Forest Court in Corolla which is very close (within yards not miles) of the northern most proposed terminus of the bridge. If the bridge goes in there we will not be allowed to make a left hand turn out of our street onto NC12. We would have to drive over 2 miles south to find an approved turnaround. We do not have mail delivery and the post office is north of us as well as our church and I do not think it fair or proper to force us into this situation.

I cannot imagine the noise outside of our house as the bride is being built - it might be uninhabitable. The reason we moved to Corolla centered on a special way of life, slow, uncomplicated and peaceful all of this will change with the bridge. That special way of life is what draws thousands of tourists each year and that will change with the bridge. I am sure that you have heard of the studies that even question its benefit as an extra evacuation route.

Finally I do not know how this could be considered fiscally responsible – why build a $700 million bridge that is not wanted and not needed when other useful bridges are desperately in need of repair?

Long story short – the MCB is not needed, not wanted and should not come to pass if you want to maintain the character of the Outer Banks as a treasure of North Carolina

Sincerely

Henry L. and Sherry A. Mollenhauer
I am 100 percent behind building the bridge. I do think the most non invasive and least impact to wildlife is the way I would choose to go...Elevate the bridge, and build it quick. I think they should charge to go to OBX a toll, but not one going back.

Get it to pay for itself.

Jim Monroe
205 Ocean Blvd
Southern Shores, NC
In my opinion there should be a mandate to build the bridge based on safety issues. If activity at the Duck Fire Station on a Sunday in May can halt traffic for 10-15 minutes, what would happen in July and August? Route 12 becomes a parking lot on many Saturday and Sunday mornings and afternoons, never mind a hurricane evacuation. During an evacuation locals leave - or should - as well as tourists swelling the volume even more. Access for emergency vehicles becomes a problem. Cars run out of gas. People need bathrooms. What a dangerous mess.

I understand the concerns of Currituck residents in Corolla and on the mainland, but Currituck County needs to get its priorities straight and deal with many of the objections with legislative action. That county has not been proactive in planning and protecting its resources. Now is the time to get organized to protect the resources of the Outer Banks and the safety of residents and visitors alike.

Caroline Morisseau
112 Sea Tern Dr
Duck NC
From: Deb Morrissey [mailto:damorrissey@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 1:30 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Correction: Local Resident's Comments Regarding the Mid-Currituck County Bridge

Regarding Question 1: On this question, I support MCB2 or MCB4. I defer on which is better.

From: damorrissey@hotmail.com To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Local Resident's Comments Regarding the Mid-Currituck County Bridge
Date: Sun, 30 May 2010 13:10:10 -0400

I believe there is an official form for doing this, but I could not fill it out electronically; so here are my comments.

I am a full-time resident of Corolla, NC. Below are my comments regarding the proposed bridge project.

Question 1: On this question, I defer. Question 2: Regarding C1 or C2, I am in favor of C1. The C2 option dumps into the Timbuck II area, which is already commercially developed. This option, I believe, would add significant congestion to this already crowded bottleneck.

Question 3: I lean toward option A because of the least impact on local residents and appears to be preferred by them.

Question 4: Reverse the center lane of 158. If it is a true emergency, reverse ALL east/southbound lanes to west/northbound. In the future, perhaps add an additional outbound lane, but in a true emergency, with the number of people on the Outer Banks during summertime, one additional lane will not be enough. As I said, you will need to reverse ALL the lanes.

Question 5: N/A.

Question 6: My concerns include the toll cost for local residents of Currituck County and the Corolla terminus, which I worry will impede access to Rt. 12.

Additional Comments: I SUPPORT this project for a number of reasons including, most importantly, hurricane evacuation. I can easily recall my renters spending 6+ hours in traffic between Corolla and Kitty Hawk during a hurricane evacuation. (This was in the mid 90s before the development of Pine Island, the Currituck Club, Buck Island, and Crown Point.)

With regard to "overdevelopment" of the Corolla Outer Banks, so far as I am concerned, the "development" horse has been out of the barn for well over 10 years. Development has and will occur whether or not a bridge is built; the zoning for such is already in place. This cannot be used as an argument against the bridge.

In the meantime, I recall when we bought our house in 1990, the bridge was an...
I am in favor of the Mid-Currituck Bridge. We need it now. It will save time and money for seasonal travelers to Currituck beaches, even after the toll charge. The environmental issues are much overblown, as they are temporary. The birds and fish seem to love the other bridges. The emission reduction of eliminating 40 extra miles is an environmental benefit. These many thousands of current once a year visitors will gladly pay for the bridge in full. Frequent travelers, workers, service vehicles, etc should all get year-round discounted passes. The storm season safety is an obvious extra benefit -- for free.

I have recently been reading the negative comments from the members of the Corolla Civic Association on their web site. These are local residents who are against the long-delayed Mid-Currituck Bridge. My perception is that this web-site’s members are taking a very narrow and self-serving approach that likely will be discounted as purely selfish even if the arguments are thoroughly crafted and presented well and often. The assumption that the planned bridge would be built is what allowed county approval of the thousands of Currituck houses, probably including theirs, in the first place. The bridge is not a new idea. The problem is now. The bridge is way overdue. NC Turnpike Authority is a perfect immediate solution.

I can understand how Northern Currituck beach residents might have a unique point-of-view since they are at the end of NC 12 and mostly removed from the route where beach traffic has travelled to reach destinations along NC 12. The majority of residents don’t often drive to the mainland. Groceries are now handy year-round. Each wants to be the last one in. And heaven forbid that it would ever be practical for working Currituck families with school-age children to live on the Currituck Outer Banks.

Our family has owned for years and frequently uses our house in Ocean Sands in Corolla. I lived in Southern Shores 30 years ago and have driven along NC 12 to Corolla and Ocean Sands from Chapel Hill hundreds of times since the 70's. The 4WD sand road to tiny Corolla just added to its charm. We enjoyed the Currituck beaches in the early days and still enjoy them now. After we finally arrive. Except for during winter, we also have to either miss the last day of each visit by departing at the crack of dawn to avoid the mounting traffic jam, or come when we can stay an extra day and avoid weekend travel. The drive time from Chapel Hill to Manteo or to Aydlett is the same, so either route we take still requires that we then spend an extra hour or more driving to get to our house. Manteo is 50 miles south of Corolla. At Aydlett we are within view of Corolla Light, but still more than an hour away. Very frustrating.

The limited and fragile NC 12 access should not be widened thru Southern Shores, Duck, and the southern Currituck OBX as a solution for the more recent northern Currituck OBX growth already now in place. The problem is not in the future...it is now. The delay of the long planned Mid-Currituck Bridge has not stopped the growth and has not discouraged people from Northern Virginia to Pittsburgh to California from becoming regular visitors or residents of our North Carolina Currituck Outer Banks. Preventing already existing development is not possible. We are probably 80% or more built out in Currituck where residences are allowed, especially south of the recommended bridge landing point. Now we just have a 25 mile long dead-end road.

Corolla is now heavily occupied/visited 6 months of the year. Continuing to route this already heavy visitor traffic and the daily workers, service vans, and delivery trucks along 40+ miles of roadway from Aydlett to Corolla and Carova, and thru the many beach communities along the way makes no sense anymore. This traffic would be much more evenly spread with the new...
bridge if the toll is set correctly to encourage Dare County visitors to use the existing bridge at Point Harbor.

Whit Morrow
New Hope Technology Foundation
1 Valentine Lane
Chapel Hill, NC  27516
(Cel) 919-260-2606
(Tel) 919-968-4332
(fax) 919-929-9074
E-mail: wmorrow@newhopetech.org

From: Corolla Civic Association [mailto:CorollaCivicAsn@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2010 9:11 AM
To: Corolla Civic Association
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Comments

Would you share the attachment with the CCA?

From: Corolla Civic Association [mailto:CorollaCivicAsn@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 5:49 PM
To: Corolla Civic Association
Subject: FW: Mid Currituck Bridge Comments

Will Taylor

From: EDWARD RILEY
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 4:09 PM
To: Corolla Civic Association
Subject: RE: Mid Currituck Bridge Comments

John,

Check for time limits for speakers. You may need to have folks sign up behind you to cede their time to you.

Mary Riley

From: Will Taylor
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 3:23 PM
To: Hill Taylor
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Comments

I have attached an updated version of the comments I intend to submit at the public meeting on the Bridge Draft Environmental Impact Statement tomorrow night.

Would you share the attachment with the CCA?

From: Mary Riley
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 10:39 AM
To: Corolla Civic Association
Subject: RE: Mid Currituck Bridge Comments

John,

I think your comments about the dunes are particularly important. You can also send your full comments to TA with request for them to be included in the public record and then use time allowed to highlight points or present the highest priorities. when I sent in mine with request I did receive a real reply acknowledging my request—

Oh and for a general fyi took me 44 minutes to drive from Whalehead to Aydlett. I appreciate Monday was ‘shoulder season’ and not a high traffic day, however that is part of the issue— the congestion concerns. Trend 10-13 weeks in summer and on weekends and cluster around check in and departure times. In my letter I approached this as one of my issues from a $5 point of view in terms of the anticipated toll collections— wish I’d had the travel time then because I’d have asked if ‘all this’ is worth 44 minutes.

Oh and I’ve driven home from Va. 64 on summer weekends – if I am crossing the border of 158 after 8:30-9 pm traffic is moving at a steady pace; if I’m on the road late morning or early afternoon there is significant congestion—so I’d like to restate one of my proposed alternatives to address the congestion issue in a prior post— work with rental agencies to stagger days and times for check in/out. I bet this would also benefit the companies who must scramble for cleaning crews, inspectors and general check in volume at these peak times as well.

Elizabeth Lindemann

From: EDWARD RILEY
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 4:09 PM
To: Corolla Civic Association
Subject: RE: Mid Currituck Bridge Comments

John,

Check for time limits for speakers. You may need to have folks sign up behind you to cede their time to you.

Mary Riley
From: Hugh Mulholland [mailto:hugh_mul@mulnet.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 02, 2010 11:09 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: 4 Lanes to Seashell Lane?

Hi,

Seashell Lane is the entrance to Section B of Ocean Sands South and 4 houses north of mine (539 Ocean Trail). What happens at Seashell Lane? Barriers in the left lane as it returns to 2 lanes? A significant merge of lanes for another half mile southbound? You don’t have a lot of land available there to widen the road without taking private property. None of the information on the project website gives specifics about where the 4 lanes ends in either MCB2 or MCB4. Why not end the 4 lanes at the Harris Teeter traffic light making the right lane a right turn only lane?

Hugh Mulholland
From: jpsmurfs@aol.com
Sent: Tue May 25 20:50:46 2010
Subject: Mid-Currituck County Bridge

We wish to provide the comments below regarding Option B for the Mid-Currituck County Bridge.

My husband and I strongly oppose this option for the bridge for a number of reasons. The first and perhaps the most egregious aspect of it is that this plan will have a major impact on our small, peaceful community by putting 8 toll booths, parking lots and lights right smack in the middle of it, right next to our homes and our quiet, peaceful way of life.

This plan will bring noise and air polluting traffic and crime where we currently have none. It will destroy the beautiful views of the night skies that we have. Where we can look up and see the stars in the most amazing display of our Universe that can be seen with the naked eye because there is little to impede the view. These are just some of the reasons my husband and I moved to this community in the first place.

Option B will take all that away. And for what? Convenience? This plan is made on the erroneous premise that it will save the taxpayers a significant amount of money and that it will be best for the environment by making improvements to Maple Swamp. Option B puts the bridge and all that traffic right through Maple Swamp. Maple Swamp is an environmentally sensitive area and services as a source of our drinking water.

Option B also calls for removing Aydlett Road and requiring the local community here to travel to and from our homes using the bridge’s roads. What happens when the bridge backs up (and we all know it will)? How are we supposed to get to and from our homes?

In addition, our community depends on Aydlett Road for emergency services. Once again, what happens when the bridge backs up? Are our homes supposed to burn to the ground or are the members of our community going to perish because these services cannot get to us in time?

It is our understanding that a multi-million dollar study showed that fixing the existing roads would be the most efficient and economical way to deal with the traffic issues during the summer season (and that’s really all we were talking about here isn’t it?). After investing the time and money into that study, why are the results being ignored? Could it be because there are those people that didn’t get the results they wanted? Is it because there are those that stand to make a lot of money from the real estate development and increased number of vacationers that the bridge will bring to the Northern Outer Banks?

Also, what about the long bridge to Hatteras which is needed far more than this one is? Why isn’t the state directing the funds and resources on this effort into that bridge? Lord knows that bridge IS needed for the people that live in those communities to travel to and fro and so they can get much needed services in order to survive.

With thoughtful consideration many of these issues can be resolved. What really makes sense? Who really benefits from this effort? Look at the pros and cons (wants versus needs) of this bridge and the long bridge to Hatteras. Don’t put the toll booths, the lights and facilities here in Aydlett. Leave them out on Route 158 where they belong. Where it is unpopulated and won’t destroy our peaceful little community.

Thank you for taking the time to read this message. Please give thoughtful consideration to whether or not there is anything that would justify the scope of the intrusion into the lives of individual citizens this plan would have and to ask that you please join us in opposing Option B for the Mid-Currituck County Bridge.

The Murphys
Residents of Aydlett, NC
We are Sanderling residents and are in favor of the bridge construction going forward now.
From: Patricia and Robert Murray [mailto:murrays@pinn.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 04, 2010 7:32 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: THE BRIDGE

We've been looking forward to "The Bridge" for many years. Sure hope you can
finally wind up all the studies etc.

Let's go for it!!

The Murrays of Ocean Sands

From: John Myers <myers@TWIDDY.COM>
Date: Fri, 28 May 2010 15:11:16 -0400
To: <midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org>
Subject: Comment on proposed bridge

I definitely think it should be built as soon as possible...but I am surprised and
disappointed it will not be 4 lanes. I think it is poor planning to build it with only two lanes.

John Myers

John Myers, CRS, GRI
Broker Associate
Twiddy & Company REALTORS
800.342.1609
252.457.1132 (direct)
deerjohn@twiddy.com
Dear Ms. Harris:

As you can determine from the enclosed documents, we have been strong proponents for the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project since September 1998.

It's been twelve years that we have heard about this bridge and its time now to proceed to get this bridge built!

We endorse MC84 as the alternative and request this project begin before it is necessary to evacuate the Outer Banks. If lives are lost because this bridge is not available, it will be a "catastrophe" that could have been avoided.

BUILD THE MID-CURRITUCK BRIDGE NOW!

Sincerely,

James M. Nast

Lou Anne Nast

64 Highland Cross
Rutherford, NJ 07070
September 18, 1996

Mr. H. Franklin Vick, PE
Manager, Planning and Environmental Branch
North Carolina Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 25201
Raleigh, NC 27611

Dear Mr. Vick:

We are writing to you strongly recommending North Carolina Department of Transportation to proceed to build the Currituck Mid-County Bridge.

As recent new property owners of our home in Duck, NC, one of our reasons to locate there stemmed from the suggestion that a new bridge connecting the Outer Banks from Rt. 158 would shorten our trip and provide a much needed third bridge to leave the Outer Banks in case of any emergency. The Mid-County Bridge is needed now as more and more people look to buy and invest in property on the Outer Banks.

Our ride from New Jersey is long and by connecting to the Outer Banks via the Mid-County Bridge will reduce our time and alleviate getting involved in the traffic going over the Wright Memorial Bridge.

All of the reasons as outlined in the enclosed article written by Lisa Hollin makes perfect and real sense to us and we encourage the NCDOT to proceed.

It's interesting to note that both of the other bridges (connecting the Outer Banks) have been re-built making them wider and safer with I assume objections.

Whenever change is implemented there will always be objections. Change is good and this plan is good.

Don't let a few influence what is necessary for the future!

BUILD THE MID-COUNTY BRIDGE NOW!

Sincerely,

James N. Nast

Lou Anne Nast
The "Mad" County Bridge

Currituck's hopes for a mid-county bridge are still up in the air, while Dare County gets the longest bridge in the state.

by Liz Helmers

"It's a source of what the people want," Cindy Shafer, Project Planning Engineer for the North Carolina Department of Transportation, stated during our phone interview in late July. Although Currituck County officially plans a mid-county sound bridge, NCDOT officials cannot ignore opposition voiced by Aydlett and Corolla area residents during Public Hearings held May 25 and 27, and the stack of comments they have received during the summer from a majority of opponents.

On August 6th Tom Wainscott, NCDOT/NC-253 Engineer, issued a statement.

"Alternative solutions other than a bridge must be considered. Therefore, further investigations and studies need to be conducted before a sound logical recommendation can be made. NCDOT has proposed a bridge across the Currituck Sound approximately 6.4 miles long with a two lane maintenance road beginning at US 138 that would terminate with a signalized intersection at NC 12. Three maintenance road concepts and two Outer Banks access are being considered. One of the Outer Banks terminus is an official Map location at the north end of the bridge."

DO YOU FEEL LIKE YOU PAID TOO MUCH IN TAXES LAST YEAR?

Come by for a free financial check up. Giving participants a chance to use professional investment counselors to look over their 1040 tax returns.

Morten Thieme, splashdowns at Absconore Street.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge, Federal Highway Administration and NCDOT completed in January of this year concludes:

"Maintaining existing needs would be more expensive and involve a significantly more displacement of existing land uses than the bridge alternative. State and federal law would permit the State to recover the cost of the bridge with tolls.

"Building the bridge would reduce marine access to Currituck Sound travel time by an average of fifteen minutes."

"Would reduce Currituck Sound access to other Currituck County schools and on the mainland. Most commute more than an hour each way to Dare County Schools some are home schooled."

"Would reduce traffic on the beach but increase during rush hours and would significantly affect motorcycle and para sail use and could make it more difficult for commercial operators and those who are home schooled."

"The bridge would affect the community of Aydlett with an easement 22 to 33.8 feet high at its highest point."

"The bridge would change the flood plain and river from 0.6 to 0.8 feet at 2 to 6 businesses at the state line."

"No direct impacts on water quality or wastewater treatment would occur with the bridge.

"A bridge is necessary to allow or new development in the form of one or two small deep water piers and up to 400 additional housing units would be built on the mainland."

"The effect of right of way purchase on the beach areas would be minimal."

"The bridge would effect potentially thousands of tourists to the Currituck Outer Banks, but would be affected by the cost of the bridge and the amount of facilities Currituck County decides to provide to support day visitors."

"Ficorned and mar road would not likely be affected with development in the form of one or two small deep water piers and up to 400 additional housing units would be built on the mainland."

"If the bridge was built many millions of dollars would be saved in development and the effects of the bridge would be minimal."

"The proposed bridge would traverse the area of the Currituck Sound."
Comments: I have 3 business in Duck NC and I dont want the bridge. I think the alternative ER2 would be the best.

On August 30, Tom Sherin, NCDOE roadway Design Engineer, issued a statement, “Alternative solutions other than...”
Dear Ms Harris:

I strongly support the construction of the proposed mid-Currituck bridge. While it is certainly important from an evacuation perspective for residents and the large number of visitors to the Outer Banks during the hurricane season, it would also improve Currituck County’s emergency response, safety, security, infrastructure and other services support to the Corolla area by reducing travel time and cost. Further, I believe a mid-Currituck bridge will facilitate the delivery of services from Outer Banks towns such as Duck, Southern Shores, Kitty Hawk, Kill Devil Hills and Nags Head because of reduced traffic on Rte. 12, and also because some contractors and vendors will even opt to drive north to Corolla via Rte. 168 and the bridge and return. Similarly, I forecast that some visitors will also use this route when traveling between Corolla and the previously mentioned southern towns for activities like sightseeing, dining and shopping because it will ease (and probably expedite) their trip. Even venues such as “The Lost Colony” could experience increased participation because of improved travel.

Even though some residents of Aydlett view the construction of the mid-Currituck bridge access road and the bridge itself as having a negative effect on their lives, it will also bring positives as well, especially in terms of business opportunities and employment for their community such as restaurants, service stations and contractors/vendors establishing new or satellite support facilities for the Corolla - Corova geographic area. I’m sure the Turnpike Authority will be sensitive to the Aydlett community in terms of minimizing construction and operational impact of the bridge and its access road through careful siting and landscaping, emulating the NCDOT.

Joel Newton

---

From: joeynewton@charter.net
To: <midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org>
Date: Friday, June 4, 2010 1:35 PM
Subject: MCB Draft EIS Comments

Dear Ms Harris:

I am writing to express my strong support for the Mid-Currituck Bridge, option MCB4.

As a homeowner in Duck for seven years, I have been horrified by the traffic that regularly stalls on NC 12 any given week day, but especially weekends, all the way from Southern Shores to where my home located just before Sanderling, and beyond.

This is an ongoing daily public health hazard. Commutes of three hours or more regularly stalls on NC 12 any given week day, but especially weekends, all the way from Southern Shores to where my home located just before Sanderling, and beyond.

I cannot believe that this decision has taken so long. With a population on the Outer Banks that is so large and growing, and at risk from natural and medical emergencies from which they cannot be readily evacuated in an appropriate manner, this bridge needs to be built as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely yours,

Teresa A. Nolan, M.D.
104 Acorn Oak Avenue, Sound Sea Village
Duck, NC 27949
From: Ed Norrett [mailto:enorrett1@verizon.net]
Sent: Mon 5/3/2010 11:41 AM
To: midcurrituck@nturnpike.org
Subject: Turmoil

If the Currituck County Officials are concerned about safety in the 4x4 area due to “beach traffic”, wait until the bridge is built. Day traffic from the Currituck mainland will make traffic on the Atlantic Expressway to the Jersey Shore (where they actually have roads) look like a walk in the park. Residents who favor the bridge now should take a trip to the Jersey Shore to see why there are so many people from NJ, Pa. and NY coming to the Outer Banks for some peace and quiet. Day traffic will destroy the Currituck Outer Banks.

Ed Norrett

From: O'Donnell, Mr. Joseph F. [mailto:jodonnell@pace.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 3:23 PM
To: midcurrituck@nturnpike.org
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

Ms. Jennifer Harris
NCTurnpike Authority

Dear Ms. Harris,

As a Corolla homeowner I believe it is imperative that you build he Mid Currituck County Bridge. The entire Northern Beaches area has grown tremendously in the last several years and Hurricane Evacuation Routes have not kept pace. We have been blessed in the last several years without any Major storms but we all know the next storm could be a Category 5 and hit with little or no warning. The present evacuation routes would be overwhelmed. Build the Bridge!

Thank You,

Joseph O'Donnell
1039 Parker Court
Corolla, NC
----- Original Message ----- 
From: obxner <obxner@gmail.com>
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri Apr 09 20:01:11 2010
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Support

As a Dare Co. property owner, I believe it is imperative that the bridge be built for the following reasons:

1. Disaster Avoidance -- We have just been lucky that a major hurricane hasn't caused a public safety crisis because of limited evacuation routing.

2. Timely access to cosmopolitan facilities, eg medical, airport etc.

3. Reduction of pollution and increased energy conservation in the reduction of major traffic jams.

Tom Odom
Sent from my iPhone
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Jennifer Old
Street Address: 950 Lakeshore Court
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER1, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-BuildAlternative and why?
No build! Environmental impact would not be good for the Sound and the wildlife. Residents and businesses would be adversely affected.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
C-2! C-1 would cause business owners at Timbuck 2 to lose their businesses.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing the center lane would avoid construction and destruction of people's property.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
The impact would not be good for businesses on the Outer Banks side. That was not included in the Statement. My belief is that there would be more residences affected and the crime rate would increase.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the Sound; and your phone number.

No boater.

Additional comments:
Please do not destroy our banks, homes, and businesses.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1570 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdotnc.gov

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Mary Oppelt
Street Address: 1525 Edgewood Pl.
City, State, Zip: Lenoir, N.C., 828-356-4023
Act/Suite No: 101

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your
comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional
comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

[ ] Do not wish any pollution brought into Sound
[ ] Save the pristine off road area
[ ] Bridge would be helpful for any time, i.e. evacuation, school/distance, hospital care

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

[ ] C1 to save homes in Monticello, Stiles

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

[ ] I'm not sure - don't make a decision

[ ] because I don't know where A or B are

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Name: Roberta Overton
Address: 2044 Martins Pt. Rd.
City: Kitty Hawk
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: rjsantelik@aol.com

Comments: My husband and I have owned homes in Ocean Sands for the past 25 years. Each year, the traffic situation has gotten increasingly worse and evacuation for hurricanes have grown more difficult. We have been in need of this mid-county bridge for a very long time and it seems that it is being held up by small interest groups of local residents. Residents living on the Outer Banks of Currituck seem to be paranoid about situations which they only conjecture may happen. While they are against having a bridge, they seem to be in support of wanting to build a resort near Pine Island, thus increasing the traffic flow problem. If the residents on the mainland do not want a road to interfere with their rural atmosphere by impacting their local roads, then the option of extending the bridge so it does not affect their town would make the most sense. This situation of delaying the bridge has gone on way too long and a decision needs to be made. Build it. Thank you.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 168 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: 

Street Address:  

City, State, Zip: 

Comments
Your opinions about the project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build alternative and why?

MCB4 - The bridge will serve as an emergency evacuation route and relieve congestion at the Wright Bridge. It will promote economic development in the mid-county on the mainland.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2 - The terminus is more central to the North Carolina banks and it is in a commercial area. This will benefit the businesses and have a lesser impact on the residential areas.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

No strict preference, but the plan not with the toll booth were the water turned more sense.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

REVERSE THE CENTER TURN LANE.....OOPS!

My concern is the bottleneck at the Coinjock Bridge.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
The mid-county bridge has the potential of inducing commercial development in the 158 Added Area. Zoning should control this.

If you are a boat or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Please provide your vessel type:

- Recreational
- Commercial
- Other:

Description:

19 ft boat, 30 ft long, 14.5 hp, 1750 lbs

Addition comments:

The mid-county bridge is a potential barrier for the mainland. It's availability and success could provide an opportunity for local-intense recreational use day in the Sound Mainland area.

* * *

Implementing a toll schedule that prices access for 7 days is extremely important to provide maintenance and support for the bridge.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578

Or E-mail: maicurtuck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Subject: vote for MCB4.
Date: Monday, June 7, 2010 8:46 AM
From: Trisha Parson <trishamp@verizon.net>
To: <midurnituck@nturnpike.org>

Jennifer Harris, P. E.

I don’t have a printer here at my cottage in Duck and cannot find the attached form. Can’t get to home computer until tomorrow morn so for answers to sub questions I leave those up to what is recommended by the BBPR Board and I do not boat.

Patricia Parson
Cottage @ 130 Spindrift Ct., Duck, NC

Cell # 703-628-0712
John Peale

From: DCBA@ncd.com
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 12:42 PM
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Comment Form (not previously attached)

DUCK COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS ALLIANCE
P.O. Box 8261, Duck, North Carolina 27949

John Wonder, President
Ed Brookes, Vice President
Gary Decker, Treasurer
Lynne Afteman, Secretary

David Hemphog - Steve Afteman, Jon Satt, Lisa Hemphog, Dan Zerfas

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Lydia Peale & John Peale
Street Address: 214A NW 2nd St Apt/Suite #108
City, State, Zip: Charlottesville, VA 22902

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCB 4 Better for both traffic handling and interface.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C1 further north would handle new building to the north.

5/31/2010

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Don't have that shown.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Cheaper.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?


Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type: whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments:

5/31/2010
Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

Attached to this e-mail is a comment letter addressed to Ms. Jennifer Harris or the Turnpike Authority. I am submitting these comments for the DEIS record. Thank you for the opportunity to share them with you.

As explained in the letter, as a Currituck County property owner and taxpayer, I am opposed to the C1 terminus that would split the Corolla Bay residential area. The C2 landing site is my “preferred alternative.”

I appreciate the hard work all of you and your associates and colleagues have undertaken on our behalf.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Pepperman

Robert E. Pepperman
1144 Danton Drive
Corolla, NC 27927

June 1, 2010

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Sent by e-mail

Dear Ms. Harris:

As a homeowner and tax payer in Currituck County, I am offering the following comments on the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. More specifically, I am commenting on the location of the proposed eastern terminus of the bridge.

I applaud the State and the Turnpike Authority for its willingness to move this important project along and to develop the toll bridge solution as a method for funding these improvements in these challenging economic times. Because the State has shown such creativity in adapting to the financial impediments to this project, it is confusing to me that the terminus designated C2 would not ultimately be the Preferred Alternative. Based upon information found on your website, the C2 terminus would make use of a 1.7 acre parcel purchased by NCDOT in 1995. The C1 terminus alternative would divide the existing Corolla Bay subdivision and require new acquisition of privately-owned property in the subdivision. Intuitively, it would seem more economically practical to utilize land already owned by the State; this appears to be partly confirmed in the cost estimates presented for the Recommended Alternatives (MCB4). In either A or B configuration, the C2 terminus is somewhat less costly than the C1 terminus.

Obviously the primary driver for this project initially was the concern that there is inadequate means to evacuate the Currituck and northern Dare County Outer Banks in case of a hurricane. This issue was identified when the Mid-Currituck Bridge was first considered nearly 20 years ago, before the substantially increased development of the area. Because of the local development, the need for expedited evacuation capacity is increased.

However, one must consider why there has been (and continues to be) developmental activities in the study area. It is my sense that this character may be irrevocably harmed if the C1 terminus is adopted that gives me the greatest concern about the project. Landing the bridge near TimBuckII would place traffic in an area that has evolved into one of the primary commercial spots in the northern Outer Banks.

According to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the fewest changes to local street and driveway access would be with C2 alternative. There are a total of ten businesses and 122 residences in the vicinity of the C2 location whereas the C2 terminus is located in an area with a more commercial character; these communities may be additionally impacted by beach access limitations, especially with the four-lane Route 12 alternative. These impacts may be substantial enough that summer vacation visits could drop off, creating an adverse economic impact to the County from an overall diminution of the property values as well as due to a reduction in the goods and services purchased by vacationers.

In conclusion, I am opposed to the C1 terminus and favor the C2 terminus for the MCB project because:

- C1 requires acquiring new private residential properties while (apparently) abandoning land already owned by the State for the purpose of providing a landing point for the new bridge.
- C1 will prospectively adversely change the character of the predominantly residential communities in and around Corolla whereas the C2 terminus is located in an area with a more commercial character;
- These potential changes could reduce the overall attractiveness of the Corolla communities to vacationers which over time will negatively affect property values and in turn reduce revenues to Currituck County.

I appreciate your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Pepperman

cc (by email): Honorable Senator Marc Basnight
Honorable Representative Bill Owens
County Commissioner Vance Aydlett
County Commissioner Owen Etheridge
County Commissioner Gene Gregory
County Commissioner Barry Nelms
County Commissioner Paul O'Neal
County Commissioner John Rater
County Commissioner Janet Taylor
Name: Robert E Perkinson  
Address: 13 Owenford Road  
City: Bluefield  
State: WV  
Zip: 24701  
Email: perkinbob@yahoo.com  
Comments: Please carefully consider and approve the Mid Currituck Bridge. My family has owned a beach house at 142 Ocean Blvd, Southern Shores since 1972...more than 38 years. The traffic problems are reaching a very difficult and unsafe level with only one reasonable solution in sight...build the bridge. I strongly support your efforts to move the project forward. Bob Perkinson

---

Subject: Public Comment Draft EIS MCB  
Date: Friday, June 4, 2010 5:40 PM  
From: George Persico <PersicoG@co.rockland.ny.us>  
To: <midcurrituck@ndturnpike.org>

Jennifer Harris, P.E.

Ms Harris,

I am George Persico, a property owner fronting NC 12 at 281 Duck Rd, Southern Shores, NC.

I wish to comment on certain aspects of MCB2 & MCB4 as they relate to traffic mitigation in Southern Shores and north of Duck. I believe that to make any final design decision it is necessary to add the following design elements.

All cross street intersections from US158 junction with NC12 to the existing 3 lane segment in Duck need to be reexamined to determine any additional opportunities for left turn lane enhancements. I have observed that most slowdowns and stops along this segment of NC12 are caused by traffic queues behind vehicles waiting to make left turns.

Serious consideration should be given to extending the 3 lane segment of Ocean Blvd (NC12) in Southern Shores to the Ocean Blvd-Duck Rd fork with improvements to allow smooth merge at this location back to 2 lanes. If this cannot be accomplished, the 3 lane segment should be extended at least to Chicahauk where there is a traffic signal, and opportunities exist to optimize the signals based on day of the week and time of day control consistent with recent traffic study data extant for this overall project.

Finally I am concerned that the 3 lane proposal that is part of MCB2 extending from the 4 lane segment to the north end of the existing 3 lanes through Duck was abandoned. MCB4 does not solve this situation, and seems to be counter to the stated goal of Hurricane evacuation. To go from 3 lanes to 2 lanes to 4 lanes during an evacuation can be confusing to the public and counter productive from a public safety view. In addition, under non-evacuation use, this two lane stretch presupposes that traffic will not travel from Corolla to Kitty Hawk, not likely to be the case as commerce continues to grow.

Please convey this comment to project team members, and enter it into the official Public Comments.

Respectfully,  
George C Persico
If and when a mid county bridge is built in Currituck, I feel it should be at Barco, or again south of Shandy. Why? If something should happen to the Knapp Bridge in the future, we all need a Route to the North for supplies, to the Beach, and toward Currituck. Nearly all our goods come to us from VA, or Elizabeth City. For us to lose this link would be a problem to us all, how Currituck & Beacher OBX. Our Currituck’s Future needs another corridor, to handle the growth of OBX and Currituck.

Sincerely,
Mark Rice
506 E. Currituck Hwy
Cambridge, NC 27923
6/8/12

As for what you have now on the selection
I’d chose ER2
Alternatives Plans

1. Dare county stop Lights, Main problem
   A. 1st stop Light no problem Martins point
   B. 2nd stop Light Kitty Hawk school, Duck Woods, Kitty Hawk Woods
      1. these land owners don't want you to travel through their neighborhood.
      2. close off the Duck Woods Road No through traffic.
      3. close off the Kitty Hawk woods Road, No through traffic.
      4. Open the Light for the Kitty Hawk During school Day's

2. A. Light for ABC store, walmart, Home depot. Shopping center
      1. carry this lights to the light at NC 12 and have a feeder road to all these stores.
         Just as they do in va. beach blvd.

3. A. Food lion, and the shops in that area, have a feeder road as well from NC 12
      1. This could have a get on ramp for traffic going north. same as martin point has.

4. NOTE THE SAME TRAFFIC COMES THRU GRANDY AND WE ALL GET ALONG, NO F***

5. A. Point is I prefer No Bridge at this time
      1. let Corolla grow at its own chosen pace.
      2. Corolla attraction is, Friendly, Nature Loving, people getting away from the main stream rat race.

6. A. Future need of a Bridge, will come on its own time.
      1. lets give the Bridge to people who want it Southern Corolla, Southern Shores.
      2. Put the bridge 1 mile South of Grandy. At the trash collection site.
      3. East sides near the Currituck, Dare county line.
         Vacationer's can now flow north to Corolla or back south 1/2 traffic each way
      4. No need to bridge cross any secondary roads now.
      5. Grady not been formed in 16 years, at trash collection site
      6. High ground, no homes, and a lot less 404 wetland.
      7. Grady has food, restaurants, shops, and food marts gas station
      8. This will provide the bikers on a lighted bike trail, some were to go, not in your back yards in Aydlett, all night long.
      9. Someone spoke at the meeting in Nags Head of biker's number like 1,000 bikers a
         week will come

7. A. LONG RANGE PLANS FOR A BRIDGE IN GRANDY
      1. could give us traffic relief to 1974 in the future.
      2. A proposal of the NCDOT county bridge west crossing north river to Corolla Point
         343 highway, This highway leads out of traffic to Highway 17.
      3. This would give us a route west in the event, Knapp Bridge fails. or chemical
         or other man made destruction.

8. A. Lights on the Bridge's bike trail
      1. I feel this will affect the ducks in the Narrows due to the lights across the sound.
      2. Ducks don't like lights.
      3. This is the reason why Ducks or leaving the Outer Banks and going inland.
      3. You don't see many duck Blinds south of Currituck bridge. Why?
Dear Ms. Harris,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the options for handling emergency evacuation of the Outer Banks. My preference is MCB4 for the following reasons:

1. For 36 years, I have witnessed (and been caught in) the influx of cars over the Wright Memorial Bridge on rental season weekends. The congestion is massive and lasts for much of the two days. In an emergency evacuation, getting both vacationers and residents across the bridge would take more than one day. I think that is unsatisfactory and the new bridge is required for safety.

2. I think the high density populations of Nags Head, Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck would fully utilize the Wright Memorial Bridge route in an emergency. I don't like the fact that option MCB2 would encourage others to use that route.

Sincerely yours,

John D. Pingree
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing the center turn lane (less impact)

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Trying to maintain the current atmosphere

Additional comments:

My local address is 108 Copper Landing Drive, Kill Devil, NC 27945.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Jeffrey Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

---

From: kpricectc@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, May 09, 2010 5:39 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

Dear Ms. Harris,

As a longtime property owner and taxpayer on Ocean Boulevard in Dare County, I feel that given the three options for EIS, the MCB4 is by far the best solution to possible evacuation problems on the Outer Banks of North Carolina. Now is the time to build the long needed mid-Currituck Bridge which will enable motorists easier access to the Outer Banks and the main land. If an emergency arises, natives and tourists alike could quickly exit the island without having to drive so far south to evacuate to the north. Having this extra bridge will alleviate unnecessary traffic in Southern Shores and expedite the evacuation procedures. Also, the bridge will be an added economic catalyst to the growth in Corolla, a town which has been growing and drawing more people over the years.

MCB4 eliminates the need to widen and expand miles of roads in Dare County saving the taxpayers millions of dollars. Surely, the planners must realize the land is so narrow in parts of Duck that expanding the road system would create a hazard for wild life as well as a hardship for property owners. Unnecessarily widening the road to have people make an extended U-turn to exit the island is surely not the answer. These people need to go straight across Currituck Sound as the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. Furthermore, a new bridge will reduce traffic on the old Wright Bridge.

For the welfare and safety of the environment as well as the property owners and citizens of the Outer Banks, MCB4 is the least invasive procedure of the three options and probably could be done quicker and with less cost than the MCB2. It appears ER2 does not eliminate the problem since it makes people drive out of their way many miles south in traffic during an emergency evacuation to the north, thus wasting precious time.

MCB4 is truly the only choice. Many thanks for your time and consideration.

Karen Olivola Price,
A Concerned Taxpayer
I write in support of option MCB4. We have been homeowners in Duck for 23 years and on occasions have waited 3 hours in line just to get to the Wright Memorial Bridge to evacuate. It’s past time that this bridge was built. Many lives could be lost waiting in traffic congestion.

The bridge corridor alternatives C1 and C2 are not in my expertise, but I trust the committee to make a good decision here. My husband Gordon Prior joins me in this support.

Let’s get the bridge built. It was being talked about when we first arrived on the Outer Banks in 1987. Of course there will be some disturbance to vegetation, but let’s put the danger to people in first place.

Blessings,
Vera P.
Less wetland would be filled in. The ridge I live on is about 2,500 to 3,000 ft wide, bordered in west by the swamp road to Northriver, east by the Maple/Laurel Swamp and then Aydlett and Currituck Sound. So much of the natural environment that I experience every day would be destroyed. On the west side of D-314 where the and off ramps are proposed is the first farm my grandfather who was orphaned at 8 years old built, where my mother was born, their house burned down and they bought the house I now live in. I hear my ancestors every day on that side of the road and occasionally see plowed woodpeckers, many I hear them on a regular basis, always see bluebirds and see eagles flying over the Maple/Laurel swamp. I know this is personal and the project is right on top of me, but the facts are the same that the state quoted in 2004 for as the last 25 years. I cannot stress enough that it would impact a fragile coastal ecosystem on both sides, drain transportation resources away from projects that need maintenance and repair in the area.

Hurricane Evacuation is one of the proposals for the bridge. Changes to the National Hurricane Center about issuing storm watches and warnings to about a day sooner (see article in the enclosed).

There has been many articles in the news lately because we are in hurricane season. A quote that I remember said, "Adults are responsible for their actions, county and state governments have no obligations to protect them from the consequences of their own unsafe behavior." I think this sums up what our tax payer money is going towards this most unnecessary bridge.

The intersection of D-314 and In 12 in Kitty Hawk is the real bottleneck problem. Work on improving the main roads from Wright Memorial Bridge and bridge intersection before exploring the bridge.

The Coquina Bridge (Intercoastal Waterway) makes us an island. Boat traffic could knock out the bridge. Don't say it not possible, it's just as real as some of their stuffs. We need another corridor.

Karen Quinlan Piers 8807 Corollado Hwy, Coquina, N.C. 27953

June 2, 2010

---

**Future storm warnings to be announced sooner**

**Change to system is Hurricane Center's biggest in a decade**

By Matt Reddy

The Associated Press

The National Hurricane Center said Tuesday it will begin issuing storm warnings 24 hours sooner than required by law after a review of systems. The change is in response to a series of storms that hit South and Southeastern the United States last year, and a review of the center's procedures.

The center said in a statement that it has improved its warnings and will begin issuing them 24 hours sooner than required by law, which is expected to save lives and property. The center also announced that it will issue warnings 24 hours sooner than required by law, which it said will be more effective.

The National Hurricane Center is warning that storms are expected to hit South and Southeastern the United States on Tuesday, and a review of the center's procedures is expected to save lives and property. The center also announced that it will issue warnings 24 hours sooner than required by law, which it said will be more effective.

The center also announced that it will issue warnings 24 hours sooner than required by law, which it said will be more effective.

---

**Aid suspended for part of Somalia because of threats**

By Robyn Dixon

Los Angeles Times

The United Nations has suspended aid to parts of Somalia due to threats. In a statement, the UN said that it had decided to suspend aid to the region because of threats to its personnel and assets. The UN also said that it would continue to provide assistance to the country's government and its partners in the United States.

The UN also said that it would continue to provide assistance to the country's government and its partners in the United States.

---

**ARCTIC WINDS CHILL SOUTH; RECORD SNOW SWEEPS EAST**

Bitter cold and snow sweeping into the northern United States left part of New England under record snowfall hit the northeastern the United States on Tuesday, and a review of the center's procedures is expected to save lives and property. The center also announced that it will issue warnings 24 hours sooner than required by law, which it said will be more effective.

The center also announced that it will issue warnings 24 hours sooner than required by law, which it said will be more effective.

---

**SUMMER CONG GIVES AN OAR: "It's still slow in the overall debate. The plan helps Annapolis."**

The Washington Post

Congressman Earl从st 11th (D-Md.) gave an interview in which he said that the overall debate on the plan helps Annapolis. He said that the overall debate on the plan helps Annapolis. He said that the overall debate on the plan helps Annapolis.

---

**MADRAS | Three California Department of Fish and Game biologists were killed Tuesday in a helicopter crash in Green River National Forest, and**

The San Francisco Chronicle

Three California Department of Fish and Game biologists were killed Tuesday in a helicopter crash in Green River National Forest, and...
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Dick Ray
Street Address: 1268 R Vine St Apt/Suite No:
City, State, Zip: Arundel Pines, NC 27968
✓ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

- Option B, Myrtle Meadow
- Better traffic flow and safety

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

- C2, better proximity to homes

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

- Option A, more apparent
- Local residents will feel safer

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

- Maybe appropriate

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

- I would be good to open dredging program up the Sound for Historian & fishing!

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: Charles Read [mailto:cbread@charter.net]  
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 6:10 PM  
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org  
Subject: NO BRIDGE

As a 10-year resident of the OBX and a former Town Manager of the Town Of Southern Shoes I strongly oppose construction of the mid-Currituck bridge.

It will create more problems than it fixes. It will ruin the aesthetic beauty and relaxed life styles of the northern OBX.

Thank you

Charles Read
Southern Shores, NC

-----Original Message-----
From: eectorset@cox.net [mailto:eectorset@cox.net]
Sent: Friday, May 28, 2010 9:09 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Project

Dear Sir/Madame,

Yes, please know that I greatly favor a Mid-Currituck Bridge. The safety issue is paramount as we witnessed many years ago with an evacuation for a hurricane and the insuing gridlock. The traffic issue for normal times would be greatly enhanced as the north end residents/guests would not be making a longer trip using the present crossing pattern. Please vote yes for this project and get in going in the near future. Many thanks.

Sincerely, Elaine Rector Resident, 100 Ruddy Duck Lane, Duck, NC
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Pamela Redmond
Street Address: PO Box 169
City, State, Zip: Topping, VA 23169
Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or the No-Build Alternative and why?
As a property owner in Corolla, I simply want to lessen my commute by at least an hour each way. I also believe it is best for evacuations from storms, gas and the traffic impact for tourism on the Outer Banks. Saturdays are a nightmare. I have seen traffic backed up to Corolla before.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
Leave the commercial district of Corolla as is. It works and does not need to be disturbed on a short term basis by construction and on a long term basis by traffic.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Established neighborhoods should be left alone as much as possible.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 168 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Bridge center lane. In these economic times I believe it would be wasteful to spend the money on a 3rd lane. When its use would be limited. We have enough time with warning to evacuate. I have done it several times.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
Tell impact on Residents and Property Owners in Corolla/Drummond/Seaside/Perkins/Carova.
We pay significant real estate taxes and our rents pay significant occupancy taxes. As a property owner I fund the Currituck County and would expect to get a pass on any annual fee, additional charge to use the bridge to access my property and maintain my property.
If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1579 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrtuck@noturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
To Whom It May Concern

In response to calls for public comment on the MCB, I offer mine as one who has vacationed in the northern OBX (NOB) almost yearly since 1974, specifically in Southern Shores (SS). My parents lived in that town as well for about 10 years in the mid 80's.

My main concern is not convenience or traffic (since I probably would not use the bridge) but that of public safety, specifically evacuation. I have witnessed exponential growth over the past 35 years, and have long contemplated the chaos which would ensue during the tourist season if a mandatory evacuation of the NOB was ordered. The prospect of driving in the direction of a hurricane towards a bottlenecked Wright Bridge is frightening, particularly if some could not get off in time. I therefore strongly support the MCB, specifically the MCB4 option. I would leave the C1/C2 decision to planners.

The key is the bridge. It is unfortunate the cost is so high, but this should have been started 20 years ago and $$ saved. BTW, would favor a 4 lane bridge and get it over with, but I'll take what I can get. I will disclose I am a land owner in Carova and plan to retire there, like many others. I am dumbfounded that some residents of Corolla and north are actually opposed to something which is obviously to their benefit!

As an aside, I don't know if you are aware of the section of land just above the Dare/ Currituck line, between Cottage Cove Rd and Ogein Dr. This is the narrowest point between the ocean and sound and has been known to flood during heavy storms ("the ocean meets the sound"). If a hurricane storm surge were to flood this to the point of Rte 12 being impassible, possibly thousands would be marooned without an MCB, the eastern entrance being north of there. I will leave to your imagination the damages resulting from the hurricane striking those essentially sitting ducks. You can be sure victims will hold accountable whomever could have built a bridge!

Lou Reiss
Germantown TN

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential
Like everyone else, I have heard "the bridge is coming, the bridge is coming" for years. Everyone is fed up with government’s inability to do anything. Studies, studies, studies and more studies have delayed and delayed this project. By not building the bridge and widening Rt. 12, we are putting off the inevitable which will be building the bridge years from now at a much higher cost, not to mention the waste of money to purchase property to widen Rt. 12. Widening Rt. 12 through Southern Shores and Duck will have a negative effect on those areas without much effect on the traffic. What are you going to do...have a 40 or 50 mph speed limit thru Duck, take away the stoplights in Southern Shores. Destroy the quaint town where people walk, jog, bike, push strollers, etc. Building the bridge, that’s the only answer that makes any sense, not just for traffic but for hurricane evacuation too. I had a friend approx. 20 years ago renting in Ocean Sands when a evacuation was ordered because of an approaching hurricane so he and his family packed up and got in line on Rt. 12. After 4 hours of sitting in the same spot, he turned around and went back to the cottage they were renting. This was 20 years ago before Pine Island, The Currituck Club and more. BUILD THE BRIDGE IS THE ONLY SMART OPTION!!!
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I would prefer to reverse the center lane.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

This bridge will greatly impact the economy of our island and diminish the integrity of our island.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length; its mooring location, where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

No Bridge!!!

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@northtoll.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

From: Barry Richman [mailto:brichman868@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Mon 5/3/2010 4:47 PM
To: midcurrituck@northtoll.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

Please place the attached letter on the public record. I'm sure you will be hearing plenty of opposition comments at the public hearings in Currituck County.

Barry S. Richman
May 3, 2010

Mr. David Joyner  
Executive Director of the NC Turnpike Authority  
C/o Jennifer Harris, PE  
1578 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Dear Mr. Joyner:

I recently read the article in the April 13, 2010 edition of The Coastland Times relating to an interview with you regarding the proposed Mid-Currituck bridge. I was floored by your statement that; “The community has been waiting for the project to reach this milestone…”. In all due respect, sir, who in the world have you been listening to?

Over the last several decades, I have had the opportunity to converse with literally thousands of Currituck Outer Banks residents, non-resident property owners and tourists and have come away with one overriding comment from a large majority of these people - we live/own/visit the Currituck Outer Banks because of its remote, pristine nature, not in spite of it!

As an opponent of the proposed Currituck Mid-County Bridge project, I have repeatedly publicly questioned the utility of the proposed bridge for a number of very pertinent reasons and am now bringing my concerns to you as follows:

1. There is no reputable evidence that the proposed bridge will have any appreciable beneficial impact on reducing evacuation times prior to or during impending natural disasters. Neither the Federal Government nor its Corps of Army Engineers found any appreciable benefit to exist! In fact, there is plenty of historical evidence that any means of easing access to a geographical area spurs residential and commercial development in the area surrounding the access point. One only needs to look at what happens in any area where a new bridge, highway ramp or subway station is built for clear evidence of that fact. An increased rate of development; without a comprehensive traffic management plan including the widening of NC 12 to its intersection with US 158, the building of a NC 12/US 158 flyover and the widening of the US 158/168 corridor from its intersection with NC 12 to the Virginia State line, will exacerbate the problem sought to be alleviated by the bridge, rather than cure it! Making the evacuation-value of such a project even more suspect, official representatives of the Commonwealth of Virginia stated at a recent Hurricane Preparedness meeting that it is their intent to close the NC/VA border to northbound traffic if traffic backups appear imminent in VA during such an evacuation event! That means that all evacuation traffic will be funneled inland in NC via the 158W/17S or 158E/64W corridors, causing monumental traffic backups in Corolla.

2. Many of the residents, tourists and non-resident Currituck Outer Banks property owners came to Currituck because of its remote, pristine nature, not in spite of it! They choose to embark on a long journey and pass the litany of larger, more developed beach communities that populate the entire east coast of the United States to vacation here. The building of the bridge will forever alter the remote/quiet nature of the Currituck Outer Banks and the Sound communities on the Currituck mainland. Do we really need another Wildwood, Ocean City, Myrtle Beach, Atlantic City or Virginia Beach here? In addition, the damage to the environment of this “sportsman’s paradise” and its wildlife sanctuaries will be devastating – oil slicks on the Currituck Sound and its marshes from oil condensation runoff from the road surface of the bridge, destruction of wildlife habitat caused by bridge construction, noise pollution, etc. The State and Federal Governments recognized the potential for such adverse environmental impacts!

3. The only physical factor deterring serious criminal activity on the Currituck Outer Banks is a limited access and egress route. Clear evidence exists nation-wide of substantial increases in serious crime spurred by increasing ease of access to and egress from geographic areas.

4. Where are the requisite plans for the public accommodations needed to handle the increased traffic into the Currituck Outer Banks caused by the presence of a Mid-County Bridge? The State’s own economic justification package depends heavily, for its economic success, on a very large increase in traffic flow to the Currituck Outer Banks from the “day-tripping” residents of the Tidewater area.

   a. Where are the plans for the hundreds of (maybe thousands of) additional parking spaces needed to accommodate the increased influx of day-trippers – a total of maybe 200 to 300 spaces currently exist at the Whalehead Club, the Currituck Lighthouse, the Southern Public Beach Access and several parking lots at the Whalehead Beach subdivision? The current lots are full and overflowing during the season. If plans exist to expand parking, they certainly have not been made public. As part of their storm-water drainage plan for Whalehead Beach, the County plans on discarding allowable use of several of the Whalehead Beach parking lots, which will further exacerbate the parking problem.

   b. Where are the plans for the multiplicity of changing rooms needed to accommodate the increased influx of day-trippers so that they can properly enjoy a day at the beach? There currently exists but one set of public changing rooms at the Southern Public Beach Access. If plans exist to expand public changing facilities, they certainly have not been made public.

   c. Where are the plans for the multiplicity of public restrooms needed to accommodate the increased influx of day-trippers-there currently exists one set of public restrooms at the Currituck Lighthouse and one set at the Southern Public Beach Access? If plans exist to expand public restroom facilities, they certainly have not been made public. The lack of public restroom facilities is currently so bad that Currituck County recently enacted an ordinance barring public urination and defecation!
d. Where are the plans for expanded fire and rescue facilities and staffing, law enforcement staffing, ocean rescue staffing and medical facilities needed to accommodate the increased population (year-round and seasonal) on the Currituck Outer Banks? If plans exist to expand such facilities and staffing levels, they certainly have not been made public. With the current rate of influx of day-trippers, it is not uncommon for Currituck Outer Banks property owners and lease-holders to find strange cars parked on their properties and community streets (in violation of Currituck County Ordinance), strangers using their; outdoor showers to rinse off and change clothes, their hot tubs and pools, and their property for the purpose of relieving themselves. The increased influx of day-trippers resulting from the proposed bridge will just exacerbate this problem without the increased levels of public accommodations needed as noted above!

5. Where are the plans to resolve the daily traffic problems in the 4-wheel drive areas of the northern reaches of the Currituck Outer Banks (beyond the northern extent of NC 12), which clearly would be exacerbated by the increased influx of day-trippers? It’s currently a mess during the season with a deadly mix of bathers, people surf fishing, ATVs and dirt bikes and 4-wheel drive vehicles. Does the State intend to open up access to all of its beaches to vehicular traffic to disperse the growing problem?

6. Many of the Dare County communities to the South of the Currituck Outer Banks endorse the Mid-County Bridge project, viewing it as a means to dramatically ease the traffic logjams created in large measure by poor traffic management planning when all of the commercial and residential development occurred along the NC 12 corridor in the northern sections of Dare County. Such a view is extremely short-sighted since a large percentage of the traffic along NC 12 is created by: (1) Currituck Outer Banks residents and tourists heading south to avail themselves of the fine restaurants, shopping facilities, cultural facilities and events, historical sites, etc located in Dare County; (2) southern Dare County residents and tourists heading north to avail themselves of the fine restaurants and shopping facilities located in Duck and Corolla; and (3) Dare County residents heading for their employment sites located in Duck and the Currituck Outer Banks. None of the traffic created by these folks will be diverted by the existence of a Mid-County Bridge! In fact, if the bridge proves to have the expected effect of spurring increased development on the Currituck Outer Banks, the increased population (residential, employment and seasonal) created by the bridge will exacerbate the traffic problems, not cure them, without a comprehensive area-wide traffic management plan along with its infrastructure in place before the first vehicle traverses the bridge if its to be built at all.

7. Assuming that Currituck County plans for the infrastructure required to support the bridge, who will foot the bill (millions upon millions of dollars) to acquire the land, develop construction plans and build the facilities. Do the State and/or Federal Governments stand ready to foot the bill? Would it be equitable to saddle the Currituck County taxpayers with the cost of resolving what appears to be a regional traffic problem created in large measure by the past development planning inadequacies of Dare County? What if the bridge is built and falls flat on its economic face – who will provide the funding for the economic shortfall and/or assume management responsibility for the “white elephant”?

8. Does it make any sense whatsoever to commit to building a new bridge of dubious utility when the State has so many bridges in immediate need of major structural repair?

9. Lastly, what a disgraceful “slap-in-the-face” the award of the project to a foreign company would be to the American engineering and construction industries, particularly in view of America’s current economic woes.

In conclusion, those of us who oppose the proposed bridge recognize that there is a real problem of unrestrained growth and traffic on the Outer Banks. What is needed is a comprehensive plan to address relief of the traffic problems area-wide and a common-sense plan to key growth to maintain the unique nature of the Outer Banks and to the availability of services and public accommodations and the rest of the infrastructure necessary to support the planned growth. We just do not see how the proposed Mid-County Bridge project by itself addresses and solves these critical problems.

Sincerely,

Barry S. Richman
868 Welk Court
Corolla, NC 27927
252-453-0626
brichman868@embarqmail.com
From: Daniel Lane
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 6:09 AM
To: CorollaCivicAsn@embarqmail.com
Subject: Fw: Mid-Currituck Bridge Comment Form

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Mary E. Riley
Street Address: 763 Sunrise Ct.
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927
Phone: 252-453-2493
email: liamor@embarqmail.com

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

NO-BUILD Alternative. The cost, environmental impact are not justified to relieve 8 weekends of heavy traffic. It has been many years since a mandatory evacuation for Currituck Outer Banks and NC12 North has been improved since then.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Neither. I prefer the NO-BUILD Alternative!

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Neither. I prefer the NO-BUILD Alternative!

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reverse the center turn lane and as the storm nears, reverse one in-bound lane. The other in-bound lane should be restricted to emergency vehicles. Also, reverse the center turn lane on NC12 North, especially in Duck and Southern Shores. Currituck County has very seldom ordered evacuation.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

The environmental impact to the Currituck Sound is of particular concern. The negative impact resulting from the increased traffic in Corolla and Aydlett will create worse traffic situations. The bridge will help the developers and no one else. Whomever believes that travelers crossing into Corolla will stay up there and not go down through Duck and Southern Shore are delusional.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Not a boater, but I forsee restrictions in boat use around this bridge. The Currituck County tradition of waterfowl hunting will end. But then again, there are very few visitors in the fall and winter. Perhaps the state will close the bridge then and operate it only for the heavy tourist season.

Additional Comments: I live in Corolla. I will not be using the bridge at any time. We go to Kitty Hawk, KDH and other beach areas for business, health and recreational pursuits. Our local produce stand is south of Grandy, which would be below the proposed bridge. When we do travel, we board our dogs in Powells Point, again south of the proposed bridge. As members of Corolla volunteer fire dept, we have never evacuated even when recommended. Currituck has never ordered a mandatory evacuation since we came in 1976.

Why is this being crammed down our throats? The citizens of Aydlett and Corolla should have a referendum to determine if the bridge should happen in their neighborhoods.
From: RipJay@aol.com [mailto:RipJay@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2010 2:04 PM
To: midcurrituck@nc-turnpike.org
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

To Jennifer Harris...

I am writing to express my wholehearted support for and delight in the recommendation provided in the recently issued DEIS related to the Mid-Currituck bridge project. My wife and I own a home in Corolla Light Village in Corolla, North Carolina and agree that a Mid-Currituck bridge would be very helpful in diverting traffic from Route 12 north of the Route 158 bridge, and also in emergency evacuation in the event of a hurricane or other natural disaster. Thanks very much for all of your great work in putting together this DEIS; we fully support and look forward to the bridge being built with due haste.

Best regards,

Jay Ripley
Chairman
Sequel Youth and Family Services
35481 Troon Court
Round Hill, VA 20141
Office 540-338-5182
Fax 540-338-5183
Cell 703-505-0955
From: Amy and Rob
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri May 14 19:35:43 2010
Subject: mid currituck bridge

I am a 10 resident of Southern Shores and owner of businesses in both Corolla and KDH. I want to express my strong support for construction of the bridge as I feel strongly if properly implemented it will have a positive impact on the Outer Banks. George Robinson
June 25th 2010

Mr. John Page, AICP, CEP
Parsons Brinckerhoff
609 Aviation Parkway, Suite 1500
Morrisville, NC 27560

RE: Mid Currituck Bridge Study, Aydlett, NC

Dear Mr. Page,

We are writing to express our disapproval of the construction of the Mid Currituck Bridge as presently proposed.

It is quite apparent that there is complete and total disregard for the businesses and families in the Aydlett area.

Many venues along the waterfront South of Aydlett present areas that would not destroy businesses or family residences, and provide a savings of tens of millions of taxpayers dollars. We find no legitimate justification for the present route chosen. This chosen route appears to be no more then a political ploy to benefit someone unknown to the citizens of this area. There is a total lack of concern for the lives of the residents and residences that will be affected by this project, bringing unprecedented noise, pollution, congestion and an added opportunity for criminal activity.

Upon retiring we have chosen this quiet, lovely, village to enjoy the remaining years of our lives, only to have it disrupted by the thoughtlessness of NC Turnpike Authority and their disregard for our welfare, property values and safety.

IN the EVENT that this project goes forth as now planned, we would like to state that we concur with the letter from Charles and Mary Ellen Angus, dated June 4, 2010, Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Study, Aydlett.

We plead with those in authority to reconsider the routing of this bridge in order to preserve this residential neighborhood and the quiet, safe venue it provides for its residents.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William (Will) and Ann Rodgers
June 5, 2010

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
3579 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1578

Dear Mrs. Harris:

I am writing one final letter to express my continued opposition to the Mid-county Currituck Bridge. I have enclosed a copy of the questions I have regarding this bridge. I have been asking these questions for several years, both in Raleigh and Washington, and have never received an answer to any of them. In response, I have received slick brochures, maps and non-applicable form letters from politicians. In one case, a politician sent me a form letter promising that if any legislation like what I proposed ever came up he/she would support it. I never suggested any legislation at any time for any reason. I only wanted answers to my questions regarding this bridge project.

Over the years, I have finally come to realize that I am the “little guy” in this debate, and in the end, what a person like me says really doesn’t matter. I believe if the money can be found, this bridge will be built to perhaps ease traffic jams on 10 (or so) Saturday afternoons per year. I also believe, as the Army Corps of Engineers and the US EPA has stated, there will be environmental damage to the area. It is really sad, but I thank you for reading my letter.

Sincerely,

Claude B. Rollins

QUESTIONS

1. One reason you give for building this bridge is to aid in evacuation in the event of a hurricane; two questions:
   - With the current ability of meteorologists to forecast the path of a storm (not always velocity) with greater accuracy, isn’t it true that ample warning can be given to permit an orderly and safe evacuation on Rt. 12?
   - Given the length of this bridge, isn’t it going to be necessary to close this bridge after the wind reaches a certain velocity, much like the bridge to Eastern Shore, Virginia? What is the wind velocity you would restrict or close the bridge?

2. The only other reason for this bridge that I have seen is it will take several hours to travel from the US 158 inland waterway area to Corolla by 2035, presumably without this bridge. What methodology and data was used to predict vehicle levels 25 years in the future? What is the margin of error?

3. Several years ago both the Army Corp of Engineers and the US EPA denied permits for this bridge on environmental grounds. Have you now received the permits? How have you corrected the potential environmental damage that would have caused?

4. It is known some vehicles passing over this bridge will leak gasoline and/or oil. Based on your traffic numbers projections, have you calculated how many gallons of petroleum will enter the sound? Do you have a plan, with the personnel and equipment to monitor this?

5. Will you restrict vehicles from using the bridge which are carrying petroleum products or other hazardous materials?

6. Won’t at least part of the bridge pass over property that is wetlands by Federal definition?

7. Several years ago the NCDOT studied this situation and concluded that improvements to existing road ways was the best approach to solve traffic problems. Following this, it appears that NCDOT was dismissed from any further involvement in this project. Why? Given their level of expertise in transportation matters.

8. The state has pledged, I believe, more than $500,000,000 to this project over 40 years. Is a tax increase planned to cover this?

9. Will the county be tasked to provide fire, police, EMS and other services for the bridge? Will this require a tax increase?

10. Many businesses north of this bridge will suffer greatly. Are there any plans for the state to provide any assistance to them?

11. This bridge will, in most people’s opinion, encourage day trippers to Corolla from throughout the area. Have you offered to assist the County in providing parking areas, both houses, etc. for the day trippers?

12. And finally, I have lived here either part or full time for the last 20 years, and I know personally that severe backups on US 158 are rare, and are confined to 10 or so Saturday afternoons from about June 15 to Labor Day. For the other 355 days, traffic flows well. So, why has this bridge idea been discussed for more than two decades, making it very difficult for people in Currituck who will be adversely affected?
Mr. Claude B. Rollins
160 Elliott Lane
Aydlett, North Carolina 27916

RE: Mid-Currituck Bridge Study

Dear Mr. Rollins:

Your letter of June 5, 2010 included a request that we answer 12 questions. I am sorry you have previously been unable to get answers to your questions. It is our policy to answer questions received by mail, e-mail, and telephone in a timely manner. Here are the answers, as we know them today, to your questions:

1. Hurricane evacuation:
   a. Early warnings can be given, but it remains our understanding from emergency management officials that they prefer that all evacuations begin in the morning and take no more than 18 hours from the time the evacuation is ordered until all evacuees have reached a point of safety. In the year 2035, if no Mid-Currituck Bridge is built, our modeling predictions show a clearance time of 36 hours.
   b. Emergency management policy is that all who evacuate should have reached a point of safety prior to the arrival of gale force winds. If it is emergency management policy to close existing bridges on the North Carolina coast at some point during a hurricane, we assume that same policy would apply to a Mid-Currituck Bridge.

2. Traffic forecasts were based on the following factors: 1) state population forecasts for the Currituck County mainland for 2030 extrapolated to 2035, 2) full build-out of current Outer Banks lots accessible to NC 12, 3) growth in Currituck County’s Outer Banks north of NC 12 at a rate similar to that over the last 10 to 15 years, 4) that new development would generate the same amount of travel demand as current development, and 5) that travel peaking characteristics would be similar to those that occur today. Other than the inherent error that occurs in any predictive modeling, error would also occur if growth occurs slower or faster than forecast or if people choose to make fewer or more trips than they do today.

3. No permit applications have ever been submitted for this project (thus none have been received). Permit applications are submitted after the completion of the environmental impact assessment process. Coordination with the US Army Corps of Engineers and the US Environmental Protection Agency, as well as other federal and state environmental and regulatory resource agencies, has occurred throughout the project. Both agencies were involved in deciding the project’s statement of purpose and need and selecting the alternatives assessed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). They will be involved in the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

4. We have calculated pollutant loadings. Potential options for handling bridge run-off are discussed in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIS. It is expected that agreement with environmental regulatory and resource agencies on how to minimize and mitigate the impact of bridge run-off will be reached prior to completion of environmental studies.

5. There are currently no plans to restrict vehicles carrying hazardous materials beyond what restrictions might exist on other bridges serving the Outer Banks.

6. Yes, part of the project would pass over wetlands under the jurisdiction of the US Army Corps of Engineers.

7. Widening US 158 as a six to eight-lane superstreet, an interchange at US 158 and NC 12, and widening NC 12 to four lanes from Southern Shores to Albacore Street would provide enough capacity on these roads to handle without congestion almost all of the travel demand generated by full build-out of the NC 12-accessible Outer Banks. No bridge would be needed. However, the NC 12 right-of-way is only 60 feet wide in most of Dare County and part of Currituck County. To widen NC 12 to four lanes in these areas would displace an estimated 195 homes and businesses and remove berms and vegetation that are valued by the community. With agreement by the environmental regulatory and resource agencies, the alternative was dismissed for this reason. Please also note that NCDOT has always and continues to be an integral part of the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. The Turnpike Authority is a division of the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT).

8. The North Carolina General Assembly has agreed to provide $15 million in annual debt service through June 2013 and $28 million for each year thereafter. No tax increase was passed in association with that commitment.

9. The county would provide fire, police, and EMS services for a Mid-Currituck Bridge just as they do for all other roads in the county. Bridge maintenance would be the responsibility of the Turnpike Authority and those selected to design, build, operate and maintain the bridge.

10. Loss of business at businesses south of the bridge is a concern we have received from others and plan to pursue further during the preparation of the Final EIS. This concern, however, appears to not have come from affected business owners. It has been our understanding in the past that businesses find even the current summer congestion levels on US 158 to be a hindrance to business and that traffic reductions would be helpful to their businesses because it would be easier for potential customers to get on and off the highway. Again, we intend to look into this concern further.

11. Provisions for day trippers would be the responsibility of the county.

12. The bridge project is included in NCDOT’s 2009 to 2015 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the North Carolina Intrastate System, the Strategic Highway Corridors Concept Development Report (NCDOT, 2005), and the Thoroughfare Plan for Currituck County (NCDOT, 1999). It also is noted in Currituck County’s land use plan. Therefore, the bridge has county and state government support and generally has for more than 20 years. Many people have asked why there is a concern with traffic congestion that happens only a few days a year. On the other hand, we have received many comments saying that reduction in congestion on those few days a year is essential. We have received comments from people that say if summer congestion is not reduced, people will stop coming to the Outer Banks. We have received comments that say a bridge would undermine what...
people value about the Currituck County Outer Banks and people would stop coming. Thus, there exist differing perceptions of the problem, the need for a solution, and the benefits of the bridge as a solution.

From a strictly traffic planning perspective, when planning transportation improvements in an area with typical travel-to-work-related congestion, it is customary to plan roads that will serve without congestion the 30th highest annual peak hour. If achieved, only 29 hours a year would be congested. In areas with seasonal peaks such as Currituck County, it is common to plan for congestion over more hours, but no specific criteria is standard. In contrast, however, on NC 12 at Southern Shores, approximately 312 hours were congested in the summer of 2006. With full build-out on the NC 12-accessible Outer Banks, this number would rise to 780 hours in the summer. Our traffic analysis indicates that in 2006 NC 12 at Southern Shores was congested approximately 7 hours a day on the summer weekend and 2 hours a day on summer weekdays given the known travel demand and recognizing that this can vary from day-to-day, if crashes occur, or if it rains. With full build-out, these numbers would rise to approximately 15 hours on the weekend and 6 hours on the weekday.

Another way to look at this is from the perspective of congested vehicle-miles traveled (VMT). For example, if 1,000 cars travel 10 miles under congested conditions, that is 10,000 vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) under congested conditions. Our traffic studies indicate that in 2006, 3.6 percent of the VMT on NC 12 from Southern Shores to its end in Currituck County traveled under congested conditions. With full build-out of the area served by NC 12, that number is expected to rise to 18.4 percent. A four-lane NC 12 would drop that percent to zero but at the price of displacing approximately 195 homes and businesses. ER2 (only three lanes on NC 12 where the existing right-of-way is narrow) would drop that percent to 14.3 percent. MCB4 would drop that percent to 9.4 percent and MCB2 would drop it to 7.2 percent.

More land has been subdivided for development than a two-lane road with one way in and one way out could handle. Four basic choices appear to be available:

- Widen existing roads; including widening NC 12 to four lanes, with a displacement of approximately 195 residents and businesses, eliminating almost all forecast congestion.
- Build a second way in and out (Mid-Currituck Bridge) so that the traffic is redistributed on the existing road system, with perhaps some improvements to other roads, resulting in the greatest reductions in congestion short of widening NC 12 to four lanes.
- Make limited improvements on the existing road system with limited reductions in congestion. An interchange with US 158 and NC 12 with associated widening of US 158 east of the Wright Memorial Bridge would be the biggest help among the possibilities available.
- Do nothing and live with the congestion, perhaps with the hope that eventually growing congestion would reduce or eliminate the demand for new homes, some subdivided lots along NC 12 would never develop, and traffic and the hours of congestion in the summer would be less than we forecast.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (919) 571-3004 or jennifer.harris@ncturnpike.org.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Harris, P.E.
Director of Planning and Environmental Studies
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing the center turn lane

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Yes, as a home owner / resident on Rt 12 in Southern Shores I am very concerned about the traffic & road less & speed

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Curriluck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: mecurriluck@northcarolina.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

From: mrosstraver@peoplepc.com
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Sun Apr 25 15:24:45 2010
Subject: Bridge

I want to see the bridge built as soon as possible!
I support the bridge - the sooner the better!
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 164 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

**Reversing center lane - less impact on adjacent land**

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

**Sound bouncing from retaining wall into residential areas**

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

N/A

Additional comments:

1) An objective of the project is to reduce evacuations time from the island so don’t tell westbound traffic. Toll booth will be an obstacle. Only toll vehicles entering OBX.

2) Are there plans to provide a reduced fare for people who live on mainland but work on island, and property owners?

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Hi

Build mid county bridge as soon as possible quite the foot dragging

Jay & Cynthia Russell
135 Tall Pine Ln.
Southern Shores

From: info@ncturnpike.org [mailto:info@ncturnpike.org]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 2:38 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Comment: Mid-Currituck Bridge

Contact Information

Name: Nancy Sager
Address: 163 Yaupon Trail
City: Kitty Hawk
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: nhsager@embarqmail.com
Comments: Please move ahead in your decision to build a mid-county bridge. We need another escape route in case of a hurricane.
Dear Jennifer:

The Wilson Cemetery at Barco, N.C. has been named in Genealogical records and/or by historians and the like for the Wilson family, which has or had many Wilson family members buried there, but in the late 1800s and early 1900s the cemetery was not called the Wilson cemetery, but the Barco Cemetery, due to the fact that the whole area was named after its first Postmaster, Caleb (Cabe) Barco. Caleb Barco was a very remarkable man for his day. He was a one legged man, who ran a General Store and became Barco’s first Postmaster in 1894. Today, the U.S. Post Office is still in operation, but at a different location. The General Store in which it was originally in operation ran until almost the mid 1900s. It was originally located across the street from the current Barco cemetery. Caleb Barco is buried in that cemetery, without even a tombstone at his head. The General Store was still there, when I was a small boy in the 1950s. I remember seeing the building and my father telling me about his great uncle early in the history of Barco. Caleb Barco was my Grandmother’s uncle from her mother’s side of the family. Her name was Clara Virginia Poyner and she was a relative of one of the early Barco settlers, Lewis Poyner. She married my Grandfather, Nathan Halstead Sawyer. In addition to this my testimony of the facts as told to me by my father, I have submitted the above mention, Currituck County Historical Society - 1977 document entitled, “BARCO”, by Hilda Mathias and Jean Doxey, to confirm any doubt of the facts. The document is highlighted in yellow verifying my direct family ancestry connection in this community, and the following reasons for my concern stated below in this letter, as well.

Today, the General Store building is long gone and the cemetery where Caleb Barco rests, without any remembrance from the community in which he so faithfully served goes into ruin and awaits a decision this year from the N.C. Turnpike Authority for possible total extinction. During the 1918 Great American Influenza Pandemic, many dead bodies [Caucasian and Negro] were horse drawn carted to Barco, put into graves, and left there without a marker. My grandfather’s grave is there also, and was marked in 1957.

It is a shame to loose a part of history, especially to those who live in Currituck County and to others, about the early American Settlers of this community. Therefore, I request the Great State of North Carolina to place a memorial marker for Caleb Barco on the location where Barco’s first Post Office was located. The marker should reflect why the area is called “Barco” and refer to the name “Caleb Barco” [Nov. 21, 1858 – August 25, 1931] being officially assigned as Barco’s first Postmaster by the U.S. Government in 1894. It should mention that the first Post Office was located in his General Store. I am not concerned about the loss of his personal marker in the cemetery, but a reference to him being buried in the Barco Cemetery which is or was located across the street from the General Store and Post Office would be good to be a part of the historical information, as well as mentioning about the Great 1918 flu pandemic burials the cemetery currently contains, since the final status and history of the cemetery is currently in question.

I also request acknowledgement of this letter as being received and on file to be referenced if, and when the remains of my grandfather, Nathan Halstead Sawyer is to be removed and relocated from the Barco Cemetery, so that his remains may be relocated to a family acceptable resting place beside his son.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr./Rev. Thomas Hill Sawyer
BARCO

By
Hilda Mathias and Jean D. Dousey

In 1894, Barco was named for the first postmaster, Caleb (Cabe) Barco. Barco is located about midway between Currituck and Coinjock. The post office was in the corner of Cabe Barco's country store, and Horace A. Brumsey was the assistant postmaster. The first remembered mail carrier was Walter Harrison. Harrison rode in a wooden cart called a sulky that carried one person. He carried mail from Currituck to Poplar Branch.

In 1926, Horace A. Brumsey, son of John and Margaret Forbes Brumsey, became the second postmaster, and his daughter, Amelia, was his assistant. The post office was moved to Mr. Brumsey's property in a building which was moved from Long Point. The present post office is at the same location, but is a different building. Amelia B. Brothers is the third and present postmaster, and Jean D. Dousey is the assistant.

Ashbury Church was a one room wood structure located two miles north of Coinjock. It was possibly named for Francis Asbury, the great leader of American Methodism. One and one half acres of land was donated by John Simmons in 1846 for the building. Singing contests were often held between Methodist and Baptist and one of the contests was held in the Mehoke Baptist Church in 1886. Ashbury was the winner that time singing "Let Us Pass Over the River".

Mr. Henry Annell was song leader, and in later years, some great programs were put on by Mrs. Allison Lindsey. At that time people came from Churches Island and Belisi Island by boat to Hampton Landing and walked to church.

Protracted meetings were held for a week each summer and several families would be responsible for food for each day. They had dinner on the grounds. The church was disbanded in 1931 and most members moved to Filimore Methodist Church. Mr. and Mrs. Luke A. Powell bought the building and turned the old church into a beautiful dwelling.

Mr. Luke A. Powell was the Agricultural Agent for Currituck County for 19 years following being a teacher at Poplar Branch School. It was largely through his efforts that a mutual livestock association was formed in 1937. This helped farmers to get a better price for their livestock. He also promoted roadside markets and fruit production in the county.

A public school was located where Fleetwood Catton's house is now. Ezekiel Elman was the first teacher 85 years ago. He was a highly educated man and some of his students became great men. Samuel T. Annell, the first Currituck boy to graduate from the U.S. Military Academy, worked his way through school and graduated in 3 years. He majored in law, received a degree at Chapel Hill, and returned to the academy as an instructor in Military Law. At age 42, Annell was appointed Acting Judge Advocate General of the Army and appointed to the rank of Brigadier General. In 1919, he resigned his commission and established a law office in Washington, D. C. He died in 1954 and was buried at West Point.

Nathan W. Walker graduated from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1903 and later was awarded a Doctrine of Philosophy degree from Columbia University. He was elected superintendent of state schools and taught at Chapel Hill where he remained until his death in 1936.

Others were James Harren, a great businessman, and John Brumsey, a great penman.
A private school was located in front of the present post office at Barco on Grandy Boswood's land. The one room building opened in 1910 and was named the Coinjock Private School. Miss Nettie Dozier was the teacher, and she taught grades one through ten. Her pupils came from Coinjock, Maple, Long Point and Barco. It was $2.00 a month for each family of the children. The school burned in 1916, and a tenant house was used for a school until 1920. The children who attended Coinjock were Viola and Junious Overton, Georgia Forbes, Lucian and Laura Midkett, and Ervin and Jenny Halstead. Children attending from Maple were Jim and Ernest Taylor, Annie Grigs, Susie Johnson and Howard Spry, Odel Davis, Maggie Davis, Bernice and Brandon Walker, Tommy and Elizabeth Gibbs. Children attending from Barco were Pattie and Cecil Swain, Hattie and Mildred Pulley, Louise Walkins, Bond, Julia and Mary Elizabeth Sawyer, Al Walker, Nathan Lindsay, Lydia, Clarissa, and Henry Amsell, Ed Sawyer, Hilda Mathias, Gilman, Wallace, Simmons, and Kathleen Brunney, and Clarence Sawyer. Children attending from Long Point were Walker, Marion and Guy Gray.

Long Point, located across the Coinjock Bay from Barco, was the light house depot. In the early 1900’s there were three families living there - Captain Chanonit, Grays and Talbot. After they moved away, Nathan Halstead Sawyer became the caretaker of the lighthouse from 1911-1914. Then Captain W. J. Varr was caretaker on Long Point until it was discontinued in 1923, and the building was moved away.

A sea plane developed trouble and landed on Long Point in 1918. It was the first plane anyone in this area had seen. It stayed for some time waiting for parts, and boat loads of people went to see it.

In the late 1800’s and early 1900’s, Oldo Landing was quite busy. It was later called Barco Landing. Elisha Swain rafted logs there. He came to the county in 1889 to cut timber. People fished there also and two men could catch more herring than they could handle.

People had a problem getting potatoes to market many years ago. They would haul them by horse and cart to Coinjock to be shipped and then would carry them on a flat to Long Point and freight boats which would pick them up. About 1916 a pier was built in the channel that runs through Coinjock Bay, a short distance from Boswood Landing. People would haul their potatoes by horse and cart to Boswood Landing, put them on flats and carry them to the pier. The first boat was the Alice Fopee, run by Mr. Sawyer. The next boat was Anna F. owned by Ernest Walker. This pier was used until the Mill Landing was put in use.

There have been some interesting stores in Barco. One was operated by Grandy Boswood from 1895 until his death in 1930. It carried a variety of things such as groceries, dry goods, and shoes. Every year at Christmas there were toys and dolls for old Santa to fill his stockings. Merchandise for this store came by boat to Coinjock and was hauled to the store by horse and cart. Hilda Mathias was Grandy Boswood’s daughter, and she helped in the store. She said her difficult job was cutting a 100 box of snuff to get 5¢ worth. When the drummer would come through with samples of shoes and material, he would show only one half of a shoe and the yard goods were picked from the samples. It was always exciting to see what he had. The Boswood store was located next to Hilda Mathias’s home.

A store was located near the Asbury Church and first owned by Jim Turner. Later it was operated by Despree Lindsey, Ed Ansell, Boscoe Baum and the last owner was Caleb Caton. This was a
family gathering place in the later years. They sold groceries, candy and had music to dance to. The older folks would sit in rocking chairs and the younger ones danced. It was a happy place.

E. E. Pigott had a store in the corner of H. A. Brumsey's field from 1913 until his death in 1926. He had groceries and some merchandise such as socks, overalls, and shirts. After his death, Mr. Brumsey moved the building to his home and used it as a barn.

Ed Sawyer had a store located not far from the present post office. He bought the store from Ray Norris who had operated it for a short time from 1934 to 1936. Ed Sawyer and his wife Aileen operated this store from 1936 to 1941. They had groceries, candy and drinks. They had a picnic in one part of the building and it too was a gathering place for young folks who liked to dance. This store was then sold to Dan Webster and his wife Maud who moved it on highway 158 in Barco. This store was interesting because they always had animals, especially monkeys. People would drop out unwanted animals there and Dan and Maud would never let an animal go hungry. The present owner is B. J. Poyner.

In 1948, a new store was opened at the intersection of Highway 14 and 158. It was known as Lee and Simpson and was operated by W. L. Lee and Charles Simpson from 1948 until 1970. It is now owned by Sam Sneed and called "Old Grist Mill Store".

Barco's early family names were John Brumsey, Caleb Caton, Ben Taylor, David Olds, Nath O'Neal, Benn Walter, Ben Wilkins, Joe Forbes, Bertie Fisher, Lewis Poyner. Early black families were Judy and Robert Frost, Simon Simmons, Thomas Simmons, David Charity, Bill Mercer, McClennen Simmons, St. Clare Burton, Rulcer Simmons, William Humphries, and Christopher Shields.
Dear Ms. Harris,

I am writing this not only as a resident of Virginia Beach but also as a property owner in Ocean Sands/Currituck county. We bought our house in 1989 when Rt. 158/168 was only two lanes and have watched the progress of better roads from our VA house to our NC cottage. Is is so much safer now than it was 21 years ago but the biggest hazard has yet to be firmly addressed. Many years ago, we had the misfortune of being at our cottage when a mandatory evacuation was ordered of the Outer Banks due to a hurricane that was aiming at NC. It took us over six hours just to reach the Wright Brothers bridge, let alone get home to safety. It was very scary having some of our children in the car with us and being trapped on the northern beaches. The Mid Currituck Sound bridge is a safety necessity and MUST be built. There are even more houses on the northern beaches than there were when we faced that long wait to evacuate and I shudder to think how long it would take to reach safety now.

Please, please encourage the construction of this bridge with no delays. When we bought our NC house in 1989, we were told the bridge was 5 years away. Today, 21 years later, it is still years away but cannot wait any longer.

Marge Schechner
769 Lakeshore Court
Corolla, NC 27927
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Anthony J Schoino

Street Address: 104 Garnet Lane Apt./Suite #

City, State, Zip: Duck, NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and why?
MCB4 will provide for hurricane evacuation as well as traffic relief at all times.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
Decisions rest left to the engineers.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Option B - Cost but OK w/A.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Reversing Center lane. Addition of a lane removes vegetation and hurts character.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.
17' Carolina Skiff - Recreational
18' draft w/motor, 7' above water level.

Additional Comments:
Jennifer H. Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Project, Alternatives

Dear Ms. Harris:

I own a house and an adjacent lot in the Carolina Dunes subdivision in Duck, North Carolina. My properties are both on Duck Road. I have been following the debate over the Bridge since 1990. I believe the alternative to widen Duck Road (NC 12) would have a direct and seriously-negative impact on my investments, and I am strictly opposed to this option.

The only acceptable alternative in the current EIS Study is MCB4.

The proposed widening and/or modifications to Duck Road (NC 12) would not solve NCDOT’s stated objectives to improve traffic flow and travel time, and reduce hurricane evacuation time. Instead, widening or modifying NC 12 from Southern Shores northward would compromise businesses, homes, and the entire character and environment of Duck — indeed, it would involve the destruction of many properties.

I join my neighbors who have been expressing opposition to the proposal that modifying NC 12 is an acceptable alternative to building the Bridge — and we have been doing so for over twenty (20) years.

When is the State going to listen?

Thank you for considering my comments. We look forward to an acceptable and final closure to these debates soon!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Lorraine H. Schmidt
Lorraine_Schmidt@msn.com

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Rachel Schrotke

Street Address: 1205 Bismark Drive Apt./Suite No.
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

This is the 3rd time I have attended. What is the cost to the taxpayer for the large state? I live 1/4 mile from the beaches.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Yes by reversing turn lane. Fit the most, what have one evacuation a year does this justify the expense? Should we compound evacuation when the existing system works beautifully.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Peter Johnston's statement: I am not an environmental expert but I am a full-time resident who is going to be negatively impacted. This is a New Jersey -- Negative traffic, crime, overcrowding houses, shopping -- and sound too.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@northtoll.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Talking Notes on Mid-County Bridge

Good Evening I am Boc Schultz a six year resident here in Corolla and the President of Monterey Shores Home Owners Association.

I moved here and retired here because of I liked the Corolla Community, a community I have known since 1950. I am active in the community because I think we need to protect Corolla from the over development. I didn't move here because there was going to be a bridge built to the mainland in the future. When I built my house here in Corolla in the late 60's the Corolla Wild Horses were running free here in Corolla and I have photos of them on my lot. The Corolla wild horses are gone now and are protected on the northern beaches. This Bridge project will put pressure on the Corolla Wild Horses and eventually force them out of Corolla. Corolla is a unique place and it is the place beauty and the place that I decided was right for me and my family to live in for many years to come. However, this Bridge Project will change everything that I loved about this community and the reason I decided to live here which I will discuss with you now.

DEIS

This proposed Bridge Project will serve three main purposes all of which are questionable.

First of all - One of which last for 26 weekend days (13 summer weeks) out of 365 days in the year and that is to get tourist to Corolla 1 hour sooner... to do what??? We have no facilities/bath houses for them to use. Beach parking is extremely limited and most rentals homes are closed to guest until mid afternoon. The tourist now park on my lawn for two hours waiting to get into their rental house.

Next is the hurricane evacuation times - which will not be shortened because folks in Corolla are forced to use Shortcut Road to Elizabeth City which is just two lane and is also accepting traffic from Dare County via RT 168. So Shortcut Rd will be a bottleneck and not improve evacuation time. Besides with today's weather forecasts folks know a storm is coming 3 to 5 days in advance and that is plenty of time for orderly evacuation. Evacuation hasn't been a problem in the past. Why should I spend $20 to $30 to leave Corolla at the last minute when I could have left 4 days ago for free down RT 12. This doesn't pass the common sense test.

Main land folks in Currituck are not going to pay a high toll or maybe any toll to come to the beach and hour sooner in the summer based on the current economy. Folks in Currituck Co don't have extra money to spend on bridge tolls to get to the beach an hour earlier.

It will increase "Day Trippers" on the 4-wheel drive area which during the season is now at or near capacity and travel on the Beach Road is very dangerous in the summer. Just ask our 10 Wild Horse Beach Tour Companies that operate on the beach with 3 to 4 trips a day and each having as many as 10 vehicles for each tour. We have traffic injuries every year on the Beach Road due to too many people being on the beach with their vehicles and pets and not knowing where to park.
Traffic flow on "Beach Red Flag Days" and "Rain Days" will still travel Rt 12 and still back up in Duck due to the 25 MPH speed limit. Any time you reduce the speed limit by 10 MPH or more you will create a back-up on heavy traffic days.

Most folks in Corolla are not going to pay a toll to save an hour of travel time. The Bridge will have extremely limited use outside of 26 weekend days a year.

The Road Improvements will Divide many communities in Corolla:
Ocean Sands
Monteray Shores - it will require folks on the east side of Rt 12 to drive to get their mail and use the clubhouse facilities. I will no longer be able to walk across Rt and get my mail or visit the clubhouse. I like to bike in NS but that will also be difficult if not impossible.
Corolla Light
Corolla Bay - still being developed on both sides of Rt 12

Additional the Bridge and Divided Roadway will adversely affect rentals on the Sound Side (west of Rt 12), because it will be difficult for these folks to get to the beach...which is why they vacation here in Corolla. You will no longer be able to just walk to the beach and beach side parking is extremely limited which creates another problem. Residents will now have to deal with a divided highway 52 weeks a year so that the tourists can get around one or two weeks a year for 13 weeks. That is 39 weeks a year that this proposed highway will not be needed. So it is perceived to be needed 13 weeks and not need three time that amount or 39 weeks a year. This too does not pass the common sense test.

The cost of this project is extremely high to support the usage...26 days/year for the bridge and 13 weeks/year for the highways. There are many other projects that should be funded and required and very much needed such as the Bonner Bridge Project.

**BOTTOM LINE:**
The Bridge and 3 or 4 lane highway with median barriers on Rt 12 will create more problems that it will relieve.
Coming to Corolla will no longer be "A DAY AT THE BEACH" experience.
What you are proposing will destroy all the reasons why folks vacation here in Corolla.
This Entire Project is not necessary and should not be funded.

I am totally against building a Mid-County Currituck Bridge.

If the Bridge is built I will relocate to another community in North Carolina.

Bob Schultz
984 Sunset Crescent
Corolla NC 27926

---

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Hearing
Outer Banks Center for Wildlife Education
May 19, 2010

My name is Kathy Schultz. I am a resident of Corolla and live at 984 Sunset Crescent in the Monterey Shores subdivision. My family has vacationed on the Currituck Outer Banks since the late 1980's. My husband and I purchased a lot in Monterey Shores in 1996 because we liked the community and its amenities, and chose our lot because of its access to the sound and as well as its close proximity to the ocean. We built a house on that lot in 1999, and had that house in a rental program for five years before selling our home in Pennsylvania and relocating to Corolla in 2004. My opinion regarding the need for a mid-Currituck County bridge has changed over the years from a favorable opinion to a negative one. The minor convenience of shorter commutes to the Currituck mainland that the bridge might provide is far outweighed by the environmental damage to this fragile area and the high cost of building and maintaining a bridge. There are barely 500 permanent residents in the Corolla area—surely not enough residents to justify a bridge with a price tag of more than $800 million. The only true reason the bridge is being proposed is to shorten the trip for tourists over the 13 in-season weekends.

However, most tourists who travel to this area on vacation have adapted to the heavy traffic patterns. I volunteer here at the Wildlife Center weekly throughout the in-season and speak with many tourists. They travel through the night to arrive early Saturday or Sunday morning, or drive halfway on Friday and arrive in Corolla by early afternoon. When my family and friends visit we always suggest that they travel here on a weekday. Vacationers continue to come to the Outer Banks year after year despite the traffic. They come here because of the remote location and wide sandy uncrowded beaches. A bridge would result in overdevelopment of a very fragile barrier island and change the entire character of the Northern Banks and for this reason I am against the bridge.

I am concerned about how the proposed bridge would affect Corolla but I am especially concerned about how it would affect my own community. A mid-Currituck bridge with a C-1 terminus would negatively impact the Monterey Shores community and specifically our immediate neighborhood in the following ways.

1. **Severely Limits Access to Community Amenities** - A bridge and the proposed changes to Route 12 to provide access to the bridge would physically divide the ocean side section from the sound side area of Monterey Shores. We reside in the ocean side section of Monterey Shores comprised of a total of 34 lots—17 homes and 17 undeveloped lots. In order to access all Monterey Shores amenities (clubhouse, fitness center, playground, adult and kids pool, boat launch, walking paths) and our mailbox, residents and guests cross two lane Route 12 at the North Harbor View intersection. Throughout most of the year it is not a problem to walk across a two lane road. However with the increase in traffic from a bridge with a C-1 terminus at Corolla Bay, residents and guests will no longer be able to safely walk, bike, or push a stroller across a busy four lane highway.
Lowers Property Values—A bridge with a C.1 terminus would lower property values for all in the ocean side section, not only because it limits access to the amenities of our community but also because those homes on North Harbor View that back up to Route 12 would lose their easement and have a drainage ditch at the edge of a four lane highway in their backyard. In addition, widening the road would eliminate the trees along the roadside that buffer the road noise resulting in increased noise from traffic. When our neighbors sit in their hot tub on their rear deck instead of looking at the pine trees and live oaks that cover the dune behind their house, they will be able to watch the traffic on Route 12.

Traffic Hazard—There is also a safety issue regarding that portion of Route 12 just north of the North Harbor View Intersection. An S curve in that section of the road has been the scene of many accidents because drivers take the curve going too fast. The road curves dangerously in that area and in fact two motorcyclists were killed an accident there in April 2010. With a C.1 terminus the increased traffic on that section of Route 12 would only make a bad situation worse.

I am against building the bridge. The minor convenience of a shorter commute to the Currituck mainland is far outweighed by the environmental damage to this fragile area and the high cost of building and maintaining a bridge.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you today.

Kathy Schultz
964 Sunset Crescent
Corolla, NC 27927
252-457-6482
melscha@embarqmail.com
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Kevin G. Schwartz
Street Address: 114 Sandy Ridge Rd
City, State, Zip: Duck, NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submission is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

MCB4

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why? C2

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why? No preference

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing center lane – less costly

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered? No

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional Comments:

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Neither option would help because Virginia would close its border diverting all traffic to Elizabeth City on Shortcut Road which is only two lanes and traffic would back up there.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Migratory birds — Corrituck Sound is home to migratory birds (snow geese; tundra swans) over the winter months — bridge construction would decrease their numbers or eliminate them entirely.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Corolla Bay is not the only community that would be divided by a bridge with C-1 terminus Montross Shores which is a soundside community would be divided by a four lane highway.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Paul Schwartz
Street Address: 1414 Duck Road Apt./Suite #
City, State, Zip: Duck, NC

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the BR2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?
MCB4 Makes the most sense minimizes impact to route 12, most cost effective and environmentally friendly.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why? Decision as per project team.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design
Option A or B and why?
Option B, less expensive

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Reversing the center turn lane...most cost effective

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
Most concerned about widening road along route 12 in Duck. This area would be significantly negatively affected if it became necessary to take property to widen road, create drainage ditches in an area that is already adversely affected by heavy traffic volume and noise etc. Difficult to maintain sound and sight buffers if roads encroach further on homes. Markedly decrease property value.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.
17 foot Carolina Skiff Recreational use. Docked at home 1414 Duck Road.

Additional Comments:
Mostly concerned with widening of road in Duck. Everything else has been studied and seems obvious choice would be MCB4.
Thanks!
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Marcory Searing
Street Address: 700 New Hampshire Ave NW Apt/Suite No: 103
City, State, Zip: Washington DC 20037

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
MCB4

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
C2 - It disturbs less residential areas.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Option A

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Reverse the center lane.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:
I strongly support MCB4 - Town advance in Corolla and believe a hurricane evacuation route closer to that community is needed urgently.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: mid@curritucknc.com

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Sue Sedam

From: "Sue Sedam" <sedam@comcast.net>
To: <ncurrir@ncchamplin.org>
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 9:36 PM
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment

Miss Jennifer Harris,

Here are the answers to your questions. Please count this form as two because it is from Don and Sue Sedam.

Thanks

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MC32, MC54 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

Don: MC54 is my preference because it is less costly, less damage to the land, also, it keeps the smallness of the Duck area. With the amount of building and lots for sale in the four wheel drive area, a bridge will be necessary now or in the very near future.

Sue: I prefer MC54 which includes the bridge because there will be less road widening on Rt. 12. It will also keep Duck a quaint place.

Question 2: If you prefer MC32 or MC54, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Don: C-2 so a subdivision is not divided and the people traveling to other areas won't impact a subdivision as much and not cause a dangerous traffic situation through a development.

Sue: I prefer C2 as it is less disruptive to Corolla Bay subdivision. It would be more direct for people who want to shop.

Question 3: If you prefer MC32 or MC54, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Don: Option A because there is less intrusion on Kudgel property owners. It is also less expensive. Once the bridge is built, it will have less impact on the swamp.

Sue: Option A is my choice because it is less costly and less impact on the community.

Question 4: As a hurricane improvement, do you prefer adding a third lane outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during the evacuation and why?

Don: I want reversing the center lane because it is less expensive. Except on the weekends and tourist season, the roads seem very adequate. A smaller road would also mean less cost for future maintenance.

Sue: My definite preference is to reverse the center turn lane during an evacuation because it is less costly. Also, the area won't be overbuilt for a 4 month season.

Question 5: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck sound, please provide information regarding vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, etc.

Don: N/A

Sue: N/A

Question 6: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of a particular concern and Why? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the draft impact statements?

Don: My concern is to keep it as inexpensive as possible with as little impact to the surrounding land areas. It's easy to overlook by looking at the amount of building and lots for sale that a bridge is going to be a must. If you want to make yourself sick, go visit Ocean City, MD if you like roads.

Sue: My chief concern would be if nothing was done. This area of the Outer Banks is unique, quiet and beautiful. I would like people to be able to leave quickly, safely and orderly as possible in the event of a hurricane evacuation. With the increased housing and tourists we now have on the Outer Banks, it has become increasingly difficult to achieve this without another bridge to accommodate the additional people.

Thank you

Don and Sue Sedam

6/1/2010
I am writing to voice our support for the construction of the mid Currituck Bridge as soon as possible.

Connie and James Serafin
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: LINDA R. SHEARS
Street Address: 3003 N. CROATIAN Hwy Apt/Suite No.
City, State, Zip: KIL DEE HILL, NCD 27958

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB4

We need protected bike path along highway A-like they do in Portland, Oregon

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C1 - serves commercial businesses near in Currituck
need protection midway across causeway

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option B - toll road booths should be near US 158 - try not to disturb Aleppo people or people along the waterfront

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Add a third or fourth lane on US 158 or Currituck only

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Indian tomb area I am curious need to be evaluated

I do not want to see highway 10 in town or Currituck widened. Just add an auxiliary lane for bikes that could be used for hurricane evacuation.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its length, draft, and length of mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

I use Pshaw 25 trailerboat, 730 draft, height 35', move our farthest shore.

Additional comments:

I would like to see a hike on highway 12 improved especially in Duck & Corolla to do this immediately

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27696-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@northpark.com

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Bruce Keith Shaw
Street Address: 118 Sandy Ridge Apt./Suite #
City, State, Zip: Duck, NC 27517

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why? Traffic from Southern Shore to Covello on I-26.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
C1 - Macleod to Covello and I-26
C2 - Reconstruct Covello

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
No Preference

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why? Reverse the center turn lane during evacuation. Why? Cost

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
Build the Bridge!
Thank you for considering these comments!
Bruce Keith Shaw

Additional Comments: No boats.
From: John.Jsheehan@aol.com
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri May 14 21:20:36 2010
Subject: Bridge

As a landowner in Southern Shores since 1964 we have witnessed the steady increase in traffic due to the expansion of the tourist trade. In order for that flow of traffic to be advantageous both to the tourist (vacationer) and residents it is crucial that the bridge goes forward. We have been debating various traffic proposals for years. Now it is time to act.

John J Sheehan
301 N Dogwood Trail
Southern Shores, NC 27949

Name: David Shrader
Address: 273 North Dogwood Trail
City: Southern Shores
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: dave@windandstars.us
Comments: I strongly oppose the construction of this bridge. My reasons are: 1) The bridge will increase capacity and worsen the traffic problems over time. More capacity will encourage more use. Traffic jams on turnover days will be in both directions. 2) We cannot afford this. The nation is broke. The state not much better. New federal mandates and taxes are unbearable. We don’t need another huge boondoggle that will doubtless run over schedule and budget. 3) I have seen no clear need demonstrated for this expensive project. The support for this been drummed up by mindless cheerleading by our Town government and some other actors that have made useful idiots of naive well meaning people. Just trash the project. Save the money and help us preserve the community. Thank you.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: 
Street Address: 
City, State, Zip: 
Apartment Suite No: 

Comments: Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the BR2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

Faster, Safer Travel.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Closer to our home.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

A

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

3RD Lane

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Not at the moment

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Not a boater. Do not plan to rent

Additional comments:

Please build the bridge!

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27695-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.state.nc.us

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Julie Shrum
Street Address: 739 Ridge Point Dr
City, State, Zip: Corolla NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MC32, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

Faster & Safer Travel

If you prefer MC32 or MC34, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Closer to our Home

If you prefer MC32 or MC34, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reverting the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Adding a 3rd lane, because then emergency personnel need to get through they can use the center turn lane.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

not at the moment

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

not a boater & do not plan to rent

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P. E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27695-1578

Or E-mail: midcurricall@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Mike Strange

Street: Address: 739 Bridgeport Lane
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

☐ Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take an additional comment form.

Do you prefer the ER2, MC32, MC34, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

Access to Currituck Roads

If you prefer MC32 or MC34, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MC32 or MC34, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Yes

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments: If you build it, we will come.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1579 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1579

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.gov

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Paula Shrum
Street Address: 1305 Joseph Bay Court/Suite No.
City, State, Zip: Midlothian, VA 23114

[ ] Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 168 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

[3rd lane]

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

[ ] Not a boater.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1570 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27602-1578

Or E-mail: midlcomaf@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Ricky Smith
Street Address: 739 Ridge Point Dr Apt/Suite No:
Corolla, NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

Travel will be faster and safer.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Closer to our house.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Least impact on Aydelott, NC community.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reverting the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Yes. Sekel

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?


If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the Sound; and your phone number.


Additional comments:

This bridge would help everyone.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot Org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Richard Sherman, Sr.
Street Address: 739 Ridge Point Drive
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

Better safety for all. Improved access to Northern Corrido.
area versus overwhelming traffic problems.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Better access to the higher concentration of developed area (business + residential). 

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

In the west project on Nags Head, NC community.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Yes — better safety for all.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

N/A

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its length, draft, and location, (where you travel in the sound) and your phone number.

N/A

Additional comments:

Don't miss this wonderful opportunity for your area. Build the Bridge!

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1676
Or E-Mail: midcurrituck@cartolink.org

Your Comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: anne.sievers@asievers68@yahoo.com
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Dear Sirs:

As owners in the northern beach area of the Outer Banks, we are definitely in support of the bridge. As a matter of fact, we were told (by realtor) the bridge would probably be built within the year when we bought our house in 1997. Our main reasons are, of course, safety and travel time.

Thank you,
Anne Sievers

From: Richard Sigal [mailto:rbSigal62@embarqmail.com]
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

We have lived on the Outer Banks in Corolla for the past 5 years. I strongly support the bridge while my husband is lukewarm on the the project because of the changes it will bring, mainly in terms of traffic and security. In Florida and other coastal states, there are numerous bridges connecting the mainland to outer keys and islands, and I don't think you would find a coastal community quite so isolated as Corolla along the East Coast. A bridge in the northern Outer Banks would facilitate not only hurricane evacuations but better response times for medical emergencies and treatment. It would also provide better accessibility for mainland residents and vacationers coming from the north. Our key industry is tourism and the traffic woes will only continue to mount as developers continue to build. The county commissioners can't have it both ways -- lots of tax revenue from rentals and tourists but no easy access to OBX. Let's get our vacationers here in a safe, efficient way and allow year-round residents (many of whom are retirees) better access to medical facilities, an airport and other conveniences.

Beth Sigal
We are both in favor of building the bridge and prefer option MCB2

Thanks,

James Sillers
Linda Sillers

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: Harry Judson Skinner
Street Address: 112 Chip Court
City, State, Zip: Duck, NC 27949

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
NC Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?
I am in favor of the MCB4 proposal as it has the least impact taking into account cost and design considerations, travel benefits, natural resources and other impacts to the Duck, NC community.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
I am in favor of the C2 routing as it has the least impact to residential properties in the Corolla community.

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
I am in favor of option A as it would have the least impact to the environment and to the Aydlett community.

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
I am in favor of the option to reverse the center lane during an evacuation. This is for an occasional use and makes better use of taxpayer monies.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
I feel that the impacts to existing communities such as Aydlett and Duck and to the environment should receive a high priority and are of particular concern to me.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or
recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.
Not applicable

Additional Comments:
The need for access to and evacuation of Corolla should have been a concern long before the development of Corolla was allowed. The disruption to existing communities has been profound as was the loss of habitat for the wild horses that used to frequent Corolla. Now that the mess has been made, the residents of Corolla should be allowed to access their community without continued impacts to Duck and Southern Shores.

From: <linda@windstream.net>
Date: Fri, 28 May 2010 13:42:28 -0400
To: <midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org>
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

I own Saltwater #3 at 1475 Duck Road, Duck, NC 27949. I support MCB4 and leave the choice between options C1 and C2 to the project team. Thank you for your consideration.
From: Frances Slingluff [mailto:afrian2@msn.com]
Sent: Mon 5/3/2010 11:02 AM
To: midcurrituck@nturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-currituck Bridge project

Dear Ms Harris:

We wish to express our support for the Mid Currituck Bridge project, and particularly for option MCB4. That option seems to best address all of the issues that this proposed project brings with it. We think it is a very good solution.

We will attend one of the public meetings that are planned.

Thanks for your great work.

Al and Fran Slingluff
Duck, N C

From: Jane
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Wed May 05 14:12:05 2010
Subject: Bridge

My folks have owned a home in SouthernShores since 1947. I have been a full time resident since 1989.

I can’t wait until the mid-Currituck Sound bridge is started and completed. I hope I can take advantage of it before I pass on (I am now almost 82). The real advantage will be the decrease of traffic during the 4 summer months. Also, I have not been able to evacuate for hurricanes since before Isabel as the roads are too clogged - and I live ocean-front.

Please do all you can to expedite their construction.

        Sincerely,

        Jane M. Smallwood

        (Mrs. Gerald E. who now has Alzheimer’s and is of no help)

        8 Purple Martin Lane, Southern Shores, 27949
        tel: 252-261-2552
---Original Message---
From: hautevue@comcast.net [mailto:hautevue@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, April 07, 2010 12:45 PM
To: 
Subject: Alignment Landing for Mid-Currituck Bridge

As a resident of Corolla, I "vote" for landing the bridge at Option C2, south of Tim Buk II. The landing would enter the Outer Banks in the long-established commercial area and provide the maximum options for visitors arriving from the mainland.

They can visit their rental company to check in (numerous companies at Albacore and Ocean Trail). They can food shop (Food Lion and Harris Teeter) and shop for goodies (Tim Buk II shopping plaza, Food Lion Shopping Plaza, etc.) easily. Those headed south would not have an extra 1/2 - 1 mile drive along Ocean Trail to pass several residential subdivisions and enter the commercial space. Option C2 is the best choice.

Very truly yours,

Arthur Smith
907 Lighthouse Drive
PO Box 104
Corolla, NC 27927

From: Alicia McDonnell <obxmail@embarqmail.com>
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Wed Jun 02 15:04:35 2010
Subject: Fw: MID Currituck Bridge Safety Issues

Please read Mr. Smith's comments. They are very important.
Thank you...Alicia McDonnell

From: E.T. Smith
Sent: Tuesday, June 01, 2010 10:09 AM
To: Corolla Civic Association
Subject: Fwd: Mid Currituck Bridge Safety Issues

Susan Taylor,

I sent this email to your association previously. The Chief of the Corolla Volunteer Fire Department wrote a response disagreeing with my assessment. I responded, asking to meet with him to discuss my views. To date he has not contacted me. Since then I have been in contact with International Fire Fighters Association and the American Society of Industrial Engineers who have confirmed my assessment. Their conclusions are that, in its current design, the proposed Mid Currituck Bridge poses a clear and present danger to public safety, particularly first responders to a disaster. In addition, ASIE pointed out that it is highly probable that run off from heavy traffic will pollute the estuaries with gas and oil because our wetlands do not easily drain and these toxins, which will build up over time. These findings have reinforced my opposition to this project. I would like to do more to assist your association in stopping the bridge before it is built. Please let me know what I can do to help.

E.T. Smith

Begin forwarded message:

From: "E.T. Smith"
Date: April 9, 2010 11:51:54 AM EDT
To: Corolla Civic Association <corollacicassoc@embarqmail.com>
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Safety Issues

I am a new resident to OBX and have not been involved in any of the discussions about the Mid Currituck Bridge project. In reviewing the limited information I have found, I have serious concerns about the safety and long-term impact of this project on my new community.

Is it correct that the bridge will be one span that is four lanes, two in either direction? If a multiple vehicle accident occurs, the only way rescuers can work the scene is from either end. A fire within the accident could have catastrophic consequences, since the rescuers could not get their equipment directly to the fire. This is not the case with the Wright Bridge, because fire apparatus could muster on the second span. Also, the projected bridge location places it in shallow water, negating the possibility of deploying fireboats or other large watercraft.

How much funding has been set aside to increase the size and capability of the Corolla Fire Department? They do not have the equipment, the training, or the manpower to handle this major responsibility. If they need to respond to a major emergency on the new bridge, they will have to deploy all of their resources, leaving the community vulnerable. Calling for assistance from neighboring jurisdictions would be futile, since a major accident on the bridge would create gridlock on Route 12, the only artery available to rescue equipment.

Have there been any traffic management studies conducted to assess the impact of traffic trying to get onto and off of Route 12 from the surrounding communities?
If the projected increases in traffic for this area are correct, numerous intersections will require traffic lights, which will have to be synchronized. The intersections themselves will have to be improved, with lighting, crosswalks and crosswalk lights. These improvements alone could cost several million dollars.

Another issue that concerns me is the safety of the pedestrians, especially in the area that is projected to be increased into four lanes. Will pedestrian overpasses be constructed as part of this project? Has funding been set aside to create barriers to limit Jaywalking? How many pedestrian crossovers are planned within two miles north and south of the bridge? Clearly, this bridge project severs the community of Corolla in two, if the people on the bayside can’t get to the ocean safely because they can’t cross a four-lane highway.

E. T. Smith

Gentlemen,

The attached letter was sent to the US Army Corps of Engineers regarding the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. Your comments would be greatly appreciated.

E. T. Smith

1260 Clearwater Lane
Corolla, North Carolina 27927

June 1, 2010

Mr. Bill Biddlecome
US Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 1000
Washington, N.C. 27889

Dear Mr. Biddlecome,

I am a new resident to OBX and have not been involved in any of the discussions about the Mid Currituck Bridge project. In reviewing the limited information I have found, I have serious concerns about the safety and long-term impact of this project on my new community.

Is it correct that the bridge will be one span that is four lanes, two in either direction? If a multiple vehicle accident occurs, the only way rescuers can work the scene is from either end. A fire within the accident could have catastrophic consequences, since the rescuers could not get their equipment directly to the fire. This is not the case with the Wright Bridge, because fire apparatus could muster on the second span. Also, the projected bridge location places it in shallow water, negating the possibility of deploying fireboats or other large watercraft. I have been in contact with International Fire Fighters Association and the American Society of Industrial Engineers who have confirmed my
assessment. Their conclusions are that, in its current design, the proposed Mid Currituck Bridge poses a clear and present danger to public safety, particularly for first responders to a disaster.

Are there plans to increase the size and capability of the Corolla Fire Department? They do not have the equipment, the training, or the manpower to handle this major responsibility. If they need to respond to a major emergency on the new bridge, they will have to deploy all of their resources, leaving the community vulnerable. Calling for assistance from neighboring jurisdictions would be futile, since a major accident on the bridge would create gridlock on Route 12, the only artery available to rescue equipment.

Have there been any traffic management studies conducted to assess the impact of traffic trying to get onto and off of Route 12 from the surrounding communities? If the projected usage of the bridge is correct, numerous intersections will require traffic lights, which will have to be synchronized. The intersections themselves will have to be improved, with lighting, crosswalks and crosswalk lights. I do not believe that anyone has addressed the safety of the pedestrians, especially in the area that is to be increased to four lanes. Will pedestrian overpasses be constructed as part of this project? Has funding been set aside to create barriers to limit Jaywalking? How many pedestrian crossovers are planned within two miles north and south of the bridge? Will the federal government pay for these improvements since neither North Carolina nor Currituck County have allocated funds? Clearly, this bridge project severs the community of Corolla in two, if the people on the bayside can't get to the ocean safely because they can't cross a four-lane highway.

While numerous comments and articles have been published regarding the environmental impact of this project, it is important to note that the American Society for Industrial Engineers pointed out that it is highly probable that run off from heavy traffic will pollute the estuaries with gas and oil because our wetlands do not easily drain and these toxins, which will build up over time.

Irrespective of the environmental and social issues this project raises for Corolla and the Outer Banks, I am most concerned with the way it appears to have been presented without full consideration of obvious life safety issues. As a retired Washington, DC law enforcement officer with nearly 45 years of experience in disaster planning, my primary regard is the welfare of the first responders and their ability to safely and effectively complete their mission.

Respectfully,

Eugene T. Smith
From: J. Charles Smith [mailto:jcharles.smith@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 05, 2010 9:48 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncctumpike.org
Cc: Paul Kapinos; Janice Smith (H)
Subject: Draft EIS Study alternatives

We own a second home in Southern Shores, where we will be retiring in the near future. Thank you for the very clear presentation of the options in the flyer. After studying them carefully, I would like to register my support in favor of MCB4. Access to the upper end of the Outer Banks is provided without massive disruption to the fragile local ecosystem along the entire length of the island. If time shows that additional upgrades are needed to the infrastructure in the future, they can be considered as the need arises. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

J. Charles Smith
UNW Executive Director
2004 Lakebreeze Way
Reston, VA 20191
p: 703.860.5160
f: 703.860.1544
e: jcharles.smith@comcast.net
w: www.unw.org

From: "Carl M. Smolka" <carl.smolka@verizon.net>
Date: Fri, 28 May 2010 10:49:44 -0400
To: <midcurrituck@ncctumpike.org>
Subject: Comments on mid Currituck bridge alternatives

My response to the questions:
Q1 – I prefer alternative MCB4
Q2 – Alternative C2 would minimize impact on residential area
Q3 – Option B because of cost
Q4 – Reversing lanes
Q5 – n/a
Q6 – I support minimal removal of vegetation

Carl M. Smolka
Duck, N.C.

Dr. Carl M Smolka
University of Phoenix Graduate School of Business
Patuxent/Potomac Trout Unlimited
Project Healing Waters

Home: 301 929 1365
Cell: 240 994 0093
Fax: 301 929 3343
From: Kennethdsnider@aol.com
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 10:07 AM
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge

Jennifer Harris, PE, NCTA

Mss. Harris, my name is Kenneth D. Snider. My wife and I are part year residents of Corolla’s, Monterey Shores PUD. I’d like to make a comment regarding the “C1” option for MCB2 or MCB4.

Monteray Shores in general must cross Rt. 12 going east to reach the beach. The 4 lane plan will make this a thrilling and dangerous crossing without a light or crossing bridge. North Harbor View (NHV) in Monterey Shores has the opposite problem. Residents and visitors must cross Rt. 12 going west to access the Monterey Shores facilities (club house, pool, tennis, mail boxes, etc.). The crossing at this point is a double blind curve. It will be impossible to cross four lanes with increased traffic flow without loss of life or limb.

PB engineers comment that this should not be a problem as the posted speed limit will be 35 mph. In my opinion this will help but 35 mph is not enforceable 24-7 and we still have the problem of increased traffic flow. As a result, property values for the 35 owners on NHV will plummet to pennies on the dollar. This may be considered as the price of progress … however when you are doing the paying, it becomes very personal. The “C1” option must consider the direct impact to Monterey Shores and NHV in particular. I would challenge you to put yourself and your family into 971 NHV at it’s current accessed value. I guarantee you will quickly understand my concern.

Thanks for the opportunity to respond via e-mail. Good luck on your recommendations … I know it will not be easy!

Ken and Judy Snider
971 North Harbor View,
PO Box 33
Corolla, NC 27927
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I prefer reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation because this method has worked well in the past.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:

The people who are pushing for the bridge are doing so for their own selfish interests and benefit.
Roadside developments and the privilidge of Dare County.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reversing center lane = more cost effective.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

- Ability to cross RT 12 (US Harbor View) with increased traffic flow and/or on ramps
- Optical road at this junction is a “downward curve and very difficult to cross.”

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or email: midcurrituck@ntturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

From: Bob Sohval [mailto:bob.sohval@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 2:00 PM
To: midcurrituck@ntturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge - Supporting MCB4

As a home owner in Corolla, NC, I would like to voice my support for MCB4. This will significantly enhance access to Corolla from the mainland while minimally impacting the existing community.

Bob Sohval
1254 Lakeside Drive
Corolla, NC
From: soreyracng@aol.com
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Fri May 14 16:39:32 2010
Subject: MID BRIDGE

YUP, ONE HUNDRED PERCENT IN SUPPORT IF IT. BEN SOREY

From: George Southard [mailto:southard@earthlink.net]
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Sunday, May 02, 2010 6:19 PM
Subject: Public Comment

We, George Lee Southard and Marilyn E. Southard property owners and summer residents at 843 Lighthouse Drive, Corolla, NC 27927 and winter residents at 444 Lighthouse Way, Sanibel, Florida 33957, a) endorse your recommended alternative MCB4 which includes the construction of a bridge across Currituck Sound, (b) we have no opinion on the Maple Swamp Crossing, deferring to the local residents there, (c) but do endorse the C2 landing south of Albacore Street in Corolla. Well thought out alternatives.

Lee and Marilyn Southard
252 453 8892
239 472 0720
From: Denise Spears [mailto:ellie389@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2010 5:18 PM
To: midcurrutuck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: OBX bridge

As a homeowner in the southern shores area, I would be relieved to see option MCB4 put in place. The endless stream of vacationers entering and exiting on transition days is very sad. The bridge would cut travel time, make it a more pleasant experience for all the people who vacation here and make it more appetizing for others to start coming. If I were a vacationer, this situation as it now stands would persuade me to look elsewhere for a vacation spot. Peace of mind that there are more exit routes during hurricane season is another reason to build the bridge.

Please record this email as a vote for MCB4.

From: Lee@trustils.com [mailto:Lee@trustils.com]  Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 10:28 AM  To: midcurrutuck@ncturnpike.org  Subject: Midcurrutuck Bridge

As a property tax payer, I support the bridge!

Have a wonderfully blessed day!

Lee Spencer
Branch Manager
1st Metropolitan Mortgage
410-544-1118 direct
443-690-8409 cell
866-887-8606 fax
"By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another"
John 13:35

May God Bless America!
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Bernard Spirito
Street Address: 886 Marsh Landing
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
If there absolutely has to be something than only the ER2, the bridge is a convenience bridge that will be damaging
to our fragile environment; building a bridge will severely impede the ability to navigate these waters for
recreational fishing and crabbing. And it is motivated by Real Estate developers, Tourists and Dare County!

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
NO BRIDGE

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
NO BRIDGE

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation land to US 158 or reversing the center
If this is truly a concern of the local people, it is for tourists and they feel uncomfortable than perhaps they need
to be a tourist elsewhere.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of
impact to our fragile environment; building a bridge will severely impede the ability to navigate these waters for
recreational fishing and crabbing. And the runoff will destroy our Wetlands and can cause flooding to area as
that are not considered

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use
We use a Carolina Skiff for recreational, fishing and crabbing.

Additional comments:
I have a concern regarding the “Clean Water Act (CWA), 1948 As Amended 1966, 1972, Section 10 Rivers And Harbors Act (RHA), 1899”; building a bridge will severely impede the ability to navigate these waters for recreational fishing and crabbing which is a traditional way of life in these waters and it threatens Interstate Commerce.

The legislative origins of the Department of the Army regulatory program are the Rivers and Harbors Acts of 1890 and 1899. Various sections establish
permit requirements to prevent unauthorized obstruction or alteration of any navigable water of the United States. The most frequently exercised authority
is contained in Section 10 (33 U.S.C. 403), which covers construction, excavation, or deposition of materials in, over, or under such waters, or any work
which would affect the course, location, condition or capacity of those waters. Actions requiring Section 10 permits include structures (e.g., piers, wharfs,
breakwaters, bulkheads, jetties, weirs, transmission lines) and work such as dredging or disposal of dredged material, or excavation, filling or other
modifications to the navigable waters of the United States. The Coast Guard also has responsibility for permitting the erection or modification of bridges
over navigable waters of the U.S.

In 1972, amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act added what is commonly called Section 404 authority (33 U.S.C. 1344) to the regulatory
program. The Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to issue permits, after notice and opportunity for public hearings,
for the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. The Federal Water Pollution Act was amended and given the common name
of the Clean Water Act.

Currituck Sound is a protected inlet of the Atlantic Ocean in northeastern part of North Carolina. Thirty miles N-S and 3–8 miles wide, this shallow, island-
filled sound is separated from the ocean by Bodie Island, part of the Outer Banks. On the NE, it joins Back Bay in Virginia Beach, Virginia, and a fork on
the NW leads to the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal, a part of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway that connects the sound to Hampton Roads and
Chesapeake Bay. It joins A-Berne’s Sound on the South. Currituck County’s Mackay Island and Currituck National Wildlife Refuge bordering the sound
are winter habitats on the Atlantic Flyway. An area of barrier beaches, it is also noted for its duck and goose hunting.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Currituck sound is among the bodies of water that are included in the Waterways forming and crossings of the Atlantic Intracoastal.
Dear Ms. Harris,

Thank you for providing people the opportunity to submit concerns on the Mid-County Bridge Project for Currituck Sound.

My first choice for this project is ER-2 - No bridge. In addition to my wanting to preserve Aydlett as the tranquil community where people can walk and children can ride their bikes in a safe environment, I want to preserve wetlands and sand strips on the outer banks. Prior to 1980, sand hills and wetlands dominated the outer banks from Currituck Club to Corolla. In thirty years, all of the sand hills have been flattened and covered by development; wetlands continue to give way to development. For these reasons and the following, I support ER-2:

- Increased traffic is for essentially twelve weeks of the peak tourist season and only Thursday-Sunday of those weeks.
- Just as the bridge would decrease southbound traffic, it would also decrease business for family owned restaurants, filling stations, seasonal fruit and vegetable stands, etc. in the south end of the county.
- Many people go to Corolla because they enjoy the tranquillity and quaintness of the communities.
- Several lines used for both recreation and livelihood for those who hunt and/or guide for migratory birds will be displaced by the bridge.
- Watermen who crab or net fish will possibly be negatively impacted at least during the construction of the bridge.
- To consider the bridge an asset for evacuation is a stretch. Since the bridge will be south of Outerbanks Bridge, all traffic from the Wright Memorial Bridge and the proposed Mid-County Bridge will merge onto NC 12 at the point the proposed bridge merges with NC 12. With current technology, we have ample time to provide a safe evacuation process. The problem is those people who refuse to follow the directions. Neither do we need an additional lane for evacuation. Turning the turn lane into an evacuation lane will be adequate for those who listen and respond.

The bridge will change all of that for both the outer banks and the mainland. Finally, with a state economy that claims it cannot provide an appropriate education at the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary institutions to spend $800 million or a billion dollars on a bridge for seasonal impact on the flow of traffic seems to me to make us poor stewards of available funds or other private or the $15 million state funds to be leased annually by the state for the next forty years.

Having said that, yet believing that the bridge is inevitable, NC 12/Corolla is the route that I believe would best serve both communities...Corolla and Aydlett. Today, based on your disclaimer in MID-CURRITUCK BRIDGE STUDY CITIZENS SUMMARY on page 10 under the heading Floodplains, I cannot support taking out the existing portion of Aydlett Road, that runs through the Maple Swamp until more information can be supplied to determine the impact of deleting this road and creating another road bed to the north of the existing road.

Last week my husband and I drove over to Corolla to locate the two sites being considered for funding the bridge in Corolla. If a bridge prevails, we support the NC 12/Corolla site for Corolla for the following reasons:

- The C1 landing would be straight across from its beginning in Aydlett and would be the most cost effective and least intrusive bridge.
- C1 will have the least negative impact on wetlands.
- Although the Corolla Bay site would be negatively impacted, this site is currently an undeveloped project (1 seashore house and 1 other house under construction with additional site work in progress). This site is far enough south of the Whitehead Heritage Park area that this property would not be affected. Yet, those people who want to make a day trip to Heritage Park and the Lighthouse could do so with a north turn and a very short drive. Those drivers going south would also have access to shops, eateries, grocery stores, and perhaps even a recreation stretch between leaving the bridge and arriving at their destination.

The major problems we see with the C2 crossing are as follows:

- The cost is greater than C1.
- More wetland will be lost and/or disrupted. We walked down the walkway through the marshland to Kitty Hawk Water Sports, the point of entry for the C2 span. It must be near the oyster marsh we saw on our trek from our attention and, yet, it was good to realize it had not been pushed from its habitat. It was also sad to realize that this point of marsh will be negatively impacted or destroyed if C2 is selected. (Your plan states that you will bridge the marsh; however, you will not have to drive piles, etc. for support of the bridge).
- While vehicular oil and other residue that will wash off the bridge and into the ester of Currituck Sound will have a negative impact on the Sound, it will have a more damaging impact on the wetlands under the bridge as it makes the turn over the wetland to connect with NC 12.
- More small businesses that provide major employment will be pushed out of business (Kitty Hawk Water Sports - 17 employees; Charter Boat with Corolla Bait & Tackle, Inc.; Pelegrino Grill Room - 20 employees; Bumper Cars 10-20 employees; none - a few).
- In addition, since the C2 crossing would be 1 mile south of Avalon Place, the businesses in the area of Food Lion and Tim-Buck II will be negatively impacted because they will be bypassed by the Mid-County Bridge.

For either configuration of the bridge, other unresolved questions include: Will people be able to ride bicycles across the bridge? Will local people and/or people who live on one side of the bridge but walk on the other side be allowed a reduced rate pass similar to the Smart Tag to the County for Virginia, as well as to the State of Virginia? In all fairness, I must say that another part of our mission last week was to determine where C1 and C2 were in relation to our mainline home on Currituck Sound. In the fifty-two years we have lived here, we look forward, almost every morning, to watching the sun pop over the marsh and reflect on the waters of Currituck Sound and to understand the relationship between the rotation of the earth and the position of the rising sun. C1 would be less intrusive to this natural phenomenon not just for us, but all of us in the Aydlett and Poplar Branch area who live on the mainland side of the Currituck Sound.
From: Bill Stanton
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Sent: Thursday, June 03, 2010 4:01 PM
Subject: Bridge to OBX

To the Turnpike Authority,

As a property owner on the Outer Banks for 30 years, my wife and I have watched the traffic increase causing congestion and delays along the entire route 12. Weekends are unbelievable making beach crossings in Southern Shores impossible with the exception of the few cross lights.

I strongly support the new bridge and here are a few reasons why:

1) noise and pollution resulting from bumper to bumper traffic on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays will be reduced significantly
2) beach access and crossings will be safer and easier
3) safer and more rapid evacuation will now be possible
4) improved residential and business property values along route 12
5) safer travel for emergency vehicles during weekend peak travel periods
6) the pace and volume of traffic will return to more normal levels for an older 2 lane road designed to accommodate light to moderate traffic

Please count on our support for the new and much needed new bridge across the Currituck Sound!

William M. & Jane N. Stanton
124 Otter Slide Lane
Chicahauk, Southern Shores, NC
252-261-1299
Dear Ms Harris,

I have reviewed the letter dated 4/23/2010 from the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC) re TIFIA funding for the Mid Currituck Bridge Project and would like to briefly comment re same.

Initially, as a retired member of the Bars of the State of North Carolina and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania I was dismayed at the sloppy and inaccurate nature of the letter itself. Contrary to what is stated on pages 1-3 of letter, the Currituck Outer Banks are not located on a "barrier island" but rather on a peninsula. Likewise, the primary purpose of the bridge is not to shorten tourist trips to "Bodie Island" nor do the "toll revenues for this bridge depend on massive growth in the number of hotels and vacation rentals on Bodie Island" (page 2). It is painfully obvious that SELC needs a geography lesson (perhaps just check the color of the lighthouses) or more likely, it did a poor "cut and paste" job from another letter/brief they submitted in opposition to another project (most likely the short Bonner Bridge alternative). In either event it is disheartening to see such carelessness in a matter of such importance.

The basic arguments advanced in the SELC letter seem to ignore the well detailed purpose and need section of the DEIS and the importance of the bridge for the reasons stated therein. The primary emphasis of the SELC letter seems to be to plead the case for replacing the Bonner Bridge as soon as possible. While we do not disagree that the Bonner Bridge needs replacing, the Mid Currituck Bridge must be judged on the merits and not in comparison to other projects. The arguments that the MCB will increase development in housing and infrastructure and negatively impact the environment ignore the realities of the explosive growth in the Currituck Outer Banks since 1986 (when the road opened to public use)---all without a bridge and without any hope for one during most of that time. Substantial development is the reality today—complete with 23 BR,27 bath houses and recent approval for a 100 room hotel/32 condominium project. At worst the bridge will incrementally increase development in the short run only.

While the SELC letter states that the Turnpike Authority's Letter of Interest is based on an "unrealistic" assessment of how the bridge would induce traffic (page2) I respectfully suggest that SELC's position is unrealistic—it needs to visit the area and do a reality check itself. As a resident of Sanderling north of the village of Duck, I have personally observed the traffic patterns in the area over the past 30 years—-they are unmistakable and clearly support the conclusion that the bridge will significantly improve regional traffic flow. The heavy seasonal traffic flow north/south into/out of the Currituck Outer Banks would clearly be alleviated by the bridge—why would anyone go 30-40 plus miles out of their way to reach their vacation destination—and endure bumper to bumper traffic to do so. There is also a steady flow of business traffic to service the existing homes, businesses, and construction activities in the Currituck Outer Banks—SELC should stand out on the Duck Rd and watch the service trucks go up and down the road. Many of those in the workforce live on the Currituck mainland—SELC should ask them if they would like to save 30-45 minutes each day, every day, to reduce their gasoline bills significantly and be able to spend significantly less road time and more work time each day. The availability of services on the Currituck mainland will also increase with the bridge and accessibility to existing and future services will be greatly improved. Likewise access to the many lower Currituck mainland businesses will be facilitated.

Finally, hurricane evacuation will be greatly facilitated by the bridge. Perhaps SELC would like to experience the frustration and concern of sitting for hours trying to get off the peninsula during a mandatory evacuation—gas running low, panic stricken kids in the car, moving a mile in about an hour etc... To experience the thrill of it all, why not have the SELC types dropped into the Currituck Outer Banks just before an evacuation is called for. When the order to evacuate is given, take them to the Dare/Currituck line and make those on the Currituck Outer Banks side of the line wait until the Southern Shores and Duck residents and visitors are evacuated before opening the road to them—my sense is that SELC will quickly sing a different tune about the bridge--- and so will the minority of bridge opponents who recently spoke at the public hearing in Corolla.

Thank you for considering these comments and many thanks to the Turnpike Authority for its excellent work to date in bringing the project to this point after so many years of frustration and disappointment. we strongly support recommended alternative MCB 4 and Option A on the mainland

Allan and Donna Starr
106 Gannet Cove—Sanderling
Duck NC 27949
To Whom It May Concern:

My family of six, comprising three generations, enjoys a yearly trip to Duck, NC. We are very much in favor of the proposed bridge across the northern Currituck Sound. Additionally, we will cheerfully pay a toll for the use of such a bridge. I hope the safety aspects of the bridge are being stressed to its opponents. During the vacation season, it would seem that it would enhance the safety of residents and visitors alike to have an additional form of egress from the Outer Banks.

Anne Strider
Charles Town, WV
Dear Jennifer,

Contrary to the opinion of those opposed to building a bridge, there is a large group of residence that do favor a bridge for a number of reasons, i.e. quicker access to medical facilities in VA since the medical facilities on the Outer Banks are not adequate, easier access to County Government facilities and evacuation.

A number of owners did not go to the hearing because we knew the nay sayers would be there loud and strong.

The one area that I do not agree with is a 4 lane road. I believe a 3 lane (center for turning) would be sufficient.

Sincerely,

Carole & Fred Stumpf
1259 Crystal Lake Ct
Corolla, NC 27927
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: ROGER C. SULLIVAN
Street Address: 314 HEMPHILL AVE Apt/Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: SOUTHERN SHORES, NC 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to the project. Please use the space below to write your
comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional
comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
MCB4 - best meets objectives while minimizing cost to the state and
minimizes impact on the communities.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
no preference - let project team/feedback decide.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Option A, while B would save some money by moving Audubon Road and positioning toll booths on the sound
would have negative impacts on the community.

5/31/2010
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 overcoming the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Add a third reverse center lane - We don't need any more pavement, only needed for hurricane evacuation.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

In all cases of road widening, recommendation is for infiltration strips (bluffs) for storm water run off. An opposed to ditches as there would be more vegetation removal, standing water (humidity), insects, and roads would end up in polt. If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location, where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Thank you for looking at all impacts (noise, wildlife, etc.) in your evaluation. I reviewed the report online, and taking into account impact on community in reading at your recommendation.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1574 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1574

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ntturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

-----Original Message-----
From: larry and louise [mailto:sulliv@verizon.net]
Sent: Saturday, May 01, 2010 9:48 AM
To: midcurrituck@ntturnpike.org
Subject: mid-Currituck Bridge Project

Dear Ms. Harris

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Currituck Bridge. My husband and I own a house in Duck. I think that the NC84 option is by far the best. I am very opposed to widening Rt. 12. I think that widening that road would be terrible, and would destroy the towns of Duck and Southern Shores.

Sincerely, Louise Sullivan
Questions posed in the DEIS are in bold and are preceded with the section numbers where they can be found. Text in italics are the answers given by the NCTA. Text other than questions posed by DEIS in bold are my responses to their answers.

While all of the detailed study alternatives are near existing road or utility corridors and are under the influence of associated edge effects, these alternatives would amplify those effects. This would be especially detrimental to maritime wildlife habitat on the Outer Banks, where existing habitat is already extremely sparse and fragmented. MCB2 and MCB4 would introduce noise disturbance to Maple Swamp. With ER2, the road widening portions of MCB2 and MCB4, and the Maple Swamp fill with mainland approach road Option B, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and avian species would all continue to be roadkill concerns. Because MCB2 and MCB4 include a new bridge structure across Maple Swamp and Currituck Sound, avian species would be a probable new roadkill concern.

3.3.4 How would aquatic wildlife be affected?

Construction operations could result in temporary impacts. Aquatic impacts would be the greatest with MCB2 and MCB4 because they include the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

3.3.4.1 Aquatic Wildlife

Microinvertebrate populations of Currituck Sound are composed primarily of burrowing amphipods near the shore, but there is a more diverse population in deeper areas. Currituck Sound has long been recognized as a nationally important area for freshwater recreational fishing. The decline of freshwater fisheries in Currituck Sound has been attributed to the increase in salinity and decrease in SAV during the 1980s. Commercial fishing activities with haul seiners and gill nets have also decreased since the 1960s (Bannister et al., 1978). Currituck Sound is an important nursery area for migratory and resident fish. In the past, nursery areas for two anadromous fish species, the blueback herring and alewife, were known to occur within Currituck Sound. Nursery areas for these species, including Whale Head Bay and Sander’s Bay, were identified in the sound from 1940 to 1983. The status of the populations of these two species was identified as declining in the sound during 1980 (Copeeland and Gray, 1989), and these areas are no longer officially recognized as anadromous fish spawning areas or primary nursery areas.

3.3.4.2 Submerged Aquatic Vegetation

The shallow waters (less than 6 feet deep) of Currituck Sound provide habitat for
extensive beds of SAV. These SAV communities are included within the open water areas of Currituck Sound. For many juvenile and adult fish, the structural complexity of SAV habitat provides refuge from predators. These habitats are also rich in invertebrates and, therefore, serve as important foraging areas. Other SAV roles include stabilizing sediment, nutrient cycling, reducing wave energy, and providing organic matter that supports complex food webs (NCWRC, 2005). For these reasons, SAV communities are considered Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC) for several managed fish species. The distribution and composition of SAV communities are influenced by several factors; among the most important factors are light, salinity, wave action, and nutrient levels.

3.3.4.3 Water Habitat Impacts

Impacts on aquatic communities are listed in Table 3-9 to Table 3-8. Fill, pile placement, and clearing would result directly in the permanent loss of or alteration of aquatic habitat within the project area, as indicated in Table 3-5 and Table 3-4. Aquatic impacts would be the greatest with MCB2 and MCB4 because they include a Mid-Currituck Bridge. Impacts would result primarily from shading. Shading would affect 14.5 to 17.8 acres of aquatic bottoms (known, probable, and potential SAV habitat in less than 6 feet of water) with MCB2 and MCB4 and 0.1 acre with ER2. Bridge foundations would affect 4.3 to 5.5 acres of SAV. Altered light levels and the introduction of silt as a hard substrate previously unavailable in the area would result in changes to the existing food web structure. Decreased autotrophic productivity (phytoplankton and aquatic vegetation) resulting from lower light levels would result in a decreased abundance of aquatic vegetation and heterotrophic grazers, and predators (zooplankton, benthic invertebrates, and fish).

Overall, ER2 and the widening components of the detailed study alternatives would result in minor impacts to aquatic habitat. Runoff from active construction areas could result in temporary increases in turbidity, siltation, and sedimentation in aquatic habitat areas, but these affects are expected to be minimal and cease after revegetation.

3.3.4.4 Impacts from Noise, Turbulence, and Siltation

At the ecosystem level, turbidity would result in a reduction in ecosystem productivity (i.e., ability of the system to produce and export energy) and nursery value by eliminating organisms that cannot readily move, and displacing mobile organisms. For individual organisms, turbidity can impair visual predation success, predator avoidance, and oxygen uptake by clogging respiratory structures. Siltation could generate increased water column turbidity, as well as another benthic vegetation and animal communities. These impacts likely would be prolonged because of poor water circulation in the sound.

3.3.4 What impacts would occur to waters under the jurisdiction of the US Army Corps of Engineers?

All detailed study alternatives would result in placing fill in waters under the jurisdiction of the USACE. Fill in jurisdictional areas would be the least for ER2 and MCB2/A/C2. The largest area of fill in jurisdictional areas would be with MCB2/B and MCB4/B, which include crossing Maple Swamp on fill. Clearing of jurisdictional areas would be greatest with MCB2 and MCB4 because of the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

Table 3-9 and Table 3-10 indicate that:

- Fill in wetlands would be the least for ER2.
- Fill in wetlands would be substantially higher with MCB2/B and MCB4/B, which would include fill in Maple Swamp instead of the clearing that would occur under Option A in the swamp.
- Clearing of wetlands would be greatest with MCB2 and MCB4 because of the inclusion of a Mid-Currituck Bridge.

ER2 would result in a minimal effect (less than 1 acre of impacts) on CAMA resources.

Shading associated with the Mid-Currituck Bridge would be the greatest impact to SAV or potential SAV (water depths less than 5 feet) at 4.2 to 5.5 acres and 10.2 to 12.3 acres, respectively. The greater impact to SAV and potential SAV would be with the C2 bridge corridor.

Permanent loss or alteration of palustrine emergent and forested areas, SAV, intertidal flats, and tidal freshwater aquatic beds would result directly from shading and pile placement with the bridge structure associated with MCB2 and MCB4.

In addition, ER2 and MCB2 would involve permanent loss of palustrine emergent and forested areas through construction of permanent drainage easements along NC 12, and also would result in increased shading of Jean Gute Creek (a PNA and probable SAV habitat). MCB4 would also result in permanent shading.

3.3.4.5 Endangered Species Act Candidate Species

Seven species occurring in North Carolina are identified by the USFWS as "candidate" species (USFWS, 2009). These species are not protected by federal law, but may be elevated to listed status in the near future. Information on candidate species potentially included in the project area is included in the Natural Resources Technical Report (C2R, Incorporated, 2009).

3.4 How would traffic noise levels change?

Each of the detailed study alternatives would cause some increased noise. Mitigation approach would be Option A and Option B with MCB2 and MCB4 would have similar noise impacts. Noise abatement measures would not be cost-effective at sites on the Currituck County mainland. Noise mitigation would be cost-effective at some locations on the Outer Banks. However, the visual impact and impacts of barriers on drainage and flooding on the Outer Banks would be substantial.

3.4.1 Existing and Predicted Noise Levels

With MCB2/B and MCB4/B, two noise analyses were conducted in Aydlett, one with the
toll plaza and one without the toll plaza. After 2023, it is expected that all tolls would be collected electronically with no need for vehicles to stop at a toll plaza.

3.4.4 How would potential accelerated sea level rise resulting from climate change affect long-term use of the detailed study alternatives?

Existing roads would be affected by sea level rise. A Mid-Currituck Bridge would be a useful asset in reducing the impact of sea level rise resulting from climate change on the project area’s road system. Under all sea level rise scenarios considered, NC 12 would be broken by inundation near the Currituck/Bare County line. The entire barrier island would be inundated at this location, creating a breach in the island. Thus, the bridge would become the only route on and off the Currituck County Outer Banks, ER2 and the road improvements associated with MCB2 and MCB4 would suffer the same levels of inundation and impact from the storm surge as the existing roads that they improve.

BRIDGE THAT IF WHEN IT BECOMES NECESSARY.

3.4.5 How would visual quality be changed?

Primary visual impacts would be the introduction of the Mid-Currituck Bridge features into views along US 158 and in Aydelott (including views of Currituck Sound) with MCB2 and MCB4. On the Outer Banks, a C1 bridge termi nates would adversely affect views of Currituck Sound from the Corolla Bay subdivision and, to a lesser extent, the northern part of Pea Island. A C2 bridge feature would adversely affect views from the outdoor recreation area at TimBuck II.

3.4.5.2 Visual Impacts

No changes to the visual features of the project area would occur with the No-Build Alternative.

On the mainland with MCB2 and MCB4, the existing landscape would be substantially changed with the introduction of the US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge interchange along US 158. Existing agricultural features would be lost, and new vertical elements would be introduced. Homes and businesses in this area would be relocated. One home close to Aydelott Road would remain with Option A only, and the interchange would be a notable presence and an adverse impact. The interchange is illustrated on Figure 2-8. Option B would displace this home.

With Option A, as the Mid-Currituck Bridge would enter Aydelott from Maple Swamp, it would transition to an eastern barn. The barn would be noticeable from homes south of the barn, and it would replace existing woods. Unless the trees are cut down by the property owners as timber, trees would obscure the barn from homes to the north.

With Option B, the proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge approach corridor would enter Aydelott near the existing grade elevation. It would include a toll plaza and an elevated realignment of Narrow Shore Road to take it over the toll plaza. These features would replace existing views within the community from both north and south of the toll plaza. Drivers on the relocated Narrow Shore Road would have views of the beach yards of homes. The toll plaza would be lighted at night, and those lights would be seen by homes to the south. The nighttime lighting of the toll plaza was expected as a concern by citizens from Aydelott, particularly as it relates to star gazing hobbyists who recognize Aydelott as an uncommon dark sky location.

**No changes to visual quality in the project area would occur with the No-Build Alternative.**

3.4.7.1 Hydraulic Impacts to Floodplain

The fill in Maple Swamp associated with MCB2/B and MCB4/B, however, could obstruct or alter flood flows and elevations and would be considered by Currituck County to be a significant alteration to a water course. MCB2/B and MCB4/B would involve:

- 2.9 acres of fill associated with the west side of the US 158 interchange.
- 10.2 acres of fill associated with the proposed 603 in Maple Swamp.
- 0.6 acre of fill at the C1 Outer Banks terminus of the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

ER2 would not involve a significant encroachment on the 100-year floodplain as defined in Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 650, Subpart A (location and Hydraulic Design of Encroachments on Floodplains). MCB2/B and MCB4/B would involve a significant encroachment since they would be considered significant alteration to a water course by
Transportation Facility Interruption

Currituck and Dare counties recognize the risks associated with the storm surge, and each has developed an emergency management program that tracks storms and orders the voluntary evacuation of the entire Outer Banks prior to a storm surge. Dare and Currituck counties also have helicopters to transport patients to area hospitals in the event NC 12 is severed as a result of a storm.

3.77 There would be no construction impacts with the No-Build Alternative.

3.5.6 What construction noise impact would occur?

Overall, construction noise impacts are expected to be generally minimal because construction noise is relatively short in duration (as it moves along the project route).

ARE YOU KIDDING! WE WILL HEAR CONSTRUCTION NOISE FOR THE DURATION OF THE CONSTRUCTION. SOUND TRAVELS MUCH FARThER OVER OPEN AREAS LIKE THE CURRITUCK SOUND!!

The most critical areas with respect to lighting would be in Aydelott, a full-time quiet residential community, and on the Outer Banks, where sensitivity to construction disturbance would be greatest in the summer tourist season because of the presence of large rental cottages in the area.

3.6 Indirect and Cumulative Effects

The previous sections considered direct impacts, impacts that would be caused by the construction and operation of the project. This section considers impacts that are not directly related to the project, but that could be contributed to by the project.

Indirect effects are impacts caused by the project but, compared to direct impacts, are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. In the case of this project, indirect effects include project-induced changes in the pattern of land use and the impacts on the community and natural environment of that change.

Cumulative effects are effects on the environment that result from the incremental impact of the proposed project when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative effects are considered because there can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. In the case of the proposed project, cumulative effects result from the project, land use changes induced by the project, and all other development activities expected through 2035.

3.6.1.1 Study Area

Because communities and ecosystems are connected in a variety of ways, the study area for the indirect and cumulative impacts assessment is larger than that for the direct impact assessment. This study area is shown on Figure 3-10. It encompasses what is believed to be the complete area of potential influence of the Mid-Currituck Bridge project, including political and planning boundaries, the communities of area workers, the area where the Mid-Currituck Bridge project would affect future growth and development, and the area where there could be impacts on the natural environment. The inclusion of these areas did not assure that impacts would occur, but rather that the construction of one of the detailed study alternatives would be sufficient to warrant consideration of this wider area.

3.6.1.4 Impact-Causing Activities

In the study area, impact-causing activities are primarily associated with:

1. The proposed project and its detailed study alternatives;
2. Private development and the provision of infrastructure to serve that development;
3. Other transportation projects presented in the 2009 to 2013 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and included in the No-Build Alternative (Figure 2-11); and
4. Logging in forested areas, including wetlands.

The above activities can alter habitat and ground cover, introduce exotic plants, alter groundwater recharge and drainage, generate noise, require cuts and fills, fill wetlands or open water, change motor vehicle operating characteristics via new thoroughfares or increased capacity of thoroughfares, and change access, circulation patterns, and travel times to major traffic attractors.

Potential to Increase Permanent Residents on the Outer Banks

The potential to increase the number of permanent residents on the Outer Banks relates specifically to:

- The completed boundary of the study area;
- The commuting pattern of the region; and
- Other factors that individuals consider in choosing a permanent residence.

An increase in permanent residents on the Outer Banks should occur with the detailed study alternatives, could create upward pressure on real estate prices and housing demand, as well as create demands for additional public services such as schools. Findings for the detailed study alternatives are:

- ER2: No Increase;
- MC18: Negligible or slight increase; and
- MC24: Negligible or slight increase.

Any increase in permanent residents would not be sufficient to affect the real estate market or municipal governance.

In large part, these findings result because the Outer Banks is a unique resort community with a high average price of housing.

Potential for Increase in the Number of Day Trips to the Outer Banks

In terms of the potential for an increase in the number of day trips to the Outer Banks,
the findings for the detailed study alternatives are:

- **ERJ:** No increase or negligible increase;

- **MCB:** Some potential for an increase over the No-Build Alternative with the potential higher in the non-road-accessible area; and

- **MCB:** Some potential for an increase over the No-Build Alternative with the potential higher in the non-road-accessible area.

- Beach access, parking, public facilities, and services are important amenities in attracting day visitors. Beaches in Currituck and Dare counties, however, have limited to modest public facilities, especially when compared to Virginia Beach, which is closer to the largest potential source of day visitors, the Hampton Roads area.

The non-road-accessible northern Currituck County Outer Banks is a unique area that would appeal to a niche market of day trippers, such as beach drivers, sport fishermen, and surfers. Thus, the potential for increased day trips would be higher in this area than in the NC 12 accessible area. However, this is a specialized beach experience that would require a four-wheeler vehicle and would provide no bathroom or other facilities or services. There is no evidence that a significant unauthorized demand exists for this form of rural beach trip. Thus, although the potential is higher than the road-accessible area, the number of increased trips is not expected to be notable.

- The lack of transportation improvements and associated growing congestion could constrain development under the No-Build Alternative. This finding is based on the following:

- Demand for the unique experience offered by Carova has been a primary reason that development is occurring. Lack of accessibility both makes it attractive and helps limit development.

- Numerous government policy constraints related to development and the extension of NC 12 into Carova render unlikely both a change in the rate of development from current trends, as well as unlikely an extension of NC 12 to support development there.

*****EVENDENTLY THEY WERE NOT TOLD OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLANS BY DEVELOPERS AND SUPPORTED BY THE COMMISSIONERS REGARDING A 37 ACRE MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT WITH PIER IN THE 4x4 AREA (Carova)!

As a direct impact, the interchange associated with MCB2 and MCB4 would be a substantial change for an area defined in the visual impact assessment as having high visual quality. The introduction of businesses in the interchange area would have a similar impact.

3.6.3 What are the substantial indirect and cumulative effects and could they be minimized?

Significant indirect effects would be visual and traffic effects at the US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge interchange with MCB2 and MCB4. Significant cumulative effects are those associated with continued development in Currituck County. The NCTA would minimize impacts associated with the US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge interchange itself. Mitigation of other impacts would be the responsibility of Currituck County.

Substantial undesirable effects were considered to be the indirect visual impact associated with development at the US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge interchange with MCB2 and MCB4 and the finding that the growth trend assumed in area land use plans with a 2023 horizon year does not appear to be sustainable to 2035 on the Currituck County mainland.

HURRICANE EVACUATION:

"The construction of a third outbound lane on US 158 would offer the greatest reduction in hurricane evacuation clearance times with any alternative." The first draft EIS done in January 1998 was rescinded as HURRICANE EVACUATION WAS A MAJOR OBSTACLE IN REACHING AGREEMENT ON THE PURPOSE AND NEED IN THE DEIS. This current DEIS reaffirms that conclusion.

1.0 1994 to 1998 Mid-Currituck Bridge Studies and Review

The Mid-Currituck Bridge Study began in mid-1994 with an alternatives study. A DEIS evaluating several alternatives for improving access and traffic service to the Currituck County Outer Banks was approved in 1994. The 1995 Notice of Intent (NOI) and the 1998 DEIS were rescinded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in 2008 (Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 167, page 31733). A new NOI was issued soon after (Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 116, page 34065).

In association with these earlier studies, public hearings were held in Aydlett and Corolla in Spring 1998 to allow area citizens an opportunity to comment on the findings presented in the 1998 DEIS. During these hearings, several citizens spoke in opposition to the proposed bridge. Environmental resources and regulatory agencies also expressed opposition to the bridge project. The primary concerns were the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the bridge project on the natural environment in the project area and its environs, as well as the direct impacts in the community of Aydlett on the mainland. Since the 1998 DEIS and its review, there have been several important developments, which resulted in the decision to withdraw the original NOI. They included:

- Expansion of the project area (as defined in the current project’s Statement of Purpose and Need, Passem Brindelhoff [PB], October 2008);

- Re-evaluation of potential detailed study alternatives in an Alternatives Scoping Report [PB, December 2008]; and
3.1.12 How would farmlands be affected?
The greatest impact on farmland would be associated with the US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge interchange with MCB2 and MCB4, but that effect would be less than 0.01 percent of all farmland soils in Currituck County.

Most of the farmland soils in the project area exist on the Currituck County mainland. Although there are state and locally important farmland soils on the Outer Banks in Dare County, these soils types are present in developed areas and thus are not considered farmland. There are no unique farmland soils in the project area.

ER2 would affect less than 2 acres of prime farmland soils and less than 2 acres of state and locally important farmland soils. MCB2A and MCB4A each would affect approximately 32 acres of prime farmland soils and 72 acres of state and locally important farmland soils, primarily in the US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge interchange area. MCB2B and MCB4B each would affect approximately 76 acres of prime farmland soils with its larger use of land in the Aydlett area and 41 acres of state and locally important farmland soils with its smaller US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge interchange area.

**THE NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE WOULD NOT AFFECT ANY FARMLAND**

No mention of the formal resolution by the Currituck County Commissioners unanimously opposing “option B” nor the opposition by Aydlett area residents. Resolution found below.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR CURRITUCK COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA SUPPORTING THE COMMUNITIES OF AYDETT AND WATERILLY IN OPPOSITION TO U.S. 158/MID-CURRITUCK BRIDGE INTERCHANGE (OPTION B) AND BARRIER WALL PREVENTING SAFE AND CONVENIENT TRAVEL FROM WATERILLY ROAD

WHEREAS, since conceptualization of the Mid-Currituck Bridge in the 1970's, the communities of Aydlett and Church's Island have requested, and the Board of Commissioners for Currituck County have agreed, that to the greatest extent possible there be minimal impact on quality of life and the safe movement within Aydlett and Church's Island;

WHEREAS, there has been a community expectation that the Mid-Currituck Bridge toll plaza would be located near U.S. Highway 158, that Mid-Currituck Bridge traffic and Aydlett local traffic would not be merged and that the Church's Island community would be able to access U.S. Highway 158 from Waterilly Road in the same or similar manner as now accessed; and

WHEREAS, there is proposed an interchange design plan known as U.S. 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge Interchange (Option B) that if constructed will locate the Mid-Currituck Bridge toll plaza in the middle of the Aydlett community, a community of rural residential development and farmland, and require local Aydlett community traffic to merge with Mid-Currituck Bridge traffic increasing the possibility of traveling public traffic detrimentally impacting the serenity of the Aydlett community; and

WHEREAS, there is proposed as part of the Mid-Currituck Bridge design the location of barrier walls at the intersection of Waterilly Road and U.S. Highway 158 that will require south bound traffic from Waterilly Road to travel north on U.S. Highway 158 across the Aydlett Bridge before making a hazardous traffic movement into the south bound lanes of U.S. Highway 158 which will cause great inconvenience to the Church's Island community and unnecessarily expose the community to an unsafe condition; and

WHEREAS, plans for U.S. 158/Mid-Country Bridge Interchange (Option B) and barrier wall at Waterilly Road fail to meet the expectation and requirement of the Aydlett and Church's Island communities and the Board of Commissioners for Currituck County;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners for Currituck County, North Carolina that:

Section 1. Currituck County opposes an interchange design plan known as U.S. 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge Interchange (Option B) and supports an interchange design plan that locates the Mid-Country Bridge toll plaza near U.S. Highway 158 and retains Aydlett Road (SR 1140) as the common and ordinary route for local traffic to and from the Aydlett community.
What the assertion fails to note is that the majority of homes in Corolla are empty during the off-season and crime has been a problem. The bridge would provide: 1. access; 2. availability; 3. convenience; 4. opportunity; and 5. ease to commit additional off-season burglaries.

The following are the results from the Currituck Comprehensive Transportation Plan:

**Question 1**

What type of transportation do you use the most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive yourself in a private automobile</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride with others in a private automobile</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use public transportation, such as bus service</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a cab or taxi service</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2**

In what community of Currituck County do you live? (Please check only one box. Use the map above for reference.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mainland</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mainland</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Banks</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knotts Island / Gibbs Woods</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In what community of Currituck County do you live? (Please check only one box. Use the map above for reference.)

- Northern Mainland
- Southern Mainland
- Outer Banks
- Knotts Island / Gibbs Woods
**Question 3**

In an average week, how often do you travel to the following destinations in Currituck County? (Please indicate the number of weekday and weekend)

### Northern Mainland

#### Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Average # of Trips</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mainland</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mainland</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outerbanks</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knots Island / Gibbs Woods</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Weekend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Average # of Trips</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mainland</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mainland</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outerbanks</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knots Island / Gibbs Woods</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Southern Mainland

#### Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Average # of Trips</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mainland</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mainland</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outerbanks</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knots Island / Gibbs Woods</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Weekend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Average # of Trips</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mainland</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mainland</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outerbanks</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knots Island / Gibbs Woods</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 4**

In an average week, how often do you travel to the following destinations outside Currituck County? (Please indicate the number of weekday and weekend)

### Outer Banks

#### Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Average # of Trips</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mainland</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mainland</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outerbanks</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knots Island / Gibbs Woods</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Weekend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Average # of Trips</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mainland</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Mainland</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outerbanks</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knots Island / Gibbs Woods</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Northern Mainland

#### Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Average # of Trips</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgin (and other points north)</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City (and other points west)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dare County (and other points south)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Weekend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Average # of Trips</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgin (and other points north)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth City (and other points west)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dare County (and other points south)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of this survey clearly indicate that residents on the Outer Banks do not travel frequently outside of their area to the Currituck Mainland and vice versa. The averages show that during all days of the week the majority of the Outer Banks residents travel to points south. The Southern Mainland residents show that during all days of the week the majority of the residents travel south as well. The majority of the Northern Mainland residents travel to Virginia and Elizabeth City. That being the case, the proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge would be built for tourists which travel to our area 13 summer weekends = 26 DAYS.
The proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge will NOT alleviate the traffic experienced on NC12 during the weekday after the multitudes have arrived for their vacations. Whereas ER1 would give the most relief as the vacationers sightsee, etc. on the Outer Banks and not travel to the mainland once they arrive. In the DEIS it is stated that traffic occurs on the 13 summer weekends, 26 days total for the area west of the Wright Memorial Bridge. “Traffic improvements are seldom designed to eliminate completely the worst hours of congestion”.

The vacation rental homes in a lot of cases do not have ample parking, and the excess vehicles are using other private driveways and street parking causing another set of problems. There currently is not enough parking on the northern Outer Banks for all visitors.

NORTH CAROLINA HAS A TOTAL OF 18397 BRIDGES WITH 5476 THAT ARE STRUCTURALLY/FUNCTIONALLY DEFICIENT. THAT IS 30% OF N.C.'S BRIDGES ARE IN NEED OF REPAIR/REPLACEMENT. INCLUDING THE BONNER BRIDGE SERVING HATTERAS ISLAND AND THE YADKIN RIVER BRIDGE, THIS BRIDGE WILL TAKE MUCH NEEDED MONEY, $15 MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR, (N.C NOW FACES A $9.4 BILLION TRUE DEBT BURDEN), AWAY FROM FIXING THESE FAILING BRIDGES. N.C. CANNOT AFFORD THIS BRIDGE.
MCB DEIS COMMENTS TO NCTA AT HEARING
Jennifer Symonds
Representing WWW.NOMCB.COM

While all of the detailed study alternatives are near existing road or utility corridors and are under the influence of associated edge effects, these alternatives would amplify those effects. This would be especially detrimental to maritime wildlife habitat on the Outer Banks, where existing habitat is already extremely sparse and fragmented. MCB2 and MCB4 would introduce noise disturbance to Maple Swamp. With ER2, the road widening portions of MCB2 and MCB4, and the Maple Swamp fill with mainland approach road Option B, mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and avian species would all continue to be roadkill concerns. Because MCB2 and MCB4 include a new bridge structure across Maple Swamp and Currituck Sound, avian species would be a probable new roadkill concern.

3.3.4 How would aquatic wildlife be affected?

Fill, pile placement, shading, and clearing would result directly in the permanent loss or alteration of aquatic habitat and the wildlife that live there. Construction operations could result in temporary impacts. Aquatic impacts would be the greatest with MCB2 and MCB4 because they include the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

Currituck Sound has long been recognized as a nationally important area for freshwater recreational fishing. The decline of freshwater fisheries in Currituck Sound has been attributed to the increase in salinity and decrease in SAV during the 1980s SAV roles include stabilizing sediment, nutrient cycling, reducing wave energy, and providing organic matter that supports complex food webs (NCWRC, 2005). For these reasons, SAV communities are considered Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPC) for several managed fish species.

Overall, ER2 and the widening components of the detailed study alternatives would result in minor impacts to aquatic habitat.

3.3.5 What impacts would occur to waters under the jurisdiction of the US Army Corps of Engineers?

All detailed study alternatives would result in placing fill in waters under the jurisdiction of the USACE. Fill in jurisdictional areas would be the least

for ER2. The largest area of fill in jurisdictional areas would be with MCB2/B and MCB4/B, which include crossing Maple Swamp on fill. Clearing of jurisdictional areas would be greatest with MCB2 and MCB4 because of the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

ER2 would result in a minimal effect (less than 1 acre of impacts) on CAMA resources.

Shading associated with a Mid-Currituck Bridge would be the greatest impact to SAV or potential SAV. The greater impact to SAV and potential SAV would be with the C2 bridge corridor. Permanent loss or alteration of palustrine emergent and forested areas, SAV, intertidal flats, and tidal freshwater aquatic beds would result directly from shading and pile placement with the bridge structure associated with MCB2 and MCB4.

3.4.5 How would visual quality be changed?

No changes to the visual quality of the project area would occur with the No-Build Alternative.

On the mainland with MCB2 and MCB4, the existing landscape would be substantially changed with the introduction of the US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge interchange along US 158. Existing agricultural features would be lost, and new vertical elements would be introduced. Homes and businesses in this area would be relocated. With Option B, the proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge approach corridor would enter Aydlett near the existing ground elevation. It would include a toll plaza and an elevated realignment of Narrow Shore Road to take it over the toll plaza. These features would replace existing forest views within the community from both north and south of the toll plaza. Drivers on the relocated Narrow Shore Road would have views of the back yards of homes. The toll plaza would be lightly at night, and those lights would be seen by homes to the south. The nighttime lighting of the toll plaza was expressed as a concern by citizens from Aydlett.

3.4.7.1 Hydraulic Impacts to Floodplain

The fill in Maple Swamp associated with MCB2/B and MCB4/B, however, could obstruct or alter flood flows and elevations and would be considered
3.5 Construction Impacts

There would be NO construction impacts with the No-Build Alternative.

As a direct impact, the interchange associated with MCB2 and MCB4 would be a substantial change for an area defined in the visual impact assessment as having high visual quality. The introduction of businesses in the interchange area would have a similar impact.

Since plans do not include widening the Intercoastal Waterway Bridge in Coinjock, due to cost, it is a choke point and will slow traffic trying to exit to the new proposed bridge, backing traffic to Barco and points north.

Option B goes directly against the land use plan for Avdlett:

POLICY TR13: To protect the character of communities near the bridge (e.g. Avdlett, Churches Island, Poplar Branch), the road leading to the bridge shall have no access points before its intersection with US 158

HURRICANE EVACUATION:

"The construction of a third outbound lane on US 158 would offer the greatest reduction in hurricane evacuation clearance times with any alternative." The first draft EIS done in January 1998 was rescinded as HURRICANE EVACUATION WAS A MAJOR OBSTACLE IN REACHING AGREEMENT ON THE PURPOSE AND NEED IN THE DEIS. This current DEIS reaffirms that conclusion.

NORTH CAROLINA HAS A TOTAL OF 18307 BRIDGES WITH 5476 THAT ARE STRUCTURALLY/FUNCTIONALLY DEFICIENT. THAT IS 30% OF N.C.'S BRIDGES ARE IN NEED OF

REPAIR/REPLACEMENT. INCLUDING THE BONNER BRIDGE SERVING HATTERAS ISLAND AND THE YADKIN RIVER BRIDGE. THIS BRIDGE WILL TAKE MUCH NEEDED MONEY, $15 MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR, (NC NOW FACES A 59.4 BILLION TRUE DEBT BURDEN), AWAY FROM FIXING THESE FAILING BRIDGES. N.C. CANNOT AFFORD THIS BRIDGE

The proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge will NOT alleviate the traffic experienced on NC12 during the weekday after the multitudes have arrived for their vacations. Whereas ER2 and ER1 would give the most relief as the vacationers sightsee, etc. on the Outer Banks and do not travel to the mainland once they arrive. In the DEIS it is stated that traffic occurs on the 13 summer weekends, 26 days total for the area west of the Wright Memorial Bridge. "Traffic improvements are seldom designed to eliminate completely the worst hours of congestion."

Regarding the Bonner Bridge Replacement:

Dare County Commission Chairman Warren Judge, "The mid-county bridge in Currituck is a matter of providing an optional route for the convenience of visitors to Corolla; whereas, we are concerned with maintaining the only safe transportation corridor for our residents' safety, health and welfare."
May 3, 2010

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Dear Ms. Harris,

My comment on the Mid Currituck Bridge Project is as follows:

We have owned a house in Duck for 36 years and have made it our permanent residence for the last six years. I have the following observations:

1. Many years ago there was a mandatory hurricane evacuation in the summer. On a clear sunny day it took my wife six hours to reach Elizabeth City, NC, normally a drive of at most an hour and ten minutes. Traffic was bumper to bumper and in a few low lying areas prone to flooding, if the hurricane had hit it would have been devastating to the people and vehicles trapped there.

2. Traffic in the town of Duck in the summer is horrendous. Often it takes me twenty minutes to get out of my development onto Route 12. On Saturdays and Sundays, when new weekly renters arrive, traffic is bumper to bumper from Powell’s Point to North of Duck, as renters try to make their way to cottages in Corolla and North of Duck. The vast majority of renters in Corolla and North of Duck come from Virginia and Northern states. The Mid-Currituck Bridge would save them a great deal of time in reaching their destination and significantly reduce traffic in the town of Duck and Southern Shores. It took a friend of mine, who lives at mile Post 2 in Kitty Hawk, an hour to travel the five miles to my house for dinner one summer Saturday.

3. For those school age children who live in Currituck County on the Outer Banks, Corolla, Carova Beach, etc., they have to travel approximately two hours each way to get to school and back unless they take the ferry. Similarly, law enforcement has to travel almost two hours to get to the Courthouse and magistrate’s office from the satellite office in Corolla.

I endorse the MCB4 proposal. The Mid-Currituck Bridge alone would significantly reduce traffic congestion in Duck and make the trip for vacationers to the Northern Outer Banks much shorter. Most significantly it would save untold lives in the event a hurricane strikes while people are still in the process of trying to evacuate the Outer Banks. As it is the two bridges crossing the Currituck Sound are potentially major bottlenecks when people from both directions converge as they all try to leave the Outer Banks at once in an evacuation. We have been extremely fortunate for many years but when the event of a hurricane does come upon us with little warning the loss of lives will be devastating if we do not plan for a sensible evacuation route. As it is the proposals will provide some relief but still do not adequately provide for an effective evacuation. MCB4 provides the most efficient plan.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

David R. Tanis
May 24, 2010

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mill Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Re: Mid Currituck Bridge

Dear Ms. Harris,

We have owned our house in Duck for 36 years and have made it our full time residence for six. Over the years we have watched as traffic has boomed because of the development North of Duck and in Corolla. During the time I worked at a law office in Kitty Hawk I was often trapped in my development for up to twenty minutes as I sought a break in traffic so I could head south on Route 12 to go to work in the morning. One Saturday evening it took a friend an hour to travel the 6 miles from his house on Virginia Dare Trail to mine to attend a dinner engagement.

These, of course, are mere inconveniences. My primary concern is the number of deaths which will inevitably occur in the face of a forced evacuation in the event of a major hurricane. About fifteen years ago my family had to be evacuated because of the threat of just such a hurricane. It took them four hours just to get to Elizabeth City. Much of the evacuation route lies very low, just a foot or so above the water table. These routes would inevitably be flooded causing an unimaginable disaster in terms of thousands of human lives lost. I am sure your investigation and research into this potential event confirms this hypothesis. I hope we do not have to actually experience such an event for the point to be made to the people making the decision.

I am adamantly in support of the construction of the Mid Currituck Bridge as soon as possible. There is no longer any reason for delay, for it has been at least ten years to my knowledge that this project has been under consideration. It is very feasible from an engineering perspective since most of the Currituck Sound at the proposed sites is less than three feet deep. The C2 route seems to make the most sense since it spans less water, and I do not believe the negative environmental impact will be that significant.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

David R. Tanis
I have owned a house on the northern outer banks for more than 20 years. I am getting ready to retire there permanently. I support building the bridge from the mainland to Corolla as recommended by the various study teams and am opposed to adding another lane to the highway for evacuation purposes. Gwen Taylor, Duck, N.C.
Hello,

I am in favor of building the bridge, using route C1, and would not mind paying a toll to use it.

Thank You,

Zachary Teich
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: W.P. & Caroline H. Thomas
Address: Aydlett, N.C., 27916

Street Address: 1400 3 Shadow Ridge Rd 150 Tabor Lane
City, State, Zip: Middlesex, VA 23112-4113 Aydlett, N.C., 27916

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I prefer the ER2 option because a bridge will impact our scenic view of the historic Currituck Lighthouse in Corolla as well as create a visual barrier for the residents of Aydlett. However, if a bridge is constructed, I prefer the MCB4 option.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer the MCB4 option, if a bridge is constructed, with bridge Alternative C1, because it creates the least visual barrier to the scenic view of the sound from our home.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I prefer the MCB4 option, if a bridge is constructed, with mainland approach road design Option A due to the following:

- Option A would not adversely impact the wildlife habitat, such as the canebrake rattlesnake and the eastern black bear, or significantly impact the flood plain or alter the hydrology of Maple Swamp as would Option B.
- Option A creates the least amount of Total Permanent and Total Wetland Impacts.
- Option A allows existing Aydlett Road through Maple Swamp to remain open for use by the residence of Aydlett and Option B would not.
- Option A locates the Toll Plaza at the Route 158 interchange and allows Aydlett Road to remain open and Option B does not.

Carolee A. Thomas
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Center Turn Lane - Least Cost

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:

- Build The Bridge, 2004
- Have It Super Coffa at Tributito

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1979 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1579

Or E-mail: midcurtuck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
The Mid county bridge in Currituck is badly needed. The approval process has gone on far too long and it’s time to get this project underway. The bridge will serve as an important new link to the mainland and will help the permanent residents by having more reasonable travel for the school children and northern beach locals to the mainland, provide additional exit route for evacuation and entrance/exit route for summer and weekend tourists bound for the northern beaches. Yes, there always will be environmental issues to work around as well as impact on the small population on the mainland, but reasonable people can find a reasonable solution. There has been too much money wasted on this process. It is amazing how a State Senator can get a bridge built in record time when it suits him and then this mess exists with a far greater need. BUILD THE BRIDGE NOW.

Chuck Toney
Kitty Hawk NC
Public Hearing Ground Rules

MAY 2 9 2000

You may register to speak at any time during the open house or public hearing by completing a speaker request card located at the sign-in table.

Speakers will be called in the order that they register. As protocol dictates, elected officials will be afforded the courtesy of speaking first.

When it is your turn to speak, please approach the microphone.

Clearly state your name for the record and your organizational affiliation if you have one. The stenographer will record your statement. Should you have any difficulty in approaching the microphone, please let one of the meeting staff know and we will accommodate your needs.

The purpose of this meeting is for us to gather information and feedback from you.

While general questions will be answered, the Project Team will not be responding to your comments here but will address them in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

To ensure that everyone has an opportunity to be heard, remarks will be limited to three minutes. (A timer will be used.) If you have a written copy of your statement that you would like to leave with us, please hand it to the stenographer. Oral and written statements submitted during the hearings will be included in the hearing transcript. Please remember that comments and conversations in the open house area were informal, were not recorded, and cannot be a part of the hearing record.

In addition to providing you with an opportunity to submit oral comments this evening, we have provided you with comment forms. You may leave these written comment forms with us tonight or submit them for receipt before the end of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

I favor MCB4 - C1 - Option A.

Pay the businesses a nice share for what they take from them.

I don't think they care how they do it. They can't do it. They are an obstacle in these villages so it won't disrupt places to do business.

Emergency drainage is deck or whalehead immediately.

Monie Lauer
3817 S. Us-17
Wigmore, NC 27979

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name:

Street Address: 1154 Port Archdale S., Apt./Suite: N.

City, State, Zip: Kill Devil Hills, NC, 27948

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

The no-build alternative is due to its drastic effect on all of the families and businesses.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer the C1 because it would enable the Timbuck II shops to stay open.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Revise the Turning lane to avoid congestion.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Keep Corolla, Duck, and Southern Shores un-commercialized.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27622-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@nctturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Debbie P. Turville
Street Address: 1524 Apdlet Rd. Apt/Suite No:
City, State, Zip: Apdlet, NC 27916

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or type additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, NCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I really would prefer no build to continue. I grew up in Virginia and really enjoy getting away from the hustle and bustle of the city. I enjoy small properties and the forests and streams. Now we have no way out of Apdlet without this noise pollution.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

People won't know to travel so far to evacuate. Traffic will be bad any way.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Please leave our county 1 road as it is now, even if it's limited sometime. I enjoy riding through the countryside. The open space is what makes us feel like we're not in the city. If we chose Option B as the main option we have option A in the back for people in Apdlet.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1678 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1678
Or E-mail: midcurruck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

From: Dennis Umberger [mailto:dumberg@aginet.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 11:37 AM
To: midcurruck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

I, Dennis Umberger, am a permanent resident of Corolla residing at 1002 Corolla Drive in the Whalehead community and I am responding to the DEIS of Mid Currituck Bridge.

I totally oppose the construction of the Mid Currituck Bridge for the following reasons:

1. At most it would solve only a 26 day/year traffic problem, Saturday and Sunday traffic during the three prime months of June, July and August.

2. The proposed traffic patterns within Corolla, particularly around TimBuck II and Monterey Shore shopping areas, would be a complete nightmare that would have to be lived with for the remaining 339 days of the year. Making it difficult for the tourist to get in and out of the shopping areas will only discourage them from coming to Corolla year after year.

3. The bridge for hurricane evacuation is a joke unless there is major road improvements along 158 all the way to Elizabeth City. There is some very strong consideration that hurricane evacuation on 168 through Virginia will not be allowed. Also, the weather service indicates that they will be giving a 5 day evacuation notice (not 3). For those who evacuated in the past with three day notice, there has not been any problem getting everyone off the Outer Banks in a reasonable time period.

4. The bridge image will ruin the pristine views of the quaint areas of Corolla forever. No more beautiful sunsets across the sound, unobstructed views of sound barriers and drainage swells along the four lanes of highway 12, and everlasting impacts to the ecological system of the Currituck Sound will have to be endured forever.

5. There has not been any proactive planning by Currituck County for the infrastructure required in Corolla to support the bridge. Inadequate public beach facilities, public parking, police protection are just a few of the things that need to be planned for instead of reacting after the fact.

6. From some of the material that is in the DEIS, I came only conclude that the maps and statements must have been made by someone that has not ever lived through the months of June, July, and August in Corolla. If they had spent a summer here, such ridiculous recommendations would not have been made. What was published is by someone sitting in some office some hundreds of miles away and has no idea of what the true conditions are.

7. With easier and faster access to the Currituck Outer Banks, there is a very likely chance there will an increase in crime. Given there would be two access points in and out of Corolla, it would be much easier for crime rings to operate in Corolla.

8. Finally and most important is that the permanent residents of Corolla choose to make it our home because we desire to have a quiet, quaint, and pristine environment around us most of the year. Yes, we endure the months of June, July, and August for the beauty and peacefulness the rest of the year. We do not want a massive structure in our backyard that will strip the area from its pristine nature forever.
YES, PERMANENT RESIDENTS OF COROLLA AND AYDELLT SHOULD HAVE THE MOST TO SAY ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT THERE SHOULD BE A BRIDGE BUILT ACROSS THE BEAUTIFUL CURRITUCK SOUND.

Thank you,

Dennis L. Umberger
PO Box 352
1002 Corolla Drive
Corolla, NC 27927

From: Mary Kaye [mailto:mikumbi@aginet.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 8:57 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

My name is Mary Kaye Umberger and I am a permanent resident of Corolla living year round at 1002 Corolla Drive in the Whalehead community and I am responding to the DES of Mid Currituck Bridge.

I am totally oppose to the construction of the Mid Currituck Bridge. I own a business, Dolphin Watch Gallery, in Corolla located at TimBuck II. I am starting my 18 year in business in Corolla. When I open my business, I knew the limitations of being in a seasonal locations. But I chose it because I like the peace and quiet of being in Corolla. Your proposal with traffic will destroy access to many of the businesses of Corolla. This is just not fair to the people that own businesses. Our town is very fragile and the last thing we need is anything that makes it difficult to get to a business. I don’t believe you have thought about that.

We really do not need a bridge. It seems to me that the only people that want the bridge are the people of Dare County (Sanderling, Duck, and Southern Shores). Maybe they could be satisfied if it was the lower Currituck Bridge and came in closer to them. I understand their limitations, but Corolla had the wisdom to make their retail space to accommodate good traffic flow. I am sorry that Duck did not have that wisdom but don’t punish us because they have a traffic problem. Please do NOT make a problem for us!

Thank you,

Mary Kaye Umberger
P.O. Box 352
Corolla, NC 27927
The email from DCBASecy@aol.com dated Sunday, May 30, 2010, 12:42 PM, contains a Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form. The email is addressed to John Wander, President; Ed Brooks, Vice President; Ed Brooks, Treasurer; and Lynne Allerman, Secretary.

Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Comment Form (not previously attached)

Date: Sunday, May 30, 2010, 12:42 PM

From: DCBASecy@aol.com <DCBASecy@aol.com>

The email contains a public comment form titled "Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form".

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
May 18, 2010
Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC  27699-1578

Dear Ms. Harris:

In response to the invitation for public comments we received by mail, we are writing to comment on alternatives outlined in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project. We have long advocated the construction of the bridge and strongly prefer alternative MCB4 to alternatives ER2 and MCB2 because they include widening the road on which our home is located and adding wide ditches on both sides of the road.

As residents on the west side of Ocean Boulevard, this action would impede our family's access to the beachfront, but more important is the detrimental impact it would have on the character of our community. While it is true that traffic on the road is sometimes heavy from May through September, the flow actually becomes congested only at certain times of day during the peak tourist season. Converting the road to a multilane highway to avoid these limited periods of congestion would create a barrier to the beach for our entire community and visitors. In addition, the purchase of easements would represent a wasteful expenditure of public resources, especially given land values in this area.

Having built our home in 1982, we witnessed firsthand increases in traffic resulting from successive extensions of Route 12 and the resulting development of Duck, Sanderling, Pine Island, Corolla, and Carova. The expansion of the Wright Memorial Bridge in 1995 and improvements to the intersection of Route 12 and 158 near the Ayeck Brown Welcome Center were effective in eliminating the traffic backups experienced in the 1980s and early 1990s. As a result, congestion along Ocean Boulevard rarely causes traffic to come to a standstill, but follows predictable patterns during which it slows, but continues to move. On Saturdays and Sundays during the summer, it is heavy going south from 9 a.m.-12 p.m. and going north from 2-5 pm. During weekdays in the summer, the combination of tourist traffic and local resident driving to and from jobs produces shorter periods of congestion at lunch and around 5 p.m. The only other predictably congested periods are rainy days when tourists cannot go on the beach, but travel to tourist sites or shopping areas. Again, it is unusual for the flow of traffic to become slow other than during these periods.

In summary, any marginal enhancement of peak-season traffic flow from the addition of a third lane along Ocean Boulevard would be more than offset by the devastating impact it would have on the quality of life in our community. Alternatives that include a wider road and wide ditches on both sides of the road would create a barrier to enjoyment of the beach by residents and visitors alike.

Thank you for considering our perspective on this situation.

Sincerely,

Charles L. Usher
Janan B. Usher

[Signature]

Charles L. Usher
Janan B. Usher
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Charles L. Ushers

Street Address: 121 Ocean Blvd
Apt./Suite No.: 
City, State, Zip: Southern Shores, NC 27949

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB4
does not include widening NC 12 through Southern Shores

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

Indifferent

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Indifferent

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Reverse center lane — more efficient use of space & less costly

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

widening Route 12 through Southern Shores would have a major negative impact on quality of life, particularly on accessibility by beach

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its weight, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

NA

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1678 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1978

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.gov

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
To Whom It May Concern:  3 May 2010

As a family with a home on the Outer Banks, we are delighted that this bridge may finally be a reality. Most of the summer residents come from the upper East coast or the Midwest. It will make the Outer Banks more attractive as a summer get-away. It will also be safer since Highway 12 will not be as congested for 3–4 months that we have the increase in population.

Thank you for sending out the Draft EIS Study. We vote for the recommended alternative; MCB4. We look forward to hearing more about the results of a final decision.

Sincerely,

Nick and Carol Varnavakis
5102 Gainsborough Drive
Fairfax, VA 22032

From: svangelder@rcn.com [mailto:svangelder@rcn.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 01, 2010 3:20 PM
To: Brown, Don
Subject: Re: EIS study recommendation

I forgot to add to my prior comments that we have been homeowners in Currituck County for 23 years and have seen a lot of change (not to mention paid more than our fair share of property taxes). For many we know, summer traffic congestion has become a deterrent to wanting to visit in the summer, especially in August when there is an increased chance of needing to evacuate for a hurricane. A bridge would be a tremendous help.  

Susan Van Gelder
Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry
From: Susan VanGelder [mailto:svangelder@rcn.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 10:52 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Cc: mkerrigan@rcn.com
Subject: EIS study recommendation

To whom it may concern:

As homeowners on the Outer Banks in Currituck County, my husband and I support the EIS study recommendation that a mid-county bridge be built to alleviate traffic, especially during hurricane warnings and other significant storms. We, as many homeowners and renters in Corolla and Duck, live north of the Outer Banks and would benefit tremendously from reduced travel time. We would also support paying a significant toll to be able to do so.

Susan VanGelder
Mark Kerrigan
470 Pipsi’s Point
Corolla, NC

Name: Steve Vassos
Address: 219 Wax Myrtle
City: Southern Shores
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: sjvnetscape@netscape.net
Comments: Thank you for your continuing efforts to complete this much needed toll bridge. Please continue with you very best efforts to make the bridge a reality, sooner than later! Sincerely, Steve Vassos
From: Via
To: Harris, Jennifer
Sent: Mon May 17 18:08:56 2010
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

I would like to express my complete support of the Currituck Bridge, option MCB4. I have been coming to Southern Shores for > 20 yrs and have witnessed the traffic increase over the years to bottle neck volume. My in-laws, who lived on the Sound, had to evacuate several times due to hurricanes and the whole process is not acceptable, it is dangerous.

No one who lives in Southern Shores wants to see Highway 12 destroyed with one of the options. Please build the bridge! We have waited so many years!

Patricia S. Via

property owner

Southern Shores

---

From: coldspringsfarm@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, May 26, 2010 11:17 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Support for Mid-Currituck Bridge Proposal

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: James P. Waddell
Street Address: 562 Ocean Trail
City: Corolla State: NC Zip: 27927

Comments

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I support MCB4. A two lane mid-Currituck bridge and the two evacuation lanes. I strongly believe this approach to the mid-Currituck bridge is the most efficient and environmentally respectful way to connect the Currituck mainland with the Currituck outer banks beaches. I believe this bridge will make the beaches more accessible and will promote a sustainable level of economic progress for the county. The new jobs created by growth in tourism will presumably be filled by current and new residents who will live on the affordable mainland and will use the bridge to commute. The benefit to Dare County is tremendous. By reducing the through traffic in Southern Shores and Duck, the Currituck bridge can help...
greatly to preserve the historic charm of those established communities. MCB4 is long overdue.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I support C2, terminating the bridge in an established commercial district. I feel that the bridge terminus is a natural spark to increasing commercial businesses and tourism. More shops and services will naturally spring up around the bridge entrance. Landing it in a residential area will only contribute to commercial sprawl, which, in the long term is a detriment.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A is probably a less impactful option than building a second bridge to accommodate a toll location.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I support reversing the center turn lane as the most cost effective and sustainably intelligent approach to emergency situations like hurricane evacuations.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft?

Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Overall I'm most concerned about the impact of proposals that seek to widen beach roads until the become 5, 6, 8...??? lane super-highways. This is the sort of approach that breeds haphazard sprawling commercial style strip malls that are now characteristic of Kitty Hawk, Kill Devil Hills and Nags Head. I feel such widened roads are very unsafe to the barefoot family vacationers who are really coming here to enjoy a quieter, slower pace of life for the few days or weeks they can spare from the hectic drive-through life back home. Our beach towns are sought for their respite from the urban and suburban sprawl lifestyles. And by tradition, American beach towns should be quaint, charming and should foster a sense of reflection, solitude and unhurried togetherness. Somehow Duck has managed to retain some sense of place and history that has sadly been lost or diminished in towns further south. Multi-lane highways are not the panacea but they are a great problem. We should be enacting zoning policies that encourage communities to grow with a sense of character and place...with residential areas and distinctive downtown shopping and recreation areas. Bridges are some of the most striking and beautiful ways to solve access needs. Like historic lighthouses, well designed bridges can and do enhance the beauty and enjoyment of the beach atmosphere in ways that multi-lane highways can never compare.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
From: C.W. Walck [mailto:c.walck1@cox.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 1:21 AM
To: midcurrituck@ntcumpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

To: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.

We are the property owners of 26 Dolphin Run which would be directly impacted if any current or future alternative other than MCB4 is put in place. We support the selection of Alternative MCB4 as the plan to follow in the planning and completion of the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

Sincerely,

Mr. & Mrs. Claude W. Walck

Subject: Public Comment on DEIS for Mid Currituck Bridge
Date: Monday, June 7, 2010 11:23 PM
From: PETER WALDRON <peter238@prodigy.net>
To: <midcurrituck@ntcumpike.org>
Cc: <jennifer.harris@ntcumpike.org>

June 7, 2010

Ms. Jennifer Harris
NC Turnpike Authority PBS&J
1578 Mail Service Center 5200 77 Center Drive, Suite 600
Raleigh, NC 27699 1578
jennifer.harris@ntcumpike.org

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Mid Currituck Bridge

My name is Peter Waldron and I am a non residential owner of property in the Ocean Sands development (707 Spinnaker Arch) and a tax payer in Currituck County. I am writing to oppose the building of a Mid Currituck Bridge. I am also writing to object to the DEIS as presently constituted. I have read through the DEIS and I find that it to be a disingenuous document and skewed in its outlook: providing arguments unsupported by evidence which justify the building of the Mid Currituck Bridge. The DEIS lacks sufficiency and appears to consider options that lead inexorably to the building of a Mid Currituck Bridge. I find the DEIS flawed in a number of ways.

Although I am and have been a tax payer in Currituck County since 1993 I have received no notification of any proposal over these years nor for this present project even though one of the options (the Bridge terminus joining NC 12 at the south end of Albacore St) will directly affect me. Not once in 17 years of discussion of this Bridge, even as the rumors associated with it have swirled about, have I received any notification for public input as plans were made so that I might be able to comment. This gives me little confidence in what is meant by the public having input. The only way that I learned of the current DEIS and the Bridge project was accidentally and by word of mouth.

And yet on p 13 of the DEIS it states that “alternatives were developed for all interested parties environmentally including human and environmental.”

In addition there is another serious encumbrance to this draft document and that is the
unavailability of information upon which it seems based, i.e., what has been referred to as the underlying data perhaps to be found on a referenced CD. I have been unable to obtain a copy and I find the lack of formal notification on the part of NCTA and the lack of information and its inaccessibility to be a disqualifying factor in moving forward as far as a final EB.

I regret that I do not have the time as a citizen to address the multitude of issues that I found indiscernible as I worked my way through the DEIS. But let me address some of the obvious ones. For example, search though I did, I found no information presented about how many people and cars are projected to come to the Outer Banks once the Bridge is built. Or even how many come now. This seems fundamental to any fair analysis of what impact the Bridge would have on the Outer Banks. It seems preposterous that one can proceed without these numbers. Since I cannot imagine any serious and real planning that might have looked at such fundamental data, I have to conclude that this information, vital to providing a picture of the Bridge’s impact, is being withheld for some other reason. If this information, and I mean on a year by year basis and not just what NCTA thinks congestion will be or not be in the year 2035, is not part of the plan, I suggest that the DEIS be returned to the drawing board and that a thorough study be made of the human and vehicular impact in all its aspects, both positive and negative. Certainly those who built and opened the Virginia’s nearby Chesapeake Expressway had and have some sense of revenue, number of cars and tolls collected in their planning and I would guess there is even a sense of how many Expressway users visit the Outer Banks. What are the Bridge’s projected revenues and how do they fit in with the human and environmental toll that will take place once in place. I find this analysis wanting.

One section of the DEIS takes a crack at the issue of whether crime will increase. This issue is raised with an equally quick dismissal citing statistics for crime at various time intervals in Dare County (which raises an eyebrow since all the pressure for this Bridge seems to come from traffic complaints out of Duck) as well as Currituck County and the State of North Carolina, all of which according to the data appear to show that crime is receding. A simplistic response is that there is no threat to crime increasing. I would think that a much better gauge would be to present information that is relevant to the Outer Banks which is under discussion and its periods of growth, including the number of cars that now cross over from the Wright Brothers Bridge to show crimes specific to the Outer Banks as it has been developed and seen its bouts of growth, eg. over the last decade. While it is good news that county crime may well be dropping, Currituck County is a much larger entity than the Outer Banks with its singular demographics. I would think a fairer approach would be to make comparisons within the Outer Banks itself over time as growth has exploded. Although I do not have these figures, I would hazard to guess that as there has been strong growth in the Outer Banks community that crime has become more of a factor along with this past decade’s growth.

The cost of the tolls seem to be undetermined (a range of $6 to $12) at this stage and that makes me wonder what kind of plan there is in place for funding. And if funding is an issue I wonder whether or not issues that have to do with the changes to the human and physical environment are being addressed at this point in time. Funding decisions by their nature will impact the natural resources of the Outer Banks and I do not see this issue properly and honestly addressed. There appears to be no solid information as to the expected use of the bridge by motorists and no projections are presented. I have to wonder what kind of plan there is that cannot present all of the fiscal alternatives. Otherwise this will fall to the taxpayer, low interest TIFIA notwithstanding. Am I to believe that estimated tolls of $6 to $12 will be sufficient to repay in full the cost of this project? The math is simple enough. It will take between 50 million to 133 million collections per vehicle visit to pay for the funding of the Bridge. Is this realistic? Can we really expect these tolls as realistic numbers or will they be much higher as one might soon guess? Where is the analysis of the true cost versus the benefits. Both now and in toll collections.

I find the No Build alternative presented and dismissed too quickly. Why not a more thorough look at its consequences with supporting data.

The DEIS raises the issue of how it will affect cohesion in the community but not how it will affect communities. Why is this ignored?

The DEIS raises the issue of potential damage to fish, wildlife and natural resources and makes the choice of what is the least damaging. Why does the standard have to be the least damaging?

The DEIS raises the issue of other factors in the study and the “potential impact on
communities and humans and natural resources" (p 13).

I found the analysis on human impact inadequate. We humans are all required to be considered by definition in an EIS. How will the Outer Banks handle what "common sense" suggests will be a huge influx of new visitors. Where are the infrastructure plans that will handle people coming to the Outer Banks daily and in increasing numbers. Where are the parking and rest facilities and water supply and treatment plans, already stretched thin or nonexistent, that take into consideration what can only be expected to be significant growth? What other vital support systems are in any planning other than to build a Bridge? The Bridge clearly puts the cart before the horse. on this matter.

As far as the impact on natural resources, it is a fact that the wild horses have had to be moved to the unpaved road area of Carova. Presently none of our beaches are cleaned or maintained through county budgeting although plenty of taxes are collected from Outer Banks property and occupancy taxes. After a few weeks of summer visitors the beaches are full of trash including abandoned cabanas which sadly reflect negatively and make the Outer Banks less attractive. The dunes, already fragile, will only deteriorate unless real efforts are made to preserve them which means a real commitment of time and resources. I fear for the wildlife as uncontrolled and unplanned growth take place with no long range plan. And I repeat there has been no plan set forth other than to increase growth by building a Bridge. One only has to look, to the BP Gulf oil spill to see the fragility of our own Outer Banks' natural environment and how easily it can slip away. Little is addressed in this matter other than cursory nods to how much fish and wildlife will be displaced during the building of the Mid Currituck Bridge. Nothing thereafter.

Finally, the DEIS states that a Mid Currituck Bridge fulfills these needs:

1. Improve traffic flow on 158 and NC 12. Again, there is no data on what the traffic flow is and therefore how can there be any data on how to ease it. I would strongly suggest that a Bridge would increase development and guests to the Outer Banks. I would think that the use of data from when the Wright Brothers Bridge added a span going from two lanes to four would a good place to begin to provide updated information and I would hazard that it would show that traffic significantly grew both on NC 12 and on US 158. Why was this not made part of the analysis?

2. Substantially reduce travel time between the mainland and the Outer Banks. The difficulty with this statement is that it is the very remoteness which give the Outer Banks is mystery and charm. To make traveling easier without real thought and analysis cheapens any visit and will predictably degrade the State of North Carolina’s most precious natural resource. I drive almost five hours from Washington DC although I would love the two hour savings offered in the DEIS as a carrot. There cannot be a tradeoff if the sheer unspoiled but threatened beauty of the Outer Banks is lost.

3. Hurricane evacuation. Hurricanes generally move 10 to 15 miles per hour and quickly get the attention of state transportation officials as well as the Governor in plenty of time for evacuation difficult though it may be. Hurricanes are not tornados which can spring up suddenly. This argument apparently is so weak that it was shelved in the last serious attempt to move the bridge project forward and does not merit serious consideration for spending $800 million for once a year event. I have been evacuated from a number of autumn hurricanes along with others. Yes, there is the inconvenience of having to travel and to be tied up in traffic but these are once a year events if that and part of life's overhead. Further I cannot see that a Mid Currituck Bridge would do anything other than create a different but just as severe bottleneck on both side of the mid county Bridge and US 158 as well as at the Wright Brothers Bridge especially as there is likely to be an explosion of even more growth, none of which is documented in the DEIS.

In conclusion I reject the DEIS document as flawed, not evidence based and legally insufficient and I am disappointed that what has been presented is not up to the standards of a careful look at all options and a full and fair analysis of a full range of how this project will impact the Outer Banks in all its environmental aspects. It appears more to be a justification for the building of a bridge. I urge you to revise this document to take into account many of the issues that have been raised by both the community and myself for review and public comment. It does not meet the rigor of the National Environmental Policy Act.

Peter J Waldron
218 2nd St SE
Washington DC 20003
202 544 6539
Peter218@prodigy.net Peter Waldron
218 2nd St SE
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Charles H. Walker
Street Address: 5926 Outer Banks Hwy, Suite 260
City, State, Zip: Nags Knos, VA 23508

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
I believe evaluation of ER2 is not viable. I guess you have to have a baseline. I believe the bridge is definitely needed. Any increase in capacity of MCB2 will be helpful so I back MCB2.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
I prefer C1. I believe there is already significant congestion in the Food Lion TimBuckII commercial area, will only make the situation worse. As a home owner in Crown Point, I feel my access will be diminished.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
I really think this is a decision for folks on the mainland to make. All being equal why not make decision on cost.
Dear Sir or Madam:

As Duck, NC, homeowners, my wife and I strongly support the building of a mid-Currituck bridge as proposed by the NC Toll Authority. In fact, such a bridge is way past due in order to ensure safe exit during storms and relieve traffic pressure on NC 12 without significant modifications to the road that would damage the village atmosphere of our wonderful Town of Duck. Travel along Route 12 has become virtually unbearable on summer weekends, and the only way to alleviate that situation in a meaningful way would be to build the mid-Currituck bridge, in our opinion.

Yours truly,
Joseph L. Walker III
Owner, 107 Plover Drive, Duck, NC

Contact:
735 Harbor Side Street
Woodbridge, VA 22191
P: 703-491-3301
C: 703-609-3042
F: 703-491-3304
www.walker-communications.net

From:<Walkercom2@vulcom.com>
Date:Fri, 28 May 2010 10:11:43 -0400
To:<midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org>
Subject:I strongly support the mid-Currituck bridge

Dear Sir or Madam:

As Duck, NC, homeowners, my wife and I strongly support the building of a mid-Currituck bridge as proposed by the NC Toll Authority. In fact, such a bridge is way past due in order to ensure safe exit during storms and relieve traffic pressure on NC 12 without significant modifications to the road that would damage the village atmosphere of our wonderful Town of Duck. Travel along Route 12 has become virtually unbearable on summer weekends, and the only way to alleviate that situation in a meaningful way would be to build the mid-Currituck bridge, in our opinion.

Yours truly,
Joseph L. Walker III
Owner, 107 Plover Drive, Duck, NC

Contact:
735 Harbor Side Street
Woodbridge, VA 22191
P: 703-491-3301
C: 703-609-3042
F: 703-491-3304
www.walker-communications.net
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Margaret B. Walker
Street Address: 1126 Glenhaven Lane Apt/Suite No. 2
City, State, Zip: Norfolk, Va. 23506

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
I believe MCB2 because, I think these roads need to be widened.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
I prefer MCB2 with the alternative C1 because it will affect less businesses.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
I think it should be a cost decision.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Reversing center lane for evacuation!

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
The inability to make a left turn in the neighborhoods.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.
N/A

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Ms Jennifer H. Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
May 10, 2010

Dear Ms Harris,

We are writing in regards the Mid-Currituck Bridge Project and wish to voice our support for the MCB4 option listed in the flyer we received from the NC Turnpike Authority.

We live in Duck 6 months a year and find the traffic going to and from Corolla on summer weekends (rental turnover days) is so congested that it makes any of our getting out plans very difficult. If not impossible. Our greatest fear is that there would be an emergency evacuation during this time when NC 12 is a parking lot. Widening or modifying NC 12 through Southern Shores and Duck would not only destroy our community paths and be extremely expensive but would not solve the basic problem of people needing a better access or exit to/from Corolla and points north.

Please record our support for the MCB4 option.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ed and Doris Walsh
13957 Forest View Drive
Beltville, MD 20705

In Duck:
113 Shimmer Way
Kitty Hawk, NC 27949

Email: ed.john.walsh@gmail.com

Good Evening:

I am John Wander representing the Duck Community and business Alliance. Our members are home owners and businesses in Duck.

I would like to make just three brief points, considering many of the details we support have already been mentioned:

1. We compliment the toll authority staff for presenting such a thorough and comprehensive draft of the alternatives and their consequences.

2. We strongly support the MCB4 alternative recommended by the toll authority.

3. We remain unanimous in our opposition to any general widening of NC-12 through Southern Shores and Duck.

Thank you for the opportunity to make these comments for the record.
Contact Information

Name: James Warren
Address: 10 Skyline Road
City: Southern Shores
State: NC
Zip: 27949
Email: unccnu@embarqmail.com
Comments: Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Mid-Currituck Bridge. I realize it is time-consuming and exasperating for visitors headed to Duck, Corolla and other areas north of Southern Shores on Saturdays and Sundays during the summer season, but one should realize that the traffic delays are for only a few weeks of the year. To me, the cost of a bridge to satisfy a small number of people for such a short time period is not justified. It is obvious that merchants in the Kitty Hawk and Southern Shores areas will suffer great losses of revenue when visitors no longer travel through those areas. In addition, the lives of residents in the Aydlett area will be very disruptive and never the same if a toll road and bridge are located in that area. There are other alternatives which could better serve the needs of visitors and the Outer Banks and not cause the turmoil with problems which the Mid-Currituck bridge will bring. Sincerely,...James Warren

June 4, 2010

Mr. John Page
Parsons Brinckerhoff
909 Aviation Parkway, Suite 1500
Morrisville, NC 27560

RE: Mid Currituck Bridge Study, Aydlett, NC

Dear Mr. Page,

We are completely opposed to having a Mid Currituck Bridge or its facilities in our community of Aydlett.

We have only been homeowners here for five and a half years. The reason that we chose to make Aydlett our retirement home was the peace, privacy and serenity that it offered. This has been my husband's dream – to live on the water and retire in peace and quiet. He worked at Ford Motor Co. for over forty years in order to achieve it.

It seems inevitable that this project is going to take place with no consideration at all of the residents of Aydlett. After reviewing the options that are being considered, we would definitely prefer the ground level approach over the high-rise. We are assuming that consideration is being made about the sound factor, which will affect us terribly, by having a heavily vegetated buffer along the new roadway. We recommend that the toll booths, offices, information facility, and all parking would be situated on HWY 158. We would like to see the bridge corridor C1 across the Currituck Sound.

We appreciate your consideration of our concerns and suggestions in this matter.

Sincerely,

Robert and Linda Wasinger
355 North Shore Rd.
Aydlett, NC 27916
232-453-2343
From: ejwod@aol.com [mailto:ejwod@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 4:18 PM
To: Page, John
Subject: Re: Test

John,

My wife Dana and I have owned our home in Corolla on the sound since 1993. We have seen and lived thru Corolla’s growth. We have yet to be convinced whether this bridge is a good or bad thing for Corolla or for that matter Currituck County.

If this project does move forward my main concern is traffic/noise associated with it. Let’s start with traffic of the two points of landing in Corolla I would like to know if traffic flow studies have been done at the height of the summer vacation season. The traffic currently at Timbuck II traffic light is horrendous in the summer time…biking is your best option. My concern would be how do you plan to handle the additional flow of traffic without causing major congestion for the folks that live in Corolla during the summer.

The northern landing would seem to have more space available to address some of the flow issues along Rt12. Additionally, how would you handle traffic coming over the new bridge that wants to travel northward??? Anyone coming off the bridge turning north would seem to present a problem with keeping traffic flowing.

Assuming you can address these issues if you do increase traffic flow along Rt12 I would request that we look into a pedestrian walkway over Rt12 since it will become more and more dangerous to try and cross Rt12 during the summer season when many families/children are here.

I look forward to hearing how these and the other issues associated with this project will be addressed.

Corolla is a beautiful place,…I’m not looking to stop progress but these are concerns that hopefully can be discussed and solved before we create more problems than we are solving.

Let’s keep making the community better.

Ed Wasloski
852 Oakridge Ct
Corolla, NC

-----Original Message-----
From: Page, John <PageJ@pbworld.com>
To: ejwod@aol.com
Sent: Mon, Apr 5, 2010 7:15 am
Subject: RE: Test

Dear Mr. Wasloski:

We will look forward to receiving your comments.

John Page
Parsons Brinckerhoff
Project Manager

From: ejwod@aol.com <mailto:ejwod@aol.com> [mailto:ejwod@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 04, 2010 9:32 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org <mailto:midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org>
Subject: Test

Hello,

I’m a homeowner in Corolla on the sound,, just wanted to confirm this address so I could submit comments on the proposed bridge.

Ed Wasloski
852 Oakridge Court
Corolla, NC
June 14, 2010

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

VIA email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Subject: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Federal Aid Project Number, BRSTP-0005) (494)

Dear Ms. Harris:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study. I have been a property owner in Whalehead Beach since 1982 (Lot 2, Section 13) and have enjoyed vacationing on the Currituck Outer Banks for more than 30 years. I am a significant stakeholder in the decision on whether and where to construct a new bridge to the Currituck Outer Banks. I pay several thousand dollars to Currituck County each year in property tax, sales tax, and other fees. On average I make 6-8 trips by car from my home in Crownsville, MD each year. Also, I am a Professional Engineer and an environmental consultant with more than 35 years of professional experience.

I have some serious concerns about the assumptions made in the analysis supporting the conclusions of the DEIS and believe some issues have been either overlooked or inadequately addressed. My concerns are summarized herein.

Proposed Bridge Funding is Discriminatory – Benefits of all build options addressed in the DEIS will accrue to all travelers to the Outer Banks, reducing travel congestion throughout the project area [the first identified need of the project is “The need to substantially improve traffic flow on the project area’s thoroughfares (US 158 and NC 12).”]. However, the cost for funding this significant project will fall almost solely on travelers going to Currituck Outer Banks through tolls collected on the Mid-Currituck Bridge (alternatives MCB2 and MCB4). It is imperative that all travelers share in funding the project.

Secondary Impacts are Overlooked or Minimized – Numerous secondary impacts of this project are mentioned only in passing or assessed in the narrowest terms. For example,

- Flooding along NC 12: NC 12 floods along much of its length during typical rain events not just at the three or four intersections mentioned in the DEIS. MCB4 does not address this condition at all beyond the intersections proposed to be (re)constructed.
- Accelerated sea level rise: This is mentioned as a reason to support MCB4 by providing an elevated roadway and possibly the only access road to the Currituck Outer Banks. This analysis is woefully incomplete without consideration of how sea level rise will affect the housing stock and desirability of the Outer Banks as a vacation destination in the near to medium term. Accelerated sea level rise could obviate the need for this project altogether and should be carefully considered before making the substantial commitment required by this project.
- Potential business impacts: The impacts to businesses go substantially beyond the need to modify access to a handful of businesses adjacent to the new intersections. For example, all businesses along US 158 south of Adylette Road will see the number of prospective customers diminish substantially as the Mid-Currituck Bridge siphons off many of the travelers they might expect to patronize their business.

Accelerated Development of the Currituck Outer Banks is Poorly Assessed – Reducing travel times and distances to the Currituck Outer Banks, regardless of the benefits of reduced congestion, will significantly accelerate development in the area. The DEIS downplays this impact, suggesting “the road-accessible portion of the Outer Banks is already largely developed.” However, there is a significant inventory of undeveloped lots throughout this area, particularly in Currituck County. Many of the current developments are only 60-70% built out, which would indicate that an almost 50% increase in the number of houses is feasible with improved accessibility. This level of development will significantly increase the number of temporary residents (i.e., renters), especially throughout the hurricane season.

The DEIS also says there is essentially no potential for change in development location, rate, or type in the non-paved road-accessible Outer Banks. The bases for this finding are limited and poorly considered. For example, the Washington Post reported (May 17, 1998) in their Sunday travel section that “… on a prime summer weekend, a thousand folks will head out to Carova Beach, at the northern end of the Outer Banks, just to do the Daytonia thing.” And, “In summer, so many autos get stuck [in the sand] that a local tow operator stations a truck at the entrance to save time.” I traveled to Corova in the summer of 2009 and found this to still be true: the level of traffic on the beach is astonishing. This too would be expected to increase by the same proportion as the hurricane evacuation benefits are overstated. Building the Mid-Currituck Bridge will result in an increased expectation of more people on the Outer Banks at any time. This is apparently overlooked in the DEIS.

Hurricane Evacuation Benefits are Overstated – Building the Mid-Currituck Bridge will result in an increased expectation of more people on the Outer Banks at any time. This is apparently overlooked in the evacuation analysis. Also, operating procedures are not addressed in the DEIS but it is apparent that collecting tolls on the bridge during a hurricane evacuation will potentially impede the flow of traffic significantly. An additional Project Commitment by NCTA and Currituck County should be made to the effect that tolls will not be collected during a mandatory hurricane evacuation.

Natural Resource Impact Considerations are Incomplete – Negative impacts of natural resources are minimized and potentially positive impacts are emphasized, however, all impacts are only superficially mentioned in the DEIS. This prevents the public from gaining a true picture of the potential impact of the Mid-Currituck Bridge on the environment. And the environment is a significant reason why I have some serious concerns about the assumptions made in the analysis supporting the conclusions of the DEIS and believe some issues have been either overlooked or inadequately addressed. My concerns are summarized herein.

Proposed Bridge Funding is Discriminatory – Benefits of all build options addressed in the DEIS will accrue to all travelers to the Outer Banks, reducing travel congestion throughout the project area [the first identified need of the project is “The need to substantially improve traffic flow on the project area’s thoroughfares (US 158 and NC 12).”]. However, the cost for funding this significant project will fall almost solely on travelers going to Currituck Outer Banks through tolls collected on the Mid-Currituck Bridge (alternatives MCB2 and MCB4). It is imperative that all travelers share in funding the project.

Secondary Impacts are Overlooked or Minimized – Numerous secondary impacts of this project are mentioned only in passing or assessed in the narrowest terms. For example,

- Flooding along NC 12: NC 12 floods along much of its length during typical rain events not just at the three or four intersections mentioned in the DEIS. MCB4 does not address this condition at all beyond the intersections proposed to be (re)constructed.
- Accelerated sea level rise: This is mentioned as a reason to support MCB4 by providing an elevated roadway and possibly the only access road to the Currituck Outer Banks. This analysis is woefully incomplete without consideration of how sea level rise will affect the housing stock and desirability of the Outer Banks as a vacation destination in the near to medium term. Accelerated sea level rise could obviate the need for this project altogether and should be carefully considered before making the substantial commitment required by this project.
- Potential business impacts: The impacts to businesses go substantially beyond the need to modify access to a handful of businesses adjacent to the new intersections. For example, all businesses along US 158 south of Adylette Road will see the number of prospective customers diminish substantially as the Mid-Currituck Bridge siphons off many of the travelers they might expect to patronize their business.

Sincerely,

George M. Webb, Jr., P.E.
May 13, 2010

North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 MAIL Service Center
RALEIGH, N. C. 27699-1578
Attn: Ms. Jennifer H. Harris, PE

Re: Proposed Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge

Dear Ms. Harris:

It is our understanding that you are in charge of the negotiations for the proposed captioned project and that we are addressing this letter to your attention.

We have for many years enjoyed a beach home at 32 Ocean Blvd in Southern Shores. Needless to say the build-up of traffic which has been a necessary part of the development of the northern outer banks has not been a positive factor.

Also, we have wondered many times when threatening weather causes along how in the world we would all respond to a need for evacuation. In fact we remember very clearly that on such an occasion one of our sons was at the cottage with his family when an evacuation order came through.

After some hours of trying to get on the highway without success, he gave up and decided to "just ride it out". Since that time, conditions have only gotten worse, so we think the provision of another evacuation route should be the overwhelming consideration for those who will make the decision on the route to be chosen.

Clearly, it would seem, that the only alternative is that referred to as "MCBS".

Further, when one considers the physical properties of this area, one concludes pretty quickly that widening roads etc is not the answer as it would seem to "do more harm than good".

Thank you for the thoughtful attention. I’m sure you will give this decision, and may we both enjoy the outcome!

Jack W. Webb

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 18, 2010

Name: Joseph J. DeFina, Webland
Street Address: 289 Duck Road Apt/Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: Southern Shores, NC 27949

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
As year-round residents of NC 12 in Southern Shores, we agree with the NC Turnpike Authority's decision to build the Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge Alternative of MCB4 because it does not include widening of NC 12 in Southern Shores.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
No Preference

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
No Preference
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

No preference

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Please refer to attached sheet

Additional comments:

Please refer to attached sheet

If you are a boat or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Does not apply

Additional comments:

Public Comment Form

Comment for Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Our property would be adversely affected by the widening of NC 12 in Southern Shores as part of both the E1K2 and MCB2 alternatives. There would be no noise abatement measure taken in our area (NSA 10) for a variety of reasons, so we would be forced to bear the additional traffic noise and we already consider it intrusive and annoying during peak travel times and speeds.

While the number of affected homes and/or properties was identified in the DEIS and related Traffic Noise Technical Report, the type of property or residence doesn't appear to have been considered. That is, the number and type of persons mainly using the property or residence. We are year-round residents living on NC 12, but how many of the properties are mostly vacant except during the summer vacation rental season? How many permanent residents would be affected versus how many transient persons (temporary residents) would be affected? It would seem that traffic noise is less annoying and intrusive to folks just staying a week on vacation than it is to persons living in the home year-round. It may have benefited the findings to identify the number and type of individuals involved rather than just the properties.

Additional Comments:

While we understand the need to collect tolls to recapture the cost of building the bridge, we feel the majority of that cost should be borne by the benefiting target audience – in this case, the transient and temporary population coming to the Outer Banks for vacation and other recreational reasons. Their migration to and from this area is a major factor in the decision to pursue building a transportation alternative. When we raised this concern at the Open House, we were informed that it is illegal to excuse toll paying for anyone but that consideration may be given to selling discounted passes. In lieu of free travel over the bridge for Outer Banks residents and its businesses and employees, we would expect to see a deeply discounted toll rate incorporated into these passes.

Wooland, 389 Duck Road, Southern Shores, NC, 27949

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27606-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: Allen Weltmann  [mailto:allen@weltmann.us]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 5:11 PM
To: mickurrutck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge Project

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a homeowner in Southern Shores at 39 12th Ave. We do not rent our property as we spend summers there as well as all major holidays and other weeks during the year.

I am writing in support of the MCB4 proposal. As designed, this proposal would significantly relieve the traffic congestion during the high tourist season of the summer. It would significantly reduce the time for many tourists to reach their destination in the northern part of the island and likely increase property values, which in turn will increase property taxes and attract more tourists (due to the shorter driving times) adding to the economic base. It would also likely open up potential for additional retail and restaurant outlets on the main land as traveling there from the northern part of the island over the bridge will take less time then traveling into Kitty Hawk.

I like the notion of the MCB2 whereby Rt 12 would open up to three lanes thus providing a turning lane and again relieving any congestion. However, given the cost to do that, I don’t believe it would be cost justified with the bridge lessening the traffic through changing the driving habits of tourists.

Sincerely Yours
Allen Weltmann

---

From: Lorraine Wenstrom  [mailto:sadiew29@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2010 12:01 AM
To: Page, John
Subject: Bridge terminus (questions from concerned citizen)

Dear John,

I live at 966 N. Harbor View in Corolla. I e-mailed you last December with my concerns about the bridge terminus on the beach side of Corolla. We are concerned about the committee choosing the north option. Our house would not be safe to live in if they chose the north option. We don’t want a 4 lane super highway in our back yard. I have heard the traffic slamming on their brakes in the middle of the night, since they are not familiar with the deadly curve in route 12 behind us. If that dune and all of the trees are removed for widening the road behind our house, we may as well say good-bye to our house. I would not feel safe sleeping or having my children or grandchildren in the yard.

We bought our home in 2001 and love the serene nature or the area. We love the stars at night and the trees. We could have bought in Daytona Beach or Virginia Beach, if we wanted loud traffic and super highways. Please consider putting the bridge (if it has to be built) south of us and our neighbors. We hoped that the bridge would never be built, since we have plenty of notice for hurricanes. We were on vacation during the hurricane of 2003. We had 2 days to evacuate and had no problem or traffic leaving our home. Our bedroom and deck are in the rear of the house, and without the dune and trees behind us, it would be so dangerous. Our house would be unsafe to live in. That is a very dangerous curve in route 12. The tourists are not familiar with the curve and come speeding around it late in the night.

We have worked very hard on our house renovating it ourselves on our vacation weeks. We are not wealthy people and planned on coming there for years to come with our family. North Harbor View has already been affected by heavy rains and an overflow of a ditch would flood us and our street. Our street has a low area and when it rains hard, the street floods. This is another thing that you should consider. Please let me know if any plans have been made to move forward on this project and where the bridge terminus is planned.

You said in December that you would contact me on this so that we
could give you our input again. We are now retired and the summer rentals are a source of income for us.

Robert and Lorraine Wenstrom
3 Sundrop Watch
Ormond Beach, FL 32174

---

From: Lorraine Wenstrom [mailto:sadiew29@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, April 11, 2010 9:00 PM
To: Page, John
Subject: mid Currituck bridge

Hi John,

I looked over the maps via e-mail. So, am I correct in reading them, that if the committee chose C2, they would not build a 4 lane highway behind our house on N. Harbor view? The bridge would come in at Timbuck 11 and start the 4 lane highway south to the Currituck Club. That seems like the best choice for the homeowners on our street and route 12. TimBuck 11 and south is mostly commercial land and open space. We think that there would be many accidents and even deaths if the 4 lane highway was behind a residential area. This is prime rental area for families with children. We depend on our family rentals during the summer. Monterey Shores is a beautiful place. We want to come here for years to come without the noise and congestion of bridge traffic. Please add this to our public opinion. thanks.

Bob and Lorraine Wenstrom
966 N. Harbor View
Corolla, NC
----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Lorraine Wenstrom <sadiew29@yahoo.com>
To: Owen Etheridge <currituckcmmish@hotmail.com>; Vance Aydlett <vaydlett@co.currituck.nc.us>; Gene Gregory <commissioners@co.currituck.nc.us>; Barry Nelms <barryobx@compueasy.com>; Paul O’Neal <Sponeal@co.currituck.nc.us>; John Rorer <john@jrorer.com>; Janet Taylor <jltaylor145@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sun, June 6, 2010 10:07:08 PM
Subject: Mid Currituck Bridge

Dear Commissioners,

We Own the property at 966 N. Harbor View in Corolla. My husband and I and most of the residents of Monteray Shores do not want this bridge to be built. We were here for a hurricane evacuation in 2003 and had plenty of notice to leave the island. Our property backs up to Rt. 12.

We have a large dune with plenty of trees to block the sound and lights of the cars. Since the last survey, the workers cut large branches near the road and I can see cars. If you change this section of Rt. 12 in choosing the Alt C1, there will be a 4 lane highway and a ditch in my back yard. We worked very hard on our house on our vacation weeks from our jobs. We planned on retiring here some day. That road is a dangerous road now, with the tourists speeding around the two dangerous curves in the road. There will be accidents and deaths if you make that a four lane...
highway. We can hear the sound of cars late at night screeching on their brakes and almost running off the road.

If you take away all of our trees and the dune, that will devalue our property along with harm our rentals. No one will want to rent a home with a ditch and a four lane highway with no protection.

The dune and trees are what save my house. Our bedroom is in the back of the house, and we won't sleep in a house with a four lane highway in our back yard. There are several houses on our street that will face the same problem. We just spent hours updating, painting, and working on our home on our vacation weeks. We bought in Monteray shores to enjoy all the amenities, including the pool, tennis courts, boat launch, fitness center, playground, and piers. How are my tenants going to get to the other side of route 12 with little children to use the amenities? This is why they rent in Monteray Shores.

This house was bought to help us in our later years, not to cause us financial difficulty. Why would any state build a bridge at the cost of $700 million to be used 26 days a year, which is Saturday and Sunday of the thirteen weeks that the majority of these houses rent. None of the residents that I have talked to will spend money to cross that bridge. We get together several times a year for a local night. There are bridges that are in need of repair in Dare county. Do we NEED this bridge, or do the tourists WANT this bridge? My family and friends up north will choose to come over the WB memorial bridge that is free. We love Corolla, and if this bridge needs to be built, it should have the terminus at Albacore street with all of the other commercial buildings. They don't have to sleep there and hear the noise and look at the lights in their windows. I am really sorry that Corolla is turning into this busy typical resort town. We all bought here to enjoy nature, the stars and the beautiful beaches. Did you ever stop to think that when you take all of this away, THEY might not come back. Thanks for hearing my comments.

Lorraine and Bob Wenstrom

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized
recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Because the center lane because it will affect the least number of people.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

Do not build parking lots or bike lanes to attract day-trippers.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

N/A

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27680-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncdot.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Kathleen M. Kyle
Street Address: 711 Oldie's Mill Apt./Suite No: 1327 Colville, NC 27927

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, VCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No. I prefer Option A. It not only meets evacuation purposes, but it also provides access to medical facilities in Colville.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2 is a relatively undeveloped area compared to Colville. The C2 area is already the most impacted area by ferry in Colville.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

To preference.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

D-427

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

D-427

If you are a boat owner or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27690-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?  

I feel this is needed depending on additional cost to project. It is better to complete now and add to safety of beach owners/visitors if a hurricane hits the Outer Banks.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional Comments:

This bridge is long overdue. In the event of a hurricane, people’s lives will be at stake. The Outer Banks has never been hit by a large hurricane hit. But if one did, it would be impossible to evacuate the families who should have left the island of earlier times. Many on the island during the season do not understand the damage a storm of this magnitude can do.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.  
North Carolina Turnpike Authority  
1578 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578  
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.

---

**Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form**

**Name:** David M Wheeler  
**Street Address:** 7108 Collingwood Ct  
**City, State, Zip:** Elkridge, MD 21075

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

- **Mail:** Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.  
  NC Turnpike Authority  
  1578 Mail Service Center  
  Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
- **Email:** midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

**Question 1:** Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

I prefer MCB4. Any no-bridge alternative fails to address the major bottleneck for both routine access and evacuation. MCB2 seems to incorporate an inordinate amount of road widening, the need for which should be reduced by the bridge.

**Question 2:** If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

I prefer C2. It brings the bridge in to what is primarily a commercial area.

**Question 3:** If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

I prefer option A (and would pay higher tolls to support it). It appears to have less impact on marshland and on mainland communities.

**Question 4:** As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane?
during an evacuation and why?  
I prefer reversing the center lane. It seems logical to use all existing pavement in an evacuation. It is also possible that in a real evacuation, the center lane will in fact be used, whether designed for such use or not. However, the technology necessary for orderly use of the center lane could be difficult, given that any associated signs, signals, and gates must be storm-worthy and independent of the power supply.

Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered? 
No additional comments

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number. 
Not applicable

Additional Comments:

From: Sam Williams [mailto:sllwms109@embarqmail.com]  
Sent: Sunday, May 30, 2010 3:12 PM  
To: midcurrituck@ncturppke.org  
Subject: Mid-County Bridge Comments

Below are my comments on the Currituck Mid-County Bridge proposal. I have also attached a copy of these comments as a MS Word document in case that format is more useful to you.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sam Williams

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

MID-COUNTY BRIDGE STUDY
CURRITUCK AND DARE COUNTIES, NORTH CAROLINA

COMMENTS ON DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

I have reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) for the Mid-County Bridge Study and have the following comments.

General Comment

It is clear that a lot of effort was put into drafting this DEIS. It is well written and appears to be comprehensive. As a citizen who will be impacted if the mid-county bridge is constructed, the DEIS was instrumental in helping me come to an informed decision on whether or not to build the bridge and, if built, which option I prefer. Thank you for preparing the DEIS and providing the opportunity for me to express my views on which option I believe should be selected.

Best Option

It is my opinion that option MCB-4 should be selected. I believe this option will provide the most benefits in the areas of traffic congestion relief and hurricane evacuation while minimizing the impact on the permanent residents of existing northern outer banks communities and the tourists who want to vacation on the Currituck County outer banks.

Building the bridge between the mainland and Currituck County outer banks will also benefit the children who live on the Currituck County outer banks. Currently, these children are forced to endure very long bus rides to get to/return from school. This long distance drive also minimizes their opportunity to participate in extracurricular activities. I would think that the bridge would also reduce the transportation costs for these students.

The Currituck County outer banks taxes provide a significant revenue stream for Currituck County and the State without a large demand for (and the associated costs of) public services. The existence of a bridge would most likely increase this revenue stream through increased tourism during the tourist "shoulder" seasons (i.e., late spring and early fall). Lengthening the tourist season would also provide for a longer period of time for seasonal employment on the Currituck County outer banks.
Additional factors cited in the DEIS that I felt important in my decision include:
- Reduction in traffic flow. Only 13% less than option MCB-2 (i.e., 52% vs 39%).
- Substantial travel time savings.
- Cost savings.
- Minimal disruption.
- Community cohesion.
- Noise and noise barriers.

Worst Options
I feel that options ER-2 and MCB-2 are the worst options presented and should not be selected. The reason for this opinion is that these options include the widening of NC 12 between the NC 12/NC 158 intersection and a point just north of Hunt Club Drive in Currituck (except for the existing three lane section in Duck, which will be unchanged).

Reasons for this opinion include:
- The widening of NC12 is counter to the stated purpose of "Minimizing the impacts to communities...". Widening NC 12 would make it more difficult to cross NC12 to get to the beaches (particularly in Town of Southern Shores). Although increased difficulty in crossing NC 12 is recognized in the DEIS, the DEIS does not recognize the crossing of NC 12 or crossovers to the beach as related to parks and recreation opportunities (Section 3.1.9).
- Throughout the DEIS the unique character of the outer banks and its importance of this character to the desirability of the outer banks as a tourist destination is recognized. The widening of NC12 through Southern Shores not only causes beach access problems but also ruins the outer banks "character" of Southern Shores. The selection of either of these options would seem to reduce the desirability of renting in one area (i.e., Southern Shores) to increase the desirability of renting in another area (i.e., Currituck County outer banks).
- Even though NC 12 would be widened south of Duck, NC 12 through Southern Shores may still be congested. This would depend on how much traffic would be "diverted" to the Currituck County outer banks by the bridge and how many cars would use the turn lane (i.e., the third lane) on NC12 (particularly in Southern Shores). In addition, congestion on NC158 between the Wright Memorial Bridge and the NC158/NC12 intersection may not improve. Although it may take longer to get congested, the choke point at Duck will still remain.
- The DEIS (Section 3.7) recognizes that, "...from the perspective of area land use and transportation plans, the short term impacts and use of resources in the construction of MCB4 would be consistent with the maintenance and enhancement of the long term productivity of the project area" and "...the widening of NC 12 in Dare County, which is not considered desirable according to area plans."

If you have any questions, please contact me.
Sam Williams
109 Pudding Pan Lane
Southern Shores, NC 27949

From: John Winn [mailto:winnja@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 31, 2010 12:00 PM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form

Name: __John Winn______________________________
Street Address: ___759 Fishermans Court___________Apt./Suite #___
City, State, Zip: ___Corolla, NC 27927_________________________

Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:

Mail: Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
      NC Turnpike Authority
      1578 Mail Service Center
      Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Email: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Question 1: Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?

NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE ... THE BRIDGE WILL DESTROY COROLLA BY TOO MUCH DEVELOPMENT, DAY-TRIPPERS AND CRIME. IT IS JUST NOT NEEDED.

Question 2: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

NA

Question 3: If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

NA

Question 4: As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

REVERSE THE CENTER LANE ... USE THE MCB AND 158 DOLLARS TO REPAIR THE BONNER BRIDGE AND OTHERS IN THE STATE.
Question 5: With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

SEE Q-1.

Question 6: If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

NA

Additional Comments:

THE MCB DOES NOT NEED TO BE BUILT FOR ANY REASON WHAT SO EVER.
As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I would reverse the center turn lane. Too much expense, homeowners and businesses would be put out of income and work.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

I am highly concerned about how I'm going to make a living. I would be wiped out. Many other businesses as well. Too many people rely on work in Timbuctu II. It's not right to put the bridge there. The environmental impact would be enormous.

If you are a boater or one who uses Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

I work on a 31' aluminum. It is my only source of income. The boat is about 12' in height. Mooring location is in math where the CZ proposal is supposed to go in. I travel where CZ is and CZ is so close. My proposed to go. Cell 349-4334.

Any bridge alternative is going to be horrible. If the area you will be taking people's jobs from them, their only source of income. Destroying tons of wildlife. Please don't build the bridge.

Any bridge.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1675

Or E-mail: mducrituck@noturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Leigh Wolfe
Street Address: 1050 Whitebeach Rd
City, State, Zip: Corolla, NC 27927

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

No Build Alternative
The present four-lane bridge equals no lane difference in hurricane evacuation.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Thomas E. Wood
Street Address: 295 Waterlily Road Apt./Suite No: 
City, State, Zip: Coinjock, NC 27923

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments:
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2-MCB2-MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

I think C2 bridge would serve the people on this outer banks better & shorter distance. It also help dock & everything south of that point. I was told for most traffic is outer banks & at exit 105, so if we have a problem at 168, it can be controlled at toll station.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2. I think it will help the outer banks that most. It’s the shortest distance between the points and will help unload the most number of people in the shortest amount of time.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Looking at travel time of 22 hrs? Just show that its needs 4 lane.

Your cost study did not show cost data for A or B.

The would have helped. Looking at national resource study, I like option A with third offroad lane. Get to be a better way to help out Waterlily. Please review.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

Yes & I really think it should be a lanes to all lanes. Just like today, in 2014, we need to get as many people out of this area. I see a big bottleneck when you hit Virginia. I think you should look at widen road (158 etc) west of here.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered? I think that saving some go well to fill in access they already have and take that money to widen 158 to Elizabeth City.

South Mills farmers agree.

I am still concerned about Waterlily and 158. I still ask a question. I did not see any study looking at alternatives to 158 as well, how about a full road lane up to first part of bridge.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

I do live exciting & I think it needs to have the same height as the Wright Memorial Bridge. If you got some thing with maybe 15-15 higher, would be nice. Otherwise, go the intial_data.

Additional comments:

How about 2 lights at Waterlily & go, and activated to ground loop on waterlily. lights will not go green till loop at Waterlily is green (not on times) and only working on weekends or Hurricane evacuation. Please help.

May not build piers for 200. I accept future extra lane. Since the road is built, we should make it work in the future.

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Tumulki Authority
1578 Mall Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27609-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@nctumulki.com

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 20, 2010

Name: Ben Woody
Street Address: 211 Augusta Dr  Apt./Suite No: ___
City, State, Zip: Grady, NC 27939

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?
MCB4: Construction of bridge with minimal land widening.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
C2: Pre-existing corridor area with minimal road widening.

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
Option A: Audlott community is not as impacted.

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?
Reverse center turn lane. Additional lane has negative impacts on businesses, water quality, traffic safety, aesthetics, and residences.

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?
Road widening does not appear to address pedestrian or multi-use traffic. A resort community must accommodate non-vehicular traffic in a safe and aesthetically pleasing manner.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type, whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use, its height, draft, and length, its mooring location, where you travel in the sound, and your phone number.

Additional comments:
Coordinate with county to either build or provide adequate width (lanes/widths) for multi-use paths. Most existing or proposed paths are on the west side of NC12.

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Mr. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Or E-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
Good Afternoon Jennifer,
My name is Glenn Wyder and my wife and I own a cottage in Southern Shores, NC. We have been vacationing on the Outer Banks since 1992 and as you can imagine we have seen significant changes in the amount of traffic on NC12 on the "get away days. We wanted to express our support for the MCSB, it will greatly improve this growing problem as well as lessen the environmental impact caused by the automobile exhaust. Thank you for allowing us to express our feelings.
Cordially,

Glenn Wyder
General Manager
Mediterranean Tile & Marble
461 Route 46 West · Fairfield, NJ 07004
(973) 808-1267 Ext. #139
(973) 808-7085 Fax
7 Olcott Square
Bernardsville, NJ 07924
(908) 953-9990 Ph.
(908) 953-9993 Fax

From: Stuart Young [mailto:syoung37@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 27, 2010 8:30 AM
To: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org
Subject: Comments on Mid-Currituck Bridge

I am very much in favor of the bridge. I would suggest that the Outer Banks bridge corridor should be C2 ending near Food Lion, because there are existing facilities for shopping and rest rooms. Corridor C2 is also better equipped to handle the traffic.

I own a house at 1103 Strong Court in Corolla Light and I expect to directly benefit from the bridge when it is built.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Stuart Young
1103 Strong Court
Corolla, NC 27927
240 463 4236
Dear Jennifer Harris, P.E., and North Carolina Turnpike Authority,
As owners of a home in Currituck County on the outer banks located at 741 Comorant Court, Ocean Sands, Corolla (Section I, Lot 3),
we are writing to comment on the plans for the mid-county bridge. Since purchasing
in the early spring of 1993, the bridge was often discussed and at that time, we thought it would be an asset not only to allow a quicker travel time, but also to help alleviate traffic in
the event of evacuation during the crowded summer months, however as plans began
to emerge, we are not in favor of this project at all.
We would like you to know that we are opposed to any widening of highway 12 with exception of making it a 3 lane road to ease the flow of traffic when needed. We do not want to see a bridge put in anywhere to cross the sound. The extreme cost, the
environmental impact, the total change to the area that would occur with this project, and the time involved would not be in the best interest of keeping the area
a desirable place to come. It would forever alter the landscape and change the very communities that vacationers come to each summer to escape the Virginia Beaches,
Ocean City, Md’s, and Myrtle Beaches with all its traffic, commercialism, etc. All the
vacationers who chose the Northern Outer Banks for vacation, know what they face in
the event of storms. After driving up and down the Outer Banks in the 17 years we
have owned there, I find that the addition of the twin spans on the Wright Mem, bridge and the double highways up to VA are very adequate for evacuation for the limited
hurricane season each year. The banks are almost deserted for 8 months out of the
year and to go to all the expense and disruption of the way of life of the people as well
as the natural habitats, and animals, who permanently live here makes no sense. We
stand to loose our investment and so will all the other homeowners with property
bordering the proposed wider thoroughfare which will become like an Interstate highway.
In closing, we would like this project to be tabled and are not in favor of the disruption of
the way of life that presently exists in the Northern Outer Banks.
Sincerely,
Pat and Mike Yurcho
741 Comorant Court
Corolla, NC 27927
and
212 East Lake Blvd.
Medford, NJ 08055
856-983-4483

---

Subject: MCB 4 Preference
Date: Monday, June 7, 2010 4:01 PM
From: Paul V. Zehfuss <nzehfuss@gmail.com>
To: <midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org>
Cc: <sittaz@ccomast.net>, Nicole Zehfuss <nzehfuss@gmail.com>, Paul Zehfuss <nzehfuss@gmail.com>

**DUCK COMMUNITY AND BUSINESS ALLIANCE**
P.O. Box 8251, Duck, North Carolina 27949

**Board Members** – Steve Altean, Jon Britt, Lisa Newburn, Don Zerbe

**Mid-Currituck Bridge Public Comment Form**

**Name:** _Paul and Sitta Zehfuss_____________________________

**Street Address:** _1322 Duck Road __

**City, State, Zip:** _Duck NC 27949________________________

**Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. The deadline for submissions is June 7, 2010. Responses can be submitted to:**

- **Mail:** Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
  NC Turnpike Authority
  1578 Mail Service Center
  Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
- **Email:** midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

**Question 1:** Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4 or No-Build Alternative and Why?
We prefer the MCB4 Alternative because it involves the least disruption to the landowners on the mainland and on the Outer Banks. It provides the most direct evacuation route for most landowners North of Southern Shores to Carova. It also seems to be the most cost effective.

**Question 2:** If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?
We prefer to see C2 built because it brings the road in to an industrial/commercial area where it will have the least impact on residential areas and it would not serve to divide any communities as would C1. Additionally, C2 requires less disturbance on the Outer Banks and can be accomplished with fewer condemnations and
disruptions.

**Question 3:** If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why? We prefer to see Option A to place the toll plaza in the interchange at 158 because it has a lesser impact on the community of Aydlett and will preserve their road. We realize that it is projected to cost $60 Million more to place it there but fail to understand why that configuration should generate such an increase in cost, especially, when the Aydlett Road access is being left intact and the disturbance to Aydlett itself is so reduced. The toll could be increased for out of state travelers to cover this increase. We would be willing to pay more to preserve Aydlett.

**Question 4:** As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why? Rather than disturb more property on the sides of 158, we would prefer to see the center lane reversed to northbound only during evacuation.

**Question 5:** With any of the alternatives, are there any type of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered? We are opposed to the installation of deep drainage ditches along the side of route 12 anywhere as they impact the access to the properties.

**Question 6:** If you are a boater or rent boats that use the Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number. We use small sailboats and a small inflatable skiff which would not be impacted by any bridge no matter where it is put.

**Additional Comments:**

We are appreciative of the work that the study groups have invested in this project and believe that MCB4, Alternative C, Option A will provide much need and long overdue evacuation routes for the homeowners and vacationers on the Outer Banks. We are excited to see it get underway!

Thank you, Sitta and Paul Zehfuss 703 321 1400

---

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Public Comment Form
Open House and Public Hearing
May 19, 2010

Name: Treal A. Zimmerman
Street Address: PO Box 10
City, State, Zip: Peri Republic, VA 27971

Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

Comments
Your opinions are important to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take additional comment forms.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2 (MCB4), or the No-Build Alternative and why?

MCB4
I prefer this because it forms primarily on the bridge - without disturbing a great deal of I2N. Parkinson

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

C2
I prefer the alternate point of I2

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?

Option A
It seems to lessen the stress on the Aydlett community

As a hurricane evacuation improvement, do you prefer adding a third outbound evacuation lane to US 158 or reversing the center turn lane during an evacuation and why?

I would prefer that we more efficiently use the existing roads - I therefore reversing the center turn lane is preferred

With any of the alternatives, are there any types of impacts that are of particular concern to you? Are there any additional types of impacts that were not addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that you feel should be considered?

My primary concern is the stated that any additional building would have on the delicate ecosystems of the barrier island. The main point this can be addressed in any eventual planning - the buffer.

If you are a boater or rent boats that use Currituck Sound, please provide information regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; where you travel in the sound; and your phone number.

Additional comments:

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception table or mail it to:
Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1576 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578
Or E-mail: midcurritck@ncturnpike.org

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2010.
From: Philip Zipin
To: Harris, Jennifer
Cc: marlazipin@aol.com; carolhheil@aol.com; 'Dennis O'Brien'
Sent: Thu Apr 22 17:49:26 2010
Subject: Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge

Ms. Harris:

Speaking on behalf of myself and my co-owners of our home at 20 Pompano Court in Southern Shores, I wanted to share with you that we are all strongly IN FAVOR of construction of the bridge. I realize that this project has been debated and discussed over a number of years, and that there have been environmental concerns raised. I do not minimize the concerns of wildlife habitation destruction, nor do I profess to know any details on that issue.

What I can tell you is that the construction of a Mid-Currituck Sound bridge will save enormous amounts of gas from cars that, as configured now, must drive south to the Wright Brothers Bridge only to travel 20-30 miles north to get to their home or beach rental in Duck, Corolla and other communities north of Southern Shores. In the 20 years since we built our home in Southern Shores, I have seen the traffic worsen yearly – quite predictably – as the communities north of us grew in size. The construction of this bridge would alleviate the constant stream of traffic going up and down Route 12 in the summertime, particularly if those heading to Kitty Hawk, Kill Devil Hills and points south do not use Route 12 as an alternate to coming in on Route 158 and the Wright Brothers Bridge.

I strongly endorse this project, which will greatly enhance the quality of life for all of us who live at or who visit the northern Outer Banks.

Thank you for your consideration of my views. Do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss this further.

-- Phil Zipin

Philip B. Zipin, Esq.
The Zipin Law Firm, LLC
8403 Colesville Road, Suite 610
Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-587-9373 (office)
301-213-5323 (cell)
301-587-9397 (fax)
www.zipinlaw.com

"Woe to him who builds up lodgings through unrighteousness, and his upper rooms through injustice; who makes a worker work for free or does not give him proper wages; who say, 'Let me make myself a fancy palace, with wide rooms at the top,' with windows and cedar paneling, and painted all vermilion."
May 31, 2010

Ms. Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

Dear Ms. Harris:

The Board of Directors of Build the Bridge-Preserve Our Roads, Inc. (BBPR) congratulates the Turnpike Authority Project Team on the exceptional quality of the EIS and for moving the project forward to this point. BBPR supports MCB4 as the best option for bridge construction since it meets all project objectives, while taking into account the environmental impacts, facilitating the transportation needs of the residents, and mitigating environmental concerns. In addition, BBPR supports Option A for the Currituck Island approach to the bridge, since this option is preferred by the Currituck County Commissioners and the community of Aydlett.

BBPR has received 23 resolutions in support of constructing a Mid-Currituck Bridge from town, county, civic organizations, and businesses. The list of those 23 resolutions is attached to this letter. In addition, we have received 22,779 petition signatures in favor of bridge construction with no widening of Route 158 in Currituck County or of I-12 through Southern Shores and Duck. The 22,779 petition signatures represent 13,116 residents and 9,663 visitors. This very strong level of support from citizens and resolutions demonstrates that the Mid-Currituck Bridge needs to be built now. We strongly urge that MCB4, including Option A for the mainland approach, be selected as the Preferred Alternative.

We also want to take this opportunity to provide a response to one of the anti-bridge speakers who addressed a recent public hearing on the Draft EIS for the Mid-Currituck Bridge. Our purpose in doing this is to demonstrate to the Turnpike Authority the arguments against construction of a bridge and to refute these arguments. Mr. John Grattan, a resident of Currituck County, has written several letters to the editor of the local newspaper. In his presentation at the May 19, 2010 Public Comment Session for the Mid-Currituck Bridge Draft EIS, one of the anti-bridge advocates, Mr. John Grattan, acknowledged that the direct impacts of a bridge are "prett" straightforward and that the draft EIS did a pretty good job of addressing them. He then asserted that "The real issues are the indirect and cumulative impacts, the growth impacts induced." He devoted the remainder of his statement to these issues. It should be noted that the same arguments were made by others who spoke in opposition to the bridge; none of these arguments were based on any alternative that includes the Mid-Currituck Bridge. Most of the arguments fall into the category of, "Not in My Backyard" and/or "Pull Up the Ladder, Since I Am 67."

The same arguments were used during the debate regarding the 1998 Draft EIS at a time when the county had planned over 5,000 lots in Currituck, which were largely undeveloped. Since then and without a bridge, development of these sites and many additional commercial developments have been approved. The continuing urbanization of Currituck has been a reality today as reflected in the recent county approval of a 100-room hotel, 10,000 square feet of retail space, and 40 acres of beachfront land. The tremendous growth in the Currituck Outer Banks took off in 1986 after NC 146 north of the Dare County line was opened to the general public at a time when there was no expectation of a bridge being built, and this growth has continued unabated to the present time.

Mr. Grattan focused many of his comments on the four-wheel drive area where he contends that, as a result of an increase in day trippers, horses and beach erosion would be negatively affected by a bridge. In fact, all of these issues are current problems. The arguments advanced by Mr. Grattan and others opposed to the bridge, regarding the negative impact of day trippers represents a scare tactic at best and a veiled attempt at social engineering at worst. It seems that the well-heeled residents of the McManus area in the area are working to elect visitors to the Currituck Outer Banks, whereas the incremental increase of day trippers from Virginia are viewed as undesired and somehow not entitled to enjoy the same amenities as the McManus types. The county has platted over 3,000 building lots in the four-wheel drive area, and many of these are now being developed. A recent completion in the four-wheel drive area announced a 23-bedroom, 27-bath rental units to be available for wedding parties. Commercial activity advertising four-wheel tours, Segways, and ATV rentals to view the horses has become so great that management of the horses is contemplating a fence in order to protect the herd. All of this has occurred without a bridge. The bridge would allow residents of the Currituck mainland, including student groups, to enjoy a day trip to the Currituck Outer Banks in a timely and cost-effective manner—something that cannot be done at the present time.

While a bridge may influence short-term development patterns, the improved transportation for schools, workers, medical services, police and fire, rental homes, and hurricane evacuation benefits far outweigh the potential problems. A bridge is needed because of development that has already occurred. Concerns over local development issues like erosion of the four-wheel drive beaches, and continued urbanization are truly issues of concern, but these need to be addressed by the county and will not be resolved by preventing a bridge.

Respectfully yours,

Gwen Crutchfield; President
Build the Bridge-Preserve Our Roads, Inc.

Gwen Crutchfield, President
John Winder, Vice-President
Geri Sullivan, Treasurer
Robert Palombo, Secretary
William Coggins, Board Member
Gene Gregory, Board Member
Keith Hall, Board Member
Allan Strib, Board Member
Sam Taylor, Board Member

regarding the negative impact of day trippers represents a scare tactic at best and a veiled attempt at social engineering at worst. It seems that the well-heeled residents of the McManus area in the area are working to elect visitors to the Currituck Outer Banks, whereas the incremental increase of day trippers from Virginia are viewed as undesired and somehow not entitled to enjoy the same amenities as the McManus types. The county has platted over 3,000 building lots in the four-wheel drive area, and many of these are now being developed. A recent completion in the four-wheel drive area announced a 23-bedroom, 27-bath rental units to be available for wedding parties. Commercial activity advertising four-wheel tours, Segways, and ATV rentals to view the horses has become so great that management of the horses is contemplating a fence in order to protect the herd. All of this has occurred without a bridge. The bridge would allow residents of the Currituck mainland, including student groups, to enjoy a day trip to the Currituck Outer Banks in a timely and cost-effective manner—something that cannot be done at the present time.

While a bridge may influence short-term development patterns, the improved transportation for schools, workers, medical services, police and fire, rental homes, and hurricane evacuation benefits far outweigh any problems a bridge might cause. A bridge is needed because of development that has already occurred. Concerns over local development issues like erosion of the four-wheel drive beaches, and continuing urbanization are truly issues of concern, but these need to be addressed by the county and will not be resolved by preventing a bridge.

Respectfully yours,

Gwen Crutchfield; President
Build the Bridge-Preserve Our Roads, Inc.
RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A MID-CURRITUCK SOUND BRIDGE

The following towns/counties/business associations/community associations have provided resolutions of support for the construction of a Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge.

Town of Duck**
Town of Kitty Hawk
Town of Kill Devil Hills
Town of Manteo
Town of Nags Head
Town of Southern Shores**
Gander County Commissioners
Currituck County Board of Commissioners*
Dare County Board of Commissioners**
Dare County Tourism Board
Northeastern North Carolina Regional Economic Development Commission
Currituck County Chamber of Commerce
Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce
Southern Albemarle Association
Outer Banks Association of Realtors, Inc.
Outer Banks Home Builders Association
Outer Banks Hotel/Motel Association
The Duck Civic Association, Inc.
The Southern Shores Civic Association
The Currituck Club Property Owners Association
Albemarle Hospital Authority Board of Commissioners
American Legion
Outer Banks Past and Military Officers Association (First Flight Chapter)

* only if NC 12 is extended
** these organizations have also passed resolutions specifically favoring MC34 as the only bridge building option...
TimBuck II. Considering that the recommendation of the North Carolina Turnpike Authority and the Federal Highway Administration in Section 2.6 of the DEIS is one of the MCBA alternatives, our preference would be Alternative MCBA/C2. This is based upon the following considerations.

- The TimBuck II terminus would have less impact on the existing land use which is largely undeveloped land between TimBuck II and the Currituck County water treatment plant. The more northern terminus would divide the Corolla Bay subdivision and directly affect a developing residential neighborhood on both sides of NC 12.

- The TimBuck II terminus clearly is better suited for merging the bridge traffic with NC 12 in a manner that would ensure the most efficient traffic flow. The existing road right-of-way at this location is better suited to the necessary intersection and widening that will be required. This location also would facilitate the flow of greatest volume of traffic by merging bridge traffic with NC 12 approximately 0.5 mile south of the congested commercial area at Albacore Street.

- The TimBuck II terminus would be more centrally located to the Outer Banks population it is intended to serve. Therefore, the effectiveness of the bridge as an evacuation route would be greatly enhanced by facilitating a more efficient flow of traffic from both north and south of that location.

- Of most significance to Corolla Light, the TimBuck II terminus would minimize traffic congestion in the immediate proximity of our community and mitigate potential safety concerns specifically with regard to pedestrians crossing NC 12 and the trolley transportation system used to transport vacation renters and owners throughout our community.

Protecting the water quality of Currituck Sound is vitally important to Corolla Light to ensure the future recreational enjoyment of the sound by our residents and guests. Therefore, our final comment which pertains to any of the bridge alternatives concerns the treatment of storm water runoff from the bridge to Currituck Sound. As you know, the sound is a very shallow, brackish water estuary subject only to wind tides and, depending upon rainfall, very slow flushing. Therefore, every effort must be made to protect the water quality of the sound from highway pollutants washed from the bridge during storm events. Consistent with all applicable North Carolina coastal storm water regulations, the storm water runoff must be collected and appropriately treated before discharging to the sound.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit comments on behalf of the Corolla Light homeowners and trust that the FEIS will select the option that is in the best interest of the communities that will be directly impacted.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Frank Karkuff
President, Corolla Light Community Association
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MR. DEWITT: Good evening. My name is Steve DeWitt. I'm the chief engineer for the North Carolina Turnpike Authority which is a division of the North Carolina DOT.

Can you hear me? It's working. I can only do so much with the microphone. Is that good?

Okay. All right. Small room. I was hoping the acoustics might be a little bit better. We are recording here. We don't need you to talk into a microphone to record but evidently we need it to hear through the room here.

So, we are here to do the public hearing for the Kitty-Currituck project. I think everybody knows why we're here and we'll go ahead and get started. The folks in the back, if you're ready?

What we want to do tonight is talk a little bit about the public hearing process. We're going to give you an overview of the project and let you see where we are with the details. John Page, one of our consultants working with us, will go through the project with a lot of detail to let you see more about specific elements of the project.

And then the real reason we're here is to get comments from you and the public as it relates to

the project and so we can take those into account as we move forward with the project development process.

I want to introduce just a few folks. I'm not going to go through a long list here. A key person with the Turnpike Authority is Jennifer Harris. Most of you may know the name. She's been involved in this project for some years now and she leads this environmental process for us, the Turnpike Authority.

DOT. I think I saw Jerry Jenkins somewhere, the division engineer here in Division 1. Jerry's with us.

Federal Highway Administration. I don't see them yet. Yes, they're in the back. The Federal Highway Administration is a very key part of this whole process, George Hoops with the North Carolina division office.

Just a few others we do have and we'll talk a little bit about the development team that we have as part of this project. We've got a couple of those gentlemen there over on the right side. And there are some other folks here that will be able to answer some specific technical questions if it's appropriate to do that at the time.

Some of the ground rules for this. This really is your opportunity to tell us what you think
about the project, about the alternatives that we'll
talk about, the issues. We're not expecting people to
come in here and say, hey, we love this. We're
expecting you to tell us what you think, good, bad,
whatever. That's what this is about, it's public
input for a purpose.

It's not a debate. I'm not going to
stand up here and debate with you about whatever it is
that you want to talk about. You say whatever you
feel compelled to say. If we can answer the question,
we will. We're not going to get into specifics. If
you have a question about a particular piece of
property or a parcel or an issue like that, we're not
going to get into that kind of discussion. As part of
this group we do have technical folks here and you've
probably seen the drawings in the other room that
we'll be more than happy when we're done here to go
and speak specifically about any particular question
that you have.

If you don't get a chance tonight to
talk, although everyone should have an opportunity. If
you don't get the form filled out for whatever reason,
you haven't communicated with us tonight, we'll talk a
little bit about e-mail addresses, other ways that you
can submit information to us. Your neighbors, if
they're not here, we want to know what they think.
good or bad, we want to know what they think and their
input is very important to us and through our e-mail
address, website and so on you can certainly submit
that to us.

No debate amongst the audience. If one
of your community friends gets up and says something
and you disagree with that, this is their time to talk
and we would ask everybody to respect everybody else's
opinion. Let that person have their say. If you wish
to come up and make a comment after that, we have a
process to do that. We don't want you debating
amongst the audience.

There is a three-minute time limit.
Three minutes doesn't seem like very long but I think
for these kinds of things three minutes certainly can
help you say what you want to say. And in addition,
you can follow up with any written words through
e-mail or through a form that we have here if you wish
to do that.

We do have a list of folks that have
signed up to speak. We will call them in the order in
which we have those. We do tend to let local elected
officials and so on come first, but they're in the
order that I've been given those and that's how we'll
read through them and call them up.

Again, if you have detailed questions, we will answer those tonight after the hearing if we can or you can certainly contact us individually to do that.

So I'm going to go through the project here with sort of a general overview, talk about the background. We'll talk about the purpose and need of the project, what that is and why it's important.

We'll talk about what we call the detailed study alternatives, the different alternatives, is it widening existing 12, is it a bridge, is it whatever, and we'll talk through those.

We'll talk a little bit about the project funding and where the money for this project is expected to come from: the state of the Environmental Impact Statement which is a huge part of where we are and why we're here tonight. We'll talk about what we're calling the Recommended Alternative after all that we've done we are at a certain point. We'll share that with you and let you see where that is.

We'll talk briefly about right-of-way and relocation. And again, if there's questions specifically about those we can address those afterwards.

And an important part of this is consideration for any boating issues that might be out on the Sound that might be impacted by the bridge.

Again, we'll talk about that here briefly.

You should have gotten a handout when you came in, a summary. It really is a really good snapshot of where we are on the issues. I'm not going to use it to speak from but you're going to see stuff up here that's obviously very similar to what you have in your handout and I may refer to it once or twice.

Across the state we are developing a series of toll projects. This is one of four I guess that are sort of somewhat imminent. I guess I'll call it, in various stages of project development. There's one under construction in Wake County now. We are under advertisement for construction for one in the Charlotte area. Getting ready to go to advertisement on the third one west of Charlotte. And this project here we'll talk about in terms of where we are and where we go forward from there.

The project area, I'm sure folks in this room are well familiar with the project and where we are but this in essence is sort of a triangle, if you will, of the study area of the project. I-98 on the mainland coming across the Wright Memorial back up
north and south on NC 12 on the Outer Banks.

The project purpose and need, and this is sort of a statement up front that we make in this EIS process that we're going to talk about tonight. And really, what an Environmental Impact Statement is intended to do is sort of define or prove that the purpose and the need of a project in fact exists and that there is a best solution to that purpose and need, if you will.

And you can see the bullets up here that create that definition, if you will, of the project. Number one, to substantially improve traffic flow on the Project Area's thoroughfares, primarily NC 12 and U.S. 158; to substantially reduce travel time for traveling between the Currituck County mainland and the Currituck County Outer Banks. And a pretty important one is to help folks evacuate the Outer Banks if a hurricane evacuation requirement takes place. And all of these things are part of what we talk about in this EIS, they're all things that we've studied as we've gone through these great details.

So the detailed study alternatives, again, this is in your handout. You probably can see it better there than maybe up on the slide. ER2, ER means existing road. That in essence is a review of the existing route of NC 12, Wright Memorial, 158.

That's one of the evaluations or the alternatives that we've studied in detail.

NCB2 and NCB4. NC, Mid-Currituck Bridge.

1 is just one of those alternatives we looked at. 4 is another one. Each one of these in essence have two alternatives within them. So for instance, NCB2 you'll see where the red is across the Sound, there are two bridge alignments there with a different point where they land on the Outer Banks. Both of those are still being considered. Both of those touchdown points are still being considered and those are the kinds of things that we want to get your input about tonight and the rest of the week while we're out here.

So ER2 is one alternative. MCB2, two alternatives within that one. And MCB4 also has those two bridge touchdown points. The major difference between MCB2 and MCB4 is the amount of widening that would take place on the Outer Banks on NC 12.

So ER2, again, in essence widening NC 12 all the way down the Outer Banks, doing some work as you go across the Wright Memorial and doing some additional work on 158 as you head north.

MCB2 does not have -- the major difference here, of course, is a bridge, and the work
that you see between the Wright Memorial and the bridge touchdown point on the mainline, there's nothing that would be shown there on 158. It still includes some widening on NC 12. Still includes some work as you hit the touchdown point in the mainland heading north on 158 primarily for hurricane evacuation. And again, a little bit of work down at the Wright Memorial Bridge.

NCH4 is very similar to NCH2 except you don't see the extensive widening up and down NC 12 on the Outer Banks. You do see a bit of widening up at the touchdown points on the Outer Banks as improvements are made on NC 12 to ensure that traffic flow can flow back and forth across the bridge and then head north on 158. It does include a hurricane consideration or evacuation consideration down at the south where the Wright Memorial Bridge goes into NC 12.

Part of the EIS process, the NEPA process, which is the National Environmental Policy Act, it's the federal law that we follow to do what we do, requires us to look at all reasonable alternatives. So we look at basically anything you can think of that would be an alternate here to solving the transportation need for the area. Is it widening an existing road? Is it adding a bridge? Is it creating a new ferry system? Is it about anything you can think of.

Included with this is what we call a no-build alternative. So we go through an analysis if we don't do anything, what are the impacts of that, what does congestion look like 20 years down the road, what are the issues with that. So we look at all the reasonable range of alternatives is what we call it as we go through the study process.

Project funding. I don't think it's a secret that this is anticipated to be a tolled project. The money doesn't exist in the state given all the priorities we have to build it really any other way at this point. The revenue bonds that we sell for toll roads are basically municipal bonds just like your community, your town would sell a municipal bond, it's very similar to that. The bonds are paid back through tolls, toll revenue and therefore they're revenue bonds.

A large component of toll projects tends to be what we call a TIFIA loan. I won't go into great detail but it's a loan program out of US DOT, very flexible loan terms, sort of like a college loan, low interest rates, flexible pay-back terms and they...
help a project work financially because of that flexibility. 
Gap appropriation. The General Assembly two years ago allocated $15 million a year for 40 years to help fill what we call the gap on this project. That gap in essence is the difference between what toll revenue will bring in and the overall capital costs, construction, right-of-way, and long-term operations and maintenance.

And again, I don’t think this is a secret. This project has been moved forward as a public-private partnership. Again, some of our partners are here with us tonight. The expectation is that they will be very involved. They have been involved and will continue to be involved as we finance this project and move forward with it.

Our expectations of the State of North Carolina is that they will design it, they will build it, they will operate it, they’ll maintain it for many years into the future. Now, they do this under the umbrella of the Turnpike Authority under the umbrella of NCDOT. The project belongs to the State of North Carolina. The State of North Carolina owns the right-of-way. The faces that you see on the project will be DOT faces and those kind of things. But

they’re a very important part of trying to ensure that this project is built.

How much will tolls cost? Our preliminary information back three years ago already showed a one-way toll somewhere in the 6 to $12 range. Where we’ll end up we don’t know yet. We’ll still have to go through some financial details. And that final toll rate probably will not be set until the construction costs are all in and we know where we are with all the elements of the project and then that toll rate is determined in essence by that. You very likely could see a variable toll, maybe a higher toll on summer weekends for obvious reasons, a lower toll during wintertime when traffic congestion isn’t nearly as bad.

All the toll revenue stays within the project corridor. You won’t see the toll revenues accrued here go to Charlotte to build some project. They will stay within the project area. They will stay to help pay off the bonds and/or equity and/or debt, whatever we have as part of the financing. And they go to the long-term operation and maintenance costs for the project.

In North Carolina the Turnpike Authority was created and the legislation was created the way it
is written is that when any project, whenever debt is paid off -- and toll bonds tend to be somewhere in the 40-year range. When we sold the bonds in Wake County we got them for 30 years, which has proven very good.

But the bottom line is the tolls stay on the project until the debt is paid off. So if it's a 40-year bond term, in this case with our private partners, if it takes us 40 years to pay back whatever debt is on the project the tolls will remain on the project for 40 years. Once the debt's paid off the tolls get removed.

How will tolls be collected? We are developing a cashless system across the state without toll booths. You won't stop, you won't pay cash like you would if you're familiar with many of the toll roads around the country. We have a system where you -- John, I went forward. How do I go back?

(Discussion held off the record.)

MR. DEWITT: The little box or tag that you see up in the left-hand corner, there's either a transponder or a sticker tag, they're really two different technologies. I'm not about to go into all that. But a transponder is the EZPass pass if you're familiar with what's been predominant in the northeast part of the country. The sticker tag concept really comes out of the Southeast. Our system is expected to capture both of those. So if you have that technology or someone that's coming down here from the north or the south has those technologies, it in essence is a prepaid account. It automatically debits the toll from your account. If you don't have a transponder or a sticker tag we have high-speed cameras that take a picture of your license plate, translates that information through the DMV in whatever state that you're from and then you would be sent a bill.

This project's a little bit different because of the uniqueness of the population of folks that come and go from this area. We very well may have some cash lanes here to ensure that we can make sure the tolls are captured fairly.

What is the draft BIS, Environmental Impact Statement? This is a process that we follow federal law, the National Environmental Policy Act. The law, the policies and procedures are all basically shepherded by the Federal Highway Administration. We work very closely obviously with them to do that. A lot of detail here. But what NEPA does is ensure that we look at all issues within a reasonable alternative of a project. We look at wetlands, we look at...
streams. We look at human impacts. We look at homes that are affected. We look at businesses. We look at archaeological issues, historical issues. Literally anything you can think about within a community is all part of this process and we have to evaluate it and ensure that we capture it fairly and deliberately.

Again, back to that purpose and need statement we talked about earlier. What is the purpose of the project? And this EIS in essence helps go through a process to define what the purpose is and prove that whatever transportation solution comes out of this is the best solution given all the many issues that are here.

We already talked about the number of reasonable alternatives, the impacts in terms of wetland and streams and communities, and those kinds of things are all part of this.

And if we do have impacts, if we have a wetland impact or a business impact, we have to talk about in this EIS how we’re going to mitigate those impacts. And it’s something that’s a very important part of going through this whole thing, and it summarizes all the many things that are part of this.

An EIS process can be years, and this particular project, the impact has been many years to get us where we are. And the EIS in essence sort of wraps all that stuff up into a package, addresses all the details, answers all the questions. And when people have concerns we’ve got to address them one way or the other. They all become a part of the administrative record of the project and all taken into account.

Who’s involved in the project? Again, we at DOT are doing a tremendous amount of the work. Our partners, the Federal Highway Administration, are really with us step-by-step. Environmental agencies, you don’t go building projects like this without the environmental agencies being a huge part of what we’re doing in wetlands, streams. This project is particular going across the Currituck Sound, Maple Swamp is part of the discussion here. Many, many, many issues that have environmental impacts. So they are part of a team that go through this process. We have to get permits and so on and so forth and we’ve got to satisfy their concerns as we go through this to ensure that we’re building the right kind of project.

Other people involved. All of you folks. You’re all stakeholders in this. It all matters to you or you wouldn’t be sitting here. You may have a home that might be impacted, you may have businesses
that are impacted. You may be a supporter. You may
not be a supporter, you may not want this bridge. All
of you and all the comments that you have and your
concerns about this are a critically important part of
making this project move forward. The public who uses
it, clearly that's an issue in this particular case.

Your local elected officials, they are
supposed to represent you and we need to know what you
think through them and what the community wants us to
do.

I think I've already touched on this but,
again, we look at all of the impacts in the area to
determine which alternative at the end seems to be the
one that makes the most sense for the transportation
issues that are here. We go through all of these
things. You know, I touched on these, I'll go through
them again.

In terms of the alternative selection
process, we've got in this case existing NC 12. We've
got a couple different bridge alignments. We've got a
couple other things in terms of potential widening of
NC 12 and other places. How do we get down to the
point that we've got one that we recommend? And
that's where we go from here. We take all that
technical information, and it is a very technical

process in the background here. Literally if we
stopped work on this project and someone picked it up
five years from now they should be able to go back
through all the same details that we've gone through,
go back through, look at the wetlands and the streams
and all those impacts and come up with the same
solution that we are coming up with now. It is a very
technical algorithmic, if you will, process to ensure
that it's repeatable, and that is a very important
part of this.

So the technical part is what it is. The
less quantifiable maybe is the public opinion part,
and the public opinion part is hugely important.
Again, what you think, how it impacts you all those
elements of it are a huge part of this.

As we go through these public hearings
cover the next few days we'll talk here in just a
minute about our recommended alignment at this point.
We'll reaffirm that through what we've heard or we
will hear over the next couple days or it will give us
pause to go back and look at are we doing the right
thing, is there a better solution that somehow we
missed.

As it relates to these alternatives, this
isn't a vote of the people, there's not a ballot. You
don’t say 90 percent of the people said this, 10 percent said that. That’s not really how this works.

But all of your comments, again, with the environmental agencies, with all the environmental issues, all balance out to give us the information we need to make a decision here.

These are not political decisions. There’s no politician saying, pick this route, do this, do that. That’s not the way this works. It’s based in federal law. We’re following federal law and if we do not follow federal law we will be challenged in court and we will lose. We have to follow federal law. Political decisions are not a part of that.

Again, it’s based on sound, defendable, repeatable, technical evidence, again, with all the public comments and so on that are here.

So, where are we? We’ve come to the point that we have what we’re calling our Recommended Alternative. This is the NCB4 designation. You can see that it is a bridge. We have not decided yet whether it’s the northern C1 or southern C2 terminus point on the Outer Banks. There is some consideration of some work on 158 as you hit again the mainland touchdown point and go north.

This shows a little bit of work that might need to be done down at the Wright Memorial Bridge. This is primarily for hurricane evacuation purposes.

And there is some amount of work, again, that we might have to do on NC 12 to ensure that traffic can freely get on the bridge and get off the bridge and function like it needs to to help solve the transportation system problems.

As we go into right-of-way, and then we’ll come back to the schedule here so you’ll know about where we are, but the right-of-way process is always one of great interest to folks and we tend to obviously get a lot of questions about that. When we get to the right point that we know which alignment in terms of that bridge in particular might be the most important here there will be a right-of-way agent that will come out and contact you. There will be a lot of discussion to in essence make sure you understand what’s happening, what the impacts are on you.

If you’re a property owner that’s affected by it you will be compensated at fair market value. We hire an appraiser just like you would hire an appraiser to buy something or sell something. They’re private appraisals and then we would offer you that amount. If you disagree with that, there’s a
process to go through. We can negotiate. If you
still disagree, there's a way through the court
process to ensure that that's done fairly.

The bottom line is if you're impacted as
a property owner it is our responsibility to the State
of North Carolina to ensure that you're made whole,
that you don't lose any money. You don't need to make
any money necessarily. We need to make sure that
you're whole as you're impacted in whatever way that
may be. Other elements here, and certainly we can
address these questions, we do have some brochures out
here in the hallway if someone wants some more
details, but in essence there's a lot that we can do
in the background to help ensure that you're made
whole.

As it relates to the boating issue, this
bridge as it is envisioned today would be very similar
to the Wright Memorial. You see that sort of bump or
hump in the middle of it. Wright Memorial is about 35
feet now. We're going through a process now to
evaluate public comments, public use of the Sound,
what does that height need to be from the water to
the bottom of bridge. And we would appreciate any
comments that you have tonight or over the next few
days, also, if you're a user of the Sound and you wish
to have some input into that.

In terms of, again, why we're here, we
really do want your participation here tonight. You
can certainly speak tonight. Again, drop your
comments in the box. You should have a form that we
gave you when you came in. You can mail them, you can
e-mail them. If you e-mail you'll get Jennifer and
she certainly will do her best to answer your
corrections.

In terms of comments, I'll show the
schedule here in a minute but our expectation and hope
is that we have public comments in by June 7th.
Certainly they're welcome anytime beyond that but to
ensure that they're taken into account in terms of
where we are today that June 7th date is important to
us.

So where do we go from here? After this
week we'll evaluate all the comments we've heard, all
the suggestions, again, pro or con, and then in August
of this year we expect to announce what we call the
Preferred Alternative, and that would be where the
bridge touches down and potentially how much work we
might or might not do on NC 12 and other pieces of the
project.

We're now in a draft EIS stage. In
September we would expect to be in the final EIS stage. We are going through the draft, a final, and then you get to a Record of Decision or a ROD as we call it which is shown up here in December of this year. That Record of Decision in essence finalizes the definition of the project, it lets permitting go forward, it lets construction go forward, it lets financing go forward. So it really is the key, if you will, to making this project become reality.

And assuming that we make these dates we would be out here very early 2011 to go through the right-of-way process, making those contacts, and then starting in essence the construction of the project and you can see the opening date is projected up here.

With that I want to turn over to John Page and John will go through details of the project for you.

MR. PAGE: What I'll be going through is taking a look at the public hearing maps that were on display at the open house earlier today. The hearing maps will also be on display at the open houses the next two nights. They are also available to look at online and they also are available in a hard copy for you to look at at the eight public review locations that are listed in your Citizen Summary. So you'll have plenty of opportunity to look at them in more detail if you wish.

Each of the sets of public hearings (sic) have five key maps. The first to remind you what Steve was saying, ER2 is the alternative that widens existing roads only.

The two MCB2 alternatives essentially widen existing roads and build the Mid-Currituck Bridge, where MCB4 focuses attention on building the Mid-Currituck Bridge with some limited widening of NC 12 in Currituck County.

We'll be using these key maps to kind of keep us oriented as we move through the various hearing maps.

Also, each hearing map has a legend. Remember, one of the things on the legend shows what right-of-way might need to be purchased. There's some places where permanent drainage easements are needed as well as temporary construction easements. The color bands that you will see as we go through the hearing maps are our study corridor. They do not represent the area of impact -- the area of impact is much smaller -- but it does indicate where we gather data and what we took a look at.

We're going to begin up in the north with
the Mid-Currituck Bridge taking a look at those. On
the mainland side of the Mid-Currituck Bridge we have
two design options that are under consideration. They
differ in terms of where the toll plaza is, whether we
cross Maple Swamp on fill or on a bridge, and what
deliberate effect we have on the circulation system,
people traveling to and from the community of Aydlett
and within Aydlett. They’re called Option A and
Option B and we’ll begin with Option A.

In all cases the bridge ends with an
interchange. The bridge and US 158 shows the Option A
interchange. In this case the toll plaza is within
the interchange. The red lines you see are control of
access. When you build an interchange you cannot have
streets and driveways directly access the ramps.

In order to maintain access for some
driveways you’ll see here there’s a connection to
Aydlett Road and up further north there is also a
connection that goes to provides access for businesses
and homes along 158 that connects to Waterlily Road.

This is an illustration that illustrates
what that toll plaza with the interchange and toll
plaza might look like.

With Option A can we cross Maple Swamp on
a bridge and into the community of Aydlett. At

Aydlett you pass the community of Aydlett on a fill
slope. And then we bridge the one road that goes up
into the other part of Aydlett so there’s no changes
in the circulation of the system in Aydlett with this
alternative.

And this photo simulation illustrates
what the bridge would look like as it leaves the
community of Aydlett and heads across the Sound.

With Option B the toll plaza is not in an
interchange. The reason for that is that we’d close
Aydlett Road and restore it to a wetland and people
traveling to and from Aydlett would use the bridge
project so we don’t want them to have to pay a toll
until they can get off. It makes for a much more
compact interchange.

With this alternative we are crossing
Maple Swamp on fill and there are several places where
we make provisions for wildlife passage for animals
that live in the swamp.

There is change to the road circulation
system in Aydlett. What you see on that slide is
there are exits from -- traveling from on 158 to
Aydlett, you can exit into Aydlett, and you can also
enter, go back to 158 from Aydlett. There is no
connection between the bridge and the community of
Aydlett.

This is also because the toll plaza is at
grade beside Narrow Shore Road which is the road that
runs along the Sound and we provide an overpass to
maintain the circulation system in the community. The
toll plaza is in the community.

And this is a photo simulation that
illustrates what the overpass would look like and the
toll plaza.

We only have one corridor on the
mainland. We have two end points that are under
consideration on the Outer Banks. They're called C1,
which is the one in green, and they're called C2 which
is the one in purple, and they split once you get into
Currituck Sound.

The bridge is two lanes. This is a
typical bridge section showing two 12-foot lanes and
two 10-foot shoulders. The cost estimates in the EIS
also include some estimates for some additional
amenities including a separated bike/pedestrian path
made out of recycled plastic lumber. It would be lit
by light that is powered by solar panels. And there
would be parking lots on either end with permeable
pavement for people who wanted to use that, and that
is one way of handling bicycle-pedestrian crossings

As Steve mentioned, there would be the
need for navigation. The navigation height has not
yet been decided. If there does need to be a single
navigation span that is higher than the 15-foot
elevation for the rest of the bridge it would probably
be closer to the mainland because the water is deeper
there.

Now we're going to move across the Sound
and take a look at the northermnost terminus, C1. It
ends in the developing subdivision called Currituck Bay.
You can see on here that we provide -- because most of
the traffic will be traveling to and from the bridge
we make that the primary movement.

Also, in order to keep traffic from
backing up to the bridge from signalized intersections
further south, NC 12 from this point would be widened
to four lanes down into the Currituck Club area.

This photo simulation illustrates that
intersection.

Now take a look at the other corridor.
You can see that it goes around the marsh islands on
Currituck Sound. Also, the bridge would bridge the
marshes that are along the shoreline at that point.

This alternative would come in just south
used to evaluate impacts in the presumption that the
primary way that drainage is handled along DC 12 today
is through inlets that direct water from the streets into
the soil. The challenge in this situation is sometimes to
determine whether the drainage system is satisfactory
or whether improvements are needed. In one particular
case the widening for four lanes would extend two miles
down through the Curtin Club area. And this is a photo
illustration looking back towards the bridge.
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ditches to infiltration basins at low levels, again, remaining dry because it will be a place to put the water if it's more convenient for everybody until there's the opportunity for it to naturally infiltrate into the soil like it does today.

Okay. We're now going to -- these are the hearings maps. Again, the color is an indication of our study area, not the area of impact. What we're looking at there is the southern end of Southern Shores. Immediately to the left of this map is the intersection with NC 12 and 158. And we'll now take a look. And again, it's three lanes. I mentioned that the drainage features are actually all outside the existing right-of-way in permanent drainage easements but very little displacement is involved in providing for the drainage.

When we get into the Duck area there's already three lanes through downtown Duck so no change is made in that area.

Moving up to the Sanderling Inn area, Dare-County Currituck line, moving into Pine Island, again, continuing three lanes.

Now, here, that is the Hampton Inn area and here we get to the Currituck Club subdivision.

It's there that the right-of-way of NC 12 widens to a hundred feet as opposed to 60 feet. That does provide room for four lanes. So it's here that the four lanes would begin. Again, in this case you see four 12-foot lanes, a median, left turn lanes at intersections.

Now, in this area there is currently no multi-use path but space would be left for one in this design so that if Currituck County wants to install a multi-use path in the future that opportunity is not foreclosed.

Again, you have the infiltration strips along the road. They can be very narrow here because most of the subdivisions control their drainage internally and we do not have subdivisions draining into the road. Again, the infiltration strips would be part of the drainage easements just outside the right-of-way.

Where you see the color change from orange to purple, that's the point with NCB4, the one where we're only doing two to four miles of widening where the road would start to widen out from two lanes to four until we can continue on.

Here we continue past Currituck Club.

Now we're back in the TimBuck II area in which we were before. This area up here where C2 came in, where you see a change from purple to green -- well, with the
widenings-existing-roads alternative, all the widening
ends at Albacore Street. So about just before the
green everything ends and you just widen existing
roads. They remain two lanes north of that point.
And as we indicated, C2 is further north so the green
indicates where the four-lane lane widening would
continue on to C2.

Also with the four-lane widening would
come changes primarily in terms of restrictions of
left turns in the Food Lion area as well as the
TimBuck II area.

And that's essentially what we are
staying along NC 12. Now we're going to move south
and take a look at what would be involved in widening
US 158 between the Wright Memorial Bridge and the
intersection with NC 12 and 158.

What's proposed along 158 in our
preliminary design is called a super street. It's
essentially a street that has more higher capacity
than normal. What you do is that you limit the people
who are trying to either cross the road from
cross-streets or turn left from cross-streets. They
cannot do that. They have to turn right and then
there is a signalized break in the median where they
can make a U-turn. What that does is it increases the
amount of through traffic that can go along the road
and reduces the opportunity for congestion that's
caused by people stopping at traffic lights. And that
would go from the Currituck Sound area to NC 12.

At NC 12 both -- previously all the
alternatives had involved widening existing roads
including the interchange at 158 and NC 12. Access,
full access to the Welcome Center is maintained. Of
course, turning movement up NC 12. The primary change
from the interchange in terms of the surrounding
community is, again, you cannot have driveways and
ramps, driveways and roads, local streets into the
ramps and so there will be a lot of change in terms of
access to 158 in this area.

In terms of one where we just build the
bridge, there would still possibly be some improvement
down in this area because we also have a hurricane
evacuation goal. US 158 is the -- according to our
model is the bottleneck for hurricane evacuation,
including this area, which is logical because we've
not all the traffic from NC 12 merging into 158.

So one option through this area would be
to add a third outbound lane to this section of 158
that could only be used in emergency situations.
There would be no interchange, there would be no other
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change in this area. And I'll show you what that
might look like in a few moments.

Okay. Finally what we're going to take a
look at is these improvements that are shown on 158.
These are all hurricane-evacuation related. Again,
based on the hurricane model the state has, the
primary challenge in terms of reducing clearance times
is to move traffic through easier along 158 from NC 12
to 168 at Buxton where the road splits. If we build
SR 2 we would need to make these improvements for 25
miles. If we build the bridge then those improvements
only need to occur for about five miles because the
bridge would divert so much traffic off of the
southern part of 158. So that's one big advantage of
the bridge in terms of hurricane evacuation.

This photo simulation illustrates what
the third outbound lane might look like and
essentially would be a wide, paved shoulder that would
be signed and marked 'for evacuation use only.'

Another option that is considered in the
EIS is the idea of reversing some turn lanes during an
evacuation. That would only work, however, if the
bridge is built because it would not be -- it's
logistically impossible to keep control of a temporary
reversal like that for a full 25 miles. But it is our

understanding from Emergency Management they could do
it for five.

These slides which we'll go through are
showing the 25 miles of adding that third outbound
lane. For the most part no additional right-of-way
would be required. There are some places were there
are slivers of right-of-way. There would during
construction for the most part require temporary
construction easements so they have room to build the
third outbound lane but for the most part there would
not be an additional right-of-way.

And again, if you build the bridge all
that you're seeing here right now would not need to be
built because of the diversion of the traffic to the
bridge. The northern bridge would reduce the traffic
significantly on 158.

Now we're starting to approach the
Intracoastal Waterway. You see it up there in the
upper right. At the Intracoastal Waterway you would
not build a third outbound lane, it would be too
expensive. What you would do with that bridge would
be reverse one of the inbound lanes to get your third
lane.

And then with all of the alternatives you
would continue either with reversal of the lanes or
using this third outbound lane through to the 168
intersection.

Steve?

MR. DEWITT: Thank you, John.

I hope everyone picked up one of these,
which is the comment form. And even if you come up
here tonight and make comments, still it would be very
helpful if you would fill this out and give your
opinion.

There are six or seven questions here
that are somewhat pointed. For instance, at the
bottom of the first page where it talks about
preference from the MCB2, MCB4 and design Option A or
B. I know there's some Aydlett folks here tonight, I
think you know why that's on there. We certainly
would like to ensure that we capture all those
comments so that form is very important to us.

We've got I think nine people here that
signed up to speak and what I'll do, again, I'll go
through those in the order in which we received them.
When those are done if there is someone else that
wants to come up and speak, you're certainly welcome
to do that.

Again, we're limiting it to three
minutes. We are recording verbatim everything we're
saying tonight. You see this lady up here typing
away. She's recording everything and it becomes part
of our public record.

Remember, you have three minutes, and do
I have a timekeeper? At the two-minute mark he'll do
something.

MR. WALSH: I'll flash a light.

MR. DEWITT: Flash a light and let you
know that your time is almost over.

And if you would please make sure you
state your name clearly so that we can capture it. If
you're affiliated with a group or company, whatever it
is, or you're just a citizen or a homeowner, just let
us know that so that we can ensure that we capture
that correctly. And because of the acoustics I would
ask you to come up here to the microphone and speak
clearly into that.

And the first person is Warren Judge, and
I think he actually slipped out.

VOICE: He had to leave.

MR. DEWITT: Okay. Don Kingston,

MR. KINGSTON: My name is Don Kingston.

I live in the Town of Duck. I am the mayor pro tem of
the Town of Duck and I'm here tonight to represent the
town council and the citizens of Duck.
The current and previous Duck town councils are in support of the MCB4 alternative in building the Mid-Currituck Bridge, specifically, the construction of a two-lane toll bridge across the Currituck Sound with approach roads in Currituck County, a third outbound evacuation lane on US 158 between NC 168 and the Mid-Currituck Bridge, or the use of the existing center turn lane, a third outbound evacuation lane on US 158 between the Wright Memorial Bridge and NC 12 or the use of the existing center turn lane, and a median in Currituck County Outer Banks from Seashell Lane to the intersection of NC 12 and the Mid-Currituck Bridge.


We are in agreement with the stated goals and purposes to build the Mid-Currituck Bridge presented by the North Carolina Turnpike Authority, those being to improve traffic flow, reduce travel time, and to reduce substantially hurricane clearance time.

We would add on the latter goal that this would also provide an alternative evacuation route in the event NC 12 is blocked in the Town of Duck during a severe storm event. There is also the potential for inlet formation within the Town of Duck which would isolate all residents and visitors from that point in Duck into Currituck County. To date we have been very fortunate, NC 12 has not been impassable during an evacuation.

We are firmly committed to the decision to select MCB4 as the Recommended Alternative. The selection of this alternative minimizes the impact on our coastal community of Duck and our new 11-acre park, that enhances pedestrian-biking safety, eliminates increased vehicular conflicts, eliminates displacement of about 47 properties, and the expensive right-of-way acquisitions.

Any widening of Route 12 through the Duck community would fundamentally change the character of the town and would be contrary to the efforts we have made to establish and maintain our town's vision of a slow-paced coastal town and family-oriented vacation destination.

The Town of Duck joins with the North Carolina Turnpike Authority, the Federal Highway
Also have long recognized that there is a better way
to get our summer visitors to the north beaches. To
visit the Mid-Currituck Bridge. For at least the past
10 years the Town of Southern Shores has been in the
forefront of efforts to make the Mid-Currituck Bridge
a reality. 10 years ago the Build a Bridge Preserv
our Roads Committee was created by our Southern Shores
Town Council in cooperation with the Town of Duck
specifically to further the movement to a
Mid-Currituck Bridge. The committee has been
singularly successful in keeping our efforts informed
of the status of the bridge, but more importantly in
analyzing and critiquing the many studies and
consultants' reports of the Department of
Transportation on the subject.

Thus, I'm pleased to appear before you
today to express the wholehearted support of the
People of Southern Shores for the draft environmental
impact statement that identifies the alternative MCB4
to the northern Outer Banks.

The People of Southern Shores urge the
North Carolina Turnpike Authority and the federal
Highway Administration to get on with it. Make this

Mr. DEVEN: I'm Hal Deven. I'm the mayor
of the Town of Southern Shores. As a town has been
the victim of weekend traffic jams by those
vacationers idling on Ocean Boulevard and on Duck Road
to their way to the north beaches. The people of
Southern Shores recognize the importance of our
summiting guests; they are the economic engine that
makes it possible for us full-time residents to live
in an area that is blessed by all who are fortunate
to be here full time.
bridge happen. It is long past due. Alternative MCB4 should be implemented as a fast-paced solution to a pernicious problem that has been endured by too many for too long.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments, sir. I'll be glad to take those. Thank you.

John Wander.

MR. WANDER: My name is John Wander. I represent the Duck Community and Business Alliance. The Community and Business Alliance is an amalgamation of homeowners in Duck and the businesses in Duck.

I agree with everything that Hal and Don have said. I'd just like to make three brief points. Number one, I'd like to thank the Turnpike Authority staff for presenting thorough and complete alternatives and to give us a choice on -- with some details behind it.

Second, we strongly support MCB4 and that alternative that's recommended by the Authority.

And third, we remain unanimous in our opposition to any widening of NC 12 through Duck and Southern Shores.

I thank you for letting me make this statement for the record.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.
their patrons to watch the sunset and see the Sound.

This is my entire livelihood along with several members of my family. We have three other businesses that also operate off this pier and they will be destroyed, also. And this is a -- we have a serious operation. It's not just a little small-time thing. We have a great deal of time and money invested in them and I believe they should receive fair consideration in the decision process.

Also, the entire Timbuck II complex, which I was the former vice president of the COA, will have a huge negative economic impact on all of those business owners as well and they should be also considered because there's about, I don't know, 50 merchants in there, something like that.

And we also have the golf course which is pictured on the front of this handout. So I mean, that's going to be the view from the bridge looking down on our little golf course that used to be so quiet and nice.

So again, my suggestion's the no-build option but if that's not possible then definitely the C1 option because no businesses or homes will be displaced, or I mean, I want to C2 -- no. I want C1, the northern one, the northern one, Corolla Bay.

MR. A. MEREDITH: I think I'm signed up to speak next.

MR. DeWITT: Are you Andrew?

MR. A. MEREDITH: Yes. Can I just give him the next three minutes?

MR. K. MEREDITH: I got everything already.

MR. DeWITT: This is Andrew Meredith, Jr.

MR. A. MEREDITH: Andrew Meredith, Jr.
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I'm Michael's partner in Corolla Water Sports and the putt-putt there and the Para Sail business.

I don't know if that map of the proposed C1 can be brought up right now? Can we look at that?
The landing, exactly where it's going to be so I can point out --

MR. DeWITT: If you have got some real specific questions we can address those --

MR. A. MEREDITH: It's not a question. I just want to point out and make sure that everybody knows exactly where we are on that map and what our business is.

MR. DeWITT: I think we're aware of that.

We're pretty tuned into it.

MR. A. MEREDITH: Okay. Then that big purple shaded area and where our property line is exactly and how we're being cut off from access to the Sound by the I guess it's 50 feet on either side of the proposed bridge and whether or not it could be -- if you do end up choosing that C2 landing, that there is room in that purple shaded area for you to pull that bridge down just a little bit to give us shoreline on our property.

The way that it's set up you've cut us off from being able to get to the Sound at all, where

even if you did come over our existing dock zone and we had to change the configuration of our dock, we do need that bridge just to come down just a little bit in order to not intersect the property line to block us out of basically our livelihood and the, you know, long-term major investment, basically.

MR. DeWITT: What we will do is that alignment is the one that's picked we certainly will meet with the folks that are impacted by it and if there's a way to miss or minimize we certainly will do that.

MR. A. MEREDITH: Okay. And I want to reiterate that I think that the whole atmosphere of Corolla is the way that it is and it is so desirable because it is hard to get to and that, you know, it makes it kind of that far-flung place. And even up in the Corolla Beach and everything and how that will all be affected by easy access to make it less desirable which I think will bring down property values in the whole area.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.

MR. A. MEREDITH: Thank you.

MR. DeWITT: Allen Forman.

MR. FORMAN: For temporary physical reasons I'd rather stay where I am.
MR. DEWITT: Can everybody hear him okay?

MR. FOWLER: My name is Allen S. Forman.

I've been a resident of the Outer Banks for 26 years.
I first came here in 1953 as a sailor in the United
States Navy and I wondered why there was nobody on the
beaches and I was told because it's so tough to get
to.

I just want to make a few comments. Here
according to NCDOT the Currituck bridge is needed for
three reasons that are listed on the talking points
for Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge. You missed one very
important reason. When you build that bridge you're
going to have people that want to move over there with
children. Right now it's a two- to two-and-a-half
hour bus trip on school buses, dangerous roads. When
the tourists get here our lives are much more in
danger than the other eight months of the year when
they're not here. It limits the children's
after-school activities. And more would participate
if they knew there was a late bus directly across the
bridge and get home in less than an hour and a half or
two hours.

The other I have a question which you
might be able to answer. Where on the list of
Turnpike Authority projects is the Mid-Currituck
Bridge listed for starting or progress made here
tonight? Which I feel progress has been made.

Until today at lunchtime I was under the
impression that the first time this bridge came up for
discussion was 26 years ago in April 1984 in the lobby
of the Sanderling Inn and there were maybe 50 or 75
people there. Within a month there was another
meeting at the Sanderling Inn lobby. I went to that.
At the third meeting I began to realize between the
people that didn't want the bridge and bureaucracy it
was going to be a long time. A little bit of
snippiness. I hope I can cross that bridge in less
than 26 years than it took for us to be here tonight.

Three main points and I'm going to sit
down. Hurricane evacuation, I'm definitely -- I've
always been since day one in favor of the bridge. But
hurricane evacuation, you can't -- if you've never
been here when there's a hurricane coming and the
people are coming up from Hatteras and they're trying
to get past 158 and 12, it's bedlam.

The other thing is I had a limousine
service here for 17 years and it was an extra two
hours. The people that I would pick up at the Norfolk
airport and take to Corolla or up above the end of the
hard road, they didn't care about the money because
they got the pleasure of staying here. But it was an 
extra two hours every time we had to do it.
And again, I want to just say you missed the point by not figuring in the high school students and the hour that they have to spend in a bus, once the bridge is built and people want to live over there, and they've got families.
Thank you very much.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.
The last card I have is Dean Helms.

MR. HELMS: My name is Dean Helms. My wife and I have lived in Southern Shores for about six years. We live on Duck Woods Drive. That's north of the 158.
I see no reason for any additional concrete between the Wright Memorial Bridge and 17/158. I like the idea of a constant flow of an existing lane, either three and two or four and one.
I accept MCB4 with the exception it's missing what you have on MCB2, which is the interchange. In a lot of ways we need the interchange before we need the bridge. I know, I'm familiar with a horse called Any Day Yesterday. But it's not just the weekends which jams up 12 and 158, it's all week long. The visitors up north go down to Pea Island.

The ones down south go up to Corolla and the horses, the lighthouse and the wonderful Currituck science museum. But I think we really have to concentrate on getting an interchange at 12 and 158. Thank you very much.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you, sir.

Is there anyone else that would like to speak? That's all the folks.

MR. MCCOMBS: I filled out a card.

MR. DEWITT: If you want to come on up, just come on up. Those are all the cards I had.

MR. MCCOMBS: I'm here on the behalf of hundreds of local bicyclists and literally thousands of bicyclists in the future. I'm not too encouraged that you lost my card so I'm not thinking --

MR. DEWITT: I have it. They stuck together a little bit. Jack McCombs. Sorry about that.

MR. MCCOMBS: Thank you. All the bicyclists, I'll call those bike riders, that I know, and it's hundreds of them in the Outer Banks, I've never met one person who does not want the bridge. We also drive cars and we're fully aware of the need for the bridge and the reasons for it.

I'm very pleased, and I said this when
you had the review about a year and a half, two years ago, that you are building into the design accommodation for cyclists. One thing I would like you to think about is what they have on the Virginia Dare Bridge. Midway eastbound and westbound are rest areas, and for some of us, it’s not so much a rest area but a place that we can stop and enjoy the beauty of that scenery there, and that will be replicated at the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

I really do not believe that most folks who are not familiar with cycling in the U.S. understand that this bridge is literally going to bring in thousands of additional people who will come here to ride bicycles. And in fact, I think there will be some people making day trips from Virginia and parts of North Carolina, driving to the western terminus of that bridge, parking, getting their bicycle out to just to ride over the bridge. And I hope that you have accommodations and you’ll have the land to build adequate parking, particularly on the western terminus, because you are absolutely going to have thousands of people coming here to ride bicycles and this bridge is going to be a big engine for that as well as the new bridge that will go over Oregon Inlet. It’s going to really enhance the economic

activity in the Outer Banks. It’s going to have a huge impact.

There is an organization now in the Outer Banks that are promoting marathons, half marathons, triathlons, and next spring they’re going to promote the first bicycle event in the Outer Banks. These bicycle events are going to increase in numbers and types. Some of the events are going to bring in as much as 10,000 cyclists for a week and they’ll be bringing in 15- to 20,000 more people for a week.

Most importantly please do not charge tolls for cyclists, because if you do that, it’s going to choke off that growth that you’re going to see in the number of cyclists and economic activities. So I would plead for NCDOT not to charge tolls for bike riders. Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments, and we do not have the intention of charging bicyclists a toll.

MR. MCCOMBS: Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Others that wish to speak? Just please come up to the podium. You can form a line if there’s enough. If not just please come up. Make sure you state your full name.

MR. AVERY: Okay. Yvonne Avery. I live
is Aydlett. I had not planned to talk tonight. I was going to be at the other two meetings where I would be with like people from Currituck County.

But anyway, you talk about when you take away from homeowners and you make them whole by giving them money or whatever. When you change a community’s way of life how can you make that whole again?

Aydlett is the most beautiful place. Have you been there?

MR. DEWITT: I have, ma’am.

MS. AVERY: I wonder how many of those on the board that will make this decision have been to Aydlett. I think if you go there then you’d think there’s no way we can change this, this is such a beautiful community. And we do not want the bridge in our front yards. And I’ll speak more later. Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Yes, ma’am?

MS. FRANCIS: I’m Cindy Francis, a landowner in Corolla and in Monterey Shores. I’m against building the bridge. I want Corolla to stay the way it is. I’m especially against Cl and it would go directly through Monterey Shores. Doing so my children will have to cross a four-way

highway, four-lane highway to get to their community pool and to get to their clubhouse and playground. I think it’s unsafe. I don’t think it’s a good alternative in any way. And it scares me to think that you would bring a bridge and dump it off into the middle of a neighborhood where children are running back and forth and I think that it would be hazardous. I just can’t imagine even considering it. I hope that you choose not to build the bridge. Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Anyone else? Yes, sir.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Wally Davis and I live in Aydlett, North Carolina.

And the reason I’m down here today is because I wanted to hear the comments of the folks here in Dare County, and the first comment, I would like to know if you’d just publicly hold a hand up if you have read this Draft Environmental Impact Statement? Have you read it entirely? Okay.

Out of how many, a hundred people here, 50, 75, you have about 20 people who have read this.

And many times today we complain about our representatives not reading the bills that are passed and they pass them. This is as important to this area as those bills are. You need to read this document.
and read it with an understanding of what it's saying
and the basis on which it's being said.

The details in this are a great question
and these folks have spent -- 15 years I've been going
to public hearings on this bridge. They spent a lot
of time compiling this information. I wouldn't agree
with a lot of it and there are times that facts are
changed to the advantage of building a bridge in this,
in my opinion. In my opinion. So it's important for
you to read your Draft Environmental Impact Statement
and be continuing in these meetings.

As I said, I've been here since the
mid '90s making comments about this. I haven't been
here quite as long as Mr. Forman, he's got me beat a
little bit. I hope that Mr. Forman is here another 26
years not to ride over a bridge.

The 1998 Draft Environmental Impact
Statement was rescinded because it had inadequate
purpose and need. The major purpose was for hurricane
evacuation. That is still part of the purpose of
this, and I'm not saying that's not something that
would be improved. However, because of the way the
design is, the one-way or turning the traffic in three
lanes going from Wright Memorial back to Coinjock
Bridge is no different than if we're going to talk

about turning the three lanes back north through
Virginia. And on top of it there's no guarantee that
Virginia will allow us to enter Virginia. They've
stopped us from going up there before and that's where
the bottleneck was.

I was surprised to find that the first
meeting on this was in Dare County on a mid-county
bridge in Currituck. What I thought important -- I
thought about it a little bit and said, you know what,
that kind of makes sense, I guess, because really, the
problem's mostly in Dare County. Most of the issues
with the traffic, Southern Shores. Duck, is in Dare
County.

And so I would agree with you, there
needs to be traffic improvement in Dare County along
Route 12, Route 158. However, this bridge doesn't
solve that problem. The MCB4 does not address the
roads that are needed to improve the traffic into
Dare -- up and down that corridor. It will -- the
same amount of traffic will go to Corolla either way,
same number of cars, so it's a matter of just
recouting them a little bit.

Lastly, I'd like to finish with saying
that this morning I rode from the end of Aydlett Road
to the Currituck County line. It took me
45-and-a-half minutes to do so. That's with water
partly across the road south of Duck, slow traffic. I
rode no higher than the traffic laws and frequently
rode less than the traffic laws. So this problem is a
problem essentially 15 weekends of the year for major
problems and during the summer for the rest of the
time.

You're talking about spending $15 million
a year by the state plus 680-- as an average of the
mid-county bridge or MCB4 alternative to pay for a
bridge that somewhere around at max. at a max. 1,095
cars per hour at the worst peak time is supposed to be
traveling. I don't believe all the 1,095 are going
into Corolla because if they got there they would be
piled up at the end of the bridge, I can tell you. So
thank you for your time.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.
And I, too, would encourage you, if
you've not read the Environmental Impact Statement we
want you to read it, we want the comments, we want
your thoughts on it, and the best way to gather that
information in your own mind is to go through it, look
at the details. And if you have questions, certainly
pass those on to us or call us and we'll talk through
it.
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Other comments that anybody wants to
take? Yes, sir.

MR. FRANCIS: Hi. My name is Matt
Francis. Both my wife and I just drove up here today
from Baltimore. We are property owners here up in the
Corolla area.

And I agree that this is a valuable
document but nowhere in it does it address the crime
that is going to come over that bridge. High schools,
great, love them. If anybody's been to Virginia
beach, you know, New Jersey, Ocean City, Maryland,
that's what this beach is going to look like in 20
years if this bridge is built. I am totally against
it. I understand the impact statements that's going
to happen to the businesses, they're going to be
affected. I also understand the road, the road
issues. I've been here during a hurricane evacuation.
Not fun.

You guys have spent a lot of money,
taxpayers' money. I'm sure on doing this study. I love
the northern part of this beach. I absolutely love
it. And you know what that does not address? How
it's going to affect the wildlife, fish, the
pollution.

There was a study that was done up in
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Baltimore about the effects of the run-off from these bridges. It's polluting the Chesapeake Bay, it's killing the fish, it's putting chemicals into the water. What is this place going to look like in 20 years with, you know, a huge, you know, three-lane, two-lane bridge coming across?

So I'm not going to give everything -- I'm going to be at every meeting this week and I can tell you right now that this is going to be totally against what I believe in.

And the other thing, too, is who's purchasing all the permits for this? Have they been purchased yet?

MR. DEWITT: The permits are part of the process that we're going through.

MR. FRANCIS: Right. So they've not been purchased yet?

MR. DEWITT: Well, purchase isn't the right word. We go through an application process and we address water quality and many of the things that you've talked about.

MR. FRANCIS: Okay. So the answer is no, nothing's been done around the permit process.

So, once again, I'm totally against this. It's going to destroy the wildlife up here. For those of you that do know about the horses, they're going to be gone. And you know what? That's really sad, because people know the Outer Banks for their wild horses that are up here. My daughter is going to be devastated.

And lastly and finally, my kids are not going to be crossing over a four-lane highway to go to their pool or to their clubhouse. And who up here, I don't know if there's lawyers in here, who's going to take responsibility after a child dies crossing your four-lane highway because there was no light put up, there was no crosswalk or the bicycles couldn't get across because the speed limit's supposedly 35 miles an hour but somebody was doing 50?

So, once again, I am against this, and I appreciate your time in preparing this for us, and thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Anyone else? Yes, ma'am?

MS. LEARY-SMITH: I've been to Raleigh and all around and I've been coming to the meetings 26 years. I stopped at Aydelott and I looked across the Currituck Sound. I'm a property owner in Currituck County in the community of Aydelott. I do not want to
lose the quality of life this community now offers.
If you place a toll in Aydlett and this
will be the last exit before crossing the mid-county
bridge, most of the travelers will only continue
through Aydlett and Poplar Branch to continue to the
Outer Banks joining the highway on 158 at Grandy, not
wanting to pay the toll. Leave your toll booth on 158
if you've got to build this bridge. We're more than
willing to travel the Swamp Road, leave it alone, to
give the bridge to travel to Corolla. The Swamp
Road has never flooded, it offers no damage to the
environment or floodplain.
Currituck County is very fortunate to
have the northern beaches which support the largest
tax base for the mainland. Because of the quality of
life this beach offers to its guests is why they
choose to come to vacation there. And the same
quality of life is why approximately 500 permanent
residents also choose to live and pay taxes in
Currituck County and from Corolla.
Why would you want to destroy the goose
that has given you the golden egg? Each of you know
that the easier it is to get somewhere, the more
people will definitely come to an area. You now have
the highest clientele, and you want to open this area
to day trippers which will only increase your daily
population, causing additional costs for law
enforcement to meet the demands of a very diverse
audience and to be detrimental to a serene, beautiful
vacationer's paradise.
The bridge cannot be self supporting and
will gobble up state funding. Let's support a much
needed bridge by replacing the Bonner Bridge. Put
your toll facilities at the best candidate using -- or
being of the Bonner Bridge.
Let us maintain that same quality of
life, not disturbing a primary nursery area for
various species of fish, wildlife and taking care of
our natural resources.
Where a tourist spends his time is what
he spends his money. You have this now, so please let
it continue and remain the same for its residents, its
taxpayers and its vacationers because that's what they
want.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you. Could you
restate your name for us?

MS. SMITH: Sorry. Penny Leary-Smith.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you very much.

Other comments from anyone? Yes, ma'am?

Please come up and state your name.
MS. PIERCE: Yes, I'm Karen.

Quidley-Pierce. I live at 5867 Currituck Highway, Corolla, North Carolina.

Again, I've been going to these for over 26 years or ever how many years and the things that come to mind and the description of our county never mentioned a Coinjock Bridge referred to as Knapp Bridge which crosses the Intracoastal Waterway. The way that I see it, that it makes lower Currituck, which is Popular Branch Township south of Coinjock Bridge an island, not a peninsula.

Every imaginable scenario is dreamed up and, yes, I mean dreamed. I don't believe there have been any facts based on how about Coinjock Bridge being wiped out during a hurricane evacuation? Not heard or mentioned of. Because when I wrote that I thought, you know, when the vehicular traffic is trying to get out because of a hurricane, guess what, so are the boat traffic. And I mean, they could hit Coinjock Bridge and then there would be no way out.

And I mean, you're building a bridge, this mid-county bridge on an island, in my eyes.

And it says that -- I recognize the importance of tourism to the county's economy, but you live in a resort and that depends on population that is seasonal and housing is mostly renter occupied.

Well, they have I just read it was 26 days -- I said 36 days -- out of 365 days they're going to spend all this money for this mid-county bridge, and that includes the check in and check out is when the traffic is worse and, you know, on the weekend. Most resorts do have traffic they have to deal with. It comes with the territory.

Hurricane evacuation. I was trying to think back and, in fact, I even talked to one of our commissioners when I come here today. I had called two years ago when all this started coming up again and I was just trying to recall how much money -- I remember it was either '88 or '89 that a hundred -- it was either a hundred or $125,000 Currituck and Dare shared in paying lobbyists, and guess what we paid for? Hurricane evacuation. And -- okay. And it just -- I called up there and they told me -- I called the finance office. Well, nobody knew, it had been too long. They told me to ask the finance office again. I'd like to find that out.

Okay, one more thing. Okay. In the paper in January of 2010 talking about hurricane evacuation, I saved the article. It says when the storm is approaching, land forecasters will now say...
watch advertisement of the tropical storm conditions could be expected that there is 48 hours instead of 36 hours. Warning of tropical storm or hurricane conditions will be issued 36 hours ahead, not 24 hours. It's really just the result of accumulation of improvements over time. The track forecast has been getting better incrementally year after year and there has been enough of an improvement now that we feel comfortable increasing it.

And just to end, I just think state money needs to be spent where there is more pressing areas, like the Bonner Bridge.

And -- oh, well, a question I have about holding ponds. How would they be checked? You know, about the environmental -- because, you know, if it runs off, guess what, it's going to run in the pond.

And from everything that I can see and really all you want to do is dig up Currituck and have ponds everywhere, and I'd just like to know if the holding pond -- how the pollution would be checked. And that's all.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Other comments or questions? Yes, sir?

MR. GREGORY: I'm Gene Gregory, Currituck County Commissioner.

I didn't know I was going to speak tonight but I did have some people here from Grandy and Currituck and I did want to say a word or two about the bridge.

Currituck commissioners have endorsed this bridge for the last 20 years. We've been on record in favor of this bridge. We desperately need this bridge for various reasons. We have to duplicate every service in Currituck County on the Outer Banks to date. We have the traffic -- as a matter of fact, I brought DOT down, about 10 years I got Don Connors to come down, I believe Mr. Jones was on that flight, too, but we flew over the traffic that particular Saturday. Traffic was backed up almost to Grandy.

We flew up here on the ridge where you turn north and south. Everything was clear south but it was bottled up, everything -- the northern traffic had everything blocked up to Grandy. If we had had that bridge that northern traffic would have been on the beach. We wouldn't have had that block up.

And I heard someone say a while ago it doesn't affect businesses in Currituck. It does affect businesses in Currituck. People on the weekends with some businesses are closing their businesses because they know people can't get out on
the road to go to them, they can't get in traffic, get
out of traffic. It does affect those businesses out
there.

If we have a sheriff -- you know, if we
had a bridge -- the sheriff's deputies now take an
hour and a half, two hours to get around if they would
have an emergency. We have to duplicate all those
depuities. If we had a bridge a deputy could be there
is 10 minutes. There's just such a need for this
bridge in Currituck.

Before I sit down I would want to say to
these Aydlett people, we have endorsed a bridge for
over 20 years now that would not empty in this
community of Aydlett. We still endorse Option A. We
do not endorse Option B that messes up this community
of Aydlett.

MR. DEWITT: Yes, sir. Thank you very
much for your comments.

Anyone else want to speak? We won't keep
you here any longer than you want to be.

If there's no more comments, again,
you've got a form, we would love for you to fill it
out and provide us your feedback. And some of you I
hope we'll see the next couple days while we're here.

Thank you very much for coming out and sharing your
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MR. DEWITT: I'm Steve DeWitt. I'm the chief engineer for the Turnpike Authority and I'll be helping guide us through this tonight.

Again, this is a public hearing. This is your opportunity to talk to us about your feelings about the project, whether you like it, whether you don't. That's what we're here to talk about tonight.

Again, if you haven't had a chance to sign up, there's a sign, there's a table up front, there are some cards to fill out and we'll talk about the rules for that in just a minute. But we want to provide anybody who wants an opportunity to come up and talk about the project to do that.

So, this is a public hearing for State Transportation Improvement Project No. R-2576. That number doesn't mean much to you but it means a lot to us. This is the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study.

What we're going to do tonight is go through again a somewhat abbreviated version of what we did last night because of our time. We're going to talk about background issues of the project, funding, schedule and so on and so forth as you can read through this slide here.

The project area. I think all of you are probably familiar with this project area and what this project is about. Important points north and south sort of all relate here to the project and the issues.

An important part of a project like this is called the purpose and need. This in essence defines the purpose, what is the purpose for a given transportation project, what is the need for that project. And the Environmental Impact Statement which we'll talk about here tonight and which is why we're here, really, goes through a process to prove one way or the other that some transportation solution, whatever it might be, is in fact the solution for the project.

This project basically has three points in that purpose and need definition. One is to improve traffic flow in the project area around NC 12/158 and so on; to reduce travel time for people between the Outer Banks and the mainland in Currituck County, and to substantially reduce hurricane evacuation time in the event that an evacuation from the area is necessary.

We have a variety of what we call detailed study alternatives. These have been screened down to the numbers, the routes that you see up here.

If you haven't picked up a Citizen...
Summary I would suggest that you do that. It's a very
good snapshot of what this is all about. If you have
it you'll see drawings and so on that may be a little
bit easier to read than what's up here.

But basically E22 is existing route.

It's looking at widening existing 12, potential
impacts and so forth for that.

MCB2 is Mid-Currituck Bridge 2 and MCB4.
Mid-Currituck Bridge 4. Both of those different
alternatives include a bridge across the Currituck
Sound. They differ in the amount of widening and
improvements that may be necessary on NC 12. And I'm
not going to spend time on these. Again, these
drawings are in your particular handouts.

We're going to talk about MCB4 tonight
because this is our Recommended Alternative at this
point. And again, it includes the bridge. The issue
yet or issues yet to be talked about in terms of where
we are and important input points for you tonight are
the touchdown points on the Outer Banks side, C1
northern points, C2 southern points, and other
associated issues.

Project funding. This is to be a toll
road. It is legislated that way. We're working in
that direction. The toll debt that we would take on
comes from a variety of things. The General Assembly
has provided $15 million a year for in essence 40
years. The bond terms for these kinds of projects are
40 years. Not too dissimilar to how you might borrow
money for a house. It takes longer but you get the
point of that.

There's other bits and pieces to this.

An important part of it is we do have a private
developer that we're working with. It is not a done
deal yet. We're going through a process with them to
determine whether or not it makes sense for the State
of North Carolina to engage this private developer to
design this project, bid it, finance it, operate it
and maintain it long term.

We are going to do what's best for the
State of North Carolina. It may or may not include
our private partners. We will get to that point as
the summer unfolds through a variety of efforts that
are going on with them.

People always want to know how much the
tolls cost or will cost. It's premature at this point
to say tolls are going to be X. You can see the
numbers up there. A study we did about three years
ago showed tolls are somewhere between the 6 and $12
range. It very likely will be a fluctuating toll, a
higher toll on summer weekends for obvious reasons,
lower tolls when the bridge would be expected to be
used a little bit less.

Across the state we are developing
basically cashless, if you will, toll technology where
you have a transponder, sticker tag, E-ZPass, that same
kind of technology. It will ride on a gantry system.
You'll have a pre-set-up account, we'll debit your
account and you'll never slow down. I call it
invisible tolling.

On this project you may very well see
some cash lanes in the short term because of the wide
variety of states and different places where folks
come from that visit this area. So you may see some
cash lanes here. And if you have seen our EIS in the
handouts you'll see some footprints for those kinds of
things.

What is an EIS? EIS is an Environmental
Impact Statement as required by federal law. The
National Environmental Policy Act dictates everything
that we do here. It's a very technical process, it's
done by engineers and planners and it's got to be
defendable, it's got to be repeatable. If we get sued
we've got to stand up in front of a court of law and
defend what we've done. If we can't say that we've
done it in accordance with law we will lose and that's
not going to be very good.

What the EIS does, again, it defines why
the project's needed or the reasonable alternatives
that we've looked at; have we looked at every
reasonable alternative in this process to come up with
whatever solution the project EIS dictates to be done.
We've looked at impacts on wetlands, streams, how
property owners are impacted, is your home impacted,
is your business impacted, are there historical issues
or archaeological issues, any environmental issues
that you could think about, all of that are studied
under this in very detailed technical detail to come
up with the process that we use here.

And lastly and I think maybe equally or
most importantly is the public sentiment about a
particular project or a particular solution. That's
why we're here tonight. Your voice matters:
tremendously in what we do in terms of moving this
project in one direction or another; where the
touchdown point is in one point or the other; if it's
a bridge, if it's not. There are issues in Aydlett.
Those are the kinds of things that these hearings this
week are to do. We will either through this process
have you affirm some of the decisions that we've made.
You will help us move forward with more important
decisions one way or the other based on the input we
got here from last night, tonight and tomorrow night.

There are many people involved in this.
The Turnpike Authority is a division of NCDOT. This
actually is a document that is owned, so to speak, by
the Federal Highway Administration. We do the bulk of
the work for them but they in essence are the
executor, if you will, of the document at the end of
the day and they have to defend it, as we will.

Environmental agencies are with us every
step of the way. They bring up concerns. We address
those concerns. We have to be able to get permits at
the end of all of this and we've got to be partners
with them to ensure that whatever transportation
solution we end up with here, that it's permissible
and we can build it and move forward with it.

Who else is involved? All you folks.
You all are stakeholders in this, your local elected
officials. People that own property in the corridor.
Whether you live in North Carolina or live somewhere
else, if you're a property owner you have a voice. If
you use this road, any roads in the area, you have a
voice. If you're a business owner, you have a voice.
If you're a life-long resident of this area certainly

you have a very important voice. All of this matters
as we go through this.

First the selection process. We go
through all these details, we get down to a certain
number of alternatives which you see in your handout,
and then we make a decision based on the details that
we have to move forward one way or the other.

This is not a vote of the people. If a
hundred percent of the people want a bridge in this
particular location, that doesn't necessarily mean
that's where it would go. There's a lot of other
factors, the environmental issues, the environmental
impacts, the historical issues. Some things are
insurmountable. But your voice is a tremendously
important part of what this is all about.

This is not a political decision. People
tend to raise their eyebrows when I say that. It is a
political decision that got gap funding for this
project. It is not a political decision in terms of
is it a bridge, is it widening SC 12, are we doing
this, are we doing that. It is a technical detailed
process based in federal law that we've got to defend
in court. You cannot defend a political whim, if you
will, in a court of law.

Our Recommended Alternative as you can
see here includes a bridge. We'll talk a little bit
more in detail as John comes up here and gets into
that, but it is a bridge alternative. The decision
still is is it CI, being the northern touchdown point
or the Outer Banks, is it the lower or southern
touchdown point.

You see some work here in green on 158
and down at the Wright Memorial Bridge. Those are for
hurricane evacuation, and we can talk about those a
little bit more, too.

We're not going to get into the detail
about the right-of-way process. If you have questions
about this we have some brochures outside or you can
contact us individually and we would be more than
happy to show you what potential impacts there may be
by any of these decisions on property that you own and
then explain to you what that process is as it moves
forward.

Boating is certainly important given
where we are. We need to know people's desires,
preferences as it relates to use of the Sound itself.
Currently we have envisioned the Mid-Currituck Bridge
to look very similar to the Wright Memorial Bridge
with a bump, if you will, in the middle of it roughly
35 feet in height, but that is dependent on who uses

the Sound and what the requirements are for ships --
boats, rather, that would want to pass under the
bridge.

What happens next? We take all the
information we gathered this week, we go back, we look
at all the technical details and we utilize your
comments to make decisions to move forward. It is our
expectation in August of this year that we'll make a
decision on what the touchdown point is for that
bridge and we'll make a decision on whatever elements
there are that we have to decide in terms of the
mainland issues, and there are some there that we need
to public input on.

In September we expect to be at our Final
EIS. We're at the Draft EIS stage. We go to a Final
EIS, and then we get to what is called the Record of
Decision. That Record of Decision basically is the
last federal action that lets us move forward with
financing, permitting and construction of this
project. We hope to have that Record of Decision in
December of this year. Assuming all that happens and
we get to the point that we're financing this either
can our own as the State of North Carolina or with our
private partners, we could expect to see right-of-way
acquisition and those kinds of activities early next
year.

This is John Page. John Page is going to come up and give you some brief details about more specifics.

MR. PAGE: In the open house you saw five key maps. They show the five different basic alternatives. To reiterate quickly, ER2 is widening existing roads only. MB3 is widening existing roads and building the bridge, and then MB4 is focusing attention solely on building the bridge.

We're going to first focus our attention on the bridge. We're looking at two different options in this area: Option A and Option B. They differ in terms of -- they all have an interchange at 158. They differ in terms of where the toll plaza is. In the case of Option B (sic) the toll plaza is at US 158.

VOICE: Can you speak up, please?

MR. PAGE: I'm sorry, the mouse is not working right now.

This illustrates that there will be connections for existing businesses, and in the case of the east side of the road it connects to Waterlily Road.

That was the slide I was going to show at first.

This is an illustration of the interchange showing the configuration of the interchange and the presence of the toll plaza. With Option A we cross Maple Swamp on a bridge in the community of Aydlett, perhaps through the community of Aydlett first on fill. There would be a bridge over Narrow Shore Road and there would be no change in the travel patterns either to or from Aydlett or within Aydlett.

This is an illustration of what the bridge might look like heading out over the Sound from the community of Aydlett.

With Option B, again, there's an interchange of 158 but the toll plaza is not -- the toll plaza is rather in Aydlett. A key difference here first is that Aydlett Road is removed and restored as a wetland, and traffic traveling to and from Aydlett would be on the approach road to the bridge.

Here's an illustration of that small interchange.

This particular alternative assumes that Maple Swamp is crossed on fill with wildlife passages. In Aydlett there is change to the existing road system. As I indicated, there would
1. people would travel to Aydlett on the bridge.
2. There would be a ramp off before the toll plaza into Aydlett. There would be a ramp back on.
3. There are some additional driveways that are shown on that slide. Those are for toll facility maintenance only.
4. The toll plaza as indicated would be in Aydlett. That’s so people going to and from Aydlett do not have to pay the toll. It would be as shown here, assumed here at grade, which means that Narrow Road is blocked and it is replaced by an overpass over the toll plaza, so there is a lot of change in the circulation system in Aydlett in addition to the presence of the toll plaza. However, in both cases, both Option A and Option B there is no way to get on or off the bridge from Aydlett.
5. This photo simulation illustrates the overpass replacement for Narrow Shore Road going over the toll plaza and also shows the toll plaza.

When we cross Currituck Sound we divide into two corridors. C1 is the northernmost end point and C2 is the southernmost end point. The bridge is two lanes. This typical section shows a typical bridge in North Carolina, two 12-foot lanes with 16-foot shoulders and a bicycle-safe rail. Additional bicycle amenities such as a separated bike path and parking lots on either end for bicycle users are also under consideration.

Across Currituck Sound, and we’re going to focus our attention on the northernmost terminus which is at the southern end of the Corolla Bay subdivision. Zooming in you can see here that the travel to and from the bridge is given the priority.

Also, with all of these alternatives there is widening of up to four lanes south of the bridge. In case it would land in here it would go four miles down to an area south of Currituck Clubhouse Drive. The four lanes is necessary to keep summer weekend traffic from backing up onto the bridge.

This is an illustration of what that intersection might look like at the Corolla Bay subdivision.

C2 would skirt the marsh islands that are in that area, and we cross or bridge the coastal marshland that is in that part of the island and we come in at just south of TimBuck II. And in this particular case the road, NC 12 will be widened for two miles south.

The two miles north that we’re not widening is the distance between here and Corolla Bay.
And this is an illustration of looking towards the bridge, about what that might look like. All right. We’ve talked about the bridge.

1. Now we’re going to briefly talk about widening.

2. The widening that we’re going to talk about would occur over the full length of NC 12. It would be three lanes with a center turn lane and the multi-use paths that are along that area would be extended.

3. Also, as we know that NC 12 there’s

4. A run of mile that we talked about.

5. In Dare County and also in Currituck County where the right-of-way is only 60 feet, three

6. Would be three lanes with a center turn lane and the multi-use paths that are along that area would be extended. The challenge is sometimes while it’s

7. Generally, the most part drainage from the road and

8. From the surrounding subdivisions in the case of those

9. three flooding problems and if you make this improvement

10. What we assume in the CS and how to address it is

11. Currently, for the most part drainage from the road and

12. County, the water goes away because it’s absorbed into

13. Primary impact here is that the infiltration strips would be

14. Would be in permanent drainage easements, and we

15. The wide band as we said represents the

16. Study area where we gathered environmental data.

17. It does not represent the extent of the impact. The

18. It is the intersection of NC 12 and 158 where the

19. Curve is where the wider infiltration strips would be

20. In.

21. The wide band as we said represents the

22. Study area where we gathered environmental data.

23. It does not represent the extent of the impact. The

24. It is the intersection of NC 12 and 158 where the

25. Curve is where the wider infiltration strips would be
purchase them surrounding the properties.

Also, in downtown Duck where it's currently three lanes there would be no change made.

In this area in general the road -- the narrow infiltration strips would drain to infiltration basins onto mostly vacant lots.

Here we're at the Currituck County line and we're moving into Pine Island, through Pine Island.

This is the Hampton Inn area.

And then in this area which is about the time the Currituck Club subdivision begins, the right-of-way widens out to 60 feet which will only fit three lanes, to a hundred feet which can fit four lanes. So from here north with the widening existing roads or the larger widening alternatives there would be four lanes, four 12-foot lanes with a median that would allow for left-hand turn lanes.

There is currently not -- in parts of this area there is not a multi-use path. We recognize that would be an important future amenity so the design assumes that there's space for it to be put in if at some time Currituck County decides it would like to do that.

Where you see the color turn from orange to purple, that's the point where we just do the little bit of widening from two to four miles, that's where it would start to widen out from two to four lanes. So that unless we do the more extensive widening, there would be no change to NC 12 south of that purple.

And continuing north, we're back here in the TimBuck II area where alternative C2 ended. You can see TimBuck II on the upper left-hand corner. The widen-existing-roads alternative begins at Albacore Street. With the widen-existing-roads alternative there would be no widening north of Albacore Street other than to configure the intersection with left-turn lanes.

If C1, the more northern alternative is built, then the four lanes would continue beyond Albacore Street to Corolla Bay where the bridge would start.

The important thing here is with C1 there would be some restrictions on left turns in the Food Lion in the TimBuck II area, where C2 is only in the TimBuck II area in order to meet current NCDOT design criteria.

Okay. That's what we have on 12. We're going to take a look now at 158. These items would
only be done -- and for some reason this slide is black so I will go on.

What is proposed here is widening to a six-lane super street east of the Wright Memorial Bridge between NC 12 and the Currituck Sound. What a super street means is in order to get more cars passing through you limit the ability of people to turn left or pass through local intersections. What they would do instead is they would turn right and then they would move to an exclusive U-turn lane which would have a signal in order to make that move. And what that does is reduces the amount of red time that through-traffic experiences and allows you to put more cars through the area.

This alternative also includes an interchange at NC 12 and 158. The primary characteristic is there would be no change in your ability to get to the Welcome Center and it would facilitate people turning onto NC 12 and the through-traffic would be able to pass over beyond through the area without having to stop.

The primary impact of this is with all our interchanges you cannot have driveways or streets connecting directly to the ramps. So in terms of businesses and homes that are right in the interchange.

area, their access to 158 would be restricted and alternate access would have to be -- would be provided, or they would access NC 12. Finally, with the NC84 there is very little widening.

One of our goals is to improve hurricane evacuation. One of the bottlenecks to hurricane evacuation is this area between the Wright Memorial Bridge and NC 12, and one solution to that would be to add a third outbound lane that would only be used in an evacuation, and this sheet reflects that. As you can see, there is no interchange. The intersection of NC 12 and 158 stays the same.

Finally we're going to take a look at the only thing that's going on on 158 that is also a bottleneck for hurricane evacuation, it's what keeps -- it's -- the only way to lower clearance times is to make improvements. If you do not build a bridge the improvements have to be made for the full 25 miles from the Wright Memorial Bridge to 168.

If you do the bridge, because so much traffic would be diverted to the Mid-Currituck Bridge then hurricane evacuation improvements on 158 would only be needed for five miles from roughly the Intracoastal Waterway north.

There are two ways that you could
accomplish this. One is to add a third outbound lane which is only used during an evacuation. This slide illustrates that.

Another way might be to reverse the center turn lane. However, because of the logistics involved it is virtually impossible for 25 miles in terms of police and cones and signs and so forth. Reversing the center turn lane could only be done if you were only improving for five miles.

And with that, Steve, you're ready to go.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you, John.

We're going to start our public comment period and I'm going to call these names up directly as I received them. There are 28 speakers, and as I mentioned when we started we need to be out of here by 9:00, and I don't want to pressure anybody to do anything more or less than you want to do. I would ask that you keep to the three-minute timeline as strictly as we can. We want to make sure that your neighbors and community all have a chance to speak.

If you spoke last night, if you expect to speak tomorrow night, if you speak three times, you don't get three votes. It doesn't work that way.

Once we capture your comments, we've captured them. Certainly you're welcome again to come up tonight, I just want to make sure you know that in case there's a question there.

People are welcome to come in wherever they can fit and I will get out of the way, I'll be glad to do that.

VOICE: If any of you would like to, you can come and sit on the edge of the stage. There's people in the hallway that they're trying to listen out in the hallway. So if there's an empty seat, raise your hand so they know where the empty seat is.

(Discussion held off the record.)

MR. DeWITT: Our ground rules, please, respect your neighbor. When they come up here and say something, there are people in this room that many don't agree with each other on certain issues, please respect your neighbor, let them say what they want to say and then you'll have your turn to disagree with them. That's certainly part of this process.

I'm not going to debate with you. You come here, you say what you want. If there's a question very generally that I can answer, I will try to answer that but I'm not going to get into a back-and-forth dialogue with you. That's not what this is about. We want to hear your comments and that's really what we're going to do tonight, okay?
If you have specific questions about a piece of property that's going to be impacted by this or what's the corner of that look like, that's not what tonight is about. You can contact us at any time as we move forward and we'll give you as much detail as you want as it relates to personal property issues and those kinds of related things. We're here tonight to look at the information that we shared with you, talk about the alignment, bridge, no bridge, widening NC 12, the Aydlett issues and so on and so forth, so that's why we're here today.

I've got a timekeeper. He's going to give you a signal when you've used two minutes and then you'll have one minute to conclude.

Yes, sir?

VOICE: Is tonight's presentation going to be made available?

MR. DEWITT: A very good point. We are recording absolutely everything that's being said tonight and that transcript is available to anybody who wants it.

VOICE: I meant the slide show.

MR. DEWITT: Sure. Is that on our website, folks? It will be by the end of the week, it will be on our website.

VOICE: The meeting at the Currituck County courthouse today, is that going to be made in the public record?

MR. DEWITT: Sure. Yes. We have -- as part of the legal process we do what's called local officials' meetings that get sort of a preview -- it isn't sort of, it is a preview of what you've seen tonight, just in a more condensed version. So they're seeing the same thing that you're seeing.

Any other questions? We need to get started.

MS. LEARY-SMITH: Why is there a time limit that all of these people that might want to show their concern they couldn't do it if you have to end at 9:00?

MR. DEWITT: We've been told we have to be out of here by 9:00. That's not my rule. We have got 29 people that have signed up. I'll stay here as long as I can. We're not trying to run anybody out. The sooner we get to this, the sooner we can get through and see where we are. If you still want to make comment somehow we'll figure out a way to facilitate that. All I can tell you is the direction I've been given personally, they're going to lock the doors at 9:00. It's not my rule, okay?
So, with that let's go ahead and get started. What I'm going to do is call up the name of the first speaker and I'm going to call the name of the second speaker so we can try and streamline this a little bit. So if you'll be prepared as the second speaker also to come up. There's two microphones. I think you can figure that part of it out.

John Grattan is first followed by Bob Schultz. And if you'll please state your name and who you represent, if you represent somebody.

MR. GRATTAN: Good evening. Before we start here, I wonder, I prepared detailed page-by-page comments and I won't bore everyone with them, I guess, but what I'd like to do is make sure the stenographer gets a copy for the record.

MR. DeWITT: Sure. Anybody that does have written comments, if you would give those to us they become part of the project record and part of the consideration, so we appreciate that.

What can I do to help you?

MR. GRATTAN: I also have copies here for anyone who might want them.

MR. DeWITT: All right. Let's go ahead and start.

MR. GRATTAN: Don't all rush. My name's

John Grattan. I live at 740 Mariner Drive in Corolla.

I want to thank you for hosting the open house.

My wife and I moved here from California three years ago. In California I was an energy and environmental attorney. I also served in the state government as Assistant Secretary of the resources agency and Assistant Secretary to the business and transportation agency. I was also a State Coastal Commissioner and in those various capacities I either helped write, edited, provided legal adequacy review, challenged or defended literally hundreds of EISes.

This is not my first rodeo, folks.

I want to say one thing here. I think the direct impacts are handled pretty well in this Draft EIS. That's about like saying for a fat person you don't sweat much. The real impacts here are the indirect impacts, and that's the indirect and cumulative impacts that -- the growth-inducing impacts that will be driven by the bridge. In that regard the Draft EIS is fatally flawed and legally insufficient.

Just to give you an idea of the total lack of focus on the most important issues associated with the proposed bridge, the Draft EIS and the all-important Chapter 3 spends 81 pages discussing the direct impacts of the bridge. It devotes basically 10
pages to the indirect impacts on the Currituck County
Outer Banks. To use a Biblical expression, this DEIS
"strains at gnats, swallows camels."

Now, I've told you I've given a
page-by-page analysis of this aspect of the DEIS.
What I'll do is summarize here quickly.
The DEIS ignores as a significant
environmental impact the fact that the growth pattern
switched from Dare County to Currituck County. That
is a significant impact and has to be looked at. It
also ignores the total growth impact on both Dare and
Currituck counties. And finally, it ignores the day
trip impacts on both Currituck County Outer Banks and
the off-road area.

MR. WALSH: You're nearing three minutes,
sir.

MR. GRATTAN: Well, let's just let me
tell you now about the most important impacts, and
that's the impacts to the four-wheel area. We have
three significant resources there that need to be
protected. We have the wild horses, we have the dune
system, and we have the maritime forest. The effects
of these resources are not even mentioned. They say
that this is not going to encourage further trips out
there. It also says it's going to save 90 minutes to

get here. I think that's going to encourage greater
impacts. They say the reason is because there's equal
resources available and closer in Virginia, Virginia
Beach.

Well, I can say one thing. The person
that wrote that statement has never been to either
Virginia Beach or the Currituck County Outer Banks.
What we need to do, what they need to do is come here
this summer and spend one day out at the off-road area
and see what's going on there, particularly after the
erosion of the dunes with the two nor'easters and the
fact that Hatteras County has been shut off -- excuse
me -- Hatteras National Seashore has been shut off to
four-wheel drivers. Where does it go, folks? It goes
right here.

So, what I -- in conclusion, I'll rush
through to conclusion here. This Draft EIS is
inadequate from a legal perspective. What needs to be
done, it can't be corrected in the Final EIS, it needs
to be pulled back, it needs to be revised, it needs to
be reissued and re-circulated. Thank you very much.

MR. D'WITT: Thank you for your comments,
I appreciate it.

Mr. Bob Schultz, and the next person up
will be Kathy Schultz.
Mr. Schultz: Good evening. My name is Bob Schultz. I'm a six-year resident here in Corolla and President of the Homeowners Association of Monterey Shores.

I moved here because I liked Corolla, okay, the community. It's a community I've known since the early 1990s. I'm active in the community. And I think we need to protect Corolla from overdevelopment. I didn't move here because there was going to be a bridge built here, okay. When I built my house here in the 1990s the wild horses still roamed free here in Corolla, okay. They no longer do that today. Things have changed, okay. And this bridge will make more changes, okay.

Some of the things that they said they're going to do with this bridge is first of all they're going to make travel time easier for the tourist, okay. This is 26 days, 26 weekend days, okay? Out of 365 days. 13 weeks out of 52 weeks a year, okay, that we're going to propose to have this bridge, okay, to make things easier for the tourists. Okay. They're going to get here an hour earlier. Okay. What are they going to do with that hour earlier? There is no facilities here for them to do anything. We have no beach houses. They can't get to the beach and parking...
year. Okay. It's not going to solve those problems.

The highway will also divide communities.

It will divide Monteray Shores. I live in Monteray Shores. Okay. I walk now from my house across 12 to get my mail and to go to the clubhouse and to go to our pool. Okay. And once the four-lane highway's built I will not able to do that anymore, okay. So you are cutting off my route to my clubhouse and my facilities that I pay yearly dues for. Okay.

MR. WALSH: That's three minutes.

MR. SCHULTZ: Okay, thank you.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Kathy Schultz, followed by Craig, and I'm having a hard time reading this.

MR. CIEKOT: Ciekot.

MR. DeWITT: Ciekot, thank you.

MS. SCHULTZ: My name is Kathy Schultz.

I'm a resident of Corolla and live at 964 Sunset Crescent, Monteray Shores subdivision.

My family has vacationed in the Currituck Outer Banks since the late 1980s and my husband and I purchased a lot in Monteray Shores in 1996 because we liked the community and its amenities and chose our lot because of the fact that it's close to the Sound as well as close proximity to the ocean. We built a

house on that lot in 1999, had the house on a rental program for five years before selling our home in Pennsylvania and relocating to Corolla in 2004.

My opinion regarding the need for a Mid-Currituck County Bridge has changed over the years from a favorable opinion to a negative one. The minor convenience of a shorter commute to the Currituck mainland that the bridge might provide is far outweighed by the environmental damage to this fragile area and the high cost of building and maintaining a bridge. There are barely 500 permanent residents in the Corolla area, surely not enough residents to justify a bridge with a price tag of more than $800 million.

The only true reason the bridge is being proposed is to shorten the trip for tourists over the 13 in-season weekends. However, most tourists who travel to this area on vacation have adapted to the heavy traffic pattern.

I volunteer here at the Wildlife Center weekly throughout the in season and speak with many tourists. They travel through the night to arrive early Saturday or Sunday morning, or drive halfway on Friday and arrive in Corolla by early afternoon. When our family and friends visit we always suggest that
they travel here on a weekday. Vacationers continue
to come to the Outer Banks year after year despite the
traffic. They come here because of the remote
location and wide, sandy, uncrowded beaches.

A bridge would result in overdevelopment
of a very fragile barrier island and change the entire
character of the northern Outer Banks. For this
reason I'm against the bridge.

I'm also concerned about how the proposed
bridge would affect Corolla, but I'm especially
concerned about how it will affect my own community.
A Mid-Currituck Bridge with a Cl terminus would
negatively impact the Monterey Shores community and
specifically our immediate neighborhood in the
following ways:

It would severely limit our access to
community amenities, and my husband has identified
that problem completely. All right.

It also would lower property values. A
bridge with a Cl terminus would lower property values
for all on the oceanside section of Monterey Shores
not only because it limits access to the amenities of
our community but also because those homes on North
Harbour View that back up to Route 12, would lose
their easement and have a drainage ditch at the end of

a four-lane highway in their back yard.

In addition, widening the road would
eliminate the trees along the roadside that buffer the
road noise resulting in increased noise from traffic.
When our neighbors sit in their hot tub on their rear
deck, instead of looking at the pine trees and live
oaks that cover the dune behind their house they'll be
able to watch the traffic line on NC 12.

Traffic hazards. There's also safety
issues regarding that portion of Route 12 just north
of North Harbor View intersection, and that curve in
that section of the road has been the scene of many
accidents because drivers take the curve too fast.
The road curves dangerously in that area and, in fact,
two motorcyclists were killed in an accident there in
April of this year. With the Cl terminus the
increased traffic on that section of Route 12 would
only make a bad situation worse.

MR. WALSH: That's three minutes.

MS. SCHULTZ: I'm against building the
bridge. The minor convenience of a shorter commute is
far outweighed by the environmental damage to this
fragile area. Thank you.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.
Mr. Cieckot followed by Bernard Spirito.
MR. CIEKOT: My name is Craig Ciekot.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I'm one of the vacationers. I've been coming here for 12 years for a week around this time, sometimes fluctuating in season, out season. I have a degree in civil engineering and transportation planning and I work for a private equity smart growth real estate developer in the D.C. Metro area.

Just a couple thoughts came to mind today as I heard of this hearing and looked at some of the alternatives that I thought might be worth sharing. I think one of the things to look at is to really consider looking outside the box and looking down and out 30 years for this area. I think the overall goal seems to be reducing the number of cars on Route 12, and a couple things to consider when looking at this and the necessity of a bridge might be to try running the Route 12 traffic calculations using person trips instead of vehicle trips and running them using person trips with a transportation alternative like adding a dedicated bus rapid transit lane up and down Route 12 and trying to create more of a community with alternative transportation instead of relying solely on vehicles on Route 12.

Another idea would be to try implementing measures to encourage vacationers to leave one or two cars on the main shore. Similar to a lot of houses, if myself come down with friends, we have five cars in the driveway. We could easily coordinate meeting, parking, leaving cars in a lot and basically reducing down to three cars. Most of the cars sit parked in the driveway for the whole week without moving, and so those are trip cars that wouldn't need to be driving up and down Saturday and Sunday on Route 12. And that could be done through providing parking lots. Maybe there's some sort of toll or tax that could be worked out through the council down here and through the attorneys, I don't know how that would work to tax vacation vehicles on Route 12.

If the bridge does come I would encourage a high toll. I'm not sure what that range would be, maybe $25 per passage, to encourage efficient use of the bridge and try to lower, again, car usage on Route 12.

I also strongly encourage any design that incorporates any biking and pedestrian lanes on the bridge. I think that is kind of the way of the future and the way we need to look for 30 years down the road as this becomes more densely populated.

So in summary just again looking mainly
at vehicle trips on Route 12 as opposed to trying to accommodate the projected and current future demand, try and reduce the current demand. So thank you for your time.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Bernard Spirito, if I got that right, followed by Barry, it looks like Richman. I'm having a hard time with the writing. Barry Richman.

MR. SPIRITO: For the record I would just like to know what has changed over the past 20 years environmentally that allows us to build this bridge. I mean, quite frankly we couldn't even get a phone over here from the mainland. But environmentally there's no -- there's nothing in the text that says, you know, why we're allowing this. And why 20 years we couldn't -- 20 years ago we could not do that.

Of course, the other comment is I believe that it will bring much more crime to the area. But again, that's a subjective objection.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Barry Richman followed by Tim Rary.

MR. RICHMAN: My name's Barry Richman. I serve as the Magistrate for Currituck County and Corolla and I'm also the President of Corolla Fire and Rescue so I see firsthand what effect day trippers have on Currituck County. Many of them pass through my office.

And Bob Schultz was absolutely right. They don't spend any money in Corolla. They bring their own food, they bring their own beer and they leave their trash on our beach. Anyway, it's full employment for me, so, and I still don't want them.

But over the last several decades I've had the opportunity to converse with literally thousands of residents of Corolla, of the Currituck Outer Banks, property owners, non-resident property owners and tourists, and after each conversation we've come away with one overriding comment: We're here, we live, we own, we visit the Currituck Outer Banks because of its remote, pristine nature and its quiet family environment, not in spite of it.

And I have been an opponent of the bridge for 25 years now. The reasons I'm such an opponent of it is, and I've been through this with the county, there are absolutely no existing plans for any substantial change in services. There's no plans for parking. There's no plans for bathrooms. There's no plans for change facilities. There's very limited plans for increase in fire, EMS, police, medical
facilities, to accommodate this.

And the initial feeling and the reason
this bridge came on the radar in the first place was
the developers in the county are interested in
developing the 3,000 residential lots that have yet
had homes built on them.

And this bridge in my view will not solve
the hurricane evacuation because it will spur
development and, in fact, exacerbate getting out of
here during a hurricane.

And for those people in Southern Shores
and Duck who think it’s going to solve their traffic
problems on 12, where do half the people come from
that travel on 12? They’re coming from this area to
go down to use the facilities in Dare County. They’re
not going to go back across the bridge and down 158
and across the Wright Memorial to get there. They’re
going to go down 12. So there is not going to be any
change.

Lastly, I’d like to say, and what a giant
slap in the face, a disgraceful slap in the face if we
awarded a project to a foreign company would be to the
American engineering and construction industries which
are in such dire straits now. If I were sitting — if
I were Beverly Perdue I’d be re-advertising this thing
till we got an American company in to build this
bridge.

MR. WALSH: That’s three minutes.

MR. RICHMAN: And lastly, does it make
any sense whatever to commit to building a new bridge
of what I consider dubious utility when the state has
so many bridges in immediate need of major structural
repair. Thank you.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you, sir.

Tim Rary followed by Carla Gezuzu.

MR. RARY: Carla and myself, we both
represent the TimBuck II Association. I’m going to
stand impartial as to whether we want the bridge or
not. There are proponents and opponents in the
TimBuck II development. Some want it, some don’t want
it. I can see the business advantages. I can see the
opposite side of it, too. I believe the residents
here are speaking to make their case very clear.

I ask if you do bring the bridge in, the
association requests that you do use the Cl
alternative. It will not box in our development so
much, it would not constrain us in our traffic
problems there. There’s enough traffic problems there
now.

Also, if you do bring it in and it does
come to realization that you bring in the C2 terminus
there, can we alter the path of that somewhat so it
doesn't affect our existing businesses? Where it
comes in it would destroy two of our businesses --
actually, three of them. The pier on the outside that
Water Sports operates has been in business operating
for 15 years. The putt-putt course will be affected
and one of the premiere restaurants in the Corolla
area, Mike Dianna's, is in that path.
Can we switch it over? Can we move it to
where these businesses will not be affected? That's
our request. About all I got to say about it. Thank
you.
Mr. DeWitt: Thank you for your comments.
Ms. Gazzula: My name is Carla Gazzula.
I'm one of the owners of Good Vibes Video which has
been in business on the beach since 1986 and in the
Corolla area since 1993 and the TimBuck II area, and
one of owners of the building where it is located, the
XDC Building.
And to back up what Tim said, we have all
been working very hard to keep our businesses going,
and mom and pop operations and so forth. And if the
bridge does come in, as much as it might enhance what
we make in our business, it will also hurt our
businesses in terms of bringing in people that
possibly our parking lots cannot handle. That has
always been a problem.
And somebody said before having somebody
come and spend a weekend watching the traffic
patterns. Well, just come on one rainy day and watch
the battling that goes on among tourists and
homeowners and so forth for parking spots within
complexes.
So I definitely think, you know, maybe
it's just a matter of putting the bridge off for a
period of time while you study bringing in all the
concomitant things that are needed, such as bathrooms,
such as bathhouses and all of these other things,
instead of just simply deciding, okay, we have a
traffic problem, we need a bridge, let's put the
bridge in and then let's deal with all the other
problems that might come about.
This is something that truly needs to be
studied, and all of the things that have been brought
up by different people need to be looked at, evaluated
and dealt with. I think that would be the only way
that it would be fair to everyone in this room who
owns, who has a business, who has enjoyed the Outer
Banks, to simply really look into it and evaluate it.
This is not any kind of slam-dunk, you know, bang-bang kind of operation that you need. You really need to look at it very, very carefully before any decision is made about where it should go or if it should come in or whether the road should be widened or whatever.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you very much for your comments.

Nancy Baker followed by Kenneth Snider.

MS. BAKER: I'm Nancy Baker. I'm a resident here of Corolla and it has taken a lot of nerve for me to stand up here and bear with me, okay? I want to thank you for letting me speak today. And I know that I spoke to a few of you earlier this evening and if I understand it, the reason for the bridge is for three concerns. Addressing three concerns. One is for hurricanes, yet there is a hurricane evacuation proposal or plan in place to evacuate us. Yes, we can't evacuate in the 16 hours that is, quote, unquote, preferred, but I feel if the state were that concerned about getting us out of here they would have put in place the bridge a long time ago. So is it really a need or a want?

Also, because of the economy of today most of us are doing just at our own homes we're asking with our money that we do have are we spending money on needs or wants. I feel this is a need -- I mean, I feel this is a want and so, therefore, why spend it with the economy, with the taxpayers having to foot the bill for this, North Carolina taxpayers, not taxpayers coming in from other states.

Another problem is the traffic flow. Is there a traffic flow problem? Yes, in the summer only. Who does it affect? It affects us and it affects the tourists. However, North Carolina is going to pay $15 million a year for 40 years to alleviate this traffic flow? Most of us I think have dealt with the traffic flow and know not to go out on Saturdays or Sundays so therefore I don't know about you but I don't want to pay $600 million to correct the traffic flow.

Shorten the commute time? Why? Who is it going to help? Most of us are residents who have made the adjustments already for commute time. It will benefit the tourists. So the State of North Carolina is going to pay $600 million again to help the tourists get to the rental houses that are owned mainly by out-of-state residents? I don't think so.

And in summary, is the bridge really a need or a want? I contend it is a want because of the word need, namely, because of safety, the bridge would...
have been built many, many years ago. The Bonner Bridge is a need. We don't have a need, we have a want.

Many of us speculate as to why the bridge is really being built and who is really going to benefit. Ask a resident, not the people who have investment properties here or hope to buy more investment properties if they were in favor of the bridge. We are all taxpayers. We are the taxpayers, not just homeowners here. We actually reside here. We are the North Carolina residents who are going to be paying these taxes.

MR. WALSH: That's three minutes.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you very much for your comments.

Kenneth Snider followed by Matt Francis.

MR. SNIDER: Hi. My name's Kenneth Snider and I'm going to get the mike out. I live at 971 North Harbour View.

And I apologize, my comments are more tactful than they are strategic. I'm not a bridge proponent. I'm actually, even though my wife and I, we commute from Williamsburg almost weekly, and I can see the advantage of this bridge, but having property here, living here half the year, I see a lot of disadvantages. And I'm not going to say the same things that have already been said so what I want to talk about is if a bridge is actually constructed, C1 versus C2.

The street I live on, North Harbour View, is the only street in Monterey Shores that is on the east side of Route 12. Having said that, then for us to use the Monterey Shores facilities then we have to cross over purely by foot Route 12 to get to the facilities.

If the C1 is constructed our ability to cross the road would be impossible. Right now that section that we cross has a double-blind curve so you can't see the traffic coming either north or south until you're right in the middle of the road. With four lanes of traffic coming down with C1 it would be impossible to cross the road, or it would be a death wish if you did it.

So my comments are C1, if you live in Monterey Shores or North Harbour View, is a real problem. There are 36 properties on that street and in the grand scheme of things it's not a big deal unless you live there.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Matt Francis followed by Cindy Francis. TAYLOR ASSOCIATES, INC.
MR. FRANCIS: My name is Matt Francis. I, too, am a homeowner in Monterey Shores. Actually, a property owner in Monterey Shores, soon to be a home.

I want to let everybody know that I am opposed to the bridge option. The objectives of the bridge are only going to cause more problems to our already fragile community. The idea of actually having -- adding revenue and having need for access for tourists at the cost of losing one of our nation’s last and natural estuaries doesn't make any sense at all. It would not solve traffic issues in Southern Shores, it will only add to them, especially during the construction of this bridge.

For those of you that do live in Southern Shores and in Duck, you're missing the point if you're supporting that bridge in so much as your revenue will be down -- will go down because of the less traffic going past your businesses. I understand the need for hurricane purposes, but what has been going on for the past 20-plus years here?

Here are the unaddressed issues that I want to bring up. Safety for my kids and others crossing the four-lane highway like was just announced to get to their clubhouse, and to get the mail, with no consideration for the pedestrians whatsoever.

Safety for residents wanting to get to the beach from the Sound side. How is that going to be addressed? It's going to basically split Monterey Shores and the community right in half.

Crime. With easy access to Monterey Shores and to the Outer Banks crime will increase dramatically, and the need for police enforcement and other services will also increase causing much more money to be needed to support this plan. The crime will pass down into Duck and Southern Shores as well.

Pollution. Poison, poison, poison.

There is no way the BIS study can address the negative effects short term and long term of how pollution will affect the environment. All it takes is one truck or car to fall off that bridge and spill their contaminants into these fragile estuaries. Don’t think it can’t happen. I live in Maryland and I’ve seen a truck fall off the Key Bridge. Not good.

Run-off carries nitrogen, phosphorus, pollution, toxic metals like mercury, which degrade our waters and threaten many of the marine life and land animals. Sediment will only smother sea grass in the estuaries, causing algae buildup which is not good.
Health effects. This will impact all of us, all of us here, even those down in Duck and Southern Shores, your friends, your families. Everybody will be affected by air pollution and the increased noise pollution. It will just be a matter of time before a child, grandchild, parent or other family member dies because of an auto accident trying to get across a road because of speed and other things. How are you all that are for this bridge and that understand the negative effects that are going to have -- that the bridge is going to bring to your home, how are you all going to live with yourselves if your family -- if this happens to your family?

People come down to this part of the Outer Banks for the beauty that it provides to us, the history it gives to our children, and the clear feeling of the -- the clear feeling of the ocean. The bridge will take away all this, take this all away and add a negative chapter to the history of this great and last barrier island in the country.

Don't take away people's dreams, livelihoods and passions to keep the area clean.

Mr. Walsh: You have three minutes.

Mr. Francis: It will only be a matter of time before our community looks like Ocean City, Maryland, Wildwood, New Jersey, and Virginia Beach. People come here to get away from that. I quote from one family member who lives in Somerville, New Jersey, that the people here are really friendly here. Up north we don't hear many people asking how is your day. It will all be gone if the bridge happens. How do you put a price on that or put that into an EIS study?

Don't ruin my dreams or anyone else's dreams just to get people to the island faster. Thank you.

Mr. DeWitt: Thank you for your comments.

Cindy Francis followed by George, and I'm sure I'm not going to get this name right, Grinnell.

Ms. Francis: I'm a mother of elementary school children and as I was bringing my daughter down last month for Easter break we were having a conversation in the car and I said to my daughter I wish that you were alive back when I was a little girl. I would be able to sit on my back porch in Corolla at my mom's house and be able to see the wild horses as they walked by as I was eating breakfast.

And she said, oh, Mom, why isn't that still happening? What happened? I said, well, unfortunately because of
the speeding cars the horses are being hit and they could no longer stay down here and they’re now up north.

With that thought in mind I wanted to find out what she’s going to be able to say to her children. What’s going to happen? What is she going to say to her children in a couple more years? Because of the fact that we were not able to keep the wild horses down here, are we going to be able to now cross our children across that street?

I’m concerned about the environment as well. In Maryland as you know most of us pay taxes to be able to support the pollution cleanup that we have as a severe problem in Maryland, and that will also happen here in North Carolina with the bridge going through. We’ll now have to pay taxes to do the clean-ups as well as the crime. I’m really concerned about the crime that will also come. Thank you.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments. George, I won’t try the last name again, followed by Michael Meredith.

MR. GRINNAN: Thank you. I’m George Grinnan. I’m from Duck, North Carolina.

The only current access or exit from the Outer Banks is one bridge, and the need for another exit has been on the table for years and years and years and it’s finally coming to the point where we hopefully will realize this future need.

All you have to do is -- I’ve been down here for 24 years so I’ve watched the change and I’ve watched the traffic build up in Duck and all the way back into Pine Island trying to get out of here on weekends as well as during rainy days and when an evacuation has been ordered.

There are some positive things with the bridge that occur when it’s not tourist time. People have children that live here on Corolla and they have to be bussed to Dare County in order to get their education. It costs them money, it costs the county money, and that is a project that can go on into the wintertime and goes on in the wintertime when the kids need to go to school. It’s a major hardship for the families that live here, not the residents and the tourists that are here as a retirement area.

The other thing is medical evacuation. There’s a long, long way to get into the hospital up at Kill Devil Hills, or I guess that’s in Nags Head, and an access across this bridge for people that are ill or have medical needs that need to be transported would be much more rapid and efficient to go across a
bridge rather than be transported up here. You think
air evacuation by helicopter is going to take care of
that? You can't pick your weather conditions, and so
in a bad weather condition you can't expect a
helicopter to evacuate you from this area like that.
You need to have access on a bridge and a second
access off this island.

These are some important facts that I
think need to be considered and taken into
consideration as far as the need for this bridge.

Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Michael Meredith followed by Lynne
Wilson.

MR. M. MEREDITH: My name's Michael
Meredith with Corolla Water Sports, Corolla Para Sail,
the Golf Links and TimBuck II and Kitty Hawk Water
Sports in Corolla. We own the mini golf and the water
sports location pictured right there on the front of
this handout.

And just for the record, I spoke last
night in Kill Devil Hills or Nags Head and I just want
to speak for Corolla, Corolla's behalf. I definitely
support the no-bridge option. I think Corolla should
just stay the way it is. People come here for the

exclusiveness and the natural beauty. They don't come
here because it's easy to get to and because the bridge
saved them 45 minutes for their commute. That's what
separates Currituck Outer Banks from the rest of the
majority of the East Coast and that's why people
vacation here and that's why they live here.

Now, if you do decide to build the bridge
I strongly suggest the C1 corridor for the Corolla
side. It would be a straighter bridge, a shorter
bridge and displace less wetlands. It would not
displace any homes or businesses and is by far the
most reasonable option in my opinion.

If you do choose C2 it will displace
several businesses. I heard one engineer last night
say that it would only be one business, but that's
just not true. There are four businesses that are
operated off of that pier that's going to be gone and
several holes in the miniature golf course will be
displaced. And according to the drawings I've seen,
at least two major buildings in TimBuck II will close,
four businesses will also be displaced. When I add
all those up I come up with nine, nine businesses
gone, established businesses.

C2 will also virtually destroy the entire
TimBuck II complex comprising about 60 merchants.
They may not be displaced but they will be affected, guaranteed.

If you do have to build the C2 option, just like Tim said earlier, just please come together with myself and the other involved parties so that the engineers could possibly move the bridge slightly south so we could still operate and make a living. I spoke with a few of the engineers who said this is a very viable option.

I have mortgages on three businesses at this location. I'm just asking for the opportunity to continue to make a living in Corolla. That's it.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Lynne Wilson followed by Bob Becker.

MS. WILSON: Good evening. My name is Lynne Wilson. I'm a 10-year resident of the off-road area of Currituck Outer Banks, currently living in North Swan Beach. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to make these comments tonight.

In reading the Draft Environmental Impact Statement it is clear that there are serious flaws in the information regarding the indirect impacts to the Currituck off-road beaches. I would like to make reference to the statements made in the DEIS and follow with a response.

In DEIS Section 3.6.1.4, indirect and cumulative impact, the potential for increase in the number of day trips to the Outer Banks it states:

'Currently day visitors to the Currituck Outer Banks comprise a small minority of the visitors. Only 5.6 percent of the respondents to a mail-in survey of visitors conducted by the Currituck County Department of Travel and Tourism indicated their business was a day trip,' unquote.

Day trippers typically do not stop at tourist information centers, nor do they fill out questionnaires. Day trippers typically go directly to the beach. This practice clearly supports your next statement that -- and this is the DEIS -- 'there are no data that indicates the preferred activity of day visitors to the Currituck Outer Banks.'

Well, I submit to you, come to the Currituck off-road Outer Banks and talk to these people, the many thousands of them. They will tell you why they come here. They come here to drive on the open beaches and spend the day without the need for the amenities that they can find at the beaches near their homes.

In reference to day trippers, the DEIS states that: "With MCB2 and MCB4 there will be some
potential for an increase over the no-build alternative with the potential higher than a non-road accessible area."

Clearly this is a huge understatement. There will be a great deal more than some potential for an increase. The reality is day trippers will increase substantially. If you build it, they will come.

With the bridge it is not reasonably for -- this is the DEIS. "With the bridge it is not reasonably foreseeable to expect a notable increase in the number of day trips to the Currituck Outer Banks because potential day visitors have other and comparable options in Virginia."

This is among the most misleading and erroneous conclusions made in the DEIS in regard to day trippers. There is nothing comparable in Virginia. There is no resemblance of Currituck's off-road beaches to those in Virginia Beach. That's why they come here. With the bridge it is reasonably foreseeable to expect a notable increase in the number of day trips to the Currituck Outer Banks.

The DEIS further states that: "Combined tolls would be a deterrent to day trips traveling on the Mid-Currituck Bridge on the Chesapeake Expressway."

Day trippers know a good deal when they see one. The savings on gas and time alone more than make up for the cost of the bridge toll. A full day vacation of fishing at a top beach destination that costs others up to $24,000 a week? Tolls become a trivial issue.

The DEIS claims: "Beach access, parking, public facilities and service are important amenities in attracting day visitors." Maybe so, but not here. The Currituck off-road beachers have free parking. Beach access is just a fun ride over the ramp and onto the sand. The lack of public facilities is not a problem for visitors. It is a problem faced by the county. This problem will be accelerated by fast, easy access to Currituck off-road beaches provided by the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

The DEIS states that: "The non-road-accessible northern Currituck Outer Banks is a unique area that appeals to a niche market of day trippers. There is no evidence that a significant unrealized demand exists for this form of rustic beach."

Oh, yes, there is.

MR. WALSH: You have three minutes.
MS. WILSON: I am at three minutes?

Okay, thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Bob Becker followed by Jennifer Symonds.

MR. BECKER: My name is Bob Becker. I live in Poplar Branch, and I want to go on record as being opposed to the bridge.

The excuse for hurricane evacuation. The traffic backs up from Virginia. It isn't so much getting off the Outer Banks, it's getting up to Virginia. And I live in Grady, or in Poplar Branch which is in Grady. Last time we had an evacuation the traffic was stopped in Grady all the way up to the Virginia line. And I don't think the bridge would help. It would just compound the problem because it will bring more people down here. Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you.

Jennifer Symonds followed by Allen Starr.


I'm going to be quoting directly out of DEIS and I will have some observations along with that.

I'll start with while all the detailed

study alternatives are near existing roads or utility corridors and are under the influence of associated edge effects; these alternatives would amplify these effects. This would especially be detrimental to maritime wildlife habitat on the Outer Banks where existing habitat is already extremely sparse and fragmented.

MCB2 and MCB4 would introduce noise disturbance in the Maple Swamp. With ER2, the road widening portions of MCB2 and MCB4 and the Maple Swamp fill with mainland approach road Option B mammals, reptiles and amphibians and avian species would all continue to be road kill concerns. Because MCB2 and MCB4 include a new bridge structure across Maple Swamp and Currituck Sound, avian species will be a probable new road kill concern.

Section 3.3.4, how would aquatic wildlife be affected. The DEIS answer: “Fill, pile placement, shading and clearing will result directly in the permanent loss or alteration of aquatic habitat and the wildlife that live there. Construction operations could result in temporary impacts. Aquatic impacts would be the greatest with MCB2 and MCB4 because they include the Mid-Currituck Bridge.”

Currituck Sound has long been recognized
as a nationally important area for freshwater recreational fishing. The decline of freshwater fisheries in the Currituck Sound has been attributed to the increase in salinity and decrease in SAV during the 1980s. SAV roles include stabilizing sediment, nutrient cycling, reducing wave energy and providing organic matter that supports complex food webs. For these reasons SAV communities are considered Habitat Areas of Particular Concern for several managed fish species.

Overall, ER2 and the widening component of the detailed study alternatives would result in minor impacts to aquatic habitat. Section 3.3.6, what impacts would occur to the waters under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers? 'All detailed study alternatives, would result in placing fill in waters under the jurisdiction of the USACE. Fill in jurisdictional areas would be the least for ER2. The largest area of fill in jurisdictional areas would be with MCB2/B and MCB4/B which include crossing Maple Swamp on fill. Clearing of jurisdictional areas would be greatest with MCB2 and MCB4 because of the Mid-Currituck Bridge.'

ER2 would result in minimal impact, less than one acre of impacts, on the CAMA resources.

Shading associated with a Mid-Currituck Bridge would be the greatest impact to SAV and potential SAV. The greater impact to SAV would be with the C2 bridge corridor. Permanent loss or alteration of palustrine emergent and forested areas, SAV, intertidal flats, and the tidal freshwater aquatic beds would result directly from the shading and pile placement with the bridge structure associated with MCB2 and MCB4.

3.4.5 --

MR. WALSH: Three minutes.

ME. SYMONDS: All right, I will summarize quickly.

The proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge will not alleviate the traffic experienced on NC 12 during the weekday after the multitudes have arrived for their vacations, whereas ER2 and ER1 would give the most relief as vacationers sightsee on the Outer Banks and do not travel to the mainland once they arrive.

In the EIS it is stated that traffic occurs on 13 summer weekends, 26 days total for the area west of the Wright Memorial Bridge. Traffic improvements are seldom designed to eliminate completely the worst hours of congestion.

Regarding the Bonner Bridge replacement,
Dare County Commission Chairman Warren Judge was quoted in the Island Free Press as saying, quote:

"The mid-county bridge in Currituck is a matter of providing an optional route for the convenience of visitors to Corolla, whereas we are concerned with maintaining the only safe transportation corridor for our residents' safety, health and welfare."

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Allan Starr followed by Andrew Meredith, Jr.

MR. STARR: My name is Allan Starr. I live at 106 Gannet Cove in the Sanderling subdivision of Duck. I speak individually and also as President of the Board of Directors of the Sanderling Property Owners Association representing 190 properties in the Sanderling community.

I'll start out by saying we do support the Recommended Alternative MCB4. I've listened with interest to the opinions and I respect the opinions of those who oppose this project. I just respectfully disagree with your conclusions.

I've been coming to the Outer Banks since 1976. We've owned property here since 1980. The development that we see are the net effects of today started when the old guard house got taken down and

the road got made public. That was this big bend that was there in the Currituck line. And we've gone everywhere from a little bit of building to the 133-bedroom, 27-bath and hundred-room hotels in that time. Anybody who has lived through it can see that that has caused some problems, many of which have been articulated by you folks tonight, and I'm sure there are a lot of others that haven't been articulated.

It's created a regional problem. It affects everything from upper and lower Currituck on the mainland side to Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores, Duck and up into Currituck Outer Banks.

And I think the problems demand a regional solution, not one that's going to benefit one section versus another. Unfortunately, every solution has a negative impact on some folks and has a positive one on others. But the reason we support MCB4 is because it does, in fact, in our opinion address the three purposes and need requirements as set forth in the document. You don't have to be an engineer, you don't have to even be smart to understand that if you have a bridge a lot of the traffic flowing down 158 is going to come across the bridge. It's not going to take the big loop down that we all talk now to get -- we live across from Jarvisburg. It's exactly where
If you've ever been involved in that and watched the guys play golf at the side of the road while they sit in the backup, you'll see what the problem is. We're well above the projected time for evacuation: NCSU cuts that dramatically. And I think that while we say, well, we've been lucky so far, we have been very lucky. But the first time people get trapped and some tragedy happens where the road gets washed out further south and you have a lot of people the road gets washed out further south and you have a lot of people getting out just like they're judging and screaming with other kind of disasters. And I really do think that while there are a lot of negatives and I truly do think that the benefits outweigh the negatives.

Thank you. MR. DAVITT: Thank you for your comments.

Andrew Meredith, Jr. is with this working Michael Xerendorf in the Water Sports in Tuck 11.
He pretty much covered all the points that I wanted to cover. I just wanted to say that I want to be on the record as being opposed to this bridge in general, and I'm saying that as far as the environmental impact on the area here is the environment here is going to be changed for the worst forever. It's never going to have the character and charm that it has now and I think you shouldn't build it.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments. Geri Sullivan followed by David, and I'm having a hard time, K-N-O-C something?

MR. KNOCH: Knoch.

MR. SULLIVAN: Geri Sullivan, 31 10th Avenue in Southern Shores.

I'm a proponent of the bridge. I'm not going to take up your time repeating what Allan said but I do think that the benefits outweigh the negatives, and I would make two other comments.

I know that one of the proposals over in Aydiett is to put the terminal over on the Sound versus near the road. I think those people are opposed to having it on the Sound where they're going to have to look at it and I think you should listen to what that community wants.

The other thing is we're hearing a term called infiltration strips. I pass the infiltration strips driving up to Norfolk all the time and there's these wide ditches full of water and pollution and these big deep weeds grow in there, and I would hope that if you build the road that you reconsider the infiltration strips and not take down all the vegetation.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you.

David Knoch followed by Karen Pierre.

MR. KNOCH: My name's Dave Knoch. I'm a resident here in Corolla for 12 years and have owned property for 32 years in the area.

We'll try not to repeat everything that's been said but certain points I'd make to you is that if the widening of Highway 12, the bridge is built, it will hurt a lot of our neighbors. They don't need to have a highway, a big four-lane highway right in your front yard.

As for the evacuation reasons, I've lived here 12 years and have never had a problem getting off the Outer Banks. Okay? 12 years, through hurricanes. You leave early or you leave late but I've never had a problem, no.

And then what concerns me are the fees
that may be charged. I think the slide shows 6 to 7.

Well, when you give it to someone else to determine it could be 25, it could be 35, it could be $10, and they have not even talked about any local fees for any of us residents. So I'm against the bridge. Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you.

Karen Pierce followed by Wendy Grattan.

MS. QUIDLEY-PIERCE: My name is Karen Quidley-Pierce. I live on the corner of US 158 and Aydlett Road, at the exact place where the Turnpike Authority plans to put the toll booth.

I live in the house that my mother and my grandparents -- I'm the third generation that lives in that house. And my farm and billboards are located on the north side, east and west of the toll booth and the Turnpike Authority plans to take all of it. In any of the plans that you look at there you see my house.

I've been fighting this for 25 years. And tonight they told me to make it personal because I'm going to be directly affected this time. But we've been fighting it all along whether I was -- for 25 years. And I'm 50-plus years old -- really, 55 -- and I don't know of any other life. The Turnpike Authority would be taking away my ability to support myself and my family. My house and farm are shown on all the maps.

And some of the things I want to point out that I really didn't write down is I have a pasture right close to my house that more people know me by my horse's name because they stop by there all the time. And they tell me that they want to stop by and feed my horse because, you know, you just don't see a place like that anymore. And we'll be getting rid of that.

And this way has been, you know, it's been in the process for 25 years and they said it could be considered psychological terrorism that I've been going through.

And one more point I want to say is I'm so glad to be part of the group that loves Currituck for what it is and not what this Mid-Currituck Bridge is going to make it and exploit our heritage and tranquility. These are qualities that money can't buy.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you very much.

Edward McCarthy followed by Don Luffnagle, if I pronounced that correctly.

MR. MCCARTHY: I'm Edward McCarthy. I
live at 1216 Coral Lane in Corolla.

We heard a lot tonight about the
technical reasons and legal reasons and so I'm going
to change that a little bit. I'm just going to go
plain person. My wife and I retired here 12 years ago
and we came here because we had a lifestyle that was
relaxed and was something really worth doing. So we
came here to try and live that lifestyle and try to
maintain it. I'm afraid that the bridge itself is
going to be the death knell to that particular
lifestyle.

One of the avowed reasons for the bridge
itself is the evacuation. Well, we've been here for
12 years, we've had a few hurricanes and as far as I
can remember we've had absolutely no problem getting
off of the Corolla area and getting further west.

My last concern merely is the funding for
the bridge. If and when the bridge is built
supposedly in 2012 we'll have a nice big bridge that
is across the Sound but when you look at the road
construction that has to go along with the bridge,
very doubtful if that is ever going to be done by
2014.

Now, there's all kinds of proposals to
fund the proposed bridge but when you consider that

what is going on in the world about the financial
crisis not only in our country, not only in my own
pocket but throughout all of Europe, is funding going
to be guaranteed that we will have funding in 2018,
2020, to finish the road? Or are we just going to end
up with a big bridge sitting in the middle that is
going to do nothing except make a bigger and better
bottleneck? Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

Don Huffnagle? Is that correct?

MR. HUFFNAGLE: Huffnagle. I am not as
prepared as most of you are here because I heard about
this meeting on my way home today from work. I live
at 403 Brandt Road in Corolla Beach and we moved down
here three years ago. Been visiting the Outer Banks
for 15 years.

I sat here tonight and I've listened, but
I work from Corolla all the way up to Avon and we
worry about the growth of this area. This area prior
to Corolla Beach is about as much growth as you're
going to get. There is just not a lot more places to
build homes.

I've tried to come down that road on 12
in Southern Shores and Duck on Saturdays and Sundays
from work and it is impossible. There are times that
I've actually stayed out to work till 5 o'clock at night to not sit in that traffic. So I can really understand the problems that the people in Southern Shores and Duck face.

If you look at a bridge, the purpose of the bridge is to move the flow of traffic. And what happens when traffic builds up on 158 all the way down to Moyock and it starts breaking loose at the light and comes down through Southern Shores and Duck, that's why you get so much traffic. This bridge is going to release that traffic to where it's just not -- and you're talking about passing all these cars on the highway.

And I do hope that we do studies to address the concerns of the people where the roads go that affect their businesses and things like that. This area needs to grow, and I know a lot of people don't want to hear that. Let me finish. I mean in the sense to where to support you and the people and the business owners that are here. I go out here and I run my route doing my job and every year 10, 12, 15 businesses close. A new person in the next year. 10, 12, 15 businesses close. Some of you in this room have probably had businesses that have had to close or had failed.

I live on Corova Beach and I have a fear of the growth there more so than beyond because there's just not that much left but here. But where I live there is a huge fear of development there. But I think the bridge -- because I've had to evacuate and I had to go through the back through Virginia, the back way, through the swamp and everything else, about six years ago to get out of here.

My wife has a lot of medical conditions. She's had to be flown twice because of not being able to get out.

So there's a lot of positive with having that bridge. There is negatives but they didn't just decide to build this bridge. They've been studying this bridge for 25 years to try to make it better for us. I think it would alleviate a lot of the buildup and the backup in the traffic. I think it would make it smoother.

Corova Beach needs to go through our legislature and we need to address things that will stop the growth.

As far as day trippers go, where that hard surface ends we need to get a proposal that we put a gate up there to where these day trippers, these day trippers that are -- you're laughing but these day
trippers that come down here, if you want to eliminate
the day tripper make them pay $50, Delaware,
everywhere else to get access to the beach. Make them
pay to get on the beach.

MR. WALSH: That's three minutes.
MR. HUFFNAGLE: Thank you.
MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.
We do have time for others that would
like to come up. If you have not signed up, that's
fine. If you will come to the microphone, form a
line or lines if there's others that wish to speak and
just follow the same protocol. I won't keep you here
any longer than you wish to. If you want to come up,
come on up.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Wally Davis. I'm
from Aydlett, 143 Sandy Lane in Aydlett, North
Carolina.

The reason I held off speaking is I want
to make sure everybody here in Corolla had the
opportunity to say their piece because your comments
tonight have done a lot for my soul, to be honest with
you.

I'm here tonight to express my concern
regarding the choice of the mid-county bridge
alternate 4 as the alternative for the recommendation

of the North Carolina Turnpike Authority. It is my
belief that the Federal Highway Administration has
made an ill-advised decision to sign off on the Draft
Environmental Impact Statement being discussed at the
public hearing. This is based on the number of
incorrect conclusions which resulted from improper
and/or slanted analysis of backup reports, use of old
and dated information, dismissing or ignoring key
issues and impacts, and allowing blatant distortions
of biased interpretation of favorable comments toward
the building of the mid-county bridge.

In the Purpose and Need section of the
document, pages 7 and 8 states that the project will
be analyzed based on the ability to meet the following
needs: To substantially improve traffic flow on the
project area's thoroughfares; to substantially reduce
travel time for persons traveling between the
Currituck County mainland and the Currituck Outer
Banks; to substantially reduce hurricane clearance
time for residents and visitors that use 158 and 158
during coastal evacuation.

I contend that the conclusion of the DEIS
fails to adequately achieve any of these three stated
needs. The improvement of the traffic flow of the
project area's thoroughfares fails to meet the DEIS
and the backup documents analysis.

Regarding this item, Tables 1, 2 and 3 of the 2030 Traffic Alternative Report pages 10, 13 and 14 measure vehicle-per-day traffic volumes including actual I presume 2006 versus 2035 without the bridge, and with NC4 with two and three lanes on Route 12.

These tables represent that traffic south of Corolla will actually get worse if a bridge is built.

Related to this it's my belief that estimates of the 2006 traffic data and future volumes are routinely inflated at an abnormal rate in order to better justify the bridge. I base this on my actual observation of traffic at random times and adjusting for the rate of increase expected in the DEIS for seasonality and probable traffic which will not utilize the bridge due to origination in the Dare County area. In other words, most of the service vehicles coming back and forth on a daily basis, not coming in and staying and going back.

I also come to the conclusion that the NCTA Alternatives Screening Report which states on pages 4 and 5 under the heading Assumptions, "widening US 158 in Currituck County was not considered because congestion is not forecast to occur on US 158 in Currituck County on summer week days in 2030 but only in summer weekends." So there is congestion issue during summer week days, according to this.

In the 2030 Traffic Alternatives Report 6.1.2 on page 77 concludes, "on US 158 north of the new bridge traffic volumes are the same with or without the bridge."

It says: "The two-mile section of 158 between Wright Memorial Bridge will have extreme congestion by 2035 if the bridge is not widened -- excuse me -- if the road is not widened. If a new bridge is constructed the roadway would require a combination of six to eight lanes. The intersection of NC 12 and US 158 should be upgraded to an interchange or similar improvement." On NC 12 and Dare widening to four lanes would resolve congestion problems with or without a new bridge.

The conclusion would be obvious. Widening Route 12, create a fly-over on Route 12 and 158, widen and limit the access on 158 south of Wright Memorial Bridge, and reconsider your recommendation and choose a no-build solution. Thank you.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you for your comments.

MS. POWERS: My name is Sandra Powers and I live in Monteray Shores.

First of all, I wasn't planning on
speaking tonight but I just want to go on record that
I oppose the building of the bridge. And when I came
here I knew there was no bridge and I chose to move
here knowing that I would have to travel long
distances in order to do certain things. I travel 50
miles one way each week just to go to church. That's
my choice. Would it be easier with the bridge? It
probably would be, but I believe that building the
bridge would destroy the environment and just the
whole area.

Thank you. That's all I have to say.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you for your comments.

MR. DIANNA: Hi, folks. I'm Mike Dianna
and I've got a restaurant in the TimBuck II shopping
center. I've been there even before that when it was
JT's restaurant starting in 1999. I'm also a property
owner and a resident of Southern Shores.

The bridge project's been something
people have been asking me about. I wish I had a
dollar for every time somebody has asked me about the
project, and I've never really been able to form a
really strong opinion one way or the other. I can see
pros, I see cons, I see, you know, how it's going to
hurt some folks, how it's going to, you know, possibly
help others.
that they are staying at one of those rental houses. Everybody wants to go to the four-wheel-drive area. And you can’t keep 20 cars from going to one house up there, to go to every house up there. So they’re going to go up in the four-wheel-drive off-road.

And also, if you’re in Southern Shores and you’re in Duck you think that you’re not going to get the traffic going down there just because they come across that bridge and come to Corolla. They’ll still want to go down to Kitty Hawk and Kill Devil Hills and see what’s down there, too. And they’re going to do it every single trip. Every rainy day for sure.

And also, the people do come here because it is pristine and remote. That’s why they come here. If they wanted to get here quicker and come on a bridge they would stay in Jersey or they’d go to Virginia Beach. And we’re going to look just like Virginia Beach where there’s not a place to put a blanket on the beach anymore.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you.

MS. MCDONALD: Good evening. My name is Alicia McDonald. I live at 965 Sunset Crescent in Corolla. I’ve been a resident down here for 11 years.

I bought my first piece of property down here in 1978 when there were no roads. We first built in 1987. And from that 1987 to 2010 there’s been talk of a bridge, but that was 23 years ago. We still don’t have a bridge, and the reason we don’t have a bridge is because people, they can’t decide whether they should widen roads, put a bridge across.

And we hear that the bridge is all for the tourists. It was just a recent study in Currituck County that the occupancy tax and occupancy rate is above 2009 for 2010. So the theory of build it and they will come is a fallacy. They are going to come whether we have a bridge or not. And the reason they’re going to come is the same reason that I chose to move down here 11 years ago knowing that I would have to drive 25 miles one way to Holy Redeemer Church. I knew they didn’t have a hospital. I am cognizant of the traffic. I do not move -- locals do not do much driving from Memorial Day to Labor Day, but we chose that. We chose to stay here for what’s here. We’ve made a cognizant decision. We know where the doctors are. We know that maybe this isn’t going to be the place for us in another 20 years. Remember, 65 is the new 55. So we’ve got time, we’ve got 10 more years on us. And so this has been an ongoing thing.
And actually, what it is, it's Dare County versus Currituck County. And it's a Dare County problem down in the intersection of 158 and NC 12. It's a Dare County problem going through Duck. It's a Currituck County problem for a business aspect over on the mainland. So we are caught between Dare County and Currituck County. And if it's for the tourists that that bridge is being built -- I didn't leave here when it was Hurricane Isabel, I stayed. I had no problem. People who left couldn't get back because they couldn't get through Dare County. So many of these problems are Dare County problems, not Currituck County problems.

And I think the best solution is to study, study, study. If we have waited 23 years to get a bridge we can wait another 23 years. Thank you.

MR. PIERCE: My name is Mack Pierce and I live at 5067 Currituck Highway in Coinjock.

And I first made a trip down to Corolla in probably 1967. Me and my wife used to come down every weekend, go to Kill Devil Hills. So I know what progress is. I look around the room and see a lot of faces that wasn't here then.

And so I'm for no bridge at this time.

Leave Corolla alone and let it develop at a slow pace and let nature lovers come here that love the area. I mean, Lord forbid if everybody from Corolla to Ocracoke, they would really freak out thinking how long it would take them to get to a hospital.

But anyway, I don't believe that all the alternatives here has been looked at on the impact of how they can build a bridge to come to Corolla. I believe a bridge if it is built should be built south of Grady, about one mile south of Grady, and that would be right there where the trash dumps is. They don't have to go through any 404 wetlands. They can come across and come to the Dare-Currituck line. That way people that want to go north, they can go north, they can go south.

When you look at the map we're on an island. When you come over into Currituck, 158 is an island because we're surrounded by water, by canals. The Knapp Bridge is the only way that you can get out of that area. If we have a chemical spill, if we have anything that happens, there's no other corridor.

The tourists are really going to be in a problem if they're trying to get out in a hurricane and there's an accident on Coinjock Bridge. They'd bring out all the EMTs and they'd block the highway, I mean, cars, trucks and everything else.
But if we build a bridge in Coinjock, I mean Grady — if I get my facts here — if we build it in Grady looking down the road in 25 years, if we need a bridge and it goes in Grady we have another corridor that they can go over the Northwest River and they can go up to 343. That would take you up to Highway 17. That would give Currituck another escape route. The bridge could be down to where it relieves the traffic where the traffic flows.

I go down the highway on a John Deere tractor in Coinjock, it don't bother me, I get used to it. And they're only coming down, like, 26 days for the summer vacation. So I have the rest of the year that I've got a five-lane highway to run them down.

I would like to see if we would have down the road — Grady has a much wider area. It's higher ground. Where we're at, I'm right there with the bridge at Aydlett and there's only, like, a thousand feet fill there and I'd hate to see the wetlands destroyed, the wildlife we have if they do the proposal where they're putting it on the ground.

You go to Aydlett Road, it's a curvy road, people slow down. That's why you got curves. Up here you got curves and it keeps the people slow. But if we put a straight road through there and they

put it on a mound going through all the wildlife is going to get run over. And it's gotten to a point, we had a bear killed on January the 2nd. Nobody even come picked it up. It just laid there. I mean, it was there right by the rest area.

So, I'm just for no bridge. Not like I say, in looking at the alternative, if they would consider other alternatives if they could be found.

Thank you.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you.

MR. RILEY: My name is Pat Riley. I live here in Corolla.

I'd like to make one observation regarding the evacuation. If a major catastrophic storm is bearing down on this area Virginia is going to have major evacuation problems, too, and in all likelihood 158 is going to be -- 168 is going to be limited or closed so all the traffic leaving here will be forced up 158 to Elizabeth City. So I don't see how that's going to in any way improve your evacuation.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you.

If anyone else would like to come forward, you certainly may. If you've made comments earlier and you didn't quite finish them you're
welcome to come back up. All right.

MS. SCHULTZ: To back up, the DEIS says that "the non-road-accessible northern Currituck County Outer Banks is a unique area that would appeal to a niche market of day trippers." "There is no evidence that a significant unrealized demand exists for this form of rustic beach trip."

Oh, yes, there is. This is a complete fallacy based on speculation and erroneous information, certainly not based on reality. A survey conducted in the summer of 2009 shows clearly where such a demand does exist and one day, a one-day off-season count conducted then showed slightly less than 1,000 cars entered the off-road beach off-season. Another survey indicated that 56 percent of the cars would come from the Tidewater area.

On growth and development, the DEIS claims that for the non-road-accessible Outer Banks there would be no reasonably foreseeable change in the location rate nor type of development. Lack of accessibility both makes it attractive and helps limit the development.

So since it is now going to be accessible and will no longer be attractive is the reasoning then since it's so easy to get there now I won't bother.

driving, let's not bother looking at real estate up here in this untouched area unlike any other along the Atlantic coastline because this bridge will change it or because it's too easy to get here? Does this argument also hold for it being an unlikely tourist destination that its remoteness is now compromised, that the accessibility to the area will make it an undesirable destination? Do the authors of this survey separate real estate companies on this list? What will really happen? Historically development of an undeveloped area occurs when access is facilitated. Does anyone really believe that the area will remain relatively undeveloped simply because it is relatively undeveloped?

The DEIS claims numerous government policy constraints related to development render unlikely both a change in the rates and characteristics of development from the current trend. All new subdivisions in the non-road accessible area have minimum three-acre-lot sizes. Smaller grandfathered lots exist but may not have acceptable septic conditions.

In response to this let it suffice to say that only a small percentage of the grandfathered lots have septic issues and there are ways to work round
these problems. The fact is there are over 2,000 undeveloped lots in the off-road, over 2,000. A major factor in keeping them undeveloped is the time and difficulty getting there. The mid-county bridge would change that. If you build it, they will come and they will build.

The DEIS in November of 2008 said that Currituck County commissioners turned down a request to allow a commercial development in this area that was not in keeping with their land use plan's policy and emphasis for this area.

Other property owners in the area also oppose the project, a very wise and judicious move on the part of the Board of Commissioners. But I fail to see how support of land use plans and policies on limiting commercial development in the off-road area would stand in the way of rapid growth from residential development that is fully supported in the land use plan and permitted in the UDO.

Serious concerns and commitment to protecting and preserving Currituck's off-road area has compelled me to serve on the Northern Currituck Beach Task Force, chair COAST, which stands for Ccounteraction, Save Tomorrow, to current President of North Swan Beach Property Owners Association. I'm serving on the Planning Board and I'm on the advisory committee of the North Carolina Coastal Federation. I am not speaking as a representative or on behalf of any of these groups tonight. I hope I have done them some justice but I am drawing from what I have learned from them.

I thank you very much, and in conclusion the DEIS findings on indirect impact to the off-road beaches consists of much misleading misinformation and lacks scientific basis. Short of a no-build option, further study in the form of a new DEIS and removal of the current DEIS needs to happen.

And I have one request that someone asked me tonight and didn't have time was a show of hands of North Carolina residents who are opposed to the bridge and show of hands of North Carolina residents who are for the bridge. Thank you.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you.
Any other comments? Yes, sir?
MR. GRAFFAN: I'll be out of here in 90 seconds, I promise. I couldn't have said it better.
I just wanted to add a couple things.
One of the two of the underlying tenets of the DEIS's conclusion that the bridge won't induce growth are, one, that the existing area is built out. I think you
could tell on your ride down here that it's not built out. Myrtle Beach is built out. We're not built out. We're going to be built out if this bridge comes through.

Next, the next reason was that the local jurisdictions are religiously implementing their land use plans and controls. Well, just this Monday night the Currituck County Board of Commissioners approved a 12.75 (acre) development composed of 32 condominium units, a hotel, a restaurant and retail. This is an oceanside property which has been designated Natural Heritage. This was approved despite the not quite unanimous recommendations of the County Planning Commission against it, Planning Board against it, and despite the fact it contravened the Land Use Plan and as a result contravened the Uniform Development Ordinance. So much for the constraints on growth.

MR. DEWITT: Thank you, sir.

MS. LEARY-SMITH: My name is Penny Leary-Smith and I understand my vote don't count but one time but I would like to repeat what I read last night. One of the things that I'm a property owner in Currituck County in the community of Aydlett.

I do not want to lose the quality of life that this community now offers, just as you don't in Corolla. If you place the tolls in Aydlett and it is the last exit before crossing the bridge, the mid-county bridge. Most of these travelers will continue on through Aydlett and Poplar Branch to continue to the Outer Banks, joining 158 at Grandy, not wanting to pay the toll, which will give the same situation as you have now at Kitty Hawk. You leave your toll booth on Highway 158 if this bridge has to be built.

And we are more than willing to travel the Swamp Road to get to the bridge to travel back over to Corolla. The Swamp Road has never flooded and it offers no damage to the environment or the floodplain.

Currituck County is very fortunate to have this northern beach which supports the largest tax base for the entire county. Because of the quality of life this beach offered its guests that's why they choose to vacation here, and the residents want that same quality of life just like the approximately 500 permanent residents who so choose to pay taxes and live in Corolla of Currituck County.

Why would you want to destroy the goose that has given you the golden egg? Each of you know that the easier it is to get somewhere, the more
people will definitely come to your area. You now have the highest clientele, and you want to open this area to day trippers which only increase your daily population, causing additional costs for law enforcement to meet the demands of this diverse clientele. And it's detrimental to the serene beautiful vacationer's paradise. This is a vacation destination, this is why they come here.

The bridge cannot be self supporting and will gobble up state funds, your taxpayers' money. Let's support a much needed bridge by replacing the Benner Bridge. Put your toll facilities to the best candidate, it being the Benner Bridge.

Let us maintain the same quality of life, not disturbing the primary nursery area for various species of fish and wildlife and taking care of our natural resources.

Where a tourist spends his time he spends his money. You have this now. Please let it continue and remain the same for its residents, its taxpayers, and its vacationers.

I appreciate, too, all of you all coming before the North Carolina Turnpike Authority, and they're the ones that have to hear from the residents. And I probably misjudged and am making a very bad comment when I say this, but I understand that your commissioners want what your people want, your residents want. And I might be wrong, but I don't think there's one here tonight to hear what anybody has had to say.

Thank you very much.

MR. PIERCE: I'd like to add one thing on to -- my name is Mack Pierce. I've been duck hunting since 1972 and if you build this bridge north of the narrows there it's going to cause the ducks to leave the narrows. If you put it south of the narrows they will still come, but the ducks do not like lights.

The more -- I've hunted over here, I hunt in North River and the more lights you get over here the more migratory birds are going over to the North River.

So, it's a choice that has to be made. Thank you.

MS. SYMONDS: I just want to quickly finish my -- Jennifer Symonds.

Section 3.5 in the DEIS, Construction Impacts. There would be no construction impacts with a no-build alternative.

As a direct impact the interchange associated with MCB2 and MCB4 would be a substantial change for an area defined in the visual impacts assessment as having high visual quality. The
introduction of businesses into the interchange area would have a similar impact. Since plans do not include the widening of the Intracoastal Waterway bridge to Coinjock due to cost it is a choke point that would slow the traffic trying to exit to the newly proposed bridge, backing traffic to Barco and points north.

Option B goes directly against the land use plan for Aydlett. Policy TR13: To protect the character of the communities near the bridge, e.g., Aydlett, Churches Island, Poplar Branch, the road leading to the bridge shall have no access points before its intersection with US 158.

With regard to hurricane evacuation, this is from the DEIS: 'The construction of the third parallel lane on US 158 would offer the greatest reduction in hurricane evacuation clearance times with any alternative.' The first Draft EIS done in January 1998 was rescinded as hurricane evacuation was a major obstacle in reaching an agreement on the purpose and need in the DEIS. This current DEIS reaffirms that conclusion.

North Carolina has a total of 16,307 bridges with 5,476 that are structurally and functionally deficient. That is 30 percent of North Carolina's bridges are in need of replacement or repair, including the Bonner Bridge serving the Hatteras Island and the Yadkin River Bridge. This bridge will take much needed money, $15 million a year, when North Carolina now faces a $9.4 billion true debt burden, away from fixing these failing bridges. North Carolina cannot afford this bridge and nor can we.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to speak? We're almost at 9 o'clock. I would ask anybody else if you want to come up, please do so now. Yes, sir.

MR. RICHMAN: I would just like to make a comment.

MR. DeWITT: State your name.

MR. RICHMAN: Barry Richman. There was something in this statement from the Turnpike Authority that said -- talked about there wouldn't be an increase in day trippers because they have similar facilities up in the Tidewater area. Well, our day trippers that come to the four-wheel-drive area don't stop at Kill Devil Hills, and that's 25 miles closer, 50 miles round trip. Why don't they? Because like in Virginia, Virginia Beach and in other places in Tidewater, they cannot drive on the beach. They're
here to drive on the beach. So it doesn't make any
difference if they have facilities closer. They don't
have the facilities closer because Virginia Beach saw
the light and saw what kind of damage was being done
to their beaches. They built a parallel road and
banned them from the beaches so that is why they're
doing that.

MR. RIGGS-DABNEY: Real quick, I'm Jan
Riggs-Dabney.

And I just wanted to say who's been
fighting for this bridge all along has been Mark
Bennight and Dare County. And you might as well face
it, our commissioners are not doing what we wanted,
because we've been saying we haven't wanted this
bridge for 25 years. And just like if you don't
believe it, look what happened last night, what they
approved of last night. We said we didn't want that,
but they're out to get the -- they want to kill the
goose so they can get all the eggs out now. We need
to get rid of these commissioners.

MR. DeWITT: Thank you.

Unless there's someone else that wants to
speak I'm going to draw this to a close. We really do
appreciate your comments tonight and your
participation has been tremendously valuable to us.

Thank you for your time.

(The record was closed at 9:02 p.m.)
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MS. HARRIS: Okay, everybody, I appreciate you all coming out tonight. We're here for the third in a series of three public hearings for the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study. My name is Jennifer Harris and I'm with the North Carolina Turnpike Authority.

Can everybody in the back hear me all right? Great.

What we plan to do tonight is give a general project overview, discuss briefly the project purpose and need, describe the detailed study alternatives that we evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, touch on project funding that we anticipate to use to build the project, also discuss the Draft EIS and the Recommended Alternative among those that we evaluated in the document, discuss the right-of-way relocation process for properties that would need to be acquired for the project, and also discuss being and other related issues for anyone that boats in Currituck Sound.

I think you're all familiar with the project area around Currituck Sound, the road surrounding it, US 158 and NC 12. The purpose and

need for the project is covered in these three bullets. The first one is substantially improve traffic flow on the project area thoroughfares which include US 158 and NC 12 in the project area, to substantially reduce travel time for persons traveling between the Currituck mainland and the Currituck Outer Banks, as well as to substantially reduce hurricane evacuation clearance times.

In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was approved at the end of March of this year we studied in detail three different alternative concepts. ER2, which means existing roads 7, includes no bridge, no Mid-Currituck bridge, but it does include substantial improvements to the existing roads in the study area. Along the length of US 158 that's highlighted if you can see it on the screen or in your project handout there will be improvements for hurricane evacuation. There would also be improvements after you would travel across the Wright Memorial Bridge for hurricane evacuation. And then the length of NC 12 with the exception of the portion in Duck would be improved to either a three- or a four-lane road. And again, this ER2, existing roads 2, option does not include a Mid-Currituck Bridge.

MB2, it does include a Mid-Currituck
Bridge. There are two different bridge corridors that
we evaluated, C1 and C2 that you see by the red
highlighted area. The difference between those is
just where it would tie into NC 12 on the Outer Banks.
It includes the widening for the length of NC 12 with
the exception of the portion in Duck that is already
three lanes, and it includes some hurricane evacuation
improvements north of the Mid-Currituck Bridge on
US 158 in the area highlighted on the picture.

And last, MCB4, again, Mid-Currituck
Bridge, it does include a bridge with the two
different bridge corridors, C1 and C2. And on NC 12
it would include either two or four miles of widening
to four lanes. There would also be some hurricane
evacuation improvements down near the Wright Memorial
Bridge in addition to hurricane improvements on 158
north of the Mid-Currituck Bridge on the mainland.

The project is expected to be funded from
several sources. First we expect to sell revenue
bonds that would be repaid with the toll revenues that
would be collected for those that use the project.
Also, a TIFIA loan which is a loan from the federal
government. The state has also appropriated money on
an annual basis, $15 million a year if a bridge is to
be built and built as a toll project. And also, we

expect some funding may come from a public-private
partnership.

If a bridge is built it will be tolled
and the toll based on the 2007 study was expected to
be in the range of 6 to $12. Toll rates have not been
set. They will be set when an investment grade
traffic and revenue study is conducted so it may or
may not be in the 6 to $12 range but that is what the
current study we have indicated. And all the toll
revenue that is collected would be used to finance,
construct, operate and maintain the bridge. And when
that debt is repaid tolls would be removed.

We expect if a bridge is built that toll
collection would be collected with both electronic
toll collection where you would have the opportunity
to place a transponder in your windshield and we also
expect there would be cash collection available on the
project; toll booths in the early years of the project.

Again, we're here because we recently
received approval on a Draft Environmental Impact
Statement. It's an environmental document that
explains why is the project needed, what are the
different alternatives that were evaluated to meet
that need, what are the impacts of those various
options and how could they be mitigated, and also discusses and summarizes the public and agency coordination we've conducted to date.

There are a lot of people involved in the study process, including the Federal Highway Administration, the Turnpike Authority, which is a division of the North Carolina DOT, and many environmental resource and regulatory agencies that we coordinate with on a regular basis, as well as you, residents, property owners, traveling public, local government and elected officials.

Again, among the alternatives that we studied we have made a recommendation in the Draft EIS, and that may or may not be substantiated by the comments that we get this week and through the comment period, which is June 7th. But we're here to hear your comments. We want to know what you think of the different options and answer your questions about the project.

Again, it's not a vote. While we do want to hear your comments, we don't tally up how many people vote for this option or that option and then that's the result. What we do is we'll take the public comment, we'll evaluate that along with the impact and cost information among the alternatives and have discussions among the study team and with resource agencies and hopefully determine an alternative that meets the purpose and need and we can ultimately get permits for.

And this is not a political decision. It is based on technical evaluations of different resources including the natural environment, physical environment and human environment.

Again, the Recommended Alternative is NC-84. We have not made a recommendation on the bridge termini nor the approach to the bridge across the Sound. There are two different options for that.

We also are available to discuss the right-of-way acquisition process and relocation assistance process. We have people here tonight. Hopefully you had a chance to speak with them before the public hearing. If not, I believe they're still available. And we have some brochures that explain those processes that are also on our website.

We also want to hear from anyone that uses Currituck Sound for boating. Right now we're trying to evaluate if we need to provide additional clearance under the bridge for boaters.

You can participate tonight by speaking or writing your comments. If you don't have time...
tonight to turn in your comments you still can send
them through mail, through e-mail, give us a phone
cell. We're asking for comments by June 7th so that
we can compile those and use those to evaluate the
public comment on the different alternatives that were
considered.

After we do that we expect to identify a
Preferred Alternative in the August time frame of this
year and complete the environmental study process with
a Record of Decision by the end of the year. And then
alter the first of the year assuming the financing can
be put in place by then, we would begin the
construction, right-of-way acquisition processes and
the project would be open to traffic by late 2014.

Now John Page is going to review the
hearing maps.

MR. PAGE: I've been asked by the
Turnpike Authority to briefly review the public
hearing maps. The public hearing maps were on display
for several hours this afternoon. They are also all
on the website of the Turnpike Authority if you want
to look at them there. And also they are located in
our eight public review locations in the area. The
public hearing maps along with the Draft Environmental
Impact Statement and all of the technical reports that
back up those findings are all at these eight public
review locations and will be there until June 7th when
the comment period ends.

You see in the back of the room we had
five key maps that show the different alternatives.
Once again, BR2 is widening existing roads only; MCB2
which has the two --- also has the two bridge corridor
options, C1 and C2 is widening existing roads and
building the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

MCB4 focuses attention on building the
Mid-Currituck Bridge with a limited amount of widening
on 12 and some hurricane evacuation improvements north
of the bridge on 158.

Also on the hearing maps, all hearing
maps there is a legend to help you read the map. I
think of most interest to you that shows property
acquisition that would be required by whether it be
complete right-of-way acquisition or a permanent
drainage easement purchase or a temporary construction
easement.

Also you will see color bands on those
hearing maps. That is the extent of our study area
where we gathered data in order to analyze. It's not
the extent of the impacts. Look at the right-of-way
line for that.
We're going to take these hearing maps one section at a time. We'll use our key maps to help keep us all oriented to where we are and we're going to begin with the bridge. First we'll begin on mainland which I'm sure is of interest to many of you. On the mainland approach we are one corridor but we have two design options. They differ in their characteristics in terms of where the top is located, whether or not we bridge Maple Swamp or put the road to -- the approach road to Maple on fill or dirt. And it also varies in terms of our effects on the local road system and the way one gets between 158 and Aydlett, and we'll discuss each of those individually.

We'll begin with Option A. Both options have an interchange on US 158. In the case of Option A the toll plaza for both directions of travel are in this interchange at 158. The red lines that you see around the interchange represent control of access. You cannot have driveways and streets hooking up to the ramps of an interchange because it's not safe.

You also if you look at the bottom part below the interchange and above you can see that there's at the end of Aydlett Road is relocated slightly and also to the north you'll see that there is an access road for homes and businesses that are not displaced by the interchange so that they can keep access to -- maintain their access but it would be through a service road that would connect to Waterlily Road.

And this simulation gives you a 3-D view of what this interchange might look like with the toll plaza.

This particular option includes a bridge across Maple Swamp. In the community of Aydlett there would be a fill section that would pass through where there's woods off the Narrow Shore Road. The bridge would begin just before Narrow Shore Road at those who are traveling north and south on Narrow Shore Road would pass under the bridge. As a result there would be no changes in the circulation system in Aydlett with this alternative. You would travel just the way you do today between 158 and Aydlett and around Aydlett.

In this photo simulation which is in your handout that you got tonight illustrates what the bridge might look like as it leaves the community of Aydlett and goes out into the Sound with Option A. Option B also has an interchange in 158.
but there is no toll plaza. The toll plaza is in Aydlett. And the other primary difference here is that this option assumes Aydlett Road is closed. We would turn it back into a wetland and the people traveling between 158 and Aydlett use the same road as the toll traffic.

I wanted to also mention on these that the different -- environmental impact process after we hear public comments, it is possible to think about it and mix things up a little bit. For example, the primary reason for proposing fill across Maple Swamp is there is a substantial cost savings. That cost savings could also be achieved by sticking with Option A, not closing Aydlett Road and putting fill across Maple Swamp and a bridge. And those are the types of things that we always consider in terms of refinements to alternatives after we hear public comment so I wanted to give you that example.

But Option B as shown here crosses Maple Swamp. Here's the smaller interchange without the toll plazas, across the Maple Swamp again on fill.

And there are wildlife crossings provided for wildlife passage or large mammals and also smaller amphibians and reptiles. Because Aydlett Road is closed and Aydlett traffic is using -- sharing the road with the toll traffic in this particular case there is a lot of change to the circulation system in Aydlett.

What you're seeing here is there is a -- you can see on this drawing there is an exit ramp from the approach road that gets you into Aydlett and there is a ramp taking you out. With neither option is there a way to get on or off the bridge in Aydlett.

Those ramps are only to get Aydlett traffic to and from US 158.

There's a couple of other road looking like things up there that are south of the toll plazas. Those are service roads for use only by the Turnpike's operators to help maintain and operate their toll plaza. Those would not be used by any public traffic.

The toll plaza shown here is at grade and as a result it crosses Narrow Shore Road at grade which means Narrow Shore Road would be closed and it would be replaced by an overpass, a ramp system. And you can see an overpass that is on top of the toll plaza.

And this photo simulation which is also in your handout illustrates what the grade separation to replace the Narrow Shore Road passage and the toll plaza and the associated lanes would look like.
We'll leave Aydlett now. As we indicated, there is only one corridor that we're considering although we do have two design options in Aydlett. But we do have end points we're considering and evaluating on the Outer Banks. And so when we get into Currituck Sound we split into two corridors.

The bridge that is proposed is two lanes. This is a typical bridge section that is used in North Carolina. It's showing two 12-foot lanes and two 10-foot shoulders and bicycle-safe rails. The 10-foot shoulder is adequate distance so that if someone is bicycling along the shoulder they are outside the effect of the breeze that you get when cars pass you.

Also included in the cost estimates in discussing the EIS are some additional possible provisions that are being considered for bicycles, and that would be an independent bicycle path perhaps made out of recycled plastic lumber. Costs include the possibility of lighting it and the lighting would be powered by solar panels.

And also, costs are included in discussion in the EIS of an option of putting a parking lot at either end of the bridge using permeable pavement where pedestrians or bicyclists could park their cars while they enjoy riding or biking across the bridge.

Also, as Jennifer mentioned, boating is an important thing. It's likely there might need to be one navigation span for taller boats. It would most likely be here on the west side closer to the mainland where the water is deeper.

We'll now move across the Sound to one of our two end points. This is the northern end point. It is called alternative C1 and it ends at the south end of the Corolla Bay subdivision.

Zooming in here you can see that we give priority to the bridge traffic in terms of coming off the bridge and heading south on NC 12. And there is a traffic signal and left turn lanes at that intersection. And this is a photo simulation that is also in your handout that illustrates what this intersection might look like.

The other alternative which is the more southern one called C2 wraps around avoiding the marshlands. It also bridges the coastal marshlands that are at the end of the bridge.

This alternative is just south of the commercial business called TimBuck II. And again, it would include a traffic signal and left turn lanes.

There also would be some limitations on turning...
movements along on the two streets in one of the
TimBuck II driveways that are in that area. Left
turns would be prohibited in order to keep through
traffic flowing.

In both these cases in order to keep
traffic from backing up on the bridge NC 12 is
proposed to be widened to four lanes down into the
Currituck Club area. So with the northernmost
alternative that widening would be about four miles
long. And with this more southern road route it would
be about two miles long of widening to four lanes on
NC 12. And here is a photo simulation that is looking
towards the bridge that illustrates how this
intersection might appear.

Looking now at the bridge the
alternatives in Aydlett and on the mainland are a
widening-existing-roads alternative and an alternative
that widens a lot of roads as well as building the
bridge. We're now going to take a brief look at what
would be done on NC 12 with these alternatives.

For these three alternatives the widening
occurs all the way from US 158 up into the end points
of the bridge. Again, in the case of MCB4 where we're
only building the bridge it would only be two to four
miles long.

In Dare County in the southern end of
Currituck where the right-of-way generally is only 60
feet wide a three-lane road is proposed, two through
lanes and a center turn lane. There is adequate
space, maybe 60 feet to do this right-of-way plus
maintain the existing multi-use paths that are through
that area.

Part of the designs we have evaluated in
the Environmental Impact Statement also addressed the
drainage problems on NC 12, and the solution that is
included in our design is the use of infiltration
strips and basins, which basically what that means is
that rather than the water going wherever it wants,
you provide low spots on the side of the road where
the rain water can go. When it stops raining it can
be infiltrated into the soil. So it's exactly the way
what happens to the water along NC 12 today except
it's controlled. It goes to a place that is not
inconvenient. It goes to the side of the road instead
of the middle of the road.

At the south end of Southern Shores,
which is the upper section, you see the infiltration
strips are quite wide, and that's because everything
drains to the road. All the developments drain to the
road so there's a lot of water to handle. When you
get further north then the infiltration strips get fairly narrow.

We'll take a quick look at the hearing maps. Along here to the left of this sheet is the intersection of NC 12 and 158. We will be going north. Again, the yellow band is the extent of our study area, not our impact area.

The primary impact of this widening is that the infiltration strips would be outside the existing right-of-way in a permanent drainage easement. Very little displacement occurs as a result of that.

As Jennifer said, when we get to Duck where the existing road is already three lanes there would be no change.

Through a lot of this area in addition to the narrow infiltration strips there would be grading to infiltration basins which take up roughly an area of a vacant lot.

This is the Currituck-Dare County line. This is Pine Island that we're passing through.

This is the Hampton Inn area.

Now, when you get to roughly the end of the southern point of the Currituck Club subdivision the right-of-way of NC 12 widens to a hundred feet

which provides room for a four-lane road, and this is what it would look like: Four 12-foot lanes with a median, left turn lanes at major intersections, and a space for a multi-use path, and then again the infiltration strips that would be in a permanent drainage easement.

Where you see the color change from orange to purple, that's the point where the widening that would be associated even with NC 12, the bridge-only alternative, would start to begin there where it would widen out from two lanes to four lanes where that purple begins.

Now we're back into the TimBuck II area where we were before when we were talking about the bridge alternatives. TimBuck II is in the upper left-hand corner and C2 would be coming into the left of that. If you're widening only existing roads, the project would end about Albacore Street. There would be no widening further north than that.

The green that you see is the four-lane road continuing on the extra two miles to the northernmost terminus.

In the commercial area which includes TimBuck II and the Food Lion there would be limits on left turns through the median in this area with the
four lanes.

That's what the hearing map shows us for NC 12. We're now going to move to the south end and we're going to take a look at what would be done on 158 with these particular alternatives.

The widening of 158 between NC 12 and Wright Memorial Bridge is shown in our design, our designs that we're evaluating in the EIS as a super street. What that means is in order to add additional capacity so you -- in terms of moving a lot of through trips through you limit the ability of people to turn left from local side streets onto 158 and you also limit their ability to cross from one side to the other. Instead, if you wanted to cross to one side or the other or turn left you would turn right and go to your own break in the median where there would be a traffic signal where a U-turn could be made. And this hearing map illustrates that.

Also, with the RR2 and MCB2 an interchange at US 158 is proposed. Full access would be maintained at the Welcome Center. People would be able to go up 12 without stopping with the 158 traffic, they would go over on a bridge.

The big change in this area would be that, again, we cannot have driveways and local streets connecting to interchange ramps so that many of the properties, particularly on the east side, would have their access limited to NC 12.

The last thing that we're going to talk about briefly is the hurricane evacuation improvements. 158 is the -- based on the work that our hurricane evacuation consultants said the bottleneck today is 158 between NC 12 and 168. If there was additional capacity or a third outbound lane that would reduce clearance times during hurricane evacuations substantially.

With MCB4 where we're only building the bridge you would need to do some hurricane evacuation improvements down here since you're not widening the road. As you see, there's no interchange with this alternative.

If we do not build the bridge you would need about 25 -- you would need to increase the capacity of the road to provide a third outbound lane for 25 miles all the way from the Wright Memorial Bridge up to 168. If you build the bridge you'd have a lot of traffic diverted to the Mid-Currituck Bridge and so those improvements would only need to be the northern five miles.

There are two alternatives that are
looked at in the EIS. The primary one is a third outbound lane that would be essentially a wide, paved shoulder marked for emergency use only. And this photo simulation illustrates that in one of the curbed areas.

Another way to do it would be to reverse the center turn lane. That would only be effective -- only be able to be done with the Mid-Currituck Bridge when only five miles of problem remains. It's logistically impossible to reverse the center turn lane for 25 miles on an unlimited access road.

Jennifer, that's what I have to say so we're ready to move on to the next part.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you, John.

I just wanted to add another comment about the Option B approach to the bridge across the Sound. We've heard from many of you since the October time frame and this week and that is that you all have concerns about the removal of Aydlett Road in addition to the prospects of a toll plaza potentially being in the Aydlett community. This is another opportunity for you to provide official comments that will be part of the record, but I did want to acknowledge that we have been getting comments over the past several months about that option already but now that we have

the draft Environmental Impact Statement approved these comments are still important to hear and I'm sure we'll be hearing them tonight again.

Before we start receiving your comments I want to thank you for being patient and sitting and listening to our presentation, giving you an overview of the project. We are here to listen and hear your comments. However, it is not a debate. Also, please be courteous to your neighbors and letting them speak. If you have differing views please give them their opportunity to speak.

We are going to be limiting you to a three-minute time limit for your comments. If at the end of everyone's speaking if you choose to speak again you will be able to do so.

We are recording your comments. This lady up here is feverishly trying to record everything that's said so please state your name when you approach the microphone when it's your turn and speak clearly so that we can get your comments down and recorded. And if you have a written statement that you're reading from that you can leave with us that will also be helpful.

The first speaker that has signed up is Tom Wood, and if Butch Petrey could be prepared after
Mr. Wood speaks that would be great.

MR. WOOD: Good evening, everyone. I'm Tom Wood from 295 Waterlily Road.

I along with I think about a hundred of my neighbors on Waterlily Road would really like to know what's going on at 158. It impacts us all and we don't see any really answers yet other than the Jersey wall may have been taken down but we still don't know whether we're going left or right or we're just going to be dead-ending at the 158.

MS. HARRIS: What we're showing now on the maps that we have here tonight about the intersection of Waterlily Road at US 158, we have removed the barrier that was previously shown. At this time we are showing a full movement intersection at that location.

We are still going through a process to evaluate if that is going to handle the traffic and if that will be a safe intersection in the future, but that's what we're currently showing and it would remain as it is today.

MR. PETREY: My name is Butch Petrey. I live at 104 Savannah Avenue in Grandy.

I'm here tonight with an open mind as far as the bridge goes. I know there's pros and I know

there's cons and all the points are valid. I'm finding that the pros are the people that aren't affected, that it's not in their back yard. The cons are if it's in your back yard, then you're affected. I know that lifestyles are affected. People moved here for a quality of life.

And my concern -- you just said that we want to hear your comments. Well, hearing comments are one thing. Acting on those comments is something else. It's just like the gentleman just came up right here. He has no idea what's going on. And I encourage your people to have a better line of communication, because when people are afraid and they don't know what's going on there are rumors and then that gets people nervous, and you can see the people here tonight and people's lives are affected and they don't know what's going on.

Another thing that I'd like to encourage you to do, this gentleman here spoke about other options. I really encourage you to look at other options. I know that there's things that you can change around and do whatever where lives aren't as affected, moving this, tweaking this, doing that. So I encourage you to do that, but I also encourage you to make sure that you listen to these people tonight.
Okay.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comments.

Next is Mike Doxey, and following him is Lisa Ray, if you can be prepared after Mr. Doxey.

MR. DOXLEY: Yes. Mike Doxey, a resident of Aydlett.

I'm here tonight for obvious reasons, to, you know, protest the mid-county bridge entirely. I don't know of anybody that lives in Aydlett that would, you know, that welcomes the mid-county bridge.

But mostly I'm here tonight to protest and speak strongly against Option B. You mentioned it a while ago. Option B's got several detrimental effects to me and my property and my livelihood. And for one is I live on Narrow Shore Road, and if Aydlett Road is taken out then all the traffic from Grady, north that don't go outboard (sic) or Macedonia Church Road at Poplar Branch, all the traffic coming north has got to go right by my house to get up to the toll plaza to get on the bridge. And I don't think that us people and in Aydlett and Poplar Branch on the Grandy side should have to go up Narrow Shore Road to get on the bridge and mangle (sic) with that traffic to get over to 158. It just don't even make sense. That's one reason.

Another reason is I own property on Aydlett Swamp Road about somewhere around a thousand feet or so. If Aydlett Swamp Road is taken out I lose all access to my property. Now, Jennifer has said that, you know, well, yes, but they may buy it because they wouldn't be able to provide access to my property. Well, I don't want to sell my property on Aydlett Swamp Road. So, you know, just because they're putting a new bridge in that don't make me want to sell, you know, property. So I'm strongly against Option B.

The main reason for me -- another main reason for me to be totally against the bridge going across Currituck Sound, and it hasn't been mentioned to my knowledge so far, is the duck blinds that are in the corridor of the mid-county bridge. Now, the mid-county bridge corridor is going to take out about probably somewhere between 20 and 30 duck blinds, or at least be close enough to them to make them really useless. Well, the duck hunting is bad enough but when you put a bridge out there, I don't know of any duck blind within a mile or two of either way of that that's going to be worth anything at all.

Now, to you all people in Raleigh and yonder, you all don't understand the importance of...
duck blinds. It's tradition in Currituck, it's a
heritage, and if they are taken out then my family --
we have three duck blinds. I've got one, my brother's
got one and my son's got one. One of them's in C2
corridor, right over it, almost. One is in C1 and one
is in C1 and C2 combined where they come across the
Sound. So it will take out all three of my family's
duck blinds. And I'm upset over that particularly --
and since the Commissioners are here and some
Commissioners-wanna-be. I want to ask them and tell
them that I want you all to support us people in
Aydlett, to keep Aydlett Swamp Road and do away with
Option B. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you. Lisa Ray is next. Following Lisa will be Brian Innes.

MS. RAY: My name is Lisa Ray and I'm with Ray Commercial.

I just want to speak really in general to
the mid-county bridge. I'm in favor of that. I also
sit on the government relations committee for the
Currituck Chamber. And in having the mid-county
bridge it will provide direction for orderly future
growth for the county. In addition to that there
would be some positive retail growth in proper areas
with controlled growth, and that's so important to

this county.
And here on the mainland we can -- I
think we'd realize more jobs, more business and
industry that would come to Currituck mainland and
support our people here with good jobs so we don't
have to go outside the county for those types of
employments.

And also, it would allow us to connect
more with the Currituck Outer Banks, those of us that
live on the mainland, and to enjoy that.

Emergency evacuation is also important
and this would also provide the evacuation for the
Currituck Outer Banks. And I look forward to the
bridge coming about.

I used to live very close to the bridge
down in Manteo, within half a mile of it, and I really
was not -- did not find the traffic objectionable at
all. Thank you very much.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.
The next speaker is Brian Innes.
Following him will be Keleen Webb.

MR. INNES: Good evening. My name is
Brian Innes. I live at Barco, very close to where the
bridge is projected to be built.

There are two brief comments that I'd
like to make and they are general comments, first
being in terms of the safety of the evacuation. A few
years ago I witnessed one mandatory evacuation of the
Outer Banks and it was not very impressive.
Understandably it was slow, it was deliberate, as I’m
sure it was very stressful for those who were involved
in it. If the bridge in any way expedites the process
which is inevitably going to be necessary in the
future then I heartily endorse the bridge.
The second point is that as we all know,
we are right now in the middle of an almost
unprecedented economic mess. Prospects for the
short-term economic improvements are at best
uncertain. Just look at what happened on Wall Street
this week. Prospects for the long term are probably
ever less predictable. Therefore, Currituck County
which is so largely dependent on the tourist industry
I suggest will need all the help that we can get.
Businesses and the prosperity that follows businesses
can only locate where there is infrastructure. The
bridge I believe will become a major component of this
county's infrastructure. For that reason we need the
bridge sooner rather than later. I would hope that
tonight the project will receive a solid and assured
support. I thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you, Mr. Innes.
Neleen Webb followed by Jennifer Symonds.
MS. WEBB: My name's Neleen Webb, a
property owner in Coinjock.
I'm against the bridge. I'm for the
no-build.
Some of the things in the Environmental
Impact Statement that you-all have been referring to
tonight, you talk about the permanent loss or
alteration of the aquatic habitat. This is going to
happen now, but what's the environmental impact going
to be in 20 years and 30 years? Who knows what the
long-term effects on the Sound will be? What will the
rippling effects be on aquatic life?
By not building the bridge we don't even
have to answer those questions because the Sound's not
going to be disturbed.
The mid-county at present is a beautiful
place to live. Putting in this bridge will destroy
the view on the Sound, will destroy our night skies.
Five years ago I laid out in the grass, laid right out
there, watched the most phenomenal meteor shower I
have ever seen, about 70 meteors a minute. You put in
this toll booth, you take out that -- that whole
experience will never be able -- we will never be able
to have that again in our area.

The Currituck Outer Banks is unique in its remoteness. One visitor to our area told me he thought the bridge was ridiculous. The reason he travels here is because of the remote beauty of our area. It's worth the drive. We're going to destroy everything that makes our area special. Even here on the mainland right in the middle of the county we're going to have this concrete monster that belongs in a city, not rural Currituck County.

One oversight I perceived in the environmental impact study is that it doesn't mention the decrease in the tourism traffic south of the bridge. You're going to impact a lot of businesses. I didn't take the time to count them all. Some of them rely directly on tourism. You've got Grandy Farmhouse, I don't know how many little farm markets. We refer to it as the season when our traffic flows, you know, it picks up because our revenues go up. And you're going to hurt people down south.

And then as far as the evacuation, let's see. One thing is I've looked at it and we're doing this for about what I'd say is 13 days. We have 13 weekends of the traffic flows heavy. Only Saturday is there a problem. So we're really putting in this bridge for 13 days.

And then you keep talking about the hurricane evacuation and how it will help with that, but in your own study that's been approved it states:

The construction of a third outbound lane on US 158 would offer the greatest reduction in hurricane evacuation clearance times. So we don't need the bridge for that. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: The next speaker is Jennifer Symonds, followed by David Baldwin.


I wanted first to formally request full financial disclosure on this project showing the breakdowns for money spent on engineering, i.e., Parsons Brinckerhoff, attorneys' fees, all studies as well as all costs for workshops, hearings, et cetera, and you get my drift.

I've sent six e-mails beginning March 1st, 2010 and have not received an adequate response regarding a financial disclosure. I'd like these documents e-mailed to me so that I may review these documents prior to the June 7th comment deadline.

Regarding political influence on this
project, while this project is not decided by politicians, in July 19, 2009 in the Daily Advance they wrote an article, "DOT to Take Over Turnpike Authority." In their article they state, "Casino is a chief proponent to giving the Turnpike Authority control of the long-delayed mid-county bridge project. Johnson, the Casino spokesman said, the Mid-Currituck Bridge is one of his top priorities." I feel this is the reason this project is listed as high priority. Other projects are much more worthy of our tax dollars.

Why is MCB4 the Recommended Alternatives when it's not clearly the best candidate to solve the issues brought forth for purposes and need of this project? Adding a third outbound lane for hurricane evacuation was determined to be the most effective way to deal with this life safety issue. It has been stated in the DEIS that if the Currituck-Dare County line flooded the Mid-Currituck Bridge would provide the only way out because the Currituck County is an island. Who knew? This is a false statement. It is not surrounded by water, whereas the southern mainland by all definitions is an island. If that were to happen, then bridge that area.

Hurricane evacuees are allowed to travel through the False Cape and Back Bay Wildlife Refuge if necessary. This option does not address the backups due to the poor interchange design at US 158 and NC 12. This option also does nothing to increase the road-carrying capacity on NC 12 and the project area thus alleviating none of the traffic after the masses arrive.

Multiple studies and recommendations have been made, including rotating or spreading out the days the vacationers arrive, adjusting the timing of the traffic signals, and addressing the poor design of the area east of the Wright Memorial Bridge on US 158 as well as trolley service. Little effort has been made to address the recommendations of these previous studies.

Section 3.1.11 in your DEIS, could crime rates increase? Your answer: "Crime rates are not anticipated to increase with any of the detailed study alternatives, including the MCB2 and MCB4 which provide a direct connection between the mainland and the Currituck Outer Banks."

I find that assumption erroneous. What the assertion fails to note is that the bridge will bring additional key components aiding in the commission of crimes: One, access; two, availability;
three, convenience; four, opportunity; five, ease, as

the majority of homes at Corolla are empty during the

off-season and property crime has been a problem.

The DEIS compares Kitty Hawk to Corolla

with regards to drive times from Norfolk, Virginia.

with the bridge. The problem is that the homes in

Kitty Hawk are not comparable to Corolla homes.

The bridge options will affect the high

environmental quality we enjoy, the quality of life,

increase crime, allow irreversible damage to the

environment and wildlife in an environmentally

sensitive area, create construction noise for the

duration of the project as well as decreasing property

values for the homes near the bridge.

ER2 is the only option and should be

considered as it is the most effective way to increase

road-carrying capacity on NC 12, deal with the

US 158/NC 12 interchange, and creates no permanent

damage to the environment. ER2 will also have no

quality of life changes for those in the project area.

For the record, I oppose any option that

includes a bridge.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

David Baldwin? Followed by Wallace

Davis.
you, I've talked to some other gentlemen and I get the
same answer. One tells me, oh, you won't be here next
year, and the other tells me, oh, that's not true.
we're not sure what we're doing. I think before you
come back and ask us anymore what we think. I really
feel you should have a real plan of what you want us
to look at. Your options are a pile of maps that half
of us couldn't read and half of us don't even know
what you want to do with them. You've got so many
options and no decision on what you're going to do.

Timeline is my life, too. I'm 53. The
man across the street's 50. I heard you say we'll
take care of you. 53 is a long way of my life to
start over, and that's what you're going to ask me to
do. All your options take me out except don't build
the bridge. You need to make a decision soon, please.

MS. HARRIS: Wallace Davis followed by
C.A. Howard.

MR. DAVIS: Hi, I'm Wally Davis. I live
at 183 Sandy Lane in Aydlett.

The Purpose and Need section of the DEIS
states that the project will be analyzed based on the
ability to meet several needs, one of which is to
improve the traffic flow.

The traffic according to the Traffic

TAYLOE ASSOCIATES, INC.

Alternatives Report portion of the DEIS says that the
traffic on Route 12 south of Corolla will actually get
worse if a bridge is built. The widening -- these are
all either detailed items or statements in the DEIS --
widening US 158 in Currituck was not considered
because congestion is not forecasted through 2030 on
summer weekdays but only on summer weekends. On
US 158 north of the new bridge traffic volumes are the
same with or without a bridge. The two-mile section
of US 158 between Wright Memorial Bridge and Route 12
will have extreme congestion by 2035 if the bridge is
not widened. If the bridge is constructed this
roadway would require a combination of six to eight
lanes.

The intersection of NC 12 and 158 should
be upgraded by an interchange or similar improvement.

On North Carolina 12 in Dare widening to
four lanes would resolve congestion problems with or
without a bridge.

The DEIS fails to address the traffic
issues resulting from acceleration of a buildout of
the remaining unimproved lots on the Currituck Outer
Banks.

Conclusion. This fails to substantially
improve traffic flow, fails to solve the Dare County
Route 12 traffic problem, worsens Corolla traffic, has no impact on US 158 in Currituck or Dare's traffic on 158. They are the same with or without the bridge.

The second item which is substantially reducing travel time to the mainland of Currituck, I drove from Aydlett to US 158 on the Currituck-Dare line on Tuesday at or below the speed limit of 45 miles an hour in 45-and-a-half minutes. Thursday it took me -- or Wednesday it took me 56 minutes to drive from my home in Aydlett to Corolla to the Wildlife Museum to make my comments. My times were improved by the fact that my wife wasn't along and I didn't have to stop at any roadside stands or markets along the way. I did have to stop for one stoplight on both trips.

At Route 12 and Duck Pier there was a radar sign on that Tuesday and it was clear and dry at the time. I was at the end of nine cars that were driving north at 30 miles an hour in a 35-mile-an-hour speed zone, and I don't have any suggestion for the DEIS how they should analyze this problem.

The DEIS bases many conclusions on summer traffic volumes. Summer weekends represent 26 days. That's 7 percent of the days in a year. For summer weekends included, only 24.9 (percent) of the total traffic days are included. 13 weekend problems a year.

The cost of a bridge is undetermined until the design is completed but estimated to be upwards of as high as possibly $760 million. North Carolina has committed to spending $15 million per year for 40 years for the shortfall of any tolls. I'm not confident in the accuracy of these estimates. It is not worth the expenditure of $85 to $760 million or even $15 million a year for the next 40 years to help traffic for 26 days. Thank you very much.

MS. HARRIS: C.A. Howard followed by Mack Pierce.

MR. HOWARD: Yes, ma'am. My name is C.A. Howard.

I am in favor of the bridge. I'm in favor of Option A for several reasons, first of which I know that people are going to be affected. People were affected when the highway was widened when property in Moyock was taken and when property down the county was taken for the widening of the highway. There was several businesses -- I actually was hired by the state to do appraisal work down there and there were several businesses that actually went bankrupt because of the construction work that was underway.
And I also believe that if you widen the road going to the bridge, the Wright Memorial Bridge, and you do not allow ingress-egress to the different properties and businesses up and down that corridor that you're going to totally wipe them out.

I do think it's wrong to mess up the road at Narrow Shores. I see no need -- I'm not an engineer but I see no need to hurt what is there now. You know, I think the simplest would be the Option A, to bring it through and just take it right straight across. Growth is inevitable, it's going to happen. If you don't believe it, ask the Scarboroughs in Duck, ask the people in Moyock, Jarvisburg, up and down the highway, it's going to come. The best thing I think we can do is try to control it and make the best of it and try to hurt as few people as possible. Thank you.

Ms. Harris: Thank you.

Mack Pierce followed by Karen Quidley-Pierce.

Mr. Pierce: My name is Mack Pierce. I live at 5067 Currituck Highway.

And it really -- I like the super street that you put up there tonight. We've been trying to get an overpass put there on NC 12 for 20 years.

Nobody in Dare County seems to want to put an overpass going to NC 12 and you all can do it with a super street. That's a good deal.

And I've got some alternative plans here. Dare County stoplights is the main problem here. The first stoplight goes to Martin's Point. That's no problem.

The second stoplight is Kitty Hawk School, Duck Woods, Kitty Hawk Woods. The owners in the Kitty Hawk Woods and Duck Woods, they don't want you traveling through their neighborhood. Close off the Duck Woods, just block it. They can come in from the back way. They don't have the through traffic going to them.

Same thing with the Kitty Hawk Woods.

They have another inlet out. Take them off the corridor there where they're not in the same corridor.

And as far as the school, you can take the light and take it, shut it down when they don't have school days and during summer months you don't need the light if you shut these two roads off.

Then you move on down, you're at the light at the ABC store, Walmart, McDonald's, Home Depot, shopping center. Well, then you can put a feeder road coming back -- they already have a feeder road coming back.
road that goes across to the Home Depot and the
Walmart, and then you could come back up to the liquor
store. So bring that in right at the one stoplight
you have at NC 12, have it where it can come back up
and do just like they do in Virginia Beach with feeder
roads.

And this could happen the same thing over
on the other side going back up onto this shopping
center, the Food Lion. Just have a feeder road coming
from that one stoplight where people can egress onto
and then when they get down, nobody has any problem
coming from Martin’s Point if they want to get on to
the highway. That’s why they cut through Duck Woods
to start with.

So none of traffic that we have in this
situation here seems to bother the people in --
stoplights down here in Grady, which seems to bottle
up when you get to Point Harbor.

So I’m for the no-bridge. I’d like to
see Corolla grow at its own pace. And Corolla
attracts the friendly, nature-loving people, people
that want to get away from the mainstream or the rat
race.

The future bridge when it comes the time
that it’s needed. I’d like to see a bridge built

south. Give the bridge to the people at the south end
of Currituck County and Southern Shores. Put the
bridge down one mile from Grady right where the trash
collection spot is. You will take in less 404
wetlands. If you go there and look at the site, it’s
high ground, you don’t have to go through a swamp to
got to the water. You can carry the people right over
to the county line. Half of them can go to the south,
half of them can go to the north. You don’t have to
widen both roads to accommodate them. The people that
want to go north, they want to be there.

And then as far as getting on down, but
the one bridge that we have going to the south of
Grady, you don’t have to cross no secondary roads.
There’s fewer houses there, you won’t have to take
that many businesses out, and when you get to the
other side it’s the Audubon. They’re already started
developing the Audubon on the north end. They need
the money. All you got to do is approach them.

The bikers, the bikers are going to come
and go. I’ve already had one meeting I went to this
week where they said there would be a thousand bikers
a week. Well, they’re going to come over, you’re
going to have a service ramp. That don’t mean nothing
at 2 o’clock in the morning. They’re going to cross
over and go into somebody's neighborhood and be in your back yards.

So I think you need to look at the combinations you've got here in putting lights for people to come over, and you have nothing there for then to come to. But if you put it in Grady you already have the Food Lion, you already have the restaurants, you already have the businesses down there that would welcome the people to come over on bicycles.

And then again you talked to us about the hunting blinds. I agree. The bridge will ruin the hunting in that area. The lights, the lights will scare the ducks off. You go south of Currituck Bridge, the ducks are not there. It's not that many blinds south of Currituck Bridge. The narrow needs to have the bridge beyond that, south, so the ducks can land in the narrows. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comments.

Karen Quigley-Pierce followed by Fannie Newber.

MS. QUIDLEY-PIERCE: Okay, I've just got one question. We were at the meeting last night. When I speak here I'll still be able to submit comments, won't I?

MS. HARRIS: Absolutely.

MS. QUIDLEY-PIERCE: Okay, I just wasn't sure about that.

Okay. This bridge is for convenience. The Bonner Bridge is necessary, and many others in the state that need the funds. 50 million a year that is going for this project, the Bonner Bridge would create the same jobs for the same people and construction.

Okay about the bridge. You were talking about the toll plaza. Well, the tolls would be collected electronically. Well, I got talking to Mark about it and he says, well, how are you going to collect when the kids take mom and dad's car and put duct tape over the license and then they get their picture taken? If you do find them they are all on welfare and you can't get blood out of a turnip.

Don't take this scenario as only going to happen once. More than likely they will be day trippers which Corolla is going to be full of. The non-road accessible northern beaches is a unique area that would appeal to a unique market of day trippers, beach drivers, sport fishermen and surfers. This experience would require a four-wheel drive and would provide no bathroom or other facilities.

And Highway 12 is not the only way off of
Corolla during a hurricane evacuation. Passage through the False Cape Back Bay Wildlife Reserve has been used in the past when necessary during a hurricane evacuation.

And I am in favor of BR2. The first thing is if anybody knows me in this room, I live on the corner of 158 and Aydlett Road. It's that place where the Turnpike Authority plans to put the toll booth. I am the third generation to live in my home. My farm and my billboards are located north, east, south and west of the toll booths. Any of the choices will impact me directly.

I've been fighting this fight for 25 years. It's been around me, it's been around me all that time and now it's on top of me. I was against it then and still am. I am 50-plus years old and I don't know another life. The Turnpike Authority would be taking away my ability to support myself and my family. My house and farm are shown on all the maps.

The way this has been approached for the last 25 years has been psychological terrorism.

And number 2 would be fill in less wetlands. The ridge I live on is about 2,500 feet wide. The rest is swamp land. Less impact on endangered species and ones that are candidate species, and it would be no change to the visual quality in the project area and it would not involve significant encroachment on the hundred-year floodplain.

Okay. Many improvements need to be done in the intersection of 158 and Highway 12 in Kitty Hawk. I think that's it.

Oh. And also, I know that you have a limit of to send our comments to you by June 7th. But also, comments need to be sent to the Corps of Engineers by June 4th, and I don't know, maybe we can find out an address for them. Comments do need to be sent to them.

MS. HARRIS: Okay. Fannie Newbern followed by Joy Davis.

MS. NEWBERRY: I'm Fannie Newbern. I live at Powells Point and I do favor the mid-county bridge but only with Option A where it does less disruption to Aydlett.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comment. Joy Davis and followed by her would be Travis Morris.

MS. DAVIS: I am Joy Davis. I live at 143 Sandy Lane in Aydlett.

I'm opposed to the mid-county bridge...
mainly because the Currituck Sound is a very important water system. It's very sensitive and it's the livelihood of many, has been for many years, fishing, crabbing and hunting, and a lot of people make their living with that. And also, we all may have to go back to living off the land with the way things are going.

So if you don't think this bridge affects it with the run-off, the Environmental Impact Statement says, "choosing a two-lane bridge because a four-lane bridge is the worst case for environmental impact." I'd say any lanes across the Currituck Sound is the worst case for air quality, water quality, and sound quality. And I don't think that it would improve any quality of Currituck with the mid-county bridge.

It's been suggested that the bridge will help traffic flow. However, it does not help traffic flow on the mainland, and it's making it worse for us. And it just seems like a bridge would bring more day trippers and year-round traffic so we would have traffic not only just four months out of the year but year 'round. I'm surprised that Moyock and Barco and Coinjock haven't spoken up more about the traffic that they would have year 'round because of people going daily. And not only that, I believe that people will move over there from Chesapeake area and they would be traveling those roads twice a day every day. So I believe traffic would be -- I believe the traffic would be worse.

I can't imagine how many cars would get off a four-lane road to cross a two-lane bridge and pay $30 for that. And I believe it will back up -- the tolls would back up the traffic on into Coinjock just trying to get over a bridge if as many cars are planned to go over there as you all suggest.

And it's been suggested that a bridge would increase business and that Currituck wants mainland businesses to grow. However, they're cutting off southern county businesses. Those south of Grandy won't be -- the cars won't stop there to go to the businesses. And the bridge, the Wright Memorial Bridge has been there for years and years and years and hasn't brought any business over to the mainland of Currituck yet other than a few like the topless bar, which I don't appreciate riding by that, actually.

So anyway, the expense of the bridge seems frivolous. If a hurricane wipes out the bridge are we going to have to bail it out like we've had to
bail out -- we're bailing out everything else in this country?

And someone just said about the evacuation. Evacuation -- when a hurricane comes the cars are backed up way south of Grandy. So if a bridge is coming into Coinjock and the traffic is already backed up south of Grandy, they can't even get off the bridge. They're going to be sitting there waiting to get onto the road to leave.

And someone had mentioned that the pros, most of the ones have the pros for the bridge are people that are not affected and the cons are from those who are affected. But I would say that everybody in this county is going to be affected with that bridge. 15 years ago the county sent out a letter to the residents asking what kind of county they wanted and overwhelmingly it was the sense that this county -- the people in the county wanted a rural flavor. And this bridge definitely contradicts what the people in this county had asked for.

So I'm against the mid-county bridge.

Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comments.

Travis Morris followed by Mike Barclay.

MR. MORRIS: I'm Travis Morris. I live

in Maple, born and raised and have a business in Coinjock.

I'm in favor of the bridge. I can appreciate the people from Aydlett's position that -- the people that live there, but I kind of -- I compare this to the road up the beach in Corolla. I've been going to Corolla since I was eight years old and I enjoyed going to the beach, taking my family over there when I can look up and down the beach and see nothing as far as you could see from one end to the other where you could -- besides then you could see Pointers Hill Station till the hippies burnt it down, but then there wasn't nothing.

But I knew that that road was necessary. It was absolutely necessary. And I had a business over there. I helped build up Corolla Village, not for myself but for some other people. And I knew when they had a road up there that would do away with me because as it was before I carried the people across the Sound on a boat and I was the only ship over there. And when they put the road, why, the real estate agents came in like fleas on a dog's back, which I knew, and that did away with me. But I knew it was inevitable and I was in favor of it, and it's the same thing for this bridge.
Now, I've been in the real estate business 40 years in Currituck and I've heard people say the values will go down. I don't believe that, the values in Aydlett. As a matter of fact, Newt Hampton who has the mail contract from Coinjock to Point Harbor, I was talking to him, I see him every morning at 6:30 in the Currituck Sports, and he said that the Aydlett post office has been (sic) more growth in Aydlett than anywhere on the route.

And that's -- anyway, I have some notes in my hand like Sarah Palin and the sweat's running out, so:

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comments.

Mike Barclay followed by Sam Taylor.

MR. BARCLAY: My name's Mike Barclay. I live at 110 Lighthouse View in Aydlett with my wife and two children.

I just am adamantly opposed to this bridge and what it's going to bring to this county and Aydlett. What I'm afraid of and I think everybody that lives in Aydlett right now is in our gut feeling is that we're going to become collateral damage in this whole process by no fault of our own.

One thing I want to point out, there's a letter that was written April 23rd, 2010 by the Southern Environmental Law Center and it was regarding a TIFIA funding for the mid-county bridge project, and what that stands for is the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act. It was sent to Susan Callender, who is the director of the TIFIA joint program office with the U.S. Department of Transportation in Washington, D.C., and it was also forwarded to Mr. Conti, Gene Conti, the head of the North Carolina Department of Transportation. David Coyner, who is the head of the North Carolina Turnpike Authority, also.

I would encourage you, every one of you in this room, if you can get a hold of this letter to read it because it talks about the funding and everything else that's being done with this bridge and who's going to end up picking up the bill for it.

I'm going to read one little paragraph in here and this covers part of it: "At a cost of over $700 million the mid-county bridge project would span seven miles of wetlands and coastal sound to access a barrier island that measures less than a mile across for most of its length. The primary purpose of the bridge would be to shorten tourist trips to the Currituck Outer Banks and the Town of Corolla, an unincorporated community with 500 permanent residents,"
and only 30 public beach access parking spaces. The project would encourage investment in real estate and infrastructure that would be highly vulnerable to hurricanes and sea level rise. It would significantly impact a fragile coastal eco-system and drain transportation resources away from sorely needed maintenance and repair projects in the immediate vicinity of the project.

I think the key word here is at a cost of over $700 million, possibly $750 million, which is three-quarters of a billion dollars.

My wife is a not a school teacher, she's a substitute school teacher. She also tutors kids. Today what we're looking at with these teachers, we've got teachers' cuts in this state, we've got projects in this state that aren't getting funded because of this bridge and what they want to do in this county. You sit there and every one of you in here with your grandchildren, your children, and that money's going away because of teachers' cuts and they can't put supplies or whatever in the schools. It's ridiculous. It's ludicrous. And every one of you in here ought to be concerned about it, every one of you.

The other thing, and I'll stop with this, and this is off their own website. This is the North Carolina Turnpike Authority Board of Directors, and as I mentioned last fall, and one of those gentlemen isn't on the North Carolina Turnpike Authority is Mr. Lanny Wilson who got into a little bit of hot water. Mr. Wilson, like I've said before, he previously served for four years on the North Carolina Real Estate Commission.

We got Mr. Sing Hamilton. Hamilton currently serves as a member of the North Carolina Real Estate Commission.

Mr. Lackey, he served for seven years on the North Carolina Real Estate Commission and currently serves on the North Carolina Housing Finance board of directors. Mr. Lackey was president of the Charlotte Regional Realty Association in 1996 that was named that organization's Realtor of the year in 2000. Bill currently serves on the board of governors of the real estate and building industry, having chaired the organization in 1998.

And then we got Mr. Teer. And these are all board of directors on the North Carolina Turnpike Authority and I'm reading right from their website, people. He is a president of Teer Associates, a Durham-based real estate development, construction and property management leasing company.
All I can say is that those are the people who have been chosen by four members of the board, or appointed by the governor. Two members are appointed by President Pro Tem, i.e., Mr. Bannett, and two by the Speaker of the House. That's your North Carolina Turnpike Authority, people, that you pay money and their salaries in this county and in the state to support, and this is one of their projects that's getting ready to get rammed up your rear end.

MS. HARRIS: Sam Taylor followed by Gwen Cruickshank.

MR. TAYLOR: My name is Sam Taylor.

I strongly support the construction of a Mid-Currituck County Bridge. At the same time as I'm quite sympathetic with all of us who are affected by change, and we have had change. In the last decade the northern Outer Banks have become a major metropolitan resort area that is effectively isolated from the mainland. The MCB4 alternatives that's been proposed alleviates this problem significantly simply by reducing the travel distance by up to 16 miles while providing an alternative northern link that could prove vital in the event of the need for an in-season evacuation.

I noticed that there's been some concern about day trippers evidenced here in this meeting and other places, and it seemed to me that most of the day trippers will be the other 99 percent of Currituck County residents who don't live on the northern Outer Banks. They include workers who provide commercial services, county employees who provide public services, school children who might actually enjoy the benefit from a field trip to the magnificent wildlife museum, and even some parents and grandparents who might like to bring their children to enjoy one of the most beautiful beaches on the east coast.

Who knows what the bridge, it might even be possible for families and children to live on the Currituck County Outer Banks and still enjoy the benefits of a public education. Times have changed and I think it's time to build it.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comments.

Gwen Cruickshank followed by Shannon Finser.

Ms. CRUICKSHANK: My name is Gwen Cruickshank. I live at Point Harbor where I have lived for the last 31 years. I find it difficult to understand the negative position the folks in Aydlett have about the bridge because in Point Harbor we have not one bridge
span but two bridge spans and it has not adversely
affected our property values or our aesthetic quality
of life.

There are times when it is necessary to
make sacrifices for the greater good and this is one
of those times.

I would not like to have all the
inevitable deaths which would result from people being
trapped by a hurricane and unable to leave the area on
my conscience and all for the sake of a pretty view.

Some may scoff at our tourists but may I
remind you that they are the fuel which powers our
engine and keeps our taxes so wondrously low and have
enabled us to build our Currituck government complex,
and consequently the tourists have rights, too.

As president of Build the Bridge,
Preserve Our Roads I can state categorically that we
have over 22,000 signatures on our petition supporting
the bridge. We have approximately 20 resolutions of
support from every municipality in Dare and Currituck
Counties as well as the Dare and Currituck Boards of
Commissioners. Indeed, the Currituck County Board of
Commissioners have passed resolutions of support for
the bridge each year for the last 10 years.

I've lost a page. There have been four

studies made and on the missing page it lists them and
I will provide that to you, and every one of those
support the bridge, not one was in opposition. This
included Currituck residents as well as Currituck
property owners in Dare as well. No matter how the
questions were phrased on these surveys or by whom
they were asked they all unanimously -- well, they all
in the majority were in favor of the bridge. This is
an overwhelming endorsement of support for the
Mid-Currituck Sound Bridge, not the minority voices of
a few which we have heard. On our petition we have
signatures of people both from Aydlett and Corolla.

Hurricane evacuation is a primary
consideration for the construction of the mid-county
sound bridge. I wonder how many have been caught
in the gridlock that occurs when there is a hurricane
evacuation. I have, and it's not pretty. Contrary to
all the planning in the world, people will not leave
the area unless they believe the hurricane is going to
impact them. Hence, the inevitable gridlock.

I would like to thank the North Carolina
Turnpike Authority personally and on behalf of BBPR
for their diligence and efforts and in particular
thanks to Jennifer Harris. Your work is much
appreciated, as is the opportunity to speak to you
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their business. So I just wanted to touch on that a little bit.

And now on behalf of the Currituck Chamber of Commerce I wanted to read our resolution supporting the Mid-Currituck Bridge that was adopted in November of 2008.

"Whereas, the North Carolina General Assembly has authorized the North Carolina Turnpike Authority to seek proposals for the development of the Mid-Currituck Bridge project:

"And whereas, Senator Mark Bassnight supports the Mid-Currituck Bridge with a filtered drainage system as a vital transportation improvement to our area and Representative Bill Owens also believes the Mid-Currituck Bridge would offer greater public safety and evacuation options;

"And whereas, the Chambers of the Northeast has listed Mid-Currituck Bridge as one of the legislative priorities for transportation in northeastern North Carolina;

"Whereas, Currituck County is divided by water between its mainland and Outer Banks communities with only one access corridor to our beaches, which is to travel through another county;

"And whereas, the Mid-Currituck Bridge
would substantially improve traffic flow on NC 12 and
US 158 roadways;

and whereas, the Mid-Currituck Bridge
would substantially reduce travel time for, one,
emergency medical services, two, working residents and
finally visitors traveling between Currituck County
mainland and the Currituck County Outer Banks;

and whereas, the Mid-Currituck Bridge
would provide the safest and most efficient method for
hurricane evacuation for residents and visitors in
Currituck and Dare County;

and whereas, alternatives to the
Mid-Currituck Bridge such as road widening and ferry
system are inadequate for the long-term solution for
traffic needs in Northeastern North Carolina,

therefore, be it resolved that the
Currituck Chamber of Commerce voted to adopt this
resolution supporting the North Carolina Department of
Transportation's and the North Carolina Turnpike
Authority's proposal to construct the Mid-Currituck
Bridge.

Be it further resolved that the
Currituck Chamber of Commerce opposes significant
widening of NC 12 and US 158 through Corolla, Duck,
Southern Shores and mainland Currituck County.

And again, that was adopted the 19th day
de November 2008 and our Government Affairs Committee
and Board of Directors would like to reaffirm that
resolution supporting the bridge at this time as well.

Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comments.

Phil Kratzer followed by Nancy Snead.

MR. KRATZER: I'm Phil Kratzer. I live
on Aydlett Road. I've lived there since 1984.

I was on the Citizens Advisory Committee
to the Land Use Plan when it was last done and I've
kept up with this bridge thing ever since I've been
here and every time we had a presentation there was no
Option B. Now all of a sudden when the bridge,
everybody knows it's going to be built — and I'm
against it, by the way — but now that it's going to
be built this Option B has been sprung on everybody.

And the only thing, advantage to it that I can see is
it saves somebody $60 million or something like that.

It's going to impact me not directly
because I live about four miles from Aydlett, but the
traffic that is going to be generated up and down
Aydlett and Poplar Branch Road is going to be
horrendous. It's already bad enough. Just come down
our road and see how many potholes are in it from
this. You're going to have people coming down here
maybe to go to the Outer Banks but they're going to
come and say, well, let's go over there and they're
just going to wander around our area at no advantage
for anybody that lives there.

And when I was on the Committee I
received e-mails about the bridge and all of them
supported the bridge but they were all from somebody
who owned land over there but they lived up in New
York or Raleigh or somewhere else. I got no e-mails
from anybody that lived over there that wants that
bridge.

What's going to happen, it's too bad
because the real driver on this whole thing is the
development of the Outer Banks which is just based on
greed. The idea that it's going to improve the
evacuation is ludicrous, because when they changed the
mandatory evacuations from a 12-hour window to a
24-hour window -- and that's the complaint that I got
from most of those carpetbagging landowners there, was
that they were losing their rentals and that was their
problem with it. If they shorten this to say, okay,
we've got this bridge now, we can go back to 12-hour,
I will bet that the people trying to get on -- come
cross the Sound and get out on that highway are going
to be backed up. And oh, by the way, when it gets
really bad Virginia closes Interstate 66. So I don't
know where all those people are going to go in the
last minute. Maybe through Ahoskie or Edenton or
something like that.

The woman that said something about going
to create more jobs, it would just be low-paying jobs
that's not going to do any -- benefit anybody really
in the county. $8 an hour doing retail is not a good
job.

The environmental impact is a moot point
because when you build the bridge, whatever wildlife
is left up there since they've done a lot of logging
up there is going to be gone. So, you know, the only
animals that are going to be affected are the people.

So I'm totally against the bridge but
it's going to be built. But I am really against this
plan B and that's just -- you know, it's just a
rip-off.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comments.
Nancy Sneed?

MS. SNEAD: The main thing that I'd like
to ask is -- where is Karen Quidley? How many years
has this been going on with the bridge?

MS. QUIDLEY-PIERCE: 25 years.
MS. SNEAD: Okay. How come it wasn't done 25 years ago and it could have saved us a fortune? That's probably because somebody's pocketbook wants to be feathered in the real estate industry.

And then God reminded me, brought me back to a scripture in Deuteronomy, 19:14 where it says, 'do not remove the ancient boundary markers of your neighbor's property.' We all sit around in Currituck acting like we own everything we sit on. The American Indian owns it. That's the way I see it.

And the only reason that bridge probably needed to go through 25 years ago was to save somebody's life from a hurricane, and everybody knew that. So I don't see why you're trying to shove it down people's throats now for a fortune. It's only like you said, for greed. God bless you all.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your comments.

Now, that's the end of the people that registered ahead of time to speak. If there are other people that wish to speak, please approach the microphone. There will still be a three-minute time limit because we want to make sure that everyone that wants to speak has an opportunity to speak, and please announce your name when you get to the microphone.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Jennifer. My name is Penny Leary Smith and I've spoken this is three rights in a row so I don't know where I'll be with you tomorrow night.

But approximately 26 to 30 years ago I had the great opportunity to know the CEO in Dominion Power. He shared the blueprints from Dominion where the bridge would be built if it was ever built. We have spent at least 26 years on this project and we still do not have a bridge whether it's needed or not. What tremendous amount of taxpayers' money has already been spent plus the other obligation for the next 40 years of the state plus other monies.

Then and now the cheapest method is ER2 and this was recognized by Dominion Power. It still is. And if you look on your handout on page 13 you'll see this.

As far as hurricane evacuation, the same potential is in place that Chesapeake will close 168 at Barco and all the traffic will still have the same backup whether there is a bridge or not.

I'm the director of Dismal Swamp Welcome Center and I am a witness and know the issues of hurricane evacuation and have worked many, many midnight hours when we did have a hurricane. DOT and
both Currituck and Dare are very much aware of this issue. With this job that they do with the emergency management is involved with the travelers to evacuate. I can assure you there is enough time for satisfactory and sufficient time to evacuate.

But also, as a property owner in Currituck County in the community of Aydlett I do not want to lose the quality of life this community now offers. If you place the tolls in Aydlett and it is to be the last exit before crossing the mid-county bridge most of those travelers will continue through Aydlett and Poplar Branch continuing to the Outer Banks joining 158 at Grandy, not wanting to pay the toll.

Leave your toll booths on 158 if you're so determined to build this bridge and we are more than willing to travel the old Swamp Road to get to the bridge to go to Corolla. The old Swamp Road has never flooded. It offers no damage to the environment or floodplain.

Currituck County is very fortunate to have these northern beaches which supports the largest tax base for the entire county. Because of the quality of life this beach offers to its guests as a destination this is why they so choose to vacation there, and the same thing for those 500 permanent residents who live and pay taxes in Currituck County.

Why do you want to destroy the goose that has given you the golden eggs? Each of you know it is easier to get somewhere the more -- easier to get somewhere and that more people will be definitely coming to this area. You have the highest clientele and you want to open this area to day trippers which will only increase your daily population causing additional costs for law enforcement to meet the demands of this diverse audience and to mess up the serene, beautiful vacation paradise destination.

The bridge cannot and will not be self-supporting and will gobble up state fundings. Let's support a much needed bridge by replacing the Bonner Bridge. Pay your toll facilities to the best candidate, that being the Bonner Bridge. Let us maintain the same quality of life in Currituck County, not disturbing a primary nursery for various species of fish and wildlife and taking care of our natural resources.

I can assure you being in the tourist business that where a tourist spends his time he spends his money. You have that now so please let it continue and remain the same for its residents, its
taxpayers and its vacationers.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you. Are there other people that wish to speak? If so, please come up to the microphone and state your name.

Is there anyone that's already spoken that wishes to speak again?

MR. DAVIS: Yeah. I'm Wally Davis. I had a few more comments and they had to do with the final item regarding the mid-county bridge.

The third need that was to be helped by this bridge was to substantially reduce hurricane clearance time for residents and visitors who use 168 and US 158 during hurricane evacuation. The Alternatives Screening Report states: 'Without improvement in the outbound capacity of this portion of US 158, which is North Carolina 168 to Route 12, future hurricane evacuation clearance times would not decrease even if North Carolina 12 was widened or the mid-county bridge was built.'

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement doesn't analyze the impact of the current widening of the improvement to US 158 from Belcross to Camden and on to Route 17, which is project J443.3. Therefore, clearance time is likely overstated in the DEIR.

Mr. Page has described in the Dare meeting this past Tuesday that use of a third lane along US 158 is impractical because of it being uncontrolled for 26 miles as a solution to the hurricane evacuation. Yet, this is an integral part of the plan that is being presented to us to help evacuate, and quite honestly, it's been done before. The problem of it being done before not working properly before was that Chesapeake shut off access to the route north on 158 and the road improvements along 158 going to Elizabeth City had not yet been completed. So with those being done I think you'll see better improvement.

Even if the bridge was built, however, the vast majority of the hurricane evacuation traffic leaving the Outer Banks is leaving northern Dare County and traveling up 158 rather than using a mid-county bridge. Given the greater population in the proximity to the Wright Memorial Bridge the need to improve US 158 rather than to build a bridge would be the highest priority, or should be the highest priority.

Merging outbound traffic from a mid-county bridge will lead to a bottleneck south of the J.P. Knapp Bridge. These scenarios presume there's a backup at Barco. If there is no backup then
nc mid-county bridge is needed. If there is a backup the mid-county bridge will likely exacerbate the problem. The bridge will likely encourage tourists and some residents to wait until the very last minute to evacuate in order to avoid losing part of their vacation. It's been done before.

The conclusion that the mid-county or MKB4 substantially improves hurricane evacuation is premature and illogical. A bridge has little positive impact to the identified need.

Additional shortcomings of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement are that the toll plaza analysis in Option B has not been included in that and either from a cost standpoint or from a water quality, air quality, community impact or noise pollution aspects of it. There's biased commentary related to where the public commenters in previous meetings lived and should be removed.

The Alternatives Screening Report on page 66 under the Public Comments section says, "many of the comments of these alternatives came from persons who would be personally affected by the particular corridor as well as people concerned about potential impacts on their community in general." And those in favor of the bridge aren't personally already affected

by this? This statement marginalizes the opinion of those who object to the bridge.

As far as an illogical analysis, the fact that the DEIS says, "a four-lane bridge was assumed as a potential worst case scenario when considering potential environmental impact of a bridge," and a two-lane bridge is substantially better environmentally? That's on table 2 of the alternatives report.

The air quality report was dated January of 2010 but no analysis of the impact of day trippers encouraged by the bridge were included. This adversely widens the area impacted by the air pollution. The Federal Highway Safety -- or Highway Administration included the disclaimer that the impact of this on air quality of a bridge is -- on the air quality is undetermined. It emits -- the North Carolina Turnpike Authority analysis it emits increases in HSAF in populated areas at the bridge. Populated or not, air pollution will occur. And it states that Currituck County has no zoning regulations and does not mention burning permits required in Currituck. I'm presuming this was probably based on old information and hasn't been updated in January of 2010.
Under the community impact report dated 11/09 it states no access to or from the mid-county bridge into Aydlett. Now, this was just six months ago and after the meeting had been held to talk about Option B. And a potential for Option B was not recognized or discussed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or the community impact report.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement does not resolve the issue of accelerated growth because of the addition of the bridge as far as additional housing.

So that's the end of my comments. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

Yes, sir.

MR. DOXEY: Again, Mike Doxey, resident of Aydlett.

I'd like to speak on your environmental statements for just a minute. The Turnpike Authority has in their Option B to take out the Aydlett Swamp Road because it causes a damming effect. And I've been in Aydlett all my life. I'm 54. The only time Aydlett Swamp Road has caused a damming effect is about four times. It has flooded once. I seen it go all the way across the road during Tropical Storm Ernesto in September of 2006. It ran across the Aydlett Road for about five or six hundred yards long for about three hours. That's the only time. And every time the damming effect, like I say, four times in my life, has been caused by excessive rainfalls.

There's culverts in there. DOT as we speak are putting in new culverts and upgrading that. And in my opinion, I've lived there all my life, it does not -- if it does cause a damming effect it's very short lived and short term and the south side of the swamp is exactly eco-system-wise as the north side of the swamp. It does not cause any detrimental effect to either side of the swamp from that damming effect.

MS. HARRIS: Thank you.

MS. JORDAN: I said I wasn't going to talk but I do have some questions. I'm Sophie Jordan. I live in Aydlett and I am against the bridge.

But I do have a concern about the toll. If we can come across this bridge and it's there, we're talking $20 to go back and forth, so the school would -- would a parent pay that much to bring your child to school? Will the government employees pay that much each day to go back and forth? I feel like
the realtors will have a packet in their rentals so
that the toll is paid through them.

So my curiosity is how is this toll going
to be used? How long will it be on the bridge, and is
it going to be the same for everyone, county
residents, tourists, so forth?

MS. HARRIS: There is a possibility that
either there is some sort of discount for frequent
users that has not been determined at this time. It’s
also anticipated that the toll rate could be different
in the off-peak compared to the peak periods. I don’t
have the details right now but those sorts of things
have been discussed and will be evaluated as we move
forward if the bridge is selected to be implemented.

Does that answer your question? Okay.

MS. WEBB: I’m Meleen Webb again.

I wanted to almost like a redirect, I
guess. The woman from the Chamber of Commerce
commented about some businesses that actually just
shut down or weren’t open on the weekends, you know,
south where the bridge is going to go in, all the
impact that, you know, the economic impact. I’m sure
that Mr. Grandy of Grandy Farm Market, I can tell you
he is packed on the weekends. He has a very high
volume from the tourism industry. You’ve got the gas

stations, the restaurants, you know, from the
simple -- the new McDonald’s -- McDonald’s thinks it’s
a good idea to go in there, they’re going to see a lot
of traffic on the weekends -- to 7-Eleven. I mean, I
wish in hindsight I had named our -- you know,
counted, I wouldn’t have named them all for you,
counted all of the businesses in the south end of our
county that are going to be directly impacted if this
bridge goes in. Thank you.

MS. HARRIS: Is there anyone else that
wishes to speak? If not, we thank you for your time
and for your comments, and please submit additional
comments in writing if you can by June 7th, we would
trely appreciate it. Have a good evening.

(The record was closed at 8:51 p.m.)
The foregoing certification does not apply to any reproduction of the same means under the direct control and supervision of the certifying reporter.
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The Mid-Currituck Bridge Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been published by the North Carolina Turnpike Authority in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The Draft EIS and associated technical reports, as well as preliminary designs of the project alternatives, are available for review on the project web site at https://www.ncdot.gov/projects/mid-currituck-bridge. Copies of all the documents are available for review at the following locations:

- Currituck County Courthouse, Currituck
- Currituck County Public Library, Barco
- Corolla Public Library, Corolla
- Dare County Public Library, Kill Devil Hills
- Town of Duck Administrative Building, Duck
- Kitty Hawk Town Hall, Kitty Hawk
- NCDOT Maintenance Yard Office, Maple
- Southern Shores Town Hall, Southern Shores

Open Houses and Public Hearings Scheduled

The Turnpike Authority will hold pre-public hearing open houses and combined corridor/design public hearings to accept public comments on this project. The open houses provide an informal opportunity to ask questions and discuss issues with project representatives, while the formal hearings allow individuals to make oral comments regarding the project. Comments at the hearings and all written comments will be recorded and considered. The open houses will be held from 3:30-6:30 PM and the hearings will start at 7:00 PM for the following dates and locations:

**Dare County Outer Banks - May 18, 2010**
- Ramada Plaza Nags Head Beach
- 1701 South Virginia Dare Trail
- Kill Devil Hills, NC

**Currituck County Outer Banks - May 19, 2010**
- Outer Banks Center for Wildlife Education
- Currituck Heritage Park on NC 12
- Corolla, NC

**Currituck County Mainland - May 20, 2010**
- Currituck County Center
- 120 Community Way
- Barco, NC

**Draft EIS Study Alternatives**

The Draft EIS study alternatives are illustrated on the figure below. Following public review of the Draft EIS, as well as a review by environmental resource and regulatory agencies, the Turnpike Authority and FHWA will select a Preferred Alternative, deciding:

- Whether or not to build the Mid-Currituck Bridge and/or widen existing roads, choosing among the No-Build Alternative, and alternatives identified as ER2, MCB2, and MCB4.
- Whether to build a third outbound hurricane evacuation lane on US 158 or to use the center turn lane on US 158 as a third outbound lane as needed during evacuations.
- Where to end a Mid-Currituck Bridge on the Outer Banks, if MCB2 or MCB4 is selected for construction, choosing between two bridge corridors identified as C1 and C2.
- Whether to cross Maple Swamp on the mainland on a bridge (Option A) or a road on fill dirt (Option B), if MCB2 or MCB4 is selected for construction. These options also differ in terms of the location of the toll plaza and Aydlett access.

The Draft EIS identifies MCB4 as the Recommended Alternative, which includes construction of a Mid-Currituck Bridge across Currituck Sound. The Recommended Alternative is not a final decision. The Draft EIS makes no recommendation related to the hurricane emergency lane improvements decision, the C1/C2 corridor decision, or the Option A/Option B Maple Swamp crossing decision.

**Public Comments**

Public comments on the Draft EIS and its findings will be accepted at the public hearings and in writing. The public comment period will remain open until Monday, June 7, 2010. Written comments should be postmarked by June 7, 2010 and mailed to:

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

or emailed by June 7, 2010 to: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org.

The Turnpike Authority will provide auxiliary aids and services under the Americans with Disabilities Act for disabled persons who wish to participate in the meetings. Anyone requiring special services should contact the Turnpike Authority at 919-571-3000 as early as possible so that arrangements can be made.
Dear Citizen:

The North Carolina Turnpike Authority was created by the General Assembly in 2002 to implement alternative financing methods to pay for a select group of projects during the time of rapid growth, dwindling resources, and skyrocketing costs. In 2006, the North Carolina General Assembly moved the Turnpike Authority under the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) as a division. Five candidate toll projects are currently being studied by the Turnpike Authority. One of these is the Mid-Currituck Bridge.

The Mid-Currituck Bridge Study calls for transportation improvements in the Currituck Sound area, with focus on consideration of a Mid-Currituck Bridge over Currituck Sound between US 158 on the Currituck County mainland and NC 12 on the Outer Banks. The proposed project would improve traffic flow, reduce travel time, and reduce hurricane evacuation clearancer time on the project area’s thoroughfares (NC 12 and US 158).

Because federal funding may be used to implement the project, a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. The Draft EIS evaluates and compares the five detailed study alternatives under consideration. The five detailed study alternatives under consideration (see the figures on pages 4 and 5) include options that involve improvements to the existing road network in the project area, both with and without a Mid-Currituck Bridge.

This Citizens Summary of the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study Draft EIS is a brief summary highlighting the major topics discussed in detail in the Draft EIS. The locations where you can review the Draft EIS are listed on the back cover. You can also download the Draft EIS from the project website: www.ncturnpike.org/projects/Mid_Currituck.

We encourage you to stay informed by adding your name to the project mailing list, attending open houses or the public hearings on the project, and visiting the project web site. If you have questions or comments about the project, or would like to be added to the project mailing list, contact the project teams directly:

Jennifer Harris, PE  
NC Turnpike Authority  
1578 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

John Page, AICP, CEP  
Parsons Brinckerhoff  
909 Aviation Parkway, Suite 1300  
Morristown, NC 27560

Project Hotline: (800) 941-5465  
Project e-mail: midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org

Thank you for your interest in the Mid-Currituck Bridge project. The Turnpike Authority welcomes and values your input and involvement in this project. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Eugene A. Conti, Jr., Secretary  
North Carolina Department of Transportation

March 2010
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PROJECT AREA

Project Description
Currituck County Outer Banks; and 3) to substantially reduce hurricane evacuation clearance time for residents and visitors who use US 138 and NC 168 during a coastal evacuation.

How were the project alternatives developed?
The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires an agency to study the adverse and beneficial impacts of a range of reasonable alternatives that meet the purpose and need for a project. For the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study, an alternatives screening study was conducted for the project. Based on study findings and comments received from the agencies and public, the five detailed study alternatives were selected.
**How do projects originate?**

The development of a project from concept to construction takes many years, and starts at the local level. Local and state planners identify future roadway needs, which are then included in a county Thoroughfare Plan prepared with the assistance of NCDOT. Local officials set priorities for transportation projects and work with the NCDOT to include Thoroughfare Plan projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program.

**Factors used to screen the potential alternatives included:**
1. ability to meet purpose and need and the level of benefit offered in relation to those purposes;
2. ability to improve system efficiency;
3. economic feasibility (cost and funding capacity); and
4. potential impacts on communities and natural resources.

Public and agency input were an important part of the alternative development and selection process, and numerous meetings with environmental resource and regulatory agencies, as well as citizens in formal workshop discussions, were held to provide opportunities for comments.

**What alternatives are being considered?**

The five detailed study alternatives under consideration are shown on pages 4 and 5 of this Citizens Summary. They are named:

1. ER2,
2. MCB2/C1 (MCB2 using bridge corridor C1),
3. MCB2/C2 (MCB2 using bridge corridor C2),
4. MCB4/C1 (MCB4 using bridge corridor C1), and
5. MCB4/C2 (MCB4 using bridge corridor C2).

The "ER" in ER2 stands for "Existing Roads." A Mid-Currituck Bridge is not included in this alternative, but only widening existing NC 12 and US 158. The "MCB" stands for Mid-Currituck Bridge. MCB2 and MCB4 both include a Mid-Currituck Bridge and different amounts of improvements to existing NC 12 and US 158. The characteristics of the detailed study alternatives are described in more detail below and in Section 2.1 of the Draft EIS.

**Two Outer Banks End Points**

As shown on the figures, for MCB2 and MCB4, there are two variations of the proposed bridge corridor in terms of its ending on the Outer Banks. Bridge corridor C1 would connect with NC 12 at an intersection approximately 2 miles north of the AYDlett Street wet area, whereas bridge corridor C2 would connect with NC 12, approximately 0.5 mile south of this area (see the figures on pages 4 and 5 and the photo simulations on page 6). An interchange would be constructed at the Mid-Currituck Bridge/US 158 intersection on the Currituck County mainland.

**Two Mainland Bridge Approach Design Options**

For the four MCB2 and MCB4 alternatives, two design options are under consideration for the mainland approach to the bridge over Currituck Sound (between US 158 and Currituck Sound). Option A and Option B (see the photo simulations of the Aydlett area on page 6). The design options differ in regards to the location of the toll plaza, whether Maple Swamp is crossed by a bridge or a road on fill (i.e., dirt or gravel used to raise the level of a road in low areas such as swamps), and whether drivers traveling between US 158 and the community of Aydlett would use existing Aydlett Road or the bridge approach road (without paying tolls). No access to and from the Mid-Currituck Bridge would be provided at Aydlett with either option. Option A would place a toll plaza within the US 158 interchange. The mainland approach road to the bridge over Currituck Sound would include a bridge over Maple Swamp. Drivers traveling between US 158 and and Aydlett would continue to use Aydlett Road. With Option B, the US 158 interchange would not include the toll. The approach to the bridge over Currituck Sound would be a road placed on fill within Maple Swamp, and a connection would be provided between the bridge approach road and the local Aydlett street system. The toll plaza would be placed in Aydlett east of the local road connection so that Aydlett traffic would not pass through the toll plaza when traveling between US 158 and Aydlett. Wildlife passages would be incorporated into the fill within Maple Swamp. Also with Option B, Aydlett Road would be ab more direct and its right-of-way restored as a wetland.

**Two Hurricane Evacuation Options**

For all five alternatives, two hurricane evacuation options are under consideration. The first option is to add a third outbound lane to US 158 for evacuation use only (see the US 158 hurricane evacuation lane photo simulation below). The second option is to reverse the existing center turn lane on US 158 to create a third outbound lane during an evacuation. When a third outbound lane is needed on the Wright Memorial Bridge or Knapp (Intracoastal Waterway) Bridge, once turning inbound lane would be reserved.

**US 158 Improvements**

With ER2 and MCB1, the section of US 158 between the Wright Memorial Bridge and just west of the existing US 158/NC 12 intersection would be widened to six or eight lane super-street. As illustrated in the US 158 six-lane super-street typical segment drawing shown on page 4, the unique characteristic of a super-street is the configuration of the intersections. Side-street traffic wishing to turn left or go straight must turn right onto the divided highway when it can make a U-turn through the median a short distance away from the intersection. After making the U-turn, drivers can then either go straight (having now accomplished the equivalent of an intended left turn) or make a right turn at their original intersection (having now accomplished the equivalent of an intention to drive straight through the intersection.)

**NC 12/US 158 Interstate**

With ER2 and MCB1, an interchange would be constructed at the current intersection of US 158, NC 12, and the Aycock Brown Welcome Center entrance (see the figures above).

**NC 12 Improvements**

The proposed NC 12 3-lane and 4-lane widening alternatives are shown on the photo simulations on page 7.
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No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative also is under consideration. The No-Build Alternative assumes that the proposed project would not be implemented, but includes other reasonably foreseeable planned improvements contained in NCDOT’s 2009 to 2015 STIP within or near the project area.

What other alternatives were examined and then eliminated from further consideration?

Other alternatives evaluated included three additional road and/or bridge alternatives, lower cost alternatives that attempted to make more efficient use of the available road capacity on NC 12 and US 158 (shifting vacation housing rental times, minor improvements to the road system, and bus transit), ferry alternatives, and multiple Mid-Currituck Bridge corridor alternatives. The alternatives and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed study are presented in Section 2.5 of the Draft EIS.

Are any of the alternatives recommended over the others?

Based on information available to date (including the Draft EIS), the Turnpike Authority and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have identified MCB4 as the Recommended Alternative. This recommendation is made taking into account cost and design considerations, travel benefits, community, natural resource, and other impacts and public involvement comments. At this time, the Turnpike Authority has no recommendation related to the two bridge corridor alternatives (C1 and C2), the mainland bridge approach design Options A and B, or a hurricane evacuation option.

The Recommended Alternative is only a recommendation; it is not a Preferred Alternative, and it is not a final decision. The Turnpike Authority and FHWA have identified a Recommended Alternative as a way of giving readers of the Draft EIS an indication of the agencies’ current thinking. After the Draft EIS comment period ends on June 7, 2010, the Turnpike Authority and FHWA will identify a Preferred Alternative based on consultation with local transportation planning agencies, state and federal environmental resource and regulatory agencies, as well as consideration of agency and public comments received on the Draft EIS and at the public hearings.

The Preferred Alternative may be developed further in the Final EIS. The NEPA process will conclude with a Record of Decision (ROD), which will document the Selected Alternative to be constructed if a build alternative is selected.

Information Needed On Boating in Currituck Sound

Another important component of project development for the proposed Mid-Currituck Bridge is a thorough analysis of boating activity in Currituck Sound. This information will be used to help the Turnpike Authority and the US Coast Guard determine the need for a bridge span with additional height to serve boaters that might pass under the bridge. If you are a boater or rent boats for use on Currituck Sound, please provide your comments regarding your vessel type; whether you use your vessel for a commercial or recreational use; its height, draft, and length; its mooring location; and where you travel in the sound. The US Coast Guard issued a Preliminary Public Notice on September 28, 2009, to notify mariners who use Currituck Sound, as well as adjacent property owners, about the proposed plans for the new bridge across Currituck Sound.
Travel Benefits and Tolling Information

How much time would I save and what are the other benefits of using the Mid-Currituck Bridge?

All of the detailed study alternatives would meet the project purpose and need to varying degrees, as shown in the "Travel Benefits of Detailed Study Alternatives" comparison table on page 8. Key differences are:

- **Traffic Flow**
  - MCB2 would have the greatest traffic flow benefits and ER2 would have the least.

- **Travel Time**
  - MCB2 also would have the greatest travel time benefits and ER2 would have the least.

- **Hurricane Evacuation Clearance Time**
  - The construction of a third outbound lane on US 158 would offer the greatest reductions in hurricane evacuation clearance time with any alternative. Reversing the center turn lane would be practical only with MCB2 and MCB4.

Who can use the toll bridge?

Anybody willing to pay the toll would be able to use the proposed toll bridge, including passenger cars, buses, light-duty trucks, and heavy-duty trucks.

How will tolls be collected?

Toll plazas would be located at the western end of the proposed bridge with all of the MCB2 and MCB4 alternatives. This means that eastbound traffic from the mainland to the Outer Banks using the bridge would pay a toll before crossing the bridge, whereas westbound traffic using the bridge would pay a toll after already crossing the bridge.

It is anticipated that tolls would be paid through a combination of electronic toll collection (ETC) and manual cash lanes in both directions. The ETC lanes would be used to allow higher-speed, no stop-processing of vehicles with the correct toll tag technology. The primary means of ETC would involve setting up an account with the Turnpike Authority and using a transponder/receiver. The transponder is a small device mounted on the windshield. The receiver is mounted over the roadway, and it electronically collects tolls from a driver's account as the vehicle travels under it. The preliminary design calls for a 35 to 45 mile per hour (mph) ETC lane with barrier separation from the more traditional manual cash lanes.

Anybody willing to pay the toll would be able to use the proposed toll bridge, including passenger cars, buses, light-duty trucks, and heavy-duty trucks. Toll plazas would be located at the western end of the proposed bridge with all of the MCB2 and MCB4 alternatives. This means that eastbound traffic from the mainland to the Outer Banks using the bridge would pay a toll before crossing the bridge, whereas westbound traffic using the bridge would pay a toll after already crossing the bridge.

The Turnpike Authority has not made any decisions about toll rates. A 2007 Preliminary Traffic and Revenue Study indicated an initial price of the toll would be based upon an Investment Grade Traffic and Revenue Study, to be completed prior to project construction if an alternative including the Mid-Currituck Bridge is selected. The price of the toll could change over time, based upon variables such as demand, financing of the project's construction, and operations and maintenance costs. The toll rate likely would be more for trucks than for cars.

Project History

A potential terminus for a Mid-Currituck Bridge on the Currituck Outer Banks just north of TimBuck II at Albacore Street was identified in 1991 and is protected under the provisions of the Transportation Corridor Official Map Act. Under the Act, the North Carolina Board of Transportation can protect future roadway corridors identified in the STIP as part of the proposed state highway system from development. Temporary restrictions are placed on private property, including prohibiting for up to three years the issuance of a building permit or the approval of a subdivision. A parcel on this site measuring 1.7 acres was purchased by NCDO T in 1995 to prevent its development.

FHWA, in cooperation with NC DOT, issued a Draft EIS for the Mid-Currituck Bridge in January 1998. The project area for the 1996 Draft EIS focused on an area near Aydlett on the mainland and near the Whalehead Beach subdivision on the Currituck Outer Banks. Public hearings were conducted for the project on May 26 and 27, 1998. The majority of the speakers, as well as the written comments received, expressed opposition to a Mid-Currituck Bridge because of natural resource impacts, the belief that the project would not solve hurricane evacuation needs, and the expectation that the project would facilitate development on the Outer Banks. Improving public services on the Outer Banks and widening NC 12 were suggested as alternatives to a Mid-Currituck Bridge. Those who favored the bridge felt emergency evacuation and traffic congestion would be improved with a bridge and the absence of a bridge would not stop development. Following the public hearings, the NEPA study process was paused to provide an opportunity for NC DOT and FHWA to re-assess the project scope and purpose in light of comments on the 1998 Draft EIS.

The project was reactivated in October 2000. In 2001, FHWA and NC DOT expanded the study to include conceptual alternatives that would involve improvements to existing NC 12 and US 158, in addition to bridge alternatives, thereby allowing for consideration of a wider range of alternatives. This broad-scale assessment of transportation needs was referred to as the "Currituck Sound Area Transportation Study." In 2006, the project was officially adopted by the Turnpike Authority as a candidate toll project. The Mid-Currituck Bridge Study Draft EIS documents the Turnpike Authority's evaluation of proposed transportation improvements in the Currituck Sound area, including consideration of a Mid-Currituck Bridge.

Travel Benefits of Detailed Study Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No-Build</th>
<th>ER2</th>
<th>MCB2</th>
<th>MCB4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2035 Traffic Flow Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Congested Vehicle-Miles Traveled (millions)</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles of Road Operating with Traffic Demand at or Above Road Capacity (Summer Average)</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles of Road with Traffic Demand 30 Percent or Above Road Capacity (Summer Average)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2035 Travel Time Benefit Aydlett Road to Albacore Street (in minutes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time via Wright Memorial Bridge (Summer Average)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time via Mid-Currituck Bridge (Summer Average)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2035 Hurricane Evacuation Clearance Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time with US 158 Reversing Center Turn Lane</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance Time with US 158 Third Outbound Lane</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Impacts

What are the impacts from the project?

The Draft EIS provides detailed discussions of the project’s anticipated impacts to the environment, as well as ways to mitigate impacts. Key impacts are noted below and in the excerpt from the Draft EIS’s comprehensive impact summary table included on page 10. The column for the Recommended Alternative (MCB4) is shown in green.

Community Impacts

Rollovers with the detailed study alternatives are shown in the table. Other key community-related impacts are as follows:

- At US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge Interchange with MCB2 and MCB4
  - Interchange features would be introduced to views along US 158. Homes, businesses, and graves would be displaced. The presence of the interchange could likely result in business development. This development, however, is desired by Currituck County. With Option B, direct access from US 158 would be lost for customers of a gas station near the end of a frontage road.

- At Aydlett with MCB2 and MCB4
  - The presence of the bridge would create a visual barrier to community in Aydlett. The bridge would be introduced to Currituck Sound views. With Option B, Aydlett traffic would use the Mid-Currituck Bridge approach road to travel between Aydlett and Narrow Shore Road and be relocated to US 158 near the end of the frontage road.

- In the Vicinity of the Outer Banks Bridge Terminals with MCB2 and MCB4, including Widening NC 12 South of the Terminals
  - Bridge corridor C1, the Corolla Bay substation on the Outer Banks would be physically divided by the bridge. Views of Currituck Sound from the substation would also be adversely affected. MCB2 widening would result in substantial changes in business access in the Albacore Street area on the Currituck Outer Banks. With bridge corridor C1, the platform owned by a water sports business and the associated business would be displaced. Driveway and street access in the Timbuck II area also would change.

- Widening Along NC 12 in Southern Currituck County and Dare County with ER2 and MCB2
  - Pedestrian crossing NC 12 in Southern Shores and at the Sandshell Inn (two locations with notable pedestrian travel) would have to cross three lanes of pavement instead of two. Four street intersections along NC 12 would be closed to through traffic but not emergency vehicles. Alternate access would exist. There would be increased noise levels (up to 10 dBA, or the equivalent of a doubling of noise) on NC 12 from US 158 to the Mid-Currituck Bridge terminus with pavement closer to homes, particularly in four-lane sections where more motor vehicles could travel the speed limit. There would be changes in views along NC 12. Permanent drainage easements would be purchased along much of NC 12.

- US 158 Improvements on the Outer Banks with ER2 and MCB2
  - For ER2 and MCB2, the superstreet would reduce the number of four-way intersections and limit direct access across US 158 in Dare County. In addition, the US 158/NC 12 interchange would be introduced into views in Kitty Hawk. For ER2, there would be substantial changes in business access at the US 158/NC 12 interchange, as well as notable parking loss at Home...
If a Mid-Currituck Bridge is selected for construction, its schedule for completion as of April 2010 is:

- **Financial Feasibility Determination**
- **Preferred Alternative Decision**
- **Final Environmental Impact Statement Approval**
- **Record of Decision Approval**
- **Concession Agreement Execution**
- **Early 2011 - Financial Close**
- **Early 2011 - Right-of-Way Purchase, Environmental Permits, and Construction Start**
- **Late 2014 - Open to Traffic**

Who makes the final decision on which alternative to build, and when?

FHWA, in coordination with the Turnpike Authority, will select the Preferred Alternative, which may or may not be the current Recommended Alternative. The Preferred Alternative will be selected based on information in the Draft EIS, as well as input received during the Draft EIS review period from the public and local, state, and federal agencies and at the public hearings. The current project schedule, as of April 2010, is shown in the project timeline at the right.

### Process, Schedule, and Cost

**Does my opinion matter?**

Yes, your opinion and input matters in the decisions about the project. All comments are considered, whether they are mailed or e-mailed to the project team throughout the process, or delivered or spoken in person at one of the open houses and public hearings. All comments received by June 7, 2010, will be considered and part of the project record.
When would project construction start?

If MCB4 were selected as the Preferred Alternative, the current schedule anticipates project construction starting in early 2011, with the project opening to traffic in late 2014. The Mid-Currituck Bridge would be paid for through North Carolina’s first venture into the world of Public Private Partnerships (PPP) for major transportation infrastructure. PPPs are formal collaborations between public agencies and private concessionaires that capture the advantages of private sector participation while maintaining public accountability to develop new infrastructure. These partnerships can be an effective way to deliver much needed infrastructure while minimizing costs and risks to the public. For funds, bond financing would be used by the PPP. Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) financing (federal government loan) could be used in addition to bonds. This financing would be repaid primarily through toll revenues. Also in 2008, the North Carolina General Assembly appropriated $15 million per year for repayment of bonds or payment of debt service not covered by toll revenues, which also could contribute to covering any shortfalls that might be associated with toll bridge financing costs.

How much would the project cost?

The project would cost between $416.1 million and $1,065.1 million (see the table below), depending on the alternative chosen and the cost of materials and land at the time of construction. The estimated costs include construction, environmental mitigation, pedestrian and bicycle features on the Mid-Currituck Bridge, right-of-way, and utility relocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detailed Study Alternatives</th>
<th>Potential Range of Total Cost (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ER2</td>
<td>$416.1 to $523.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB2/A/C1</td>
<td>$894.2 to $1,062.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB2/B/C1</td>
<td>$800.1 to $970.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB2/A/C2</td>
<td>$898.1 to $1,065.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB2/B/C2</td>
<td>$902.4 to $973.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB4/A/C1</td>
<td>$895.3 to $816.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB4/B/C1</td>
<td>$900.7 to $724.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB4/A/C2</td>
<td>$890.3 to $800.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCB4/B/C2</td>
<td>$895.5 to $716.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How long do project development studies and EISs take?

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires an agency to study a range of reasonable alternatives to meet a project’s purpose and need. This process entails numerous engineering and environmental studies. NEPA also requires the public and agencies be given opportunities to participate and provide input throughout the process. For large projects, the necessary work requires several years to complete. The Turnpike Authority strives to maintain a reasonable schedule, while ensuring full compliance with NEPA.

Want to know more about the NCTA? Visit our web site at www.ncturnpike.org
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project
Formal Public Hearing
Speaker’s Request Card

May 20, 2010

Name: ____________________________
Organization/Affiliation: ___________
Street Address: ____________________
City, State, Zip: ____________________
Tel: __________________ Email: ________

Comments: Please add me to your newsletter mailing list.

□ Add me to your non-mailing list.

Include any important issues related to this project. Please use the space below to write your comments. If you need additional room to write, please use additional paper or take a picture.

Do you prefer the ER2, MCB2, MCB4, or the No-Build Alternative and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer bridge corridor alternative C1 or C2 and why?

If you prefer MCB2 or MCB4, do you prefer mainland approach road design Option A or B and why?
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Please:
• Sign in
• Take a copy of the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study Citizens Summary and a public comment form
• Move to Station 1 and view an introductory slide presentation

We look forward to discussing the project with you and to receiving your comments.

Your comments must be received by the close of the comment period on June 7, 2002.

North Carolina Turnpike Authority
Mid-Currituck Bridge Project

Please leave your completed comment form at the reception desk or mail it to:

North Carolina Turnpike Authority
101 Turner Blvd.
Randleman, NC 27319

If you are a member of any local organization, please provide information regarding the organization.

Additional comments:

[Blank space for comments]
Copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, associated technical reports, and the public hearing maps may be viewed at the following locations until June 7, 2010:

You may make oral comments tonight at the public hearing, submit written comments today, or mail comments to:

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

You may also send comments in an email to midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org.

Comments are due by June 7, 2010.

If a Mid-Currituck Bridge is selected for implementation, its schedule for completion as of April 2010 is:

- Final Environmental Impact Statement: September 2010
- Record of Decision: December 2010
- Concession Agreement with Bridge Builder and Operator: December 2010
- Close on Financing: Early 2011
- Right-of-Way Purchase, Environmental Permits, and Construction Begins: Early 2011
- Open to traffic: Late 2014

The Turnpike Authority expects to continue to have periodic Citizens Informational Workshops and other public involvement opportunities as the project progresses.

Timeline for Mid-Currituck Bridge Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Financial Feasibility Determination</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative Decision</td>
<td>August 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concession Agreement with Bridge Builder and Operator</td>
<td>December 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close on Financing</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Purchase, Environmental Permits, and Construction Begins</td>
<td>Early 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to traffic</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Turnpike Authority expects to continue to have periodic Citizens Informational Workshops and other public involvement opportunities as the project progresses.

Please Comment

Public Comments

You may make oral comments tonight at the public hearing, submit written comments today, or mail comments to:

Jennifer Harris, P.E.
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
1578 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1578

You may also send comments in an email to midcurrituck@ncturnpike.org.

Comments are due by June 7, 2010.

Public Review Locations

Coops of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement associated technical reports, and the public hearing maps may be viewed at the following locations until June 7, 2010:

- Currituck County Courthouse
- Currituck County Public Library
- Corolla Public Library
- Dare County Public Library
- Kill Devil Hills
- Town of Duck Administrative Office
- Kitty Hawk Town Hall
- Kitty Hawk
- Town of Duck
- Western Shores Town Hall
- Southern Shores Town Hall
- Dare County Public Library
- Currituck County Public Library
- Corolla Public Library
- Kitty Hawk Town Hall
- Kitty Hawk
- Town of Duck
- Western Shores Town Hall
- Southern Shores Town Hall

They also may be viewed on the project web site at http://ncturnpike.org/projects/Mid_Currituck/
US 158 Hurricane Evacuation Lane

Photo Simulation

Detailed Study Alternatives

LEGEND

- Red: Bridge Corridor Alternatives
- Orange: Right Lanes (Super-segment)
- Yellow: Four Lanes
- Light Blue: Five Lanes (Super-segment)
- Green: Four Lanes
- Red: Mid-Corridor Bridge
- Blue: Three Bridge Lanes

Photo Simulation: Existing/No-Build Alternative
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Outer Banks Terminus Alternatives

Bridge Corridor C1 Photo Simulation

Bridge Corridor C2 Photo Simulation

NC 12 Four-Lane Widening

Existing/No-Build Alternatives

NC 12 4-Lane Widening

Bridge Corridor C1 Photo Simulation

Bridge Corridor C2 Photo Simulation

NC 12 Four-Lane Widening

Existing/No-Build Alternatives

NC 12 4-Lane Widening

Bridge Corridor C1 Photo Simulation

Bridge Corridor C2 Photo Simulation

NC 12 Four-Lane Widening

Existing/No-Build Alternatives

NC 12 4-Lane Widening

Bridge Corridor C1 Photo Simulation

Bridge Corridor C2 Photo Simulation

NC 12 Four-Lane Widening

Existing/No-Build Alternatives

NC 12 4-Lane Widening

Bridge Corridor C1 Photo Simulation

Bridge Corridor C2 Photo Simulation

NC 12 Four-Lane Widening

Existing/No-Build Alternatives

NC 12 4-Lane Widening
Design Options A and B

Option A

Option B

LEGEND
- Existing Road
- Proposed and Improved Existing Road
- Proposed Toll Plan and Buildings
- Proposed Bridge and Other Infrastructure
- Maple Swamp Boundary
- Existing Paved Road to be Resurfaced
- Option A Toll Plaze
- Option B Toll Plaze
Currituck Sound Water Depths

Mid-Currituck Bridge at Aydlett (Option A and Option B)

Option A - Aydlett Area Photo Simulation

Option B - Aydlett Area Photo Simulation
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 the Currituck County Outer Banks is expected to be substantially shorter for many trips, and overall congestion throughout the project area is also expected to be reduced.

Alternative Concepts Considered in the Draft EIS

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

Detailed Study Alternatives

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?**
- 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
What is a Draft EIS?

Who is involved in the project?

What is the project needed for?

What are the reasonable alternatives?

What are the impacts?

How can impacts be mitigated?

Who Else Is Involved?

Local Stakeholders
- Residents
- Property owners
- Traveling public
- Local governments
- RPO
- Towns
- Counties
- Elected officials

Who is involved in the project?
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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, defensible, repeatable technical evidence with consideration of all public comments
- Process dictated by federal law (NEPA)

The Technical Evaluation of...

- Wetlands and Streams
- Water Quality
- Endangered Species
- Floodplains
- Historic and Archaeological Resources
- Noise
- Relocations
- Air Quality
- Hazardous Materials
- Farmlands
Recommended Alternative is MCB4

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

Comments Due: F-24

June 2010

Comments Due
- 1

Farm Day
- 2

Public Day
- 3

Plant Day
- 4

Holiday
- 5

Holiday
- 6

Plant Day
- 7

Plant Day
- 8

Plant Day
- 9

Plant Day
- 10

Plant Day
- 11

Holiday
- 12

Public Day
- 13

Public Day
- 14

Public Day
- 15

Public 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

QUESTIONS

Information in this Slideshow

- Background Information
- Project Purpose
- Description of Detailed Study
- Alternatives
- Draft EIS
- Recommended Alternative
- Right of Way and Relocation
Design Options A and B

US 158/Mid-Currituck Bridge
Interchange with Options A and B

Existing Photo Simulation

US 158 Hurricane Evacuation
Lane Alternatives
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Mid-Currituck Bridge Typical Section

NC 12 Four-Lane Widening

Existing Photo Simulation

NC 12 Three-Lane Widening

US 158 Super-Street

Photo Simulation
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State and Local Transportation Planning

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.

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

How much will the tolls cost?
- Based on a Preliminary Traffic & Revenue Study, the toll could range from $6 to $12 each way
- Initial price of toll will be based on an 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 much will the tolls cost?
- Based on a Preliminary Traffic & Revenue Study, the toll could range from $6 to $12 each way
- Initial price of toll will be based on an 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?

Alternative Concepts Considered in the Draft EIS

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

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?
Alternatives Evaluated by Project Impacts

- Human Environment
- Physical Environment
- Cultural Environment
- Natural Environment

Recommended Alternative is MCB4

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

Recommended Alternative is MCB4

“Recommended Alternative” is only a recommendation.
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

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 homes, closing costs

Public Workshop Stations

- STATION 1 – This Presentation
- STATION 2 – Maps and Displays
- STATION 3 – Right-of-Way Acquisition Information
- STATION 4 – NCTA Representatives
- STATION 5 – Boating in Currituck Sound
- STATION 6 – Comments/Draft EIS Review
Thank you for attending the Mid-Currituck Bridge Pre-Hearing Open House and taking part in the North Carolina Turnpike Authority’s transportation planning process.

Participate in this Workshop
- Sign up to speak at the Public Hearings
- Talk with a team member
- Drop your comments in the box
- E-mail your comments
- Mail your comments

Send your comments to:
North Carolina Turnpike Authority
Mid-Currituck Bridge Study

Please proceed to Station 2.
This slideshow will repeat in 2 minutes.

June 2010
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Tonight’s Agenda

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

“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...

Introductions

- NCTA
- NCDOT
- FHWA
- Others

“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
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 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 county mainland and Outer Banks is projected to be substantially shorter for many trips, and overall congestion throughout the project area is also predicted to be reduced.

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
Detailed Study Alternatives

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

Alternative Concepts Considered in the Draft EIS

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

Revenue Bonds

TIFIA Loans

Gap Appropriation

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?

What is a Draft EIS?

- Why is the project needed?
- What is the project’s purpose?
- What are the reasonable alternatives?
- What are the impacts?
- How can impacts be mitigated?
- Summary of public and agency involvement.

What are the reasonable alternatives?

What are the reasonable alternatives?

- New bridge
- Rehabilitation
- No action

What are the impacts?

What are the impacts?

- Traffic
- Environmental
- Economic

How can impacts be mitigated?

How can impacts be mitigated?

- Traffic
- Environmental
- Economic

Why is the project needed?

Why is the project needed?

- Increase capacity
- Reduce congestion
- Improve safety

What are the reasonable alternatives?

What are the reasonable alternatives?

- New bridge
- Rehabilitation
- No action

What are the impacts?

What are the impacts?

- Traffic
- Environmental
- Economic

How can impacts be mitigated?

How can impacts be mitigated?

- Traffic
- Environmental
- Economic

What is a Draft EIS?

What is a Draft EIS?

- Why is the project needed?
- What is the project’s purpose?
- What are the reasonable alternatives?
- What are the impacts?
- How can impacts be mitigated?
- Summary of public and agency involvement.

What are the reasonable alternatives?

What are the reasonable alternatives?

- New bridge
- Rehabilitation
- No action

What are the impacts?

What are the impacts?

- Traffic
- Environmental
- Economic

How can impacts be mitigated?

How can impacts be mitigated?

- Traffic
- Environmental
- Economic
Who is involved in the project?

Local Stakeholders
- Residents
- Property owners
- Traveling public
- Local governments
- RPO
- Towns
- Counties
- Elected officials

Who Else Is Involved?

- 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
- Endangered Species
- Floodplains
- Historic and Archaeological Resources
- Noise
- Community Resources
- Relocations
- Air Quality
- Hazardous Materials
- Farmlands

Community Resources
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

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

- Drop your comments in the box.
- Speak at the Public Hearings.
- Mail your comments.
- E-mail your comments.

Comments Due F-41

June 2010
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
Thank you for attending the Mid-Currituck Bridge Study Corridor/Design Public Hearing. We will now receive your comments.