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## Executive Summary

In December of 2008, the Transportation Planning Branch of the North Carolina Department of Transportation and Davidson County initiated a study to cooperatively develop the Davidson County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), which includes the City of Lexington and the Town of Denton. This is a long range multimodal transportation plan that covers transportation needs through 2035. Modes of transportation evaluated as part of this plan include: highway, public transportation and rail, bicycle, and pedestrian. This plan does not cover standard bridge replacements, routine maintenance, or minor operations issues. Refer to Appendix A for contact information on these types of issues.

Findings of this CTP study were based on an analysis of the transportation system, environmental screening, and public input. Refer to Figure 1 for the CTP maps, which were mutually endorsed/adopted in 2010 and 2011. Implementation of the plan is the responsibility of Davidson County, its municipalities, and NCDOT. Refer to Chapter 2 for information on the implementation process.

This report documents the recommendations for improvements that are included in the Davidson County CTP. The major recommendations for improvements are listed below. More detailed information about these and other recommendations can be found in Chapter 2.

## HIGHWAY

- I-85/US 29-52-70: Widen to an eight-lane divided freeway from Business I-95/US 52 to Rowan County.
- Business I-85/US 29-52-70: Upgrade to interstate standards from the WinstonSalem MPO Boundary to l-85.
- Business I-85/US 29-70: Upgrade to expressway standards from the High Point MPO Boundary to US 52.
- US 64: Widen to a four-lane divided expressway from Davie County to Randolph County.
- NC 8 (Lexington): Widen to a four-lane divided boulevard from US 52 to Business I85/US 29-64-70 (Old Winston Road Section), from West Holly Grove Road (SR 2203) to East 10th Avenue (Talbert Boulevard Section), and from East 10th Avenue to l-85 (Cotton Grove Road Section).
- NC 8 (South): Widen to a three-lane facility from Wrenn Road (SR 1115) to Rothrock Road (SR 2412).
- NC 49: Widen to a four-lane divided expressway from 0.49 miles east of Rowan County to Randolph County.
- NC 109: Widen to a four-lane divided facility from the High Point MPO to NC 47 in Denton.
- NC 150: Widen to a four-lane divided facility from the Winston-Salem MPO to Michael Road (SR 1215) and widen to a three-lane facility with center left-turn lane from 0.1 miles north of Swicegood Road (SR 1155) to Swicegood Road (SR 1155).
- East 10th Avenue (SR 3345): Widen to a four-lane divided facility from South Main Street (SR 3346) to Talbert Boulevard (NC 8) and upgrade to boulevard standards.
- East Center Street (SR 1243): Widen to a four-lane divided facility from Curry Street to Talbert Boulevard (NC 8).
- Hargrave Road (SR 1224): Widen to a three-lane facility with center left-turn lane from Hargrave Lane (SR 3165) to I-85.
- South Main Street (SR 3346): Widen to a four-lane divided facility from East 10th Avenue to Anne Lewis Drive (SR 3158) and upgrade to boulevard standards.
- Old US 52 (SR 3010): Widen to a three-lane facility with center left-turn lane from 0.33 miles south of the Winston-Salem MPO to US 52.
- Southwestern Connector:
- U-2545: Construct a new four-lane divided boulevard from South Main Street (SR 3346) to Fairview Drive (SR 2212).
- Southwestern Connector Extension: Construct a new two-lane facility from Fairview Drive (SR 2212) to Plaza Parkway.


## PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

The following public transportation recommendations were developed as a part of this study:

- A fixed-route bus service route be developed through DCTS within Lexington, connecting north Lexington to southwest Lexington and the Lexington Memorial Hospital. It is also recommended that a park-and-ride lot be constructed near the Business I-85/US 64 Interchange.
- A fixed-route bus service route be developed through DCTS within Lexington, connecting northwest Lexington to south Lexington.

It is also recommended that each of these inner-city circular routes connect with the proposed intermodal connector and proposed Amtrak train stop in downtown Lexington.

- Denton Park and Ride Lot - It is recommended that a park-and-ride lot be constructed near the NC 47/NC 109 intersection in Denton.


## BICYCLE

The 2005 Regional Bicycle Study, published by the Piedmont Triad Rural Planning Organization, identified seven county bicycle routes throughout Davidson County as well as connector routes. For more information on these facilities, refer to Chapter 2 of this report.

## PEDESTRIAN

The City of Lexington, Town of Denton, and the unincorporated communities of Tyro and Welcome have recommendations of sidewalks for pedestrians. Existing sidewalks facilities were identified in the 2007 Davidson County Sidewalk Inventory published by the Piedmont Triad Rural Planning Organization. For a full listing of sidewalk recommendations, refer to Chapter 2 of this report.
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## I. Analysis of the Existing and Future Transportation System

A Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) is developed to ensure that the progressively developed transportation system will meet the needs of the region for the planning period. The CTP serves as an official guide to providing a well-coordinated, efficient, and economical transportation system for the future of the region. This document should be utilized by the local officials to ensure that planned transportation facilities reflect the needs of the public, while minimizing the disruption to local residents, businesses and environmental resources.

In order to develop a Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), the following are considered:

- Analysis of the transportation system, including any local and statewide initiatives;
- Impacts to the natural and human environment, including natural resources, historic resources, homes, and businesses;
- Public input, including community vision and goals and objectives.


## Analysis Methodology and Data Requirements

Reliable forecasts of future travel patterns must be estimated in order to analyze the ability of the transportation system to meet future travel demand. These forecasts depend on careful analysis of the character and intensity of existing and future land use and travel patterns.

An analysis of the transportation system looks at both current and future travel patterns and identifies existing and anticipated deficiencies. This is usually accomplished through a capacity deficiency analysis, a traffic crash analysis, and a system deficiency analysis. This information, along with population growth, economic development potential, and land use trends, is used to determine the potential impacts on the future transportation system.

## Roadway System Analysis

An important stage in the development of a CTP is the analysis of the existing transportation system and its ability to serve the area's travel desires. Emphasis is placed not only on detecting the existing deficiencies, but also on understanding the causes of these deficiencies. Roadway deficiencies may result from inadequacies such as pavement widths, intersection geometry, and intersection controls; or system problems, such as the need to construct missing travel links, bypass routes, loop facilities, additional radial routes or infrastructure improvements to meet statewide initiatives.

One of those statewide initiatives is the Strategic Highway Corridor (SHC) Vision Plan adopted by the Board of Transportation on September 2, 2004 and last revised on July 10, 2008. The SHC Vision Plan represents a timely initiative to protect and maximize the mobility and connectivity on a core set of highway corridors throughout North Carolina, while promoting environmental stewardship through maximizing the use of existing facilities to the extent possible, and fostering economic prosperity through the quick and efficient movement of people and goods.

The primary purpose of the SHC Vision Plan is to provide a network of high-speed, safe, reliable highways throughout North Carolina. The primary goal to support this purpose is to create a greater consensus towards the development of a genuine vision for each corridor - specifically towards the identification of a desired facility type (Freeway, Expressway, Boulevard, or Thoroughfare) for each corridor. Individual Comprehensive Transportation Plans shall incorporate the long-term vision of each corridor. Refer to Appendix A for contact information.

In the development of the rural area of this plan, travel demand was projected from 2009 to 2035 using a trend line analysis based on Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) from 1991 to 2008. In addition, local land use plans and growth expectations were used to further refine future growth rates and patterns. The established future growth rates were endorsed by the Davidson County CTP Committee (November 2009).

In the development of the urban area (Lexington) of this plan, travel demand was projected from 2009 to 2035 using a travel demand model. Travel demand models are developed to replicate travel patterns on the existing transportation system as well as to estimate travel patterns for 2035. In addition, local land use plans and growth expectations were used to develop future growth rates and patterns. The established future growth rates were endorsed by the Lexington CTP Committee (February, 2010).

Existing and future travel demand is compared to existing roadway capacities. Capacity deficiencies occur when the traffic volume of a roadway exceeds the roadway's capacity. Roadways are considered near capacity when the traffic volume is at least eighty percent of the capacity. Refer to Figures 2 and 3 for existing and future capacity deficiencies.

Capacity is the maximum number of vehicles which have a "reasonable expectation" of passing over a given section of roadway, during a given time period under prevailing roadway and traffic conditions. Many factors contribute to the capacity of a roadway including the following:

- Geometry of the road (including number of lanes), horizontal and vertical alignment, and proximity of perceived obstructions to safe travel along the road;
- Typical users of the road, such as commuters, recreational travelers, and truck traffic;
- Access control, including streets and driveways, or lack thereof, along the roadway;
- Development along the road, including residential, commercial, agricultural, and industrial developments;
- Number of traffic signals along the route;
- Peaking characteristics of the traffic on the road;
- Characteristics of side-roads feeding into the road; and
- Directional split of traffic or the percentages of vehicles traveling in each direction along a road at any given time.

The relationship of travel demand compared to the roadway capacity determines the level of service (LOS) of a roadway. Six levels of service identify the range of possible conditions. Designations range from LOS A, which represents the best operating conditions, to LOS F, which represents the worst operating conditions.

LOS D indicates "practical capacity" of a roadway, or the capacity at which the public begins to express dissatisfaction. The practical capacity for each roadway was developed based on the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual using the NCLOS Program. Recommended improvements and overall design of the transportation plan were based upon achieving a minimum LOS D on existing facilities and a LOS C for new facilities. Refer to Appendix E for detailed information on LOS.

## Traffic Crash Analysis

Traffic crashes are often used as an indicator for locating congestion and roadway problems. Crash patterns obtained from an analysis of crash data can lead to the identification of improvements that will reduce the number of crashes. A crash analysis was performed for the Davidson County CTP for crashes occurring in the planning area between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009. During this period, a total of 36 intersections were identified as having a high number of crashes as illustrated in Figure 4. Refer to Appendix F for a detailed crash analysis.
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## Bridge Deficiency Assessment

Bridges are a vital and unique element of a highway system. First, they represent the highest unit investment of all elements of the system. Second, any inadequacy or deficiency in a bridge reduces the value of the total investment. Third, a bridge presents the greatest opportunity of all potential highway failures for disruption of community welfare. Finally, and most importantly, a bridge represents the greatest opportunity of all highway failures for loss of life. For these reasons, it is imperative that bridges be constructed to the same design standards as the system of which they are a part.

The NCDOT Bridge Maintenance Unit inspects all bridges in North Carolina at least once every two years. Bridges having the highest priority are replaced as Federal and State funds become available. Eighty-five deficient bridges were identified within the planning area and are illustrated in Figure 5. Refer to Appendix G for more detailed information.

## Public Transportation and Rail

Public transportation and rail are vital modes of transportation that give alternative options for transporting people and goods from one place to another.

## Public Transportation

North Carolina's public transportation systems serve more than 50 million passengers each year. Five categories define North Carolina's public transportation system: community, regional community, urban, regional urban and intercity.

- Community Transportation - Local transportation efforts formerly centered on assisting clients of human service agencies. Today, the vast majority of rural systems serve the general public as well as those clients.
- Regional Community Transportation - Regional community transportation systems are composed of two or more contiguous counties providing coordinated / consolidated service. Although such systems are not new, the NCDOT Board of Transportation is encouraging single-county systems to consider mergers to form more regional systems.
- Urban Transportation - There are currently nineteen urban transit systems operating in North Carolina, from locations such as Asheville and Hendersonville in the west to Jacksonville and Wilmington in the east. In addition, small urban systems are at work in three areas of the state. Consolidated urban-community transportation exists in five areas of the state. In those systems, one transportation system provides both urban and rural transportation within the county.
- Regional Urban Transportation - Regional urban transit systems currently operate in three areas of the state. These systems connect multiple municipalities and counties.
- Intercity Transportation - Intercity bus service is one of a few remaining examples of privately owned and operated public transportation in North Carolina. Intercity buses serve many cities and towns throughout the state and provide connections to locations in neighboring states and throughout the United States and Canada. Greyhound/Carolina Trailways operates in North Carolina. However, community, urban and regional transportation systems are providing increasing intercity service in North Carolina.

An inventory of existing and planned fixed public transportation routes for the planning area is presented on Sheet 3 of Figure 1. The Piedmont Authority for Regional Transportation (PART) serves Davidson County with two bus routes, one to Winston Salem and another to Greensboro. There are currently two Park-and-Ride lots for these routes, one on Hargrave Road (SR 1224) near the Davidson County Airport and the other on Forest Hill Road (SR 1247) near US 64.

There are also planned bus routes for Lexington that include the construction of park-and-ride lots. These routes will be run through the Davidson County Transportation System. These routes will traverse the City of Lexington and connect with the existing Davidson County PART routes.

There is also a Park-and-Ride Lot planned on NC 109 in Denton. This Park-and-Ride Lot will serve citizens who want to share rides to other locations in and around Davidson County.

All recommendations for public transportation were coordinated with the local governments and the Public Transportation Division of NCDOT. Refer to Appendix A for contact information.

## Rail

Today, North Carolina has 3,684 miles of railroad tracks throughout the state. There are two types of trains that operate in the state, passenger trains and freight trains.

The North Carolina Department of Transportation sponsors two passenger trains, the Carolinian and Piedmont. The Carolinian runs between Charlotte and New York City, while the Piedmont train carries passengers from Raleigh to Charlotte and back everyday. Combined, the Carolinian and Piedmont carry more than 200,000 passengers each year.

There are two major freight railroad companies that operate in North Carolina, CSX Transportation and Norfolk Southern Corporation. Also, there are more than 20 smaller freight railroads, known as shortlines.

An inventory of existing and planned rail facilities for the planning area is presented on Sheet 3 of Figure 1. Amtrak currently has two stops near Davidson County, one in High Point and the other in Salisbury. NCDOT has plans for an additional stop in Lexington in conjunction with high-speed rail from Washington, DC to Charlotte.

All recommendations for rail were coordinated with the local governments and the Rail Division of NCDOT. Refer to Appendix A for contact information.

## Bicycles \& Pedestrians

Bicyclists and pedestrians are a growing part of the transportation equation in North Carolina. Many communities are working to improve mobility for both cyclists and pedestrians.

NCDOT's Bicycle Policy, updated in 1991, clarifies responsibilities regarding the provision of bicycle facilities upon and along the 77,000 -mile state-maintained highway system. The policy details guidelines for planning, design, construction, maintenance, and operations pertaining to bicycle facilities and accommodations. All bicycle improvements undertaken by the NCDOT are based upon this policy.

The 2000 NCDOT Pedestrian Policy Guidelines specifies that NCDOT will participate with localities in the construction of sidewalks as incidental features of highway improvement projects. At the request of a locality, state funds for a sidewalk are made available if matched by the requesting locality, using a sliding scale based on population.

NCDOT's administrative guidelines, adopted in 1994, ensure that greenways and greenway crossings are considered during the highway planning process. This policy was incorporated so that critical corridors which have been adopted by localities for future greenways will not be severed by highway construction.

Inventories of existing and planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities for the planning area are presented on Sheets 4 and 5 of Figure 1. The 2009 Davidson County Greenway Master Plan and the 2007 Piedmont Triad Rural Planning Organization Sidewalk Inventory were utilized in the development of these elements of the CTP.

All recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities were coordinated with the local governments and the NCDOT Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation. Refer to Appendix A for contact information.

## Land Use

G.S. §136-66.2 requires that local areas have a current (less than five years old) land development plan prior to adoption of the CTP. For this CTP, the 2009 Davidson County Land Development Plan and the 2010 Lexington Land Development Plan were used to meet this requirement and are illustrated in Figures $6 \& 7$ and 6A \& 7A, respectively.

Land use refers to the physical patterns of activities and functions within an area. Traffic demand in a given area is, in part, attributed to adjacent land use. For example, a large shopping center typically generates higher traffic volumes than a residential area. The spatial distribution of different types of land uses is a predominant determinant of when, where, and to what extent traffic congestion occurs. The travel demand between different land uses and the resulting impact on traffic conditions varies depending on the size, type, intensity, and spatial separation of development. Additionally, traffic volumes have different peaks based on the time of day and the day of the week. For transportation planning purposes, land use is divided into the following categories:

- Residential: Land devoted to the housing of people, with the exception of hotels and motels which are considered commercial.
- Commercial: Land devoted to retail trade including consumer and business services and their offices; this may be further stratified into retail and special retail classifications. Special retail would include high-traffic establishments, such as fast food restaurants and service stations; all other commercial establishments would be considered retail.
- Industrial: Land devoted to the manufacturing, storage, warehousing, and transportation of products.
- Public: Land devoted to social, religious, educational, cultural, and political activities; this would include the office and service employment establishments.
- Agricultural: Land devoted to the use of buildings or structures for the raising of non-domestic animals and/or growing of plants for food and other production.
- Mixed Use: Land devoted to a combination of any of the categories above.

Anticipated future land development is, in general, a logical extension of the present spatial land use distribution. Locations and types of expected growth within the planning area help to determine the location and type of proposed transportation improvements.

Davidson County primarily anticipates growth in areas designated as "Commercial and Industrial Centers." Commercial and Industrial Centers, as depicted in Figure 7, encompass commercial and industrial land uses. These areas tend to be in or near established populated areas and are located throughout Davidson County, typically along major routes. Considerable residential, commercial, and industrial growth is expected in the northern part of Davidson County, especially between Lexington and the Forsyth County Line, as well as along primary growth corridors, which are along major routes throughout the county.


Figure 6: Davidson County Existing Land Use


Figure 6A: Lexington Existing Land Use


Figure 7: Davidson County Proposed Land Use


Figure 7A: Lexington Proposed Land Use


## Consideration of Natural and Human Environment

In recent years, environmental considerations have come to the forefront of the transportation planning process. Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires consideration of impacts on wetlands, wildlife, water quality, historic properties, and public lands. While a full NEPA evaluation was not conducted as part of the CTP, potential impacts to these resources were identified as a part of the project recommendations in Chapter 2 of this report. Prior to implementing transportation recommendations of the CTP, a more detailed environmental study would need to be completed in cooperation with the appropriate environmental resource agencies.

A full listing of environmental features that were examined as a part of this study is shown in the following tables utilizing the best available data. Environmental features occurring within Davidson County are shown in Figure 8.

## Table 1 - Environmental Features

- Airport Boundaries
- Anadromous Fish Spawning Areas
- Beach Access Sites
- Bike Routes (NCDOT)
- Coastal Marinas
- Colleges and Universities
- Conservation Tax Credit Properties
- Emergency Operation Centers
- Federal Land Ownership
- Fisheries Nursery Areas
- Geology (including Dikes and Faults)
- Hazardous Substance Disposal Sites
- Hazardous Waste Facilities
- High Quality Water and Outstanding

Resource Water Management Zones

- Hospital Locations
- Hydrography (1:24,000 scale)
- Land Trust Priority Areas
- National Heritage Element Occurrences
- National Wetlands Inventory
- North Carolina Coastal Region Evaluation of Wetland Significance (NC-CREWS)
- Paddle Trails - Coastal Plain
- Railroads (1:24,000 scale)
- Recreation Projects - Land and Water Conservation Fund
- Sanitary Sewer Systems Discharges, Land Application Areas, Pipes, Pumps and Treatment Plants
- Schools - Public and Non-Public
- Shellfish Strata
- Significant Natural Heritage Areas
- State Parks
- Submersed Rooted Vasculars
- Target Local Watersheds - EEP
- Trout Streams (DWQ)
- Trout Waters (WRC)
- Water Distribution Systems - Pipes, Pumps, Tanks, Treatment Plants, and Wells
- Water Supply Watersheds
- Wild and Scenic Rivers

Additionally, the following environmental features were considered but are not mapped due to restrictions associated with the sensitivity of the data.

Table 2 - Restricted Environmental Features

- Archaeological Sites
- Historic National Register Districts
- Historic National Register Structures
- Macrosite Boundaries
- Managed Areas
- Megasite Boundaries



## Public Involvement

Public involvement is a key element in the transportation planning process. Adequate documentation of this process is essential for a seamless transfer of information from systems planning to project planning and design.

The Piedmont Triad RPO requested the development of a comprehensive transportation plan for Davidson County and Lexington through a prioritized list of regional needs. A meeting was held with the Davidson County Board of Commissioners in 2008 to formally initiate the study, provide an overview of the transportation planning process, and to gather input on area transportation needs.

Throughout the course of the study, the Transportation Planning Branch cooperatively worked with the Davidson County and Lexington CTP Transportation Committees, which included a representative from each municipality, city and county staff, and the RPO, to provide information on current local plans, to develop transportation vision and goals, to discuss population and employment projections, and to develop proposed CTP recommendations. Refer to Appendix $H$ for detailed information the goals and objectives survey and a listing of committee members.

The public involvement process included holding four public drop-in sessions in Davidson County and Lexington to present the proposed Comprehensive Transportation Plan to the public and solicit comments. The first meeting was held on January 22, 2009 at the Lexington Public Works Building; the second meeting was held on November 16, 2009 at the Denton Town Hall; the third meeting was held on December 3, 2009 at the West Davidson Public Library in Tyro; the fourth meeting was held on September 16, 2010 at the Lexington Municipal Club. Each session was publicized in the local newspaper.

A public hearing was held on April 5, 2010 during the Davidson County Commissioners meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the plan recommendations and to solicit further input from the public. The rural portion of the Davidson County CTP was adopted during this meeting.

A public hearing was held on November 8, 2010 during both the Davidson County Commissioners and the Lexington City Council meetings. The purpose of these meetings was to discuss the plan recommendations and to solicit further input from the public. The Lexington portion of the Davidson County CTP was adopted during these meetings.

The Piedmont Triad RPO endorsed the rural portion of the Davidson County CTP on April 21, 2010. The North Carolina Board of Transportation voted to mutually adopt the rural portion of the Davidson County CTP on July 1, 2010.

The Piedmont Triad RPO endorsed the Lexington portion of the Davidson County CTP on December 15, 2010. The North Carolina Board of Transportation voted to mutually adopt the Lexington portion of the Davidson County CTP on January 6, 2011.

## II. Recommendations

This report documents the development of the 2010 Davidson County CTP as shown in Figure 1. This chapter presents recommendations for each mode of transportation in Davidson County.

## Implementation

The CTP is based on the projected growth for the planning area. It is possible that actual growth patterns will differ from those logically anticipated. As a result, it may be necessary to accelerate or delay the implementation of some recommendations found within this plan. Some portions of the plan may require revisions in order to accommodate unexpected changes in development. Therefore, any changes made to one element of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan should be consistent with the other elements.

Initiative for implementing the CTP rests predominately with the policy boards and citizens of Davidson County and its municipalities. As transportation needs throughout the State exceed available funding, it is imperative that the local planning area aggressively pursue funding for priority projects. Projects should be prioritized locally and submitted to the Piedmont Triad RPO for regional prioritization and submittal to NCDOT. Refer to Appendix A for contact information on funding. Local governments may use the CTP to guide development and protect corridors for the recommended projects. It is critical that NCDOT and local government coordinate on relevant land development reviews and all transportation projects to ensure proper implementation of the CTP. Local governments and the North Carolina Department of Transportation share the responsibility for access management and the planning, design and construction of the recommended projects.

Prior to implementing projects from the CTP, additional analysis will be necessary to meet the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) or the North Carolina (or State) Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). This CTP may be used to provide information in the NEPA/SEPA process.

The following pages contain problem statements for each recommendation, organized by CTP modal element.

## Problem Statements

## HIGHWAY

US 64 Proposed improvements from US 601 in Local ID: R-3602
Davie County to US 52 Last Updated: 7/20/2011


## Identified Problem

Parts of US 64 are projected to be near or over capacity by 2035 from the Davie County Line to US 52. The primary purpose of this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of LOS D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

US 64 is a major east-west corridor in Davidson County, connecting Lexington with rural areas in the county. The facility is a vital artery in moving people and goods through North Carolina, connecting two county seats, Lexington and Mocksville, and serving as an alternative route to Interstate 40 through central North Carolina.

US 64 is currently a two-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from Davie County to US 52. It is part of the statewide tier of the NC Multimodal Investment Network (NCMIN).

By 2035 the facility is projected to be near or over capacity from NC 150 to the US 52 Interchange based on providing a LOS D. Traffic is projected to increase from 13,500 vehicles per day (vpd) near Happy Hill Road (SR 1231) in 2009 to 20,000 vpd in 2035, compared to a capacity of 15,800 vpd.

## Community Vision and Problem History

Due to US 64's close proximity to Lexington as well as the rest of the triad region, locals expect moderate growth into the future. US 64 in envisioned to be the main route from rural western Davidson County to Lexington. While other secondary routes also lead into Lexington, high traffic volumes are not intended on these routes.

There is currently a single crossing of the Yadkin River in the Western Davidson County area. This is the only crossing of the Yadkin River between Davidson and Davie County. Many residents of both Davie and Davidson County use this crossing to access jobs and other amenities.

US 64 has also been identified as an alternative to I-40 between the western part of the state and Raleigh in the US 64-NC 49 Corridor Study Report. As traffic reaches capacity on I-40, travelers will look to US 64 as a viable alternative when traveling through central North Carolina.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (Part of TIP No. R-3602) is to widen US 64 from a two-lane facility to a four-lane expressway from Davie County to US 52. Additionally, a portion of this project includes bicycle accommodations.

The proposed improvements to US 64 will help to reduce congestion between Lexington and the Davie County Line. Additionally, it will fulfill the SHC Vision Plan, which recommends US 64 be upgraded to expressway standards from Interstate 40 in Davie County to Asheboro.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2009 Davidson County Land Development Plan indicates this currently rural area will remain fairly rural in nature for the foreseeable future, with the exception of anticipated commercial and industrial growth near the Davie County Line and near the US 52 Interchange. Primarily residential development is expected to occur along this corridor. In order to achieve expressway standards, access will only occur at fully controlled access interchanges or nonsignalized at grade intersections.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for US 64 directly connects to proposed improvements of NC 150 where an interchange is recommended. The Strategic Highway Corridor (SHC) Vision Plan designates this facility as an expressway through Davidson County.

The 1994 City of Lexington Thoroughfare Plan first recommended the improvement of US 64 to a multi-lane facility. Consistent with this prior recommendation, the 2011 Davidson County CTP also recommends improvement to a multi-lane facility with partial access control as an expressway facility.

The proposal has also been identified as an alternative to l-40 between the western part of the state and Raleigh in the US 64-NC 49 Corridor Study Report.

The US 64-49 Corridor study can be viewed at the following website: http://www.ncdot.org/projects/us64phase1/

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, parts of the project area are within the critical and non-critical water supply watershed. Along existing US 64 from the Yadkin River to 0.5 miles east of the Yadkin River is within the critical water supply watershed. Along existing US 64 from 0.5 miles east of the Yadkin River to NC 150 is within the non-critical water supply watershed. There is a targeted local watershed within the project area from NC 150 to US 52. Wetlands have been identified being within 200 feet of existing US 64 near Old US 64 (SR 1192), Happy Hill Road (SR 1231), and the US 52 interchange.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. There are specific improvements for adding bicycle lanes on US 64 from Davie County to Old US 64 (SR 1192) as well as a bicycle facility that crosses US 64 at Koontz Road (SR 1186).

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.


## Problem Statement

US 64 is projected to be over capacity by 2035 from I-85 to Cunningham Road (SR 2104). The primary purpose of this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

US 64 is a major east-west corridor in Davidson County, connecting Lexington with rural areas in the county. The facility is a vital artery in moving people and goods through North Carolina, connecting two county seats, Lexington and Asheboro, and serving as an alternative to Interstate 40 through central North Carolina.

US 64 is currently a five-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes including a center turn lane from Business I-85/US 29-70 to I-85 and a two-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from I-85 to Randolph County. It is part of the statewide tier of the NC Multimodal Investment Network (NCMIN).

By 2035 a portion of this facility is projected to be over capacity based on providing a LOS D. Traffic from I-85 to Cunningham Road (SR 2104) is projected to increase from 11,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 17,000 vpd in 2035, compared to a capacity of $15,800 \mathrm{vpd}$.

## Community Vision and Problem History

Due to US 64's close proximity to Lexington as well as the rest of the triad region, locals expect moderate growth into the future. US 64 in envisioned to be the main route from rural eastern

Davidson County to Lexington. US 64 is the primary route between Lexington and Asheboro, the county seats of Davidson County and Randolph County respectively. While other secondary routes also lead into Lexington, high traffic volumes are not intended on these routes.

US 64 has also been identified as an alternative to l-40 between the western part of the state and Raleigh in the US 64-NC 49 Corridor Study Report. As traffic reaches capacity on I-40, travelers will look to US 64 as a viable alternative when traveling through central North Carolina.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (TIP No. R-2220) is to convert the existing 5-lane major thoroughfare to a 4-lane expressway from Business I-85/US 29-70 to I-85 and to widen US 64 from a two-lane major thoroughfare to a four-lane expressway from I-85 to Randolph County.

The proposed improvements to US 64 will help to reduce congestion between Lexington and the Randolph County Line. Additionally, it will fulfill the SHC Vision, which recommends US 64 be upgraded to an expressway from Interstate 40 in Davie County to Asheboro.

Additionally, there were also 30 crashes with an average severity index rating of 7.29 between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009 at the interchange of US 64 and I-85. Improving the existing five-lane facility may reduce the amount and severity of crashes at this location.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2009 Davidson County Land Development Plan indicates this currently rural area is anticipated to become a growth corridor, with commercial and industrial centers potentially developing near the US 64/NC 109 interchange. Primarily commercial and industrial development is expected to occur along this corridor. Mobility on this existing 2-lane facility can be maximized by limiting driveway access. In order to achieve expressway standards, access will only occur at fully controlled access interchanges or non-signalized at grade intersections.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for US 64 directly connects to proposed improvements of Business I-85/US 29-70 and NC 109, including an interchange at NC 109.

In the 2011 Randolph County CTP, US 64 is proposed to be widened to a 4-lane expressway from Davidson County to the proposed Asheboro Bypass (TIP Project R-2536). The Strategic Highway Corridor (SHC) Vision Plan designates this facility as an expressway through Davidson County.

The proposal has also been identified as an alternative to l-40 between the western part of the state and Raleigh in the US 64-NC 49 Corridor Study Report.

The US 64-49 Corridor study can be viewed at the following website: http://www.ncdot.org/projects/us64phase1/

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, parts of this project are within the non-critical water supply watershed.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. Bicycle accommodations are recommended for US 64 from New Cut Road (SR 2262) to Cunningham Mill Road (SR 2104).

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## Problem Statement

NC 8 is projected to be over capacity by 2035 from US 52 to Business I-85/US 29-64-70. The primary purpose of this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

NC 8 is a major north-south corridor in Davidson County, connecting Lexington with developing areas of the county.

NC 8 is currently a two-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from US 52 to Leonard Road (SR 1417), a three-lane major thoroughfare with 12 -foot lanes including a center left-turn lane from Leonard Road (SR 1417) to Longview Street, and a four-lane undivided major thoroughfare (two northbound lanes and one southbound lane) with 12-foot lanes with, including a center turn lane from Longview Street to Business I-85/US 29-64-70. It is part of the regional tier of the NC Multimodal Investment Network (NCMIN).


By 2035 the facility is projected to be over capacity based on providing a LOS D. Traffic near US 52 is projected to increase from 15,500 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 19,000 vpd in 2035, compared to an overall capacity of 15,800 vpd, while traffic near Business I-85/US 29-6470 is projected to increase from 26,000 vpd in 2009 to 29,000 vpd in 2035 , compared to an overall capacity of $27,500 \mathrm{vpd}$.

## Community Vision and Problem History

Due to Lexington being in close proximity of the Greater Triad Region, locals expect the area will continue to grow moderately into the future. Population is expected to increase through the 2035 planning period, in large part due to new residents from the Winston Salem area.

NC 8 is the primary route into downtown Lexington from areas north, including Winston Salem. As traffic increases, the already over capacity facility will continue to break down, causing more traffic delays and possibly more crashes. While the community envisions a vibrant suburban area, the current levels of congestion make access difficult for residents and visitors.

This is the first time this deficiency has been identified on a transportation plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (Local ID DAVID0002-H) is to convert the existing facility to a four-lane divided boulevard from US 52 to Business l-85/US 29-64-70.

The proposed improvements to NC 8 will help to reduce congestion into and within Lexington.
Along this corridor, there were four crash locations between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009. Thirty-three crashes with an average severity index rating of 8.51 occurred at the intersection of NC 8 and Ninth Street, twenty-eight crashes with an average severity index rating of 4.44 occurred at the interchange of Business I-85/US 29-64-70, eleven crashes with an average severity index rating of 4.36 occurred at the interchange of US 52 and NC 8 , and then crashes with an average severity index rating of 3.96 occurred at the intersection of NC 8 and Arrington Drive (SR 1846). Improving the existing facility may reduce the amount and severity of crashes at these locations.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2009 Davidson County Land Development Plan indicates this currently rural to urban area is envisioned to become a growth corridor, with commercial and industrial centers potentially developing on NC 8 from US 52 to Business I-85/US 29-64-70. Existing land uses are more rural and residential in nature near US 52 and more commercial and industrial in nature near Business I-85/US 29-64-70. Primarily commercial and industrial development is expected to occur along this corridor. Mobility on this existing facility can be maximized by limiting driveway access.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for NC 8 directly connects to proposed improvements of Business I85/US 29-64-70, including an upgraded interchange at this location.

The 1994 City of Lexington Thoroughfare Plan did not make any recommendations along this corridor. This was due to another project, US 52, that was under construction at the time. While the construction of US 52 diverted through-traffic off NC 8, traffic accessing Downtown Lexington has continued to increase along NC 8 and traffic conditions have worsened.

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, parts of the proposed project are within the targeted local watershed.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. A future bus route, to be operated by the Davidson County Transportation System, is planned to service part of this facility from Biesecker Road (SR 1408) to 9th Street. Sidewalks exist along this facility from Biesecker Road (SR 1408) to 9th Street. A sidewalk has been recommended to cross Business I-85/US 29-64-70 from 9th Street to Chestnut Street.

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## Problem Statement

NC 8 is projected to be over capacity by 2035 from Raleigh Road (SR 2205) to I85. The primary purpose of this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

NC 8 is a major north-south corridor in Davidson County, connecting Lexington with the rural areas in the county.

The Talbert Boulevard section of NC 8 is a four-lane undivided major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from Raleigh Road (SR 2205) to 0.08 miles east of East Center Street (SR 1243), and a two-lane major thoroughfare with 12 -foot lanes from 0.08 miles east of East Center Street (SR 1243) to 0.07 miles west of East Center
 Street (SR 1243), a four-lane undivided major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from 0.07 miles west of East Center Street (SR 1243) to Fairview Drive (SR 2212), and a four-lane undivided major thoroughfare (two westbound lanes and one eastbound lane), with 12-foot lanes, including a center turn lane from Fairview Drive (SR 2212) to East 10th Avenue (SR 3345).

The Cotton Grove section of NC 8 is currently a three-lane major thoroughfare with 12 -foot lanes including a center turn lane from East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) to Hickory Street, a twolane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from Hickory Street to Fairview Drive (SR 2212), a five-lane undivided thoroughfare with 12 -foot lanes including a center turn lane from Fairview Drive (SR 2212) to Brown Road (SR 1254), and a four-lane divided boulevard from Brown Road (SR 1254) to l-85. It is part of the regional tier of the NC Multimodal Investment Network (NCMIN).

By 2035 the facility is projected to be near or over capacity in several sections of NC 8 based on providing a LOS D.

- The Talbert Boulevard section near East Center Street is projected to increase from 10,000 vpd in 2009 to $14,200 \mathrm{vpd}$ in 2035, compared to an overall capacity of $13,800 \mathrm{vpd}$.
- The Cotton Grove section near Old Linwood Road (SR 1104) is projected to increase from $13,500 \mathrm{vpd}$ in 2009 to 17,500 vpd in 2035, compared to an overall capacity of $13,800 \mathrm{vpd}$.


## Community Vision and Problem History

Due to Lexington being in close proximity to $1-85$, locals expect moderate growth into the future. Population is also expected to increase through the 2035 planning period, in part due to in part due to new residents from the High Point area.

There are currently two major routes that traverse downtown Lexington: NC 8 and Main Street (SR 3346). Main Street (SR 3346) from NC 8 (Fifth Street) to East Tenth Ave (SR 3345) is a typical downtown route, with many historic structures and other buildings built near the existing roadway. Main Street (SR 3346) is currently a four-lane undivided major thoroughfare. As traffic congestion builds on this route, citizens will look for an alternate route to traverse Downtown Lexington. NC 8 is only other option to do so.

This route was previously identified as deficient in the 1994 Lexington Thoroughfare Plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (DAVID0003-H) is to improve the existing facility to a four-lane divided boulevard from Raleigh Road (SR 2205) to l-85. This project also includes sidewalks for pedestrians.

Along this corridor, there were five crash locations between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009. Fourteen crashes with an average severity index rating of 8.00 occurred at the intersection of NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road) and Fairview Drive (SR 2212), Twelve crashes with an average severity index of 5.32 occurred at the intersection of NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard) and Center Street (SR 1243), Twenty crashes with an average severity index rating of 4.70 occurred at the intersection of NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard) and Fairview Drive (SR 2212), Seventeen crashes with an average severity index rating of 3.18 occurred at the intersection of I-85 and NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road), and eleven crashes with an average severity index rating of 2.35 occurred at the intersection of NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road) and Plaza Parkway.

The proposed improvements to NC 8 will help to reduce congestion and improve mobility into and within Lexington.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2010 Lexington Land Use Plan indicates that both the Talbert Boulevard and Cotton Grove Road sections of NC 8 are planned for redevelopment. This area currently consists of older textile and furniture mills as well as established commercial and residential developments. Primarily industrial redevelopment is expected along the Talbert Boulevard section of NC 8 and commercial redevelopment is expected along the Cotton Grove Road section of NC 8. Mobility on this existing facility can be maximized by limiting driveway access. Future land use plan amendments and land use decisions should consider the functionality of this corridor.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for NC 8 directly connects to the proposed improvement of East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) and the proposed Southwestern Connector (TIP No. U-2545).

The 1994 City of Lexington Thoroughfare Plan recommends improvement of Cotton Grove Road to a 3-to-5 lane facility. Expanding upon this prior recommendation, the 2011 Davidson County CTP also recommends improvement to a multi-lane facility and specifies partial access control as a boulevard facility.

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, parts of the proposed project are within the targeted local watershed.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. A future bus route, to be operated by the Davidson County Transportation System, is planned to service part of this facility from Young Drive to Fairview Drive and from Smith Avenue to Lowes Boulevard. Sidewalks exist along parts of this facility from Cornelia Street to Kirkwood Street and from East 10th Avenue to Federal Street. Sidewalks have been recommended from Raleigh Road (SR 2205) to Cornelia Street, from Kirkwood Street to East 10th Avenue (SR 3345), and from Federal Street to Brown Street (SR 1254).

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## Problem Statement

NC 8 is projected to be near capacity by 2035 from Wrenn Road (SR 1115) to Rothrock Road (SR 2412). The primary purpose of this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

NC 8 a major north-south corridor in Davidson County, connecting Lexington with rural areas in the southern half of the county.

NC 8 is currently a two-lane major thoroughfare with 12foot lanes from Wrenn Road (SR 1115) to Rothrock Road (SR 2412). It is part of the regional tier of the NC Multimodal Investment Network (NCMIN).

By 2035 the facility is projected to be near capacity based providing a LOS D. Traffic just south of Wrenn Road (SR 1115) is projected to increase from 7,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 14,000 vpd in 2035, compared to an overall capacity of $15,300 \mathrm{vpd}$.


## Community Vision and Problem History

Due to NC 8 being the primary access to High Rock Lake in Davidson County, locals expect moderate growth into the future. Citizens living in this region would like this area to maintain its rural character. They would also like to access services and amenities in Lexington.

This is the first time this deficiency has been identified on a transportation plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project ( $\mathrm{R}-2300 \mathrm{BA}$ ) is to widen the existing two-lane major thoroughfare to a three-lane major thoroughfare with a center turn lane from Wrenn Road (SR 1115) to Rothrock Road (SR 2412). This project also includes accommodations for bicycles from LinwoodSouthmont Road (SR 1396) to Rothrock Road (SR 2412).

The proposed improvements to NC 8 will help to reduce congestion between Lexington and southern Davidson County.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2009 Davidson County Land Development Plan indicates this currently rural area is envisioned to remain fairly rural in nature, with a small commercial and industrial center planned for south of Wrenn Road (SR 1115). Primarily residential development is expected to occur along this corridor.

This route directly accesses a growing recreational area near High Rock Lake. Being the only direct access to services and amenities in Lexington, this facility will continue to see growth into the future, causing moderate congestion.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The NC 8 improvements are included in the 2009-15 STIP as Project R-2300. Sections R2300BC and BB have been completed (from I-85 to Wrenn Road). Sections R-2300AB and AA include upgrading the existing two-lane facility by widening the lanes (from Rockrock Road to NC 49).

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, parts of proposed project are within the non-critical water supply watershed.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. There are specific improvements for adding bicycle lanes on NC 8 from Linwood-Southmont Road (SR 1396) to Rothrock Road (SR 2412) as well as an on-road recommendations that intersect NC 8 at Linwood-Southmont Road (SR 1396).

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## NC 47 Proposed improvements from l-85 to

## Problem Statement

NC 47 is projected to be near or over capacity by 2035 from I85 to Linwood-Southmont Road (SR 1396). The primary purpose of this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

NC 47 a north-south corridor in Davidson County, connecting Lexington with Denton and rural areas in the southern half of the county.

NC 47 is currently a two-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from 0.35 miles south of I-85 to Old Linwood Road (SR 1104), a three-lane major thoroughfare with 12 -foot lanes including a center turn lane from Old Linwood Road (SR 1104) to the Lexington City Limits, and a two-lane thoroughfare with 12 -foot lanes from the Lexington City Limits to LinwoodSouthmont Road (SR 1396). It is part of the regional tier of the NC Multimodal Investment Network (NCMIN).

By 2035 the facility is projected to be over capacity based on providing a LOS D. Traffic just south of I-85 is projected to
 increase from 9,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 16,700 vpd in 2035, compared to an overall capacity of $15,300 \mathrm{vpd}$.

## Community Vision and Problem History

Due to existing and planned industrial areas in this southern Lexington, there is expected to be moderate growth in the foreseeable future. According to the 2010 Lexington Land Use Plan, this area is envisioned to be a vital industrial employment center for Lexington and Davidson County. Access to Interstate 85 from this area is limited to NC 47, causing further demands on this two-to-three lane facility.

This route was previously identified as deficient in the 1994 Lexington Thoroughfare Plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (DAVID0004-H) is to widen the two-lane thoroughfare to a three-lane thoroughfare with 12 foot lanes including a center turn lane from l-85 to Linwood-Southmont Road (SR 1396).

The proposed improvements to NC 47 will help to reduce congestion between I-85 and this area of Lexington.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2010 Lexington Land Use Plan indicates that this area of Lexington is currently planned for industrial and warehouse development. Several existing industrial facilities, including Hekman Warehouse and Jeld-Win Industries, are located along NC 47 near I-85. Primarily industrial development is expected along these corridors.

Industries have easy access to I-85 and the Davidson County airport from this area, further spurring anticipated industrial growth. Most of this growth will be along NC 47 from I-85 to Linwood-Southmont Road (SR 1396).

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for NC 8 directly connects to Hargrave Road (SR 1224) improvements. These two improvements provide better access for industrial developments to I 85 and the Davidson County Airport.

The 1994 City of Lexington Thoroughfare Plan recommends improvement of NC 47 to a multilane facility. Consistent with this prior recommendation, the 2011 Davidson County CTP also recommends improvement to a multi-lane facility.

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, parts of the proposed project are within the targeted local watershed.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. There are specific improvements for adding bicycle lanes LinwoodSouthmont Road (SR 1396), which intersects this project.

The existing Amtrak Railroad is recommended to be upgraded to a high-speed rail corridor from Raleigh to Charlotte. This railroad intersects NC 47 near Linwood-Southmont Road (SR 1396).

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## Problem Statement

NC 109 is projected to be near or over capacity by 2035. The primary purpose of improving NC 109 is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

NC 109 is a major north-south corridor in Davidson County, connecting Denton with Thomasville. NC 109 is currently a twolane major thoroughfare with 12 -foot lanes from the High Point MPO Boundary to Denton. It is part of the regional tier of the NC Multimodal Investment Network (NCMIN).

By 2035 the facility is projected to be near or over capacity based on providing a LOS D. Traffic near US 64 is projected to increase from 13,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 20,000 vpd in 2035, compared to an overall capacity of $15,800 \mathrm{vpd}$, and traffic near Denton is projected to increase from 9,200 vpd in 2009 to 15,000 vpd in 2035, compared to an overall capacity of 15,800 vpd.

NC 109 is also the main connection between the areas public
 schools. During peak times, through traffic is often delayed, especially around Denton.

## Community Vision and Problem History

NC 109 is the only route that traverses eastern Davidson County, from Thomasville in the High Point MPO to Denton at NC 47. Through traffic from Thomasville to Denton is mixed with local traffic, causing delays. While the county envisions a multi-modal friendly area, especially from South Davidson High School to Denton, the current and future levels of congestion make access difficult for citizens and visitors alike. During peak times, through traffic is often delayed on sections of NC 109.

This is the first time this deficiency has been identified on a transportation plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (TIP No R-4734) is to widen NC 109 from a two-lane to four-lane divided facility from the High Point MPO to Denton. This project also includes accommodations for bicyclists and pedestrians. Although this project was originally classified as an other major thoroughfare, it will function as a boulevard. Subsequent updates of this plan should classify this facility as a boulevard.

The proposed improvements to NC 109 will help to reduce congestion in this area of eastern Davidson County.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2009 Davidson County Land Development Plan indicates this currently rural area is envisioned to become a growth corridor, with commercial and industrial centers potentially developing near the US 64/NC 109 interchange. Primarily commercial and industrial development is expected to occur along this corridor.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for NC 109 directly connects to the US 64 improvements, including an interchange with US 64.

The 2011 High Point MPO Comprehensive Transportation Plan recommends improvement of NC 109 to a four-lane divided facility from I-85 to the High Point MPO Boundary. Consistent with this recommendation, the 2011 Davidson County CTP also recommends improvement to a four-lane divided facility.

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, parts of the proposed project are within the non-critical water supply watershed. Wetlands have been identified within 200 feet from existing NC 109 near John Wright Road (SR 2272), Old NC 109 (SR 2416), and North Main Street (SR 2414).

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. There is a proposed park-and-ride lot near the intersection of NC 109 and NC 47 within Denton for commuters who wish to carpool.

There are specific improvements for adding multi-use paths along NC 109, from Cedar Springs Road (SR 2330) to the Denton town limits as well as adding bicycle lanes to NC 109 from the Denton Town Limits to NC 47. Bicycle lanes are also recommended on Cid Road (SR 2318), which intersects this project.

Sidewalks are recommended on NC 109 from the Denton town limits to NC 47.

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## E Tenth Ave (SR 3345) Proposed improvements from <br> Local ID: DAVID0012-H <br> S Main St (SR 3346) to NC 8 (Talbert Blvd)

## Problem Statement

East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) is projected to be over capacity by 2035 . The primary purpose this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) is a major northsouth connector within Lexington, connecting NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road and Talbert Boulevard) with South Main Street (SR 3346).

East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) is currently a three-lane major thoroughfare with 12 -foot lanes including a center-turn lane from South Main Street (SR 3346) to NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard).

By 2035 the facility is projected to be over capacity based providing a LOS D. Traffic is projected to increase from 17,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 20,500 vpd in 2035, compared to an overall capacity of 15,800
 vpd.

## Community Vision and Problem History

East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) is a major north-south connector that links NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road) with South Main Street (SR 3346). This is a direct connection from I-85 to downtown Lexington. All traffic is funneled through this three-lane corridor. During peak times, through traffic is often delayed due to lack of travel lanes. Traffic often backs up from the intersection of Tenth Avenue (SR 3345) and South Main Street (SR 3346) through the intersection of Tenth Avenue (SR 3345) and NC 8.

This route was previously identified as deficient in the 1994 Lexington Thoroughfare Plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (Local ID DAVID0012-H) is to widen East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) from a three-lane facility to a four-lane divided boulevard from the NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard) to South Main Street (SR 3346).

The proposed improvements to East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) will help to reduce congestion in this area of Lexington.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2010 Lexington Land Use Plan indicates this area is planned for redevelopment. This area currently consists of older textile and furniture mills as well as established commercial developments, including restaurants and small shops. Primarily commercial and industrial development is expected to occur along this corridor.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) directly connects to the proposed NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard and Cotton Grove Road) and South Main Street (SR 3346) improvements.

The 1994 City of Lexington Thoroughfare Plan recommends improvement of East 10th Avenue to a 5 lane facility. Consistent with this prior recommendation, the 2011 Davidson County CTP also recommends improvement to a multi-lane facility with partial access control as a boulevard facility.

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, the proposed project is within the targeted local watershed.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County.

Sidewalks exist along East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) from NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard) to South Main Street (SR 3346).

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## E Center St (SR 1243) Proposed improvements from <br> Local ID: DAVID0019-H NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) to Curry St

## Problem Statement

East Center Street (SR 1243) is projected to be over capacity by 2035. The primary purpose of this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

East Center Street (SR 1243) is a major northsouth corridor within Lexington, connecting downtown Lexington with NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard) and ultimately, I-85.

East Center Street (SR 1243) is currently a three-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes including a center-turn lane from NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard) to Curry Street.

By 2035 the facility is projected to be over capacity based providing a LOS D. Traffic is projected to increase from 9,500 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 18,000 vpd in 2035,
 compared to an overall capacity of 15,800 vpd.

## Community Vision and Problem History

East Center Street (SR 1243) is a major north-south route that connects downtown Lexington with NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard) and I-85. East Center Street is a four-lane major thoroughfare from South Main Street (SR 3346) to Curry Street, then narrows from to a three-lane major thoroughfare from Curry Street to NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard). All traffic is funneled through this three-lane corridor. During peak times, through traffic is often delayed due to lack of through travel lanes. The community envisions a roadway that allows through traffic to make its way through this primarily residential area without negatively impacting the local area.

This is the first time this deficiency has been identified on a transportation plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (Local ID DAVID0019-H) is to widen East Center Street (SR 1243) from a three-lane facility to a four-lane divided facility from the NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) to Curry Street.

The proposed improvements to East Center Street (SR 1243) will help to reduce congestion in this area of Lexington.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2010 Lexington Land Use Plan indicates this area is planned for urban residential. This area currently consists of mainly established residential neighborhoods as well as some smaller commercial development, including a neighborhood grocery store. Primarily residential and commercial development is expected to occur along this corridor.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for East Center Street (SR 1243) directly connects to the proposed NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) improvements, which include upgrading the urban interchange with East Center Street (SR 1243).

The 1994 City of Lexington Thoroughfare Plan did not make any recommendations along this corridor. This was due to other recommendations on NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road) and Raleigh Road (SR 2205) that the plan made. The 2011 Davidson County CTP does make recommendations for NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road), but does not make any recommendations for Raleigh Road (SR 2205). This is due to most of the existing and planned development activity in Lexington being located around East Center Street (SR 1243), NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road), and the proposed Southwestern Connector.

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, none of the natural and human environmental features examined as a part of this study were identified in the immediate vicinity of the project.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County.

Sidewalks exist along East Center Street (SR 1243) from NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) to Curry Street.

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## S Main St (SR 2235) Proposed improvements from Local ID: DAVID0033-H E 10th Ave (SR 3345) to Anne Lewis Dr (SR 3158) Last Updated: 7/20/2011



## Problem Statement

South Main Street (SR 3346) is projected to be over capacity by 2035. The primary purpose this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

South Main Street (SR 3346) is a major north-south corridor within Lexington, connecting downtown Lexington with other major arterials.

South Main Street (SR 3346) is currently a two-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from Anne Lewis Drive (SR 3158) to Prospect Street and a three-lane major thoroughfare with 12foot lanes including a center turn lane from Prospect Street to East 10th Avenue (SR 3345).

By 2035 the facility is projected to be over capacity based providing a LOS D. Traffic near Anne Lewis Drive (SR 3158) is projected to increase from 14,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to $24,800 \mathrm{vpd}$ in 2035 , compared to a capacity of $13,800 \mathrm{vpd}$. Traffic near East 10th Avenue (SR 3345 ) is projected to increase from 17,300 vpd in 2009 to 25,600 vpd in 2035, compared to a capacity of $15,800 \mathrm{vpd}$.

## Community Vision and Problem History

South Main Street (SR 3346) is the only major north-south route that traverses downtown Lexington and is the main connection between downtown Lexington and areas to the south. All traffic is funneled through this two-lane corridor. While the city envisions a vibrant, multi-modal community, the current and future levels of congestion make access difficult for residents and visitors alike. During peak times, through traffic is often delayed due to lack of through travel lanes.

This is the first time this deficiency has been identified on a transportation plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (Local ID DAVID0033-H) is to widen South Main Street (SR 3346) from a two-lane facility to a four-lane divided boulevard from the Anne Lewis Drive (SR 3158) to East 10th Avenue (SR 3345). This project also includes pedestrian facilities.

Along this corridor, there were three crash locations between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009. Eleven crashes with an average severity index rating of 5.71 occurred at the intersection of South Main Street (SR 3346) and Anne Lewis Drive (SR 3158), twenty-three crashes with an average severity index rating of 5.50 occurred at the intersection of South Main Street (SR 3346) and Eleventh Avenue, and twenty-one crashes with an average severity index rating of 4.17 occurred at the intersection of South Main Street (SR 3346) and East 10th Avenue (SR 3345),

The proposed improvements to South Main Street (SR 3346) will help to reduce congestion in this area of Lexington.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2010 Lexington Land Plan indicates this suburban area is planned for redevelopment. This area currently consists of mainly established residential neighborhoods with limited small commercial development, including gas stations. Primarily commercial and industrial development is expected to occur along this corridor.

The CTP proposal for a boulevard facility would provide adequate mobility along the corridor as well as provide access to residents and businesses.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for South Main Street (SR 3346) directly connects to the proposed East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) improvements as well as the proposed Southwestern Connector (TIP No. U-2545).

The 1994 City of Lexington Thoroughfare Plan did not make any recommendations along this corridor. This was due to another project, US 52, that was under construction at the time. While the construction of US 52 diverted through-traffic off South Main Street (SR 3346), traffic accessing Downtown Lexington has continued to increase along this facility and traffic conditions have worsened.

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, the proposed project is within the targeted local watershed.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. There are specific improvements for adding a bus route along South Main Street (SR 3346) from Anne Lewis Drive (SR 3158) to East 10th Avenue (SR 3345).

Sidewalks exist along South Main Street (SR 3346) from East 10th Avenue (SR 3345) to Stamey Avenue and sidewalks are recommended from Stamey Avenue to Anne Lewis Drive (SR 3158). There are also recommendations for adding sidewalks along South Main Street (SR 3346) from Anne Lewis Drive (SR 3158) to Business I-85/US 29-52-70.

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## Problem Statement

Old US 52 (SR 3010) is projected to be over capacity by 2035 . The primary purpose of this project is to relieve congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

## Justification of Need

Old US 52 (SR 3010) is a north-south corridor in northern Davidson County, connecting the community of Welcome to Lexington.

Old US 52 (SR 3010) is currently a two-lane minor thoroughfare with 11-foot lanes from Enterprise Road (SR 1499) to Tall Pines Road (SR 1822), a three-lane minor thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes including a center turn lane from Tall Pines Road (SR 1822) to Carver Road (SR 1502), a two-lane minor thoroughfare with 11-foot lanes from Carver Road (SR 1502) to Hinkle Lane (SR 1821), a threelane minor thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes including a center turn lane from Hinkle Lane (SR 1821) to North Leonard Road (SR 1460), and a two-lane minor thoroughfare with 11-foot lanes from North Leonard Road (SR 1460) to US 52.

By 2035 the facility is projected to be over capacity based on providing a LOS D. Traffic near Carver Road (SR 1502) is projected to increase from 13,500 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 20,500 vpd in 2035 , compared to an overall capacity of $15,300 \mathrm{vpd}$.

## Community Vision and Problem History

The addition of US 52 in the 1990's has helped the community of Welcome with through-trips in their area. However, the close proximity of this community to the Winston Salem MPO has caused significant growth over the past 20 years. Many citizens who work in Winston Salem have chosen to move to this community, causing increased stress on the existing infrastructure. North Davidson High School, North Davidson Middle School, and Welcome Elementary School are also located in this community, causing additional stress to the existing facilities.

Old US 52 (SR 3010) is the only route that traverses the community of Welcome. All traffic is funneled through the community of Welcome, mixing through and local traffic. While the community envisions a vibrant, multi-modal friendly area, the current and future levels of congestion make access difficult for residents and visitors alike. During peak times, through traffic is often delayed due to lack of turning lanes.

This is the first time this deficiency has been identified on a transportation plan.

## CTP Project Proposal

## Project Description

The proposed project (Local ID DAVID0037-H) is to widen Old US 52 (SR 3010) from a twolane major thoroughfare to a three-lane major thoroughfare with center turn lane from Enterprise Road (SR 1499) to Tall Pines Road (SR 1822), from Carver Road (SR 1502) to Hinkle Lane (SR 1821), and from North Leonard Road (SR 1460) to US 52. This project also includes pedestrian facilities.

The proposed improvements to Old US 52 (SR 3010) will help to reduce congestion between the community of Welcome and Lexington.

## Relationship to Land Use Plans

The 2009 Davidson County Land Development Plan indicates this developing area is planned to be a commercial and industrial growth center. Currently, this corridor supports small businesses and three schools. Primarily commercial and industrial development is expected to occur along this corridor.

Improvement to existing Old US 52 (SR 3010) in the Welcome Community is limited due to an existing railroad on the west side of the facility and existing development on the east side of the facility.

## Linkages to Other Plans and Proposed Project History

The improvement proposal for Old US 52 (3010) directly connects to the proposed US 52 and NC 8 improvements.

The 1994 City of Lexington Thoroughfare Plan did not make any recommendations along this corridor. This was due to another project, US 52, that was under construction at the time. While the construction of US 52 diverted through-traffic off Old US 52 (SR 3010), traffic accessing the community of Welcome has continued to increase along this facility and traffic conditions have worsened.

## Natural \& Human Environmental Context

Based on available GIS data, parts of the proposed project are within the targeted local watershed.

## Multi-modal Considerations

The CTP includes recommendations for public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Davidson County. There are recommendations for adding bicycle lanes to Welcome-Bethesda Road (SR 1464), which intersects Old US 52 (SR 3010). Sidewalks are recommended on Old US 52 (SR 3010) from Critcher Drive (SR 1564) to Welcome-Bethesda Road (SR 1464) in the community of Welcome.

## Public/ Stakeholder Involvement

No significant issues associated with this project were identified during the public/stakeholder involvement process.

## Interstate 85/US 29-52-70, TIP No. I-2304

Interstate 85/US 29-52-70 from Business I-85/US 29-52-70 to Rowan County is currently near or over capacity. The 2009-2015 TIP includes project I-2304 that is intended to address this problem. The project consists of widening the existing facility from a four to eight-lane freeway, including the construction of new bridges over the Yadkin River. This project is currently under construction. For additional information about this project, including the Purpose and Need, contact NCDOT's Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch.

## Southwestern Connector, TIP No. U-2545

Connectivity between east and southwest Lexington is currently limited to Main Street (SR 3346) and NC 8. The 2009-2015 TIP includes project U-2545 that is intended to address this problem. The proposed project consists of constructing a four-lane divided boulevard on new location from NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road) to South Main Street (SR 3346). This project is currently in the project development phase. For additional information about this project, including the Purpose and Need, contact NCDOT's Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch.

## Business I-85/US 29-52-70, TIP No. R-4750

Existing Business I-85/US 29-52-70 is currently a four-lane freeway from the Winston Salem MPO to I-85 and does not meet the future mobility needs in central North Carolina. The 20092015 TIP includes project R-4750 that is intended to address this problem. The project consists of upgrading the existing freeway to interstate standards from the Winston Salem MPO to I-85. This project is currently under construction. For additional information about this project, including the Purpose and Need, contact NCDOT's Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch.

## Business I-85/US 29-70, TIP No. R-2808B

Business I-85/US 29-70 is currently a four-lane facility from the High Point MPO to US 52 and does not meet the future mobility needs in central North Carolina.

The proposed project (Part of TIP No. R-2808B) is to upgrade the existing facility to expressway standards from the High Point MPO to US 52.

The proposed improvements to Business I-85/US 29-70 will fulfill the SHC Vision Plan, which recommends this facility be upgraded to expressway standards from the High Point MPO to US 52.

## US 64, Local ID DAVID0001-H

Based on North Carolina's vision for mobility and connectivity, US 64 from US 52 to Business I85/US 29-64-70 does not meet the future mobility and connectivity needs in Lexington and central North Carolina.

This facility is intended to provide mobility in Lexington and, ultimately, connectivity between Mocksville and Asheboro. US 64 is part of the Strategic Highway Corridor (SHC) Vision Plan. The existing facility is currently a boulevard and is proposed to be upgraded to an expressway, including an urban interchange at Forest Hill Road (SR 1237). As development occurs along this corridor, every effort should be made to limit access in order to maintain mobility and connectivity.

## NC 49, Local ID DAVID0007-H

Based on North Carolina's vision for mobility and connectivity, NC 49 from Asheboro to Charlotte does not meet the future mobility and connectivity needs in Davidson County and central North Carolina.

This facility is intended to provide mobility in Davidson County and, ultimately, connectivity between Asheboro and Charlotte. NC 49 is part of the Strategic Highway Corridor (SHC) Vision Plan. The existing facility is currently a 2-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes and is proposed to be upgraded to an expressway, including an interchange at NC 8. As development occurs along this corridor, every effort should be made to limit access in order to maintain mobility and connectivity.

## NC 150, Local ID DAVID0010-H

Based on Davison County's need for mobility and connectivity, NC 150 from the Winston Salem MPO to the Tyro community does not meet the future mobility and connectivity needs in western Davidson County.

This facility is intended to provide mobility in western Davidson County and, ultimately, connectivity between the Winston Salem MPO and the Tyro community. The existing facility is currently a two-lane major thoroughfare with 12-foot lanes from the Winston Salem MPO to Tyro Road (SR 1115), a three-lane major thoroughfare with center left-turn lanes from Tyro Road (SR 1115) to 0.1 miles north of Swicegood Road (SR 1155) and a two-lane major thoroughfare with 10-foot lanes from 0.1 miles north of Swicegood Road (SR 1155) to Swicegood Road (SR 1155). NC 150 is proposed to be four-lane divided major thoroughfare from the Winston Salem MPO to Tyro Road (SR 1115) and a three-lane major thoroughfare with center left-turn lane from 0.1 miles north of Swicegood Road (SR 1155) to Swicegood Road (SR 1155).

Swicegood Road (SR 1155) provides a more direct connection from the community of Tyro to I85/US 29-52-70. NC 150 should be rerouted onto Swicegood Road (SR 1155) from Tyro to NC 150 near I-85/US 29-52-70. Existing NC 150 from Tyro to Swicegood Road (SR 1155) near I85/US 29-52-70 should be redesignated as a secondary route. As development occurs along this corridor, every effort should be made to limit access in order to maintain mobility and connectivity.

## Hargrave Road (SR 1224), Local ID DAVID0025-H

Hargrave Road (SR 1224) from Hargrave Lane (SR 3165) to I-85 is projected to be over capacity by 2035. The primary purpose of improving Hargrave Road (SR 1224) is to relieve
congestion on the existing facility such that a minimum of Level of Service (LOS) D can be achieved.

By 2035 the facility is projected to be over capacity based providing a LOS D. Traffic on Hargrave Road (SR 1224) is projected to increase from 11,000 vehicles per day (vpd) in 2009 to 16,800 vpd in 2035 , compared to an overall capacity of $13,800 \mathrm{vpd}$.

The proposed project (Local ID DAVID0025-H) is to convert the existing two-lane major thoroughfare to a three-lane minor thoroughfare with center left-turn lane from Hargrave Lane (SR 3165) to l-85.

The proposed improvements to Hargrave Road (SR 1224) will help to reduce congestion in Lexington near the Davidson County Airport.

## Southwestern Connector Extension, Local ID DAVID0040-H

Connectivity between west and south Lexington is currently limited to Main Street (SR 3346) and Cotton Grove Road (NC 8). The primary purpose of this project is to provide connectivity between east and south Lexington and to provide access to existing and future shopping areas on and around Plaza Parkway.

The proposed project (DAVID0040-H) is to construct a new two-lane minor thoroughfare on a four lane right-of-way from the termini of the proposed Southwestern Connector at Fairview Drive (SR 2212) to Plaza Parkway.

## Minor Widening Improvements

The following routes do not have capacity issues, but are recommended to be upgraded to two 12-foot lanes with 2 -foot paved shoulders.

- R-2300 AB/AA: NC 8 - From Rothrock Rd (SR 2412) to NC 49
- DAVID0005-H: NC 47 - From Shiptontown Rd (SR 2310) to Yates Rd (SR 2347)
- DAVID0008-H: NC 109 - From NC 47 to Klopman Mill Rd (SR 2559) [Three 12-foot lanes]
- DAVID0009-H: NC 109 - From Klopman Mill Rd (SR 2559) to NC 49
- DAVID0011-H: NC 150 - From Swicegood Rd (SR 1155) to Old Salisbury Rd (SR 1147)
- DAVID0013-H: Allred Road (SR 2248) - From Raleigh Road (SR 2205) to NC 47
- DAVID0014-H: Badin Lake Rd (SR 2554) - From NC 49 to Montgomery County
- DAVID0015-H: Becks Church Road (SR 2250) - From Raleigh Road (SR 2205) to NC 47
- DAVID0016-H: Becky Hill Rd (SR 1435) - From Yadkin College Rd (SR 1194) to NC 150
- DAVID0017-H: Belmont Road (SR 3159) - From Interstate 85 to NC 47
- DAVID0018-H: Brown Street (SR 1254) - Old Linwood Rd (SR 1104) - NC 8
- DAVID0020-H: East Center Street (SR 1243) - From Lexington City Limits to Raleigh Road (SR 2205)
- DAVID0021-H: County School Road (SR 2783) - From US 64 to East Holly Grove Road (SR 2010)
- DAVID0022-H: Denton Rd (SR 1002) - From NC 8 to High Rock Rd (SR 2507)
- DAVID0023-H: Flat Swamp Rd (SR 2351) - From NC 8 to 0.2 miles west of Buie Rd (SR 2350)
- DAVID0024-H: Happy Hill Road (SR 1231) - From NC 150 to US 64
- DAVID0026-H: Helmstetler Road (SR 1205) - From Old US 64 (SR 1192) to Mount Carmel Road (SR 1305)
- DAVID0027-H: High Rock Rd (SR 2507) - From Denton Rd (SR 1002) to S. Snyder St
- DAVID0028-H:

Hill Everhart Road (SR 1842) - From City Lake Road (SR 1841) to Greensboro Road Extension (SR 1844)

- DAVID0029-H: East Holly Grove Road (SR 2010) - From US 64 to Interstate 85
- DAVID0030-H: Hoover Rd (SR 1468) - From NC 150 to Arnold Rd (SR 1453)
- DAVID0031-H: John Young Road (SR 2246) - From Becks Church Road (SR 2250) to Allred Road (SR 2248)
- DAVID0032-H: Koontz Rd (SR 1186) - From Yadkin College Rd (SR 1194) to US 64
- DAVID0034-H: Michael Road (SR 1215) - From NC 150 to Old Salisbury Road (SR 1147)
- DAVID0035-H: Mount Carmel Church Road (SR 1220) - From Helmstetler Road (SR 1205) to Tyro Road (SR 1213)
- DAVID0036-H: Old Hargrave Road (SR 1222) - From Old Salisbury Road (SR 1147) to Green Needles Road (SR 1297)
- DAVID0038-H: Pine Ridge Road (SR 1454) - From Arnold Road (SR 1457) to West Center Street Extension (SR 1242)
- DAVID0039-H: Rowe Road (SR 1425) - From West Center Street Extension (SR 1242) to US 64
- DAVID0041-H: S Snyder St - From High Rock Rd (SR 2507) to W Salisbury St (SR 2351)
- DAVID0042-H: Turner Road (SR 2005) - From the High Point MPO planning area to East Holly Grove Road (SR 2010)
- DAVID0043-H: Yadkin College Rd (SR 1194) - From Koontz Rd (SR 1186) to Becky Hill Rd (SR 1435)


## PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION \& RAIL

The Piedmont Authority for Regional Transportation (PART) operates two bus routes into Lexington. The Davidson County US 52 Express Route, which runs from Winston Salem on US 52 to Lexington, has 2 stops and 2 Park-and-Ride Lots. The Davidson County Business 85 Express Route, which runs from High Point on Business I-85/US 29-70, has 2 stops and 2 Park-and-Ride Lots.

- North Lexington Park-and-Ride Lot on US 64 behind Rite-Aid
- South Lexington Park-and-Ride Lot on Hargrave Road (SR 1224) near the Davidson County Airport

Lexington PART Circular Routes - The Davidson County Regional Transit Development Plan recommends that a fixed-route bus service route be developed through the Davidson County Transportation System. Two fixed bus routes are recommended to circulate throughout Lexington. The first route will connect northern Lexington to southwest Lexington and Lexington Memorial Hospital. The plan includes a recommended Park-and-Ride Lot near the Business I85/US 64 Interchange. The second route will connect northwest Lexington and the existing northern Lexington Park-and-Ride Lot to southern Lexington. These new routes will also connect to the recommended intermodal connector on South Pugh Street, near the proposed high-speed rail corridor station. It is further recommended that a Park-and-Ride Lot be constructed near the proposed intermodal connector.

The CTP process also identified a potential location for a park and ride lot in Denton on NC 109 at NC 47. This location has been identified to service as a carpool/vanpool meeting point for commutes to different metropolitan areas outside Denton. The final location would be subject to agreements with property owners, etc.

Amtrak Rail Stop - It is recommended that a train stop be constructed at South Railroad Street along the existing Amtrak route and recommended High-Speed Rail Corridor.

## BICYCLE

The 2009 Davidson County Greenway Master Plan has identified recommended greenways for bicycles and pedestrians throughout the county. These features are shown on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Maps as recommended multi-use paths.

While there is no state designated bicycle route in Davidson County, the Piedmont Triad Rural Planning Organization has identified seven county bicycle routes throughout the county as well as connector routes. The Uwharrie National Forest also contains several bicycle trails in and around the forest boundaries.

On-road bicycle facilities that have been identified as needing improvement as well as recommended multi-use paths are shown in the Bicycle Map.

In accordance with American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), roadways identified as bicycle routes should incorporate the following standards as roadway improvements are made and funding is available:

- Curb \& gutter sections require at minimum 4-ft bike lanes or 14 - ft wide outside lanes.
- Shoulder sections require a minimum 4-ft paved shoulder.
- All bridges along roadways where bike facilities are recommended shall be equipped with 54 " railings.

The 2009 Davidson County Greenway Master Plan identifies recommended greenways for bicycles and pedestrians throughout the county. These are shown on the Pedestrian Map as recommended multi-use paths.

## PEDESTRIAN

The Piedmont Triad Rural Planning Organization completed a sidewalk inventory for the municipalities of Davidson County. These features are shown on the Pedestrian Map as existing sidewalks or sidewalks that need improvement.

The following facilities in Lexington are recommended to have sidewalks for pedestrians:

- DAVID0003-H: NC 8 (Cotton Grove Road), from Federal Street to Plaza Parkway
- DAVID0001-P: NC 8 (Raleigh Road), from North Pugh Street to NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard)
- DAVID0003-H: NC 8 (Talbert Boulevard), from NC 8 (Raleigh Road) to NC 8 (Cotton

Grove Road)

- DAVID0002-P: East 5th Avenue from South Railroad Street to South Salisbury Street
- DAVID0004-P: East 7th Avenue from South Salisbury Street to South Talbert Blvd
- DAVID0005-P: East 8th Avenue from South Salisbury Street to South Salisbury Street
- DAVID0006-P: West 4th Avenue from South State Street to South Main Street (SR 3346) and from Park Street to 0.05 miles north of South Hargrave Street
- DAVID0007-P: West 5th Avenue (SR 1192) from Business I-85/US 29-70 to 0.07 miles west of Glenwood Drive
- DAVID0009-P: West 9th Avenue from South State Street to 0.05 miles north of South Main Street (SR 3346)
- DAVID0012-P: East 4th Street from North Salisbury Street to North Pugh Street and from Conner Street to North Church Street
- DAVID0013-P: East 5th Street from North Salisbury Street to Raleigh Road (SR 2205)
- DAVID0014-P: West 3rd Street from Greensboro Street to North Main Street (SR 3346)
- DAVID0015-P: West 6th Street from Greensboro Street to North Main Street (SR 3346)
- DAVID0016-P: West 9th Street from Hames Street to Old Winston Road (NC 8)
- DAVID0018-P: West Center Street (SR 1243) from Burler Street to 0.5 miles east of Market Street
- DAVID0021-P: Cornelia Street from Talbert Blvd (Existing NC 8) to 0.05 miles east of Talbert Blvd
- DAVID0024-P: Fairview Drive (SR 2212) from East Center Street (SR 1243) to NC 8
- DAVID0025-P: South Ford Street from 0.05 miles south of West 6th Avenue to West 7th Avenue and from West 4th Avenue to West 5th Avenue
- DAVID0026-P: Greensboro Street from West 4th Street to West 1st Street
- DAVID0027-P: South Hargrave Street from West 6th Avenue to West 7th Avenue
- DAVID0028-P: West Holly Grove Road (SR 2203) from Raleigh Road (SR 2205) to Edgewood Drive
- DAVID0029-P: Marble Alley from Center Street (SR 1243) to East 3rd Avenue
- DAVID0030-P: Old Linwood Road (SR 1104) from Cotton Grove Road (NC 8) to Mendota Avenue
- DAVID0031-P: South Payne Street from West 2nd Avenue to West 3rd Avenue
- DAVID0032-P: Plaza Parkway from Southwestern Connector Extension to NC 8
- DAVID0033-P: North Pugh Street from East 5th Street to Raleigh Road
- DAVID0034-P: South Pugh Street from Center Street (SR 1243) to East 1st Avenue
- DAVID0035-P: South Railroad Street from East 2nd Avenue to East 3rd Avenue
- DAVID0036-P: Raleigh Road (SR 2205) from North Pugh Street to East 5th Street
- DAVID0038-P:
- DAVID0039-P:
- DAVID0040-P:
- DAVID0041-P:

North Salisbury Street from Hopedale Street to East 4th Street South Salisbury Street from East 4th Avenue to East 5th Avenue Southbound Street from West 5th Avenue (SR 1192) to West 6th Avenue South State Street from West 4th Avenue to West 9th Avenue

The following facilities in Denton are recommended to have sidewalks for pedestrians.

- DAVID0043-P: NC 47, from Denton Town Limits to Salisbury Street (SR 2351)
- DAVID0005-H: NC 47-109, from NC 109 to Forest Drive
- R-4734: NC 109, from Denton Town Limits to NC 47
- DAVID0044-P: 1st Street, from NC 47 to North Main Street (SR 2414)
- DAVID0045-P: 4th Street, from NC 47 to Broad Street
- DAVID0046-P: Broad Street, from NC 47 (Salisbury Street) to 4th Street
- DAVID0047-P: Carroll Avenue, from Varner Street to NC 109
- DAVID0023-H: High Rock Road (SR 2507), from South Snider Street to Peacock Avenue (SR 1002)
- DAVID0048-P: North Main Street (SR 2414), from 4th Street to 3rd Street
- DAVID0050-P: Meadowdale Drive (part off-road facility), from Old Camp Road (SR 2437) to NC 47
- DAVID0051-P: Old Camp Road (SR 2437), from Meadowdale Drive to Salisbury Street (SR 2351)
- DAVID0052-P: Peacock Avenue (SR 1002), from High Rock Road (SR 2507) to NC 109
- DAVID0053-P: Salisbury Street (SR 2351), from Old Camp Road (SR 2437) to Hulin Street
- DAVID0036-H: South Snider Street, from Salisbury Street (SR 2351) to High Rock Road (SR 2507)
- DAVID0054-P: Varner Street, from NC 47 to Carroll Avenue

The following facilities in the Tyro Community are recommended to have sidewalks for pedestrians:

- DAVID0007-H: NC 150, from Giles Road (SR 1183) to Swicegood Road (SR 1155)
- DAVID0055-P: Dragon Drive (SR 3139), from Michael Road (SR 1215) to West Davidson High School
- DAVID0056-P: Michael Road (SR 1215), from NC 150 to Dragon Drive (SR 3139)
- DAVID0057-P: Tyro School Road (SR 1180), from NC 150 to West Davidson Library

The following facility in the Welcome Community is recommended to have sidewalks for pedestrians:

- DAVID0033-H: Old US 52, from Critcher Drive (SR 1564) to Welcome-Bethesda Road (SR 1464)

The 2009 Davidson County Greenway Master Plan identifies recommended greenways for bicycles and pedestrians throughout the county. These are shown on the Pedestrian Map as recommended multi-use paths.


## Appendix A Resources and Contacts

## North Carolina Department of Transportation

## Customer Service Office

Contact information for other units within the NCDOT that are not listed in this appendix is available by calling the Customer Service Office or by visiting the NCDOT homepage:
1-877-DOT-4YOU

$$
(1-877-368-4968)
$$

https://apps.dot.state.nc.us/dot/directory/authenticated/ToC.aspx

## Secretary of Transportation

Eugene A. Conti, Jr., Ph.D.
1501 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1501
(919) 733-2520
gconti@ncdot.gov
http://www.ncdot.org/about/leadership/secretary.html

## Board of Transportation Member

Mr. Ralph Womble
635 North Trade Street
Winston Salem, NC 27101
(336) 777-3876
rwomble@ncdot.gov
http://www.ncdot.gov/about/board/default.html

## Highway Division Engineer

Contact the Division Engineer with general questions concerning NCDOT activities within each Division and for information on Small Urban Funds.
Mr. Pat Ivey, PE
375 Silas Creek Parkway
Winston Salem, NC 27127
(336) 703-6500
pivey@ncdot.gov
http://www.ncdot.gov/doh/operations/division9/

## Division Project Manager

Contact the Division Project Manager with questions concerning transportation projects within each Division.
Mr. Brett Abernathy, PE, PLS
375 Silas Creek Parkway
Winston Salem, NC 27127
(336) 703-6500
ibabernathy@ncdot.gov

## Division Construction Engineer

Contact the Division Construction Engineer for information concerning major roadway improvements under construction.
Mr. Keith E. Raulston, PE
375 Silas Creek Parkway
Winston Salem, NC 27127
(336) 703-6500
kraulson@ncdot.gov

## Division Traffic Engineer

Contact the Division Traffic Engineer for information concerning traffic signals, highway signs, pavement markings and crash history.
Mr. J. P. Couch, PE 375 Silas Creek Parkway
Winston Salem, NC 27127
(336) 703-6500
ipcouch@ncdot.gov

## Division Operations Engineer

Contact the Division Operations Engineer for information concerning facility operations.
Mr. Mike Shaffner, PE 375 Silas Creek Parkway
Winston Salem, NC 27127
(336) 703-6500
mshaffner@ncdot.gov

## Division Maintenance Engineer

Contact the Division Maintenance Engineer information regarding maintenance of all state roadways, improvement of secondary roads and other small improvement projects. The Division Maintenance Engineer also oversees the District Offices, the Bridge Maintenance Unit and the Equipment Unit.

Mr. David W. Spainhour, PE
375 Silas Creek Parkway
Winston Salem, NC 27127
(336) 703-6500
dspainhour@ncdot.gov

## District Engineer

Contact the District Engineer for information on outdoor advertising, junkyard control, driveway permits, road additions, subdivision review and approval, Adopt A Highway program, encroachments on highway right of way, issuance of oversize/overwidth permits, paving priorities, secondary road construction program and road maintenance.
Mr. Chris T. Corriher, PE
4770 South Main Street
Salisbury, NC 28147
(704) 639-7560
ccorriher@ncdot.gov

## Transportation Planning Branch (TPB)

Contact the Transportation Planning Branch for information on long-range multi-modal planning services, including Strategic Highway Corridors.
1554 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1554
(919) 707-0900
http://www.ncdot.gov/doh/preconstruct/tpb/

## Piedmont Triad Rural Planning Organization (RPO)

Contact the RPO for information on long-range multi-modal planning services.
Ms. Hanna Cockburn, AICP
2216 West Meadowview Rd, Suite 201
Greensboro, NC 27407-3480
(336) 294-4950
hcockburn@ptcog.org

## Strategic Planning Office

Contact the Strategic Planning Office for information concerning prioritization of transportation projects.
Mr. Don Voelker
1501 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1501
(919) 715-0951
djvoelker@ncdot.gov
https://apps.dot.state.nc.us/dot/directory/authenticated/UnitPage.aspx?id=11054

## Project Development \& Environmental Branch (PDEA)

Contact PDEA for information on environmental studies for projects that are included in the TIP.

1548 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1548
(919) 707-6000
http://www.ncdot.gov/doh/preconstruct/pe/

## Secondary Roads Office

Contact the Secondary Roads Office for information regarding the status for unpaved roads to be paved, additions and deletions of roads to the State maintained system and the Industrial Access Funds program.

1535 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1535
(919) 733-3250
http://www.ncdot.gov/doh/operations/secondaryroads/

## Program Development Branch

Contact the Program Development Branch for information concerning Roadway Official Corridor Maps, Feasibility Studies and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
1534 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1534
(919) 733-2039
http://www.ncdot.org/planning/development/

## Public Transportation Division

Contact the Public Transportation Division for information public transit systems.
1550 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1550
(919) 733-4713
http://www.ncdot.org/transit/nctransit/

## Rail Division

Contact the Rail Division for rail information throughout the state.
1553 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1553
(919) 733-7245
http://www.bytrain.org/

## Division of Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation

Contact this Division for bicycle and pedestrian transportation information throughout the state.

1552 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1552
(919) 707-2600
http://www.ncdot.gov/transit/bicycle/

## Bridge Maintenance Unit

Contact the Bridge Maintenance Unit for information on bridge management throughout the state.
1565 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1565
(919) 733-4362
http://www.ncdot.gov/doh/operations/dp chief eng/maintenance/bridge/

## Highway Design Branch

The Highway Design Branch consists of the Roadway Design, Structure Design, Photogrammetry, Location \& Surveys, Geotechnical, and Hydraulics Units. Contact the Highway Design Branch for information regarding design plans and proposals for road and bridge projects throughout the state.
1584 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1584
(919) 250-4001
http://www.ncdot.gov/doh/preconstruct/highway/

## Other State Government Offices

## Department of Commerce - Division of Community Assistance

Contact the Department of Commerce for resources and services to help realize economic prosperity, plan for new growth and address community needs.
http://www.nccommerce.com/en/CommunityServices/

## Appendix B <br> Comprehensive Transportation Plan Definitions

## Highway Map

For visual depiction of facility types for the following CTP classification, visit http://www.ncdot.gov/doh/preconstruct/tpb/SHC/facility/.

## Facility Type Definitions

- Freeways
- Functional purpose - high mobility, high volume, high speed
- Posted speed - 55 mph or greater
- Cross section - minimum four lanes with continuous median
- Multi-modal elements - High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV)/High Occupancy Transit (HOT) lanes, busways, truck lanes, park-and-ride facilities at/near interchanges, adjacent shared use paths (separate from roadway and outside ROW)
- Type of access control - full control of access
- Access management - interchange spacing (urban - one mile; non-urban - three miles); at interchanges on the intersecting roadway, full control of access for $1,000 \mathrm{ft}$ or for 350 ft plus 650 ft island or median; use of frontage roads, rear service roads
- Intersecting facilities - interchange or grade separation (no signals or at-grade intersections)
- Driveways - not allowed
- Expressways
- Functional purpose - high mobility, high volume, medium-high speed
- Posted speed - 45 to 60 mph
- Cross section - minimum four lanes with median
- Multi-modal elements - HOV lanes, busways, very wide paved shoulders (rural), shared use paths (separate from roadway but within ROW)
- Type of access control - limited or partial control of access;
- Access management - minimum interchange/intersection spacing 2,000ft; median breaks only at intersections with minor roadways or to permit U-turns; use of frontage roads, rear service roads; driveways limited in location and number; use of acceleration/deceleration or right turning lanes
- Intersecting facilities - interchange; at-grade intersection for minor roadways; right-in/right-out and/or left-over or grade separation (no signalization for through traffic)
- Driveways - right-in/right-out only; direct driveway access via service roads or other alternate connections
- Boulevards
- Functional purpose - moderate mobility; moderate access, moderate volume, medium speed
- Posted speed - 30 to 55 mph
- Cross section - two or more lanes with median (median breaks allowed for Uturns per current NCDOT Driveway Manual
- Multi-modal elements - bus stops, bike lanes (urban) or wide paved shoulders (rural), sidewalks (urban - local government option)
- Type of access control - limited control of access, partial control of access, or no control of access
- Access management - two lane facilities may have medians with crossovers, medians with turning pockets or turning lanes; use of acceleration/deceleration or right turning lanes is optional; for abutting properties, use of shared driveways, internal out parcel access and cross-connectivity between adjacent properties is strongly encouraged
- Intersecting facilities - at grade intersections and driveways; interchanges at special locations with high volumes
- Driveways - primarily right-in/right-out, some right-in/right-out in combination with median leftovers; major driveways may be full movement when access is not possible using an alternate roadway
- Other Major Thoroughfares
- Functional purpose - balanced mobility and access, moderate volume, low to medium speed
- Posted speed - 25 to 55 mph
- Cross section - four or more lanes without median (US and NC routes may have less than four lanes)
- Multi-modal elements - bus stops, bike lanes/wide outer lane (urban) or wide paved shoulder (rural), sidewalks (urban)
- Type of access control - no control of access
- Access management - continuous left turn lanes; for abutting properties, use of shared driveways, internal out parcel access and cross-connectivity between adjacent properties is strongly encouraged
- Intersecting facilities - intersections and driveways
- Driveways - full movement on two lane roadway with center turn lane as permitted by the current NCDOT Driveway Manual


## - Minor Thoroughfares

- Functional purpose - balanced mobility and access, moderate volume, low to medium speed
- Posted speed - 25 to 55 mph
- Cross section - ultimately three lanes (no more than one lane per direction) or less without median
- Multi-modal elements - bus stops, bike lanes/wide outer lane (urban) or wide paved shoulder (rural), sidewalks (urban)
- ROW - no control of access
- Access management - continuous left turn lanes; for abutting properties, use of shared driveways, internal out parcel access and cross-connectivity between adjacent properties is strongly encouraged
- Intersecting facilities - intersections and driveways
- Driveways - full movement on two lane with center turn lane as permitted by the current NCDOT Driveway Manual


## Other Highway Map Definitions

- Existing - Roadway facilities that are not recommended to be improved.
- Needs Improvement - Roadway facilities that need to be improved for capacity, safety, or system continuity. The improvement to the facility may be widening, other operational strategies, increasing the level of access control along the facility, or a combination of improvements and strategies. "Needs improvement" does not refer to the maintenance needs of existing facilities.
- Recommended - Roadway facilities on new location that are needed in the future.
- Interchange - Through movement on intersecting roads is separated by a structure. Turning movement area accommodated by on/off ramps and loops.
- Grade Separation - Through movement on intersecting roads is separated by a structure. There is no direct access between the facilities.
- Full Control of Access - Connections to a facility provided only via ramps at interchanges. No private driveway connections allowed.
- Limited Control of Access - Connections to a facility provided only via ramps at interchanges (major crossings) and at-grade intersections (minor crossings and service roads). No private driveway connections allowed.
- Partial Control of Access - Connections to a facility provided via ramps at interchanges, at-grade intersections, and private driveways. Private driveway connections shall be defined as a maximum of one connection per parcel. One connection is defined as one ingress and one egress point. These may be combined to form a two-way driveway (most common) or separated to allow for better traffic flow through the parcel. The use of shared or consolidated connections is highly encouraged.
- No Control of Access - Connections to a facility provided via ramps at interchanges, at-grade intersections, and private driveways.


## Public Transportation and Rail Map

- Bus Routes - The primary fixed route bus system for the area. Does not include demand response systems.
- Fixed Guideway - Any transit service that uses exclusive or controlled rights-of-way or rails, entirely or in part. The term includes heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, monorail, trolleybus, aerial tramway, included plane, cable car, automated guideway transit, and ferryboats.
- Operational Strategies - Plans geared toward the non-single occupant vehicle. This includes but is not limited to HOV lanes or express bus service.
- Rail Corridor - Locations of railroad tracks that are either active or inactive tracks. These tracks were used for either freight or passenger service.
- Active - rail service is currently provided in the corridor; may include freight and/or passenger service
- Inactive - right of way exists; however, there is no service currently provided; tracks may or may not exist
- Recommended - It is desirable for future rail to be considered to serve an area.
- High Speed Rail Corridor - Corridor designated by the U.S. Department of Transportation as a potential high speed rail corridor.
- Existing - Corridor where high speed rail service is provided (there are currently no existing high speed corridor in North Carolina).
- Recommended - Proposed corridor for high speed rail service.
- Rail Stop - A railroad station or stop along the railroad tracks.
- Intermodal Connector - A location where more than one mode of transportation meet such as where light rail and a bus route come together in one location or a bus station.
- Park and Ride Lot - A strategically located parking lot that is free of charge to anyone who parks a vehicle and commutes by transit or in a carpool.
- Existing Grade Separation - Locations where existing rail facilities and are physically separated from existing highways or other transportation facilities. These may be bridges, culverts, or other structures.
- Proposed Grade Separation - Locations where rail facilities are recommended to be physically separated from existing or recommended highways or other transportation facilities. These may be bridges, culverts, or other structures.


## Bicycle Map

- On Road-Existing - Conditions for bicycling on the highway facility are adequate to safely accommodate cyclists.
- On Road-Needs Improvement - At the systems level, it is desirable for an existing highway facility to accommodate bicycle transportation; however, highway improvements are necessary to create safe travel conditions for the cyclists.
- On Road-Recommended - At the systems level, it is desirable for a recommended highway facility to accommodate bicycle transportation. The highway should be designed and built to safely accommodate cyclists.
- Off Road-Existing - A facility that accommodates only bicycle transportation and is physically separated from a highway facility either within the right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way.
- Off Road-Needs Improvement - A facility that accommodates only bicycle transportation and is physically separated from a highway facility either within the right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way that will not adequately serve future bicycle needs. Improvements may include but are not limited to, widening, paving (not re-paving or other maintenance activities), and improved horizontal or vertical alignment.
- Off Road-Recommended - A facility needed to accommodate only bicycle transportation and is physically separated from a highway facility either within the right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way.
- Multi-use Path-Existing - An existing facility physically separated from motor vehicle traffic that is either within the highway right-of-way or on an independent right-of-way that serves bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Sidewalks should not be designated as a multi-use path.
- Multi-use Path-Needs Improvement - An existing facility physically separated from motor vehicle traffic that is either within the highway right-of-way or on an independent right-of-way that serves bicycle and pedestrian traffic that will not adequately serve future needs. Improvements may include but are not limited to, widening, paving (not re-paving or other maintenance activities), and improved horizontal or vertical alignment. Sidewalks should not be designated as a multi-use path.
- Multi-use Path-Recommended - A facility physically separated from motor vehicle traffic that is either within the highway right-of-way or on an independent right-of-way that is needed to serve bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Sidewalks should not be designated as a multi-use path.
- Existing Grade Separation - Locations where existing "Off Road" facilities and "Multi-use Paths" are physically separated from existing highways, railroads, or other transportation facilities. These may be bridges, culverts, or other structures.
- Proposed Grade Separation - Locations where "Off Road" facilities and "Multi-use Paths" are recommended to be physically separated from existing or recommended highways, railroads, or other transportation facilities. These may be bridges, culverts, or other structures.


## Pedestrian Map

- Sidewalk-Existing - Paved paths (including but not limited to concrete, asphalt, brick, stone, or wood) on both sides of a highway facility and within the highway right-of-way that are adequate to safely accommodate pedestrian traffic.
- Sidewalk-Needs Improvement - Improvements are needed to provide paved paths on both sides of a highway facility. The highway facility may or may not need improvements. Improvements do not include re-paving or other maintenance activities but may include: filling in gaps, widening sidewalks, or meeting ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements.
- Sidewalk-Recommended - At the systems level, it is desirable for a recommended highway facility to accommodate pedestrian transportation or to add sidewalks on an existing facility where no sidewalks currently exist. The highway should be designed and built to safely accommodate pedestrian traffic.
- Off Road-Existing - A facility that accommodates only pedestrian traffic and is physically separated from a highway facility usually within an independent right-ofway.
- Off Road-Needs Improvement - A facility that accommodates only pedestrian traffic and is physically separated from a highway facility usually within an independent right-of-way that will not adequately serve future pedestrian needs. Improvements may include but are not limited to, widening, paving (not re-paving or other maintenance activities), improved horizontal or vertical alignment, and meeting ADA requirements.
- Off Road-Recommended - A facility needed to accommodate only pedestrian traffic and is physically separated from a highway facility usually within an independent right-of-way.
- Multi-use Path-Existing - An existing facility physically separated from motor vehicle traffic that is either within the highway right-of-way or on an independent right-of-way that serves bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Sidewalks should not be designated as a multi-use path.
- Multi-use Path-Needs Improvement - An existing facility physically separated from motor vehicle traffic that is either within the highway right-of-way or on an independent right-of-way that serves bicycle and pedestrian traffic that will not adequately serve future needs. Improvements may include but are not limited to, widening, paving (not re-paving or other maintenance activities), and improved horizontal or vertical alignment. Sidewalks should not be designated as a multi-use path.
- Multi-use Path-Recommended - A facility physically separated from motor vehicle traffic that is either within the highway right-of-way or on an independent right-of-way that is needed to serve bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Sidewalks should not be designated as a multi-use path.
- Existing Grade Separation - Locations where existing "Off Road" facilities and "Multi-use Paths" are physically separated from existing highways, railroads, or other transportation facilities. These may be bridges, culverts, or other structures.
- Proposed Grade Separation - Locations where "Off Road" facilities and "Multi-use Paths" are recommended to be physically separated from existing or recommended highways, railroads, or other transportation facilities. These may be bridges, culverts, or other structures.


## Appendix C CTP Inventory and Recommendations

## Assumptions/ Notes:

- Local ID: This Local ID is the same as the one used for the Prioritization Project Submittal Tool. If a TIP project number exists it is listed as the ID. Otherwise, the following system is used to create a code for each recommended improvement: the first 4 letters of the county name is combined with a 4 digit unique numerical code followed by '-H' for highway, '-T' for public transportation, '-R' for rail, '-B’ for bicycle, '-M' for multi-use paths, or '-P' for pedestrian modes. If a different code is used along a route it indicates separate projects will probably be requested. Also, upper case alphabetic characters (i.e. 'A', 'B', or 'C') are included after the numeric portion of the code if it is anticipated that project segmentation or phasing will be recommended.
- Jurisdiction: Jurisdictions listed are based on municipal limits, county boundaries, and MPO Metropolitan Planning Area Boundaries (MAB), as applicable.
- Existing Cross-Section: Listed under '(ft)' is the approximate width of the roadway from edge of pavement to edge of pavement. Listed under 'lanes' is the total number of lanes, with the letter ' $D$ ' if the facility is divided.
- Existing ROW: The estimated existing right-of-way is based on NCDOT Road Characteristics shapefile. These right-of-way amounts are approximate and may vary.
- Existing and Proposed Capacity: The estimated capacities are given in vehicles per day (vpd) based on LOS D for existing facilities and LOS C for new facilities. These capacity estimates were developed using the North Carolina Level of Service (NCLOS) Program, as documented in Chapter II.
- Existing and Proposed AADT (Annual Average Daily Traffic) volumes, given in vehicles per day (vpd), are estimates only based on a systems-level analysis. The ' 2035 AADT $\mathrm{E}+\mathrm{C}$ ' is an estimate of the volume in 2035 with only existing plus committed projects assumed to be in place, where committed is defined as projects programmed for construction in the 2009-15 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The '2035 AADT with CTP' is an estimate of the volume in 2035 with all proposed CTP improvements assumed to be in place. The '2035 AADT with CTP' is shown in bold if it exceeds the proposed capacity, indicating an unmet need. For additional information about the assumptions and techniques used to develop the AADT volume estimates, refer to Chapter II.
- Proposed Cross-section: The CTP recommended cross-sections are listed by code; for depiction of the cross-section, refer to Appendix D. An entry of 'ADQ' indicates the existing facility is adequate and there are no improvements recommended as part of the CTP.
- CTP Classification: The CTP classification is listed, as shown on the adopted CTP Maps (see Figure 1). Abbreviations are $\mathrm{F}=$ freeway, $\mathrm{E}=$ expressway, $\mathrm{B}=$ boulevard, $\mathrm{Maj}=$ other major thoroughfare, Min= minor thoroughfare.
- Tier: Tiers are defined as part of the North Carolina Mulitmodal Investment Network (NCMIN). Abbreviations are $\mathrm{Sta}=$ statewide tier, Reg= regional tier, Sub= subregional tier.
- Other Modes: If there is an improvement recommended for another mode of transportation that relates to the given recommendation, it is indicated by an alphabetic code ( $\mathrm{H}=$ highway, $\mathrm{T}=$ public transportation, $\mathrm{R}=$ rail, $\mathrm{B}=$ bicycle, and $\mathrm{P}=$ pedestrian).
DAVIDSON COUNTY CTP INVENTORY AND RECOMMENDATIONS





| HIGHWAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Section (From - To) | Jurisdiction | Dist. <br> (mi) | 2009 Existing System |  |  |  |  |  | 2035 Proposed System |  |  |  |  | CTP <br> Classification | Tier | Other <br> Modes |
|  |  |  |  |  | CrossSection |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { ROW } \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Speed } \\ \text { Limit } \\ (\mathrm{mph}) \end{gathered}$ | Existing Capacity (vpd) | $\begin{array}{r} 2009 \\ \text { AADT } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2035 \\ \text { AADT } \\ \text { No } \\ \text { Build } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2035 <br> AADT <br> with <br> CTP | Proposed Capacity (vpd) | Rec. CrossSection | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROW } \\ & (\mathrm{ft}) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Conrad Hill Mine Rd (SR 2229) | US 64 - Old US 64 (SR 2205) | Davidson County | 2.5 | 22 | 2 | - | 55 | 15500 | 1400 | 1700 | 1700 | 15500 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | County Home Rd (SR 2783) | Ward Curry Rd (SR 2783) - US 64 | Davidson County | 0.9 | 22 | 2 | - | 55 | 12000 | 1000 | 1500 | 1500 | 12000 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
| DAVID0021-H | County School Rd (SR 2783) | US 64 - E Holly Grove Rd (SR 2010) | Davidson County | 0.2 | 18 | 2 | - | 45 | 11900 | 2000 | 3100 | 3200 | 15800 | 2A | 60 | Min | Sub |  |
| DAVID0022-H | Denton Rd (SR 1002) | SR 2569 - NC 8 | Davidson County | 3.3 | 18 | 2 | - | 55 | 11900 | 1900 | 2600 | 2600 | 15800 | 2A | 60 | Min | Sub | B |
|  | Fairview $\operatorname{Dr}$ (SR 2212) | E Center St (SR 1243) - Talbert Blvd (Existing NC 8) | Davidson County | 0.4 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 13800 | 6700 | 8000 | 7400 | 13800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Fairview $\operatorname{Dr}$ (SR 2212) | Talbert Dr (Existing NC 8) - Proposed Southwestern Connector | Davidson County | 1.7 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 13800 | 13000 | 16500 | 15100 | 13800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub | T |
|  | Fairview Dr (SR 2212) | Proposed Southwestern Connector - NC 8 | Davidson County | 0.5 | 36 | 3 | - | 35 | 15800 | 12000 | 15500 | 10000 | 15800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub | T |
|  | Farmer Rd (SR 1001) | NC 109 - Harvard St (SR 2339) | Denton | 0.2 | 22 | 2 | - | 35 | 15500 | 2400 | 3500 | 3500 | 15500 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Farmer Rd (SR 1001) | Harvard St (SR 2339) - 0.14 miles east of Harvard St (SR 2339) | Denton | 0.1 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 15800 | 2400 | 3500 | 3500 | 15800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Farmer Rd (SR 1001) | 0.14 miles east of Havard St (SR 2339) Randolph County | Davidson County | 2.5 | 24 | 2 | - | 55 | 15800 | 2400 | 3200 | 3200 | 15800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0023-H | Flat Swamp Rd (SR 2351) | NC 8-0.2 miles west of Buie Rd (SR 2350) | Davidson County | 2.5 | 18 | 2 | - | 55 | 11900 | 1900 | 2500 | 2500 | 11900 | 2A | 60 | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Flat Swamp Rd (SR 2351) | 0.2 miles west of Buie Rd (SR 2350) - Denton St (SR 2437) | Davidson County | 1.3 | 22 | 2 | - | 35 | 13800 | 2800 | 3900 | 3900 | 13800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub | P |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Floyd Church Rd (SR 2304) | Holloway Ch Rd (SR 2294) - NC 8 | Davidson County | 3.3 | 24 | 2 | - | 55 | 13800 | 600 | 1100 | 1100 | 13800 | 2A | 60 | Min | Sub | B |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Forest Hill Rd (SR 1237) | W Center St Ext (SR 1242) - US 64 | Lexington | 0.5 | 18 | 2 | - | 35 | 11800 | 6500 | 9000 | 9000 | 11800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Forest Hill Rd (SR 1237) | US 64 - Old US 64 (SR 1192) | Lexington | 0.5 | 18 | 2 | - | 45 | 12200 | 4000 | 6500 | 6500 | 12200 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Green Needles Rd (SR 1297) | Old Hargrave Rd (SR 1222) - $1-285 /$ Bus 1-85/US $29-52-70$ | Lexington | 0.4 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 13800 | 1700 | 2200 | 1700 | 13800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Greensboro St Ext (SR 1844) | Bus 1-85/US 29-70-Ridge Rd (SR 1813) | Davidson County | 0.9 | 24 | 2 | - | 45 | 15300 | 4000 | 6400 | 5000 | 15300 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Greensboro St Ext (SR 1844) | Ridge Rd (SR 1813) - Hill Everhart Rd (SR 1842) | Davidson County | 1.4 | 24 | 2 | - | 45 | 15300 | 2500 | 3600 | 2700 | 15300 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Greensboro St Ext (SR 1844) | ```l}\begin{array}{l}{\mathrm{ Hill Everhard Rd (SR 1842) - Bus I-85/US 29-64-}}\\{70}``` | Lexington | 0.9 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 13800 | 2000 | 2600 | 2700 | 13800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0024-H | Happy Hill Rd (SR 1231) | NC $150-\mathrm{Rowe} \mathrm{Rd} \mathrm{(SR} \mathrm{1425)}$ | Davidson County | 1.7 | 18 | 2 | - | 55 | 11900 | 900 | 1100 | 1300 | 15800 | 2A | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
| DAVID0024-H | Happy Hill Rd (SR 1231) | Rowe Rd (SR 1425) - US 64 | Davidson County | 0.9 | 18 | 2 | - | 55 | 11900 | 1200 | 1400 | 1700 | 15800 | 2A | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Hargrave Ln (SR 3165) | Hargrave Rd (SR 3165) - I-285/Bus I-85/US 29- $52-70$ | Lexington | 0.2 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 13800 | 6100 | 9600 | 7900 | 13800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0025-H | Hargrave Rd (SR 1224) | 1-85- Hargrave Ln (SR 3165) | Lexington | 0.2 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 13800 | 11000 | 16800 | 15400 | 18500 | 3A | 80 | Min | Sub |  |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 9ns | ！eW | OOV | OOV | 008G1 | 000t | 0082 | 008t | 00 gLZ | ¢ 9 | 0S1 | t 8t | 2＇0 | Kıunoう uosp！nea |  | OSL ON／0L－62 Sn PIo |  |
|  | qns | u！w | OOV | OOV | 008G | 008S | 000t | 00L2 | 008S | GS | － | 己 ヵて | $0 \cdot 1$ | Kıunoう uospinea | OGI ON－（G6Z）¢S）py yıe｜， | （LtLl ys）py Kınqs！ıles pio |  |
|  | ans | u！w | OQV | OOV | 008S | 0089 | 0009 | 0022 | 008S1 | ¢ 9 | － | 乙 ヵて | て＇1 | Kıunoう uospinea |  | （Ltトl ys）py Kanqs！ıles pio |  |
|  | ans | u！w | OQV | OOV | 008S | 001t | 009ع | 00Lz | 008G1 | ¢s | － | 乙 ヵट | s．1 | Kıunoう uospııеа |  | （LtトL ys）py Kanqs！ıles pio |  |
|  | ans | U！W | OOV | OOV | 0089 | 000S | 006t | 009 $\varepsilon$ | 008S | Gs | － | て †て | 0 ＇ 2 | иотби！хәา |  | （LtIL ys）py Kınqs！ıles pio |  |
|  | ans | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 008S | 008tr | 002ロト | 00001 | 008S | ¢9 | － | て 㲸 | z＇0 | иотби！хәา |  | （LtレL ys）py Kanqs！ıles pio |  |
|  | qns | u！${ }^{\text {N }}$ | OOV | OOV | 008G | 00091 | 00\＆カト | OOSL1 | 008G1 | GG | － | 乙 †乙 | g＇0 | ио¢6иххә7 |  | （LtIL ys）py Kınqs！les pio |  |
|  | qns | u！${ }^{\text {N }}$ | OOV | OOV | 008S | 00091 | 00991 | 00021 | 008S | GS | － | 乙 ヵて | ع＇0 | иот6иххә7 |  | （Ltrl ys）py kinqs！les pio |  |
| 1 | qns | u！w | OOV | OOV | 00918 | 000 21 | 00991 | 000Z | 00918 | GG | 001 | 乙 †乙 | ع＇0 | ио¢би！хә7 |  | （LtIL yS）py Kınqs！！es PIO |  |
|  | ans | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 008S | 002ヵ | 009ع | 000E | 008G | ¢G | 09 | 乙 ટ乙 | $0^{\circ} \mathrm{Z}$ | иоүби！хә7 | $\angle \downarrow$ ON－（992）¢SS）py suemo | （toll ys）py poomu！pio |  |
|  | qns | u！w | OOV | OOV | 008G | $00 \angle 9$ | 009t | 000t | 008S | ¢ 9 | 09 | 乙 こ乙 | 10 | иотби！хә7 | （992）ys）py suәмо－98－1 | （toll as）py poomu！PIO |  |
|  | ans | u！w | OQV | OQ＊ | 00\＆s | $00 \angle 9$ | 009t | 00\＆t | 008G1 | Gs | 09 | 乙 ટ乙 | 9.0 |  | 98－1－（tGZL पS）is umora | （toll ys）py poomu！pio |  |
|  | qns | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 00\＆S | 00GL | 0098 | 002E | 00\＆S | St | － | 乙 乙乙 | ع＇0 | иот6иххә7 |  | （tOLL ¢S）py poomu！ PIO |  |
|  | qns | u！ | OOV | OOV | 00\＆S | $00 \varepsilon \varepsilon$ | 008t | 00tt | 00ES | St | － | 乙 乙乙 | L＇0 | ио¢иㅣхว |  | （tOLL ¢S）py poomu！P PIO |  |
|  | qns | u！w | OQV | OQV | 008\＆1 | $009 \varepsilon$ | 00zs | 008 $\dagger$ | 008\＆ | ¢ $\varepsilon$ | － | 乙 ટ乙 | t＇0 |  |  | （toll ys）py poomu！pio |  |
|  | qns | u！ | OOV | OOV | 008\＆ | 00६z | 00ヶて | 0061 | 008\＆ | ¢ $\varepsilon$ | － | 乙 ટ乙 | 1＇t |  |  | （zzz）ys）py әледблен PIo |  |
|  | qns | u！${ }^{\text {W }}$ | OOV | $\forall Z$ | 008G | 00S2 | $00 \varepsilon \varepsilon$ | 0092 | 008E1 | ¢ $\varepsilon$ | － | 乙 0Z | ع\％0 | ио¢6и！ 1 ¢7 |  | （zž）¢ ¢S）ру әлелблен PIO | H－9800aıı $\quad$ a |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | qns | u！ W | OOV | $\forall Z$ | 008G | 00GZ | 0092 | 0002 | 008\＆ | Gs | － | 乙 0乙 | 9＇1 | Kıunoう uospinea |  |  | H－G8000ıı $\quad$ a |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9ns | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 00021 | 0081 | 0061 | 00ヶ1 | 008\＆1 | S9 | 09 | Z OZ | でト | Kıunoう uosp！nea |  | （S08L ys）py paure in |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9nS | U！W | 09 | $\forall Z$ | 008G1 | 0029 | 00＜$\downarrow$ | $009 \varepsilon$ | 00611 | Gs | － | 281 | $1 \cdot \varepsilon$ | Kıunoう uosplnea |  |  | H －tع00aı $\wedge \forall a$ |
| $\perp$ | qns | 9 | OOV | OOV | $0018 \varepsilon$ | 00¢¢Z | 00092 | 00091 | $0018 \varepsilon$ | ¢ $\varepsilon$ | 002 | † 8t | L＇0 |  |  | （9t\＆ys）is uiew S |  |
| 1 | 9nS | 9 | 01t | Ot | $0018 \varepsilon$ | 00802 | 008t2 | 000ヶt | 008E1 | ¢ | 09 | 乙 tて | 10 |  |  | （9t\＆ 4 yS ）is uliew S | H－\＆800alı ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 1 | 9nS | 9 | 01t | Ot | $0018 \varepsilon$ | 009Z2 | 0099z | 008 21 | 008G1 | ¢ | 09 | ع 98 | $1 \cdot 1$ |  |  | （9t\＆ $\mathrm{yS}^{\text {S }}$ ）is uliew S | H－\＆800alı ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 1 | qns | ！ew | OOV | OOV | 00g $\angle 2$ | 00 St L | 002\＆Z | 000 21 | 00GLZ | ¢ $\varepsilon$ | 09 | t 8t | 9＇0 | ио¢6иихج7 |  | （9t\＆ $\mathrm{yS}^{\text {g }}$ is uliew S |  |
| 1 | 9ns | ！ew | OOV | OOV | 00gzz | 00¢S1 | 009St | 00011 | 00gzz | 02 | 09 | $\checkmark$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | ${ }^{\circ} 0$ |  | （Z6） | （9t\＆ys）is uilew S |  |
|  | 1ə！$\perp$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { uo!̣eo } \\ -!!!s e \mid כ \\ \text { dıO } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (H) } \\ \text { MOU } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { uo!pos } \\ \text {-ssouj } \\ \text {-כәy } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { pInng } \\ \text { on } \\ \hline 0 \forall \forall \\ \text { sعoz } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 10 \forall \forall \\ 600 Z \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (4dw) } \\ & \text { lum } \\ & \text { pəods } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { (H) } \\ \mathrm{MOY} \end{array}$ | souel（H） <br> uo！pos <br> －ssorj | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} (!\mathrm{U}) \\ 7 \mathrm{i}!\mathrm{a} \end{array}\right\|$ | uо！p！psunn |  | K！！！ | al |
|  |  |  |  | แә引s／ | S pesodold | d seoz |  |  | mpts＾S | Sulis！ | 36002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 人 $\forall$ | MH5 |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | qns | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 008Sト | 001t | 00\＆t | 000E | 00\＆G1 | St | － | 乙 七乙 | で0 | Kıunoう uоsp！леа |  | （ $\varepsilon$ L8L ¢S）py әбр！ |  |
|  | qns | U！W | OOV | OGV | 008¢1 | 0081 | 0081 | 0021 | 008¢1 | St | － | こ $\begin{aligned} & \text { t乙 }\end{aligned}$ | $6{ }^{\circ}$ | Kıunoう uosp！＾e］ |  | （ع181 पS）py әбр！ |  |
| 9 | qns | U！W | 09 | $\forall Z$ | 008¢1 | 00ヶ¢ | 00tを | 00ع乙 | 008¢1 | S9 | － | こ $\downarrow$ 仡 | 0 －$\dagger$ | Kıunoう uosp！＾e］ |  | （ع181 पS）py әбp！y |  |
| 9 | qns | U！W | 09 | $\forall Z$ | 008G1 | 00tャ | 00tャ | 001E | 008G1 | SS | － | て $\downarrow$ ¢ | ع＇0 | Kıunoう uosp！＾е］ |  | （ع18L ¢S）py әбр！ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | qns | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 00021 | 0021 | 0021 | 001． | 00021 | GG | 09 | 乙 0乙 | $て ゙ 1$ | Kıunoo uosp！＾еа |  | （L८てZ पS）py sopouy |  |
|  | qns | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 00021 | 00ヶレ | 00ヶt | 0021 | 00021 | SS | 09 | 乙 02 | 1．1 | Kıunoう uоsp！лео |  | （L†てZ ४S）py səpoчч |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | qns | u！$W$ | OOV | OOV | 008G1 | 0006 | 0006 | 002L | 008G1 | GS | － | 乙 七乙 | ＋＇L | Kıunoう uosp！лед |  | （sozz ys）py ¢б゙！əpy |  |
|  | qns | u！W | OOV | OOV | 00281 | 00891 | 001－21 | 000E1 | 00281 | St | 09 | $\varepsilon$ 㲸 | で0 | Kıunoう uosp！＾e］ | （0szz ys）py younuo sxoəg－¢8－1 |  |  |
|  | qns | U！ 1 | OOV | OOV | 00281 | 00891 | 00181 | 00911． | 00281 | St | 09 |  | で0 | Kıunoう uosp！ле |  |  |  |
|  | qns | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 008S 1 | 0096 | 00801 | 0089 | 00EG1 | St | － | 乙 七乙 | 90 | Kıunoう uоsp！леа |  | （SOzz ys）py чб！！pey |  |
|  | qns | u！ W | OOV | OOV | 00\＆G1 | 00011 | 00021 | 0008 | 00\＆G1 | St | － | 乙 七乙 | to | রıunoo uosp！леа |  | （sozz ys）py чб！！əреу |  |
|  | qns | u！w | OOV | OOV | 008\＆1 | 008L1 | 00ZZ1 | 0098 | 008\＆1 | S $\varepsilon$ | － | 乙 $\dagger 乙$ | 6.0 | и0ı6и！$\times$ ¢7 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | qns | ！eW | OOV | OOV | 008G1 | 0008 | 0002 | 0009 | 008G1 | ¢ $\varepsilon$ | － | 乙 $\quad$ ¢ | S＇0 | и016и！${ }^{\text {a }}$ ， |  | Кемялеd ezeld |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | qns | u！ W | 09 | $\forall Z$ | 008G1 | 0091 | 0061 | 0021 | 00611 | ¢ 9 | － | 281 | 9．1 | Kıunoう uosp！лео |  |  | H－88000I＾$\forall$ O |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | qns | u！ W | 09 | $\forall Z$ | 008G1 | 0068 | 006\＆ | 0092 | 008G1 | GS | － | 乙 $\dagger$ ¢ | 9＇Z | Kıunoう uosp！леа |  | （toez ys）py syıxd |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | qns | U！W | 09 | OOV | 008E1 | 00Et | 00\＆t | 000E | 008\＆1 | GS | － | 202 | 9＇Z | Kıunoう uosp！＾е | 2u！ 7 Kıunoう udopuey－601 ON | （sozz ys）t9 Sn PIO |  |
|  | qns | U！W | OOV | OOV | 008¢1 | 009E | 0098 | $000 \varepsilon$ | 008¢1 | SG | － | こ $\quad$ 切 | 8．9 | Kıunoう uosp！＾е | 601 ON－（9ヶてZ पS）py paill | （sozz ys）t9 Sn PIO |  |
|  | qns | U！W | OOV | OOV | 008¢1 | 00tG | 00tG | 009t | 008G1 | SG | － | こ 㲸 | S＇1 | Kıunoう uosp！＾е |  | （cozz ys）t9 Sn PIO |  |
|  | qns | U！W | OOV | OOV | 008E1 | $00 \angle 9$ | 00801 | 0088 | 008E1 | S $\varepsilon$ | － | 乙 $\downarrow$ 乙 | S＇0 |  | 0L－6Z Sn／G8－I sng－8 ON／ZS Sn／G8Z－I | （z6LL ys）t9 Sn PIO |  |
|  | qns | U！W | OOV | OOV | 008¢1 | 006t | 0078 | 0009 | 008¢1 | St | － | こ† | 6．1 | Kıunoう uosp！＾e］ |  | （z6LL ys）t9 Sn PIO |  |
|  | qns | U！W | OOV | OOV | 008¢1 | 00Et | $00 \angle 9$ | 009t | 008¢1 | St | － | こ $\dagger$ ¢ | でト | Kıunoう uosp！＾e］ |  | （z6LL ys）t9 Sn PIO |  |
| 9 | qns | U！W | 09 | $\forall Z$ | 008S1 | 001s | 001s | 000\＆ | 008G1 | G9 | － | こ $\dagger$ ¢ | $6{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{Z}$ | Kıunoう uosp！＾e］ | 0G1 ON－t9 Sn | （z6LL ys）t9 Sn PIO |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | qns | u！ W | OOV | $\forall \varepsilon$ | 00281 | 00061 | 00061 | $00 \angle 6$ | 008\＆1 | S $\varepsilon$ | 001 | 乙 †乙 | 6.1 | Kıunoう uоsp！леа |  | （0LOE YS）zS SП PIO | H－LE000I＾$\forall$ O |
| d | qns | u！w | OOV | 日® | 00281 | 00061 | 00061 | $00 \angle 6$ | 008\＆1 | S $\varepsilon$ | 001 | 乙 七乙 | で0 | Kıunoכ uosp！леа |  | （010¢ ¢S）zS Sn PIO | H－L8000I＾$\triangle$ O |
| d | qns | u！$W$ | OOV | gย | 00281 | 00961 | 00961 | 009Z1 | 008G1 | S\＆ | 001 | $\varepsilon$ 乙દ | 6.0 | Kıunoう uоsp！лед |  | （0LOE ¢S）zS Sn PIO | H－LE000I＾$\forall$ O |
| d | qns | U！$W$ | OOV | $8 \varepsilon$ | 00281 | 00g02 | 00g02 | 009\＆1 | 008¢1 | St | 001 | 乙 $\downarrow$ 乙 | 90 | Kıunoう uosp！ле |  | （0L0\＆ys）zs Sn PIO | H－L800al $\wedge$ O |
| d | qns | u！W | OOV | 8\＆ | 00281 | 00002 | 00002 | 000ع1 | 008¢ 1 | St | 001 | $\varepsilon \quad$ 乙¢ | で0 | Kıunoう uosp！ле |  | （0L0\＆ys）zs Sn PIO | H－L800al $\wedge$ V |
|  | qns | $\mathrm{u}!\mathrm{W}$ | OOV | $\forall \varepsilon$ | 00281 | 00002 | 00002 | 00081 | 008¢1 | St | 001 | $\varepsilon{ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 10 | Kıunoう uosp！＾еа |  | （010\＆ys）zS Sn PIO | H－LE000I＾$\forall$ O |
|  | qns | u！W | OOV | $\forall \varepsilon$ | 00881 | 00002 | 00002 | 000EL | 008G1 | GS | 001 | 乙 乙乙 | 80 | Kıunoう uosp！лед |  | （0LOE ¢S）zS Sn PIO | H－LE000I＾$\forall$ O |
|  | qns | u！w | OOV | OOV | 0091E | 00012 | 00012 | 000ヤt | 00918 | SG | 002 | ¢ 8t | $\varepsilon{ }^{\circ}$ | Kıunoう uоsp！лед |  | （0LOE YS）zS SП PIO |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { səроW } \\ & \text { дəцłо } \end{aligned}$ | 1ə！$\perp$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { uo!!eo } \\ -!!!\operatorname{sejo} \\ \text { diO } \end{array}$ | （H） MOY | uo！！כes －SSOJ －วəy |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { p!!ng } \\ \text { on } \\ \perp G \forall \forall \\ \text { sع0乙 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 a \forall \forall \\ 600 Z \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { (ydw) } \\ \text { l!w! } \\ \text { pəəds } \end{gathered}$ | $\left.\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { (H) } \\ \mathrm{MOY} \end{array} \right\rvert\,$ | səue｜ （H） <br> uolpos  <br> －ssolj  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { (!w) } \\ & 7 \mathrm{f}!0 \end{aligned}$ | uo！！！psunn | （0¢－mo』y）uo！pos | K！！！！Pe | व1 |
|  |  |  |  | mels | S pesodod | SEOZ |  |  | metsks | 6u！ | 136002 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 人 $\forall$ | MHS |  |  |  |  |


| HIGHWAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility | Section (From - To) | Jurisdiction | Dist. <br> (mi) | 2009 Existing System |  |  |  |  |  | 2035 Proposed System |  |  |  |  | CTP Classification | Tier | Other <br> Modes |
|  |  |  |  |  | CrossSection |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { ROW } \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{array}$ | Speed Limit (mph) | Existing Capacity (vpd) | $\begin{array}{r} 2009 \\ \text { AADT } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 2035 \\ \text { AADT } \\ \text { No } \\ \text { Build } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 2035 \\ \text { AADT } \\ \text { with } \\ \text { CTP } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Proposed Capacity (vpd) | Rec. CrossSection | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{ROW} \\ (\mathrm{ft}) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |
| DAVID0039-H | Rowe Rd (SR 1425) | W Center St Ext (SR 1242) - Happy Hill Rd (SR 1231) | Davidson County | 1.7 | 18 | 2 | 60 | 55 | 11900 | 700 | 1000 | 1100 | 15800 | 2A | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
| DAVID0039-H | Rowe Rd (SR 1425) | Happy Hill Rd (SR 1231) - US 64 | Davidson County | 0.5 | 18 | 2 | 60 | 55 | 11900 | 400 | 600 | 600 | 15800 | 2A | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Salisbury St (SR 2351) | Denton St (SR 2437) - High Rock Rd (SR 2507) | Denton | 0.1 | 22 | 2 | - | 35 | 15300 | 2800 | 3900 | 3900 | 15300 | ADQ | 60 | Min | Sub | P |
|  | Salisbury St (SR 2351) | High Rock Rd (SR 2507) - Hulin St | Denton | 0.1 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 15800 | 5200 | 5200 | 6900 | 15800 | ADQ | 60 | Min | Sub | P |
|  | Salisbury St (SR 2351) | Hulin St - NC 47 | Denton | 0.2 | 24 | 2 | - | 35 | 15800 | 5200 | 5200 | 6900 | 15800 | ADQ | 60 | Min | Sub | P |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U-2545 | Southwestern Connector | S Main St (SR 3346) - Old Linwood Rd (SR 1104) | Lexington | 1.5 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10000 | 43500 | 4C | 110 | B | Reg | P |
| U-2545 | Southwestern Connector | Old Linwood Rd (SR 1105) - Cotton Grove Rd (NC 8) | Lexington | 0.7 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5000 | 43500 | 4C | 110 | B | Reg | P |
| U-2545 | Southwestern Connector | Cotton Grove Rd (NC 8) - Fairview Dr (SR 2212) | Lexington | 0.3 | 24 | 2 | - | 25 | 11900 | 4000 | 6000 | 6000 | 38100 | 4C | 110 | Min | Sub | T |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0040-H | Southwestern Connector Ext | Fairview Dr (SR 2212) - Plaza Parkway | Lexington | 0.6 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3000 | 15800 | 2 E | 110 | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0041-H | S. Snider St | Salisbury St (SR 2351) - High Rock Rd (SR 2507) | Denton | 0.2 | 18 | 2 | - | 35 | 11900 | 1000 | 1500 | 1500 | 15800 | 2 E | 60 | Min | Sub | B P |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0042-H | Turner Rd (SR 2005) | E Holly Grove Rd (SR 2010) - Lexington PAB | Davidson County | 1.8 | 20 | 2 | - | 55 | 13800 | 2200 | 2900 | 2900 | 15800 | 2A | 60 | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tussey Rd (SR 1221) | Old Salisbury Rd (SR 1147) - Helmsteter Rd (SR 1205) | Davidson County | 1.2 | 20 | 2 | - | 55 | 13800 | 1000 | 1100 | 1900 | 15800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tyro Rd (SR 1213) | Old Salisbury Rd (SR 1147) - Mt Carmel Church Rd (SR 1220) | Davidson County | 0.2 | 24 | 2 | - | 55 | 15800 | 5700 | 8900 | 7700 | 15800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Tyro Rd (SR 1213) | Mt Carmel Church Rd (SR 1220) - Helmstetler Rd (SR 1208) | Davidson County | 1.2 | 24 | 2 | - | 55 | 15800 | 4300 | 7000 | 5900 | 15800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  | Tyro Rd (SR 1213) | Helmstetler Rd (SR 1208) - NC 150 | Davidson County | 2.3 | 24 | 2 | - | 55 | 15800 | 4100 | 6600 | 4900 | 15800 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Ward Curry Rd (SR 2219) | Raleigh Rd (SR 2205) - County Home Rd (SR 2783) | Davidson County | 1.0 | 22 | 2 | - | 55 | 15500 | 1100 | 1500 | 1500 | 15500 | ADQ | ADQ | Min | Sub |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0043-H | Yadkin College Rd (SR 1194) | N Koontz Rd (SR 1186) - Becky Hill Rd (SR 1435) | Davidson County | 0.8 | 18 | 2 | - | 55 | 11900 | 700 | 1000 | 1000 | 15800 | 2A | 60 | Min | Sub | B |

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AND RAIL

| PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility/ Route | Section (From - To) | Speed Limit (mph) | Distance (mi) | Existing System | Proposed System | Other <br> Modes |
|  |  |  |  |  | Type | Type |  |
| DAVID0001-T | DAVIDSON COUNTY US 52 EXPRESS | Winston Salem MPO Boundary - South Lexington Park-and-Ride | Varies | 13.2 | Bus | -- | H |
| DAVID0002-T | DAVIDSON COUNTY BUSINESS I-85 EXPRESS | High Point MPO Boundary - South Lexington Park-and-Ride | Varies | 10.6 | Bus | -- | H |
| DAVID0003-T | LEXINGTON CIRCULAR ROUTE 1 | North Lexington - Proposed Intermodal Connector/Amtrak - Southwest Lexington | Varies | 9.7 | -- | Bus | H |
| DAVID0002-T | LEXINGTON CIRCULAR ROUTE 2 | Northwest Lexington - Proposed Intermodal Connector/Amtrak - South Lexington | Varies | 10.7 | -- | Bus | H |
| ${ }^{1}$ Only major public transportation routes and proposals are shown here. For further documentation of the public transportation system, refer to the 2010Davidson County Regional Transit Development Plan. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| RAIL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Speed |  | Existing System |  |  | Proposed System |  |  | Other <br> Modes |
| ID | Facility/ Route | Section (From - To) | Class | Limit (mph) | Distance (mi) | Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { ROW } \\ \text { (ft) } \end{gathered}$ | Trains per day | Type | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROW } \\ & \text { (ft) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Trains } \\ \text { per day } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| 73,74,75,76 | Amtrak (Carolinian) | New York, NY - Charlotte | 1 | Varies | 704 | Passenger | 25-100 | 4 | Passenger | 25-100 | 4 | -- |
| 19,20 | Amtrak (Cresent) | New York, NY - New Orleans, LA | I | Varies | 1377 | Passenger | 25-100 | 2 | Passenger | 25-100 | 2 | -- |
| 79,80 | Amtrak (Piedmont) | Raleigh - Charlotte | I | Varies | 173 | Passenger | 25-100 | 2 | Passenger | 25-100 | 2 | -- |

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ${ }^{1}$

| BICYCLE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility/ Route | Section (From - To) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Distance } \\ (\mathrm{mi}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Existing System |  | Proposed System |  | Other <br> Modes |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | (ft) | lanes | Type | Cross-Section |  |
| R-4734 | NC 109 | SR 2205 - Denton Town Limits | 2.9 | Concurrent with NC 109 - see Highway Table |  |  |  | HP |
| R-4734 | NC 109 | Denton Town Limits - SR 1001 | 0.4 | Concurrent with NC 109 - see Highway Table |  |  |  | HP |
| DAVID0001-B | Bringle Ferry Rd (SR 1002) | Rowan County Line - NC 8 | 3.4 | 24 | 2 | Bicycle | 2A | H |


| PEDESTRIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility/ Route | Section (From - To) | Distance (mi) | Existing System |  | Proposed System |  | Other <br> Modes |
|  |  |  |  | Type | Side of Street | Type | Side of Street |  |
|  | City of Lexington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0003-H | Cotton Grove Rd (NC 8) | Federal St - Southwestern Connector | 0.3 | Concu | rrent with | 8 - see High | vay Table | H |
| DAVID0003-H | Cotton Grove Rd (NC 8) | Southwestern Connector - Plaza Pkwy | 0.6 | Concu | rent with | 8 - see High | way Table | H |
| DAVID0001-P | Raleigh Road (NC 8) | N Pugh St - E 5th St | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0001-P | Raleigh Road (NC 8) | 0.05 miles north of Church St - Talbert Blvd (NC 8) | 0.2 | Sidewalks | West | Sidewalks | East | H |
| DAVID0003-H | Talbert Blvd (NC 8) | Cotton Grove Rd (NC 8) - Kirkwood St | 1.3 | Concurrent with NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) - see Highway |  |  |  | H |
| DAVID0003-H | Talbert Blvd (NC 8) | Cornelia St - Raleigh Rd (SR 2205) | 0.3 | Concurrent with NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) - see Highway |  |  |  | H |
| DAVID0002-P | E 5th Ave | Railroad St - S Salisbury St | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0003-P | E 6th Ave | S Main Street (SR 3346) - S Salisbury St | 0.1 | Sidewalks | North | Sidewalks | South |  |
| DAVID0004-P | E 7th Ave | S Salisbury St - S Talbert Blvd | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0005-P | E 8th Ave | S Salisbury St - S Salisbury St | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0005-P | W 4th Ave | S State St - S Main St | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0006-P | W 4th Ave | Hargrave St - 0.04 miles south of S Hargrave St | 0.0 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0006-P | W 4th Ave | Park St - 0.05 miles north of S Hargrave St | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0007-P | W 5th Ave (SR 1192) | Bus. I-85/US 29-64-70-0.07 miles west of Glenwood Dr | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0008-P | W 7th Ave | S State St - 0.06 miles east of Robbins St | 0.3 | Sidewalks | South | Sidewalks | North |  |
| DAVID0009-P | W 9th Ave | S State St - 0.05 miles north of S Main St | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0010-P | E1st St Ext | N Cecil St - Curry St | 0.1 | Sidewalks | South | Sidewalks | North |  |
| DAVID0011-P | E 3rd St | N Salisbury St - N Pugh St | 0.1 | Sidewalks | North | Sidewalks | South |  |
| DAVID0012-P | E 4th St | N Salisbury St - N Pugh St | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0012-P | E 4th St | Conner St - N Church St | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0013-P | E 5th St (NC 8) | N Salisbury St - Raleigh Rd (SR 2205) | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0014-P | W 3rd St | Greensboro St - N Main St (SR 3346) | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0015-P | W 6th St (NC 8) | Greensboro St - N Main St (SR 3346) | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0016-P | W 9th St | Hames St - Old Winston Rd (NC 8) | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |


| PEDESTRIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility/ Route | Section (From - To) | Distance <br> (mi) | Existing System |  | Proposed System |  | Other <br> Modes |
|  |  |  |  | Type | Side of Street | Type | Side of Street |  |
| DAVID0017-P | W 10th St | S Main St (SR 3346) - 0.22 miles west of S Main St (SR 3346) | 0.2 | Sidewalks | North | Sidewalks | South |  |
| DAVID0018-P | W Center St (SR 1243) | Burler St - 0.5 miles east of Market St | 0.2 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0019-P | N Cecil St | E Center St (SR 1243) - E 1st St Ext | 0.1 | Sidewalks | East | Sidewalks | West |  |
| DAVID0020-P | Church St | 0.04 mileswest of Nokomis St - 0.06 miles east of Nokomis St | 0.1 | Sidewalks | South | Sidewalks | North |  |
| DAVID0021-P | Cornelia Street | Talbert Blvd (NC 8) - 0.05 miles east of Talbert Blvd (NC 8) | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0022-P | Courtney St | Vance St - W 2nd St | 0.0 | Sidewalks | South | Sidewalks | North |  |
| DAVID0023-P | Curry St | E Center St (SR 1243) - E 1st St Ext | 0.1 | Sidewalks | North | Sidewalks | South |  |
| DAVID0024-P | Fairview Dr (SR 2212) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E Center St (SR 1243) - NC } 8 \text { (Cotton Grove } \\ & \text { Rd) } \end{aligned}$ | 2.6 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0025-P | S Ford St | W 4th Ave - W 5th Ave | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0025-P | S Ford St | 0.05 miles south of W 6th Ave - W 7th Ave | 0.0 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0026-P | Greensboro St | W 6th St (NC 8) - W 4th St | 0.2 | Sidewalks | West | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0026-P | Greensboro St | W 4th St - W 1st St | 0.2 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0027-P | S Hargrave St | W 6th Ave - W 7th Ave | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0028-P | W Holly Grove Rd (SR 2203) | Raleigh Rd (SR 2205) - Edgewood Dr | 0.4 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0029-H | S Main St (SR 3346) | Southwestern Connector - Stamey Ave | 1.0 | Concurrent with S Main St - see Highway Table |  |  |  | H |
| DAVID0029-P | Marble Alley | E Center St (SR 1243) - E 3rd Ave | 0.2 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0030-P | Old Linwood Rd (SR 1104) | Cotton Grove Rd (NC 8) - Mendota Ave | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0031-P | S Payne St | W Center St (SR 1243) - W 2nd Ave | 0.1 | Sidewalks | East | Sidewalks | West |  |
| DAVID0031-P | S Payne St | W 2nd Ave - W 3rd Ave | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0032-P | Plaza Pkwy | Southwestern Connector Extension - NC 8 | 0.5 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0033-P | N Pugh St | East 5th St (NC 8) - Raleigh Rd (NC 8) | 0.0 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0034-P | S Pugh St | E Center St (SR 1243) - E 1st Ave | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0035-P | S Railroad St | E 2nd Ave - E 3rd Ave | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0035-P | S Railroad St | E 3rd Ave - E 5th Ave | 0.2 | Sidewalks | West | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0036-P | Robbins St | W 6th St - W 7th St | 0.1 | Sidewalks | West | Sidewalks | East |  |
| DAVID0037-P | Salem St | W 6th St - 0.3 miles south of Chestnut St | 0.4 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0038-P | N Salisbury St | Hemstead St - Hopedale St | 0.1 | Sidewalks | East | Sidewalks | West |  |
| DAVID0038-P | N Salisbury St | Hopedale St - E 4th St | 0.2 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0038-P | N Salisbury St | E 4th St - E 3rd St | 0.1 | Sidewalks | West | Sidewalks | East |  |
| DAVID0039-P | S Salisbury St | E 5th Ave - E 6th Ave | 0.1 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0040-P | Southbound St | 5th Ave (SR 1192) - 0.02 miles north of W 6th Ave | 0.0 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |


| PEDESTRIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility/ Route | Section (From - To) | Distance (mi) | Existing System |  | Proposed System |  | Other <br> Modes |
|  |  |  |  | Type | Side of Street | Type | Side of Street |  |
| U-2545 | Southwestern Connector | $\begin{aligned} & \text { S Main Street (SR 3346) - Fairview Dr (SR } \\ & \text { 2212) } \end{aligned}$ | 2.5 | Concurrent with SW Connector - see Highway Table |  |  |  | H |
| DAVD0035-H | Southwestern Connector Ext | Fairview Dr (SR 2212) - Plaza Pkwy | 0.6 | Table <br> Concurrent with SW Connector Ext - see Highway |  |  |  | H |
| DAVID0041-P | S State St | W 4th Ave - W 9th Ave | 0.4 |  |  | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0042-P | Vance St | W Center St (SR 1243) - Courtney St | 0.3 | Sidewalks | East | Sidewalks | Both |  |
|  | Town of Denton |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0043-P | NC 47 | Denton Town Limits - 2nd St | 0.2 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both | H B |
| DAVID0043-P | NC 47 | 2nd St - Salisbury St (SR 2351) | 0.2 | Sidewalks | East | Sidewalks | West | HB |
| DAVID0043-P | NC 47 | Salisbury St (SR 2351) - NC 109 | 0.4 | Sidewalks | East | Sidewalks | West | HB |
| DAVID0005-H | NC 47-109 | NC 109 - Forest Park Dr | 0.3 | Concurrent with NC 47-109 - see Highway Table |  |  |  | H B |
| R-4734 | NC 109 | Denton Town Limits - NC 47 | 0.4 | Concurrent with NC 109 - see Highway Table |  |  |  | H B |
| DAVID0044-P | 1st St (SR 1001) | NC 109 - N Main St (SR 2414) | 0.3 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0044-P | 1st St | N Main St (SR 2414) - NC 47 | 0.1 | Sidewalks | South | Sidewalks | North | H |
| DAVID0045-P | 4th St | NC 47-Broad St | 0.4 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | South |  |
| DAVID0046-P | Broad St | 4th St - NC 47 | 0.4 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0047-P | Carroll Ave | Varner St - NC 109 | 0.1 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0023-H | High Rock Rd (SR 2507) | S Snider St - Peacock Ave (SR 1002) | 0.1 | Concurrent with High Rock Rd - see Highway Table |  |  |  | H |
| DAVID0048-P | N Main St (SR 2414) | 4th St - 3rd St | 0.1 |  | - | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0048-P | N Main St (SR 2414) | 3rd St - NC 47 | 0.3 | Sidewalks | Both | -- | -- |  |
| DAVID0049-P | S Main St (SR 2501) | NC 47- James Ave | 0.2 | Sidewalks | East | Sidewalks | West |  |
| DAVID0049-P | S Main St (SR 2501) | James Ave - Peacock Ave (SR 1002) | 0.1 | Sidewalks | Both | -- | -- |  |
| DAVID0049-P | S Main St (SR 2501) | Peacock Ave (SR 1002) - Noell Ave | 0.2 | Sidewalks | West | Sidewalks | East |  |
| DAVID0050-P | Meadowdale Dr | Old Camp Rd (SR 2346) - Farmbrook Dr | 0.3 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | North |  |
| DAVID0051-P | Old Camp Rd (SR 2346) | Salisbury St (SR 2351) - Meadowdale Dr | 0.4 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | East |  |
| DAVID0052-P | Peacock Ave (SR 1002) | High Rock Rd (SR 2507) - NC 109 | 0.9 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0053-P | Salisbury St (SR 2351) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Old Camp Rd (SR 2437) - High Rock Rd } \\ & \text { (SR 2507) } \end{aligned}$ | 0.1 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0053-P | Salisbury St (SR 2351) | High Rock Rd (SR 2507) - Hulin St | 0.1 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both | H |
| DAVID0053-P | Salisbury St (SR 2351) | Hulin St - NC 47 | 0.2 | Sidewalks | Both | -- | -- | H |
| DAVID0036-H | S. Snider St | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Salisbury St (SR 2351) - High Rock Rd (SR } \\ & \text { 2507) } \end{aligned}$ | 0.2 | Concurrent with S. Snider St - see Highway Table |  |  |  | H B |
| DAVID0054-P | Varner St | NC 47-Carroll Ave | 0.5 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both |  |
|  | Tyro Community |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0007-H | NC 150 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Giles Rd (SR 1183) - Swicegood Rd (SR } \\ & 1155) \end{aligned}$ | 0.5 | Concurrent with NC 150 - see Highway Table |  |  |  | H |
| DAVID0055-P | Dragon Dr (SR 3139) | Michael Rd (SR 1215) - West Davidson High School | 0.3 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0056-P | Michael Rd (SR 1215) | NC 150 - Dragon Dr (SR 3139) | 0.3 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both |  |
| DAVID0057-P | Tyro School Rd (SR 1180) | NC 150 - West Davidson Library | 0.2 | -- | -- | Sidewalks | Both |  |


| PEDESTRIAN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ID | Facility/ Route | Section (From - To) | Distance <br> (mi) | Existing System |  | Proposed System |  | Other <br> Modes |
|  |  |  |  | Type | Side of Street | Type | Side of Street |  |
|  | Welcome Community |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DAVID0033-H | OId US 52 (SR 3010) | \|SR 1564-1464 | 1.8 | Concu | nt with Old | 52 - se | hway Table | H |

[^0]
## Appendix D Typical Cross Sections

Cross section requirements for roadways vary according to the capacity and level of service to be provided. Universal standards in the design of roadways are not practical. Each roadway section must be individually analyzed and its cross section determined based on the volume and type of projected traffic, existing capacity, desired level of service, and available right-of-way. These cross sections are typical for facilities on new location and where right-of-way constraints are not critical. For widening projects and urban projects with limited right-of-way, special cross sections should be developed that meet the needs of the project.

The typical cross sections were updated on December 7, 2010 to support the Department's "Complete Streets" policy that was adopted in July 2009. This guidance established design elements that emphasize safety, mobility, and accessibility for multiple modes of travel. These "typical" cross sections should be used as preliminary guidelines for comprehensive transportation planning, project planning and project design activities. The specific and final cross section details and right of way limits for projects will be established through the preparation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation and through final plan preparation.

On all existing and proposed roadways delineated on the CTP, adequate right-of-way should be protected or acquired for the recommended cross sections. In addition to cross section and right-of-way recommendations for improvements, Appendix C may recommend ultimate needed right-of-way for the following situations:

- roadways which may require widening after the current planning period,
- roadways which are borderline adequate and accelerated traffic growth could render them deficient, and
- roadways where an urban curb and gutter cross section may be locally desirable because of urban development or redevelopment.
- roadways which may need to accommodate an additional transportation mode


## TYPICAL HIGHWAY CROSS SECTIONS 2 LANES

## WIDE PAVED SHOULDERS <br> 2 A POSTED SPEED $=55 \mathrm{MPH}$ <br> 

## 2 B

WIDE PAVED SHOULDERS


2 C


## TYPICAL HIGHWAY CROSS SECTIONS 2 LANES

## 2 D



## 2 E

CURB AND GUTTER
WITH BIKE LANES AND SIDEWALKS


2 F
BUFFERS AND SIDEWALKS WITHOUT A ROADWAY DITCH (2O MPH TO 45 MPH )
(TYPICALLY COASTAL AREA MANAGEMENT ACT COUNTIES)


## TYPICAL HIGHWAY CROSS SECTIONS 2 LANES

2 G

CURB \& GUTTER - PARKING ON EACH SIDE



2 H
CURB \& GUTTER - PARKING ON ONE SIDE


2 I
RAISED MEDIAN WITH CURB \& GUTTER


## TYPICAL HIGHWAY CROSS SECTIONS 3 LANES

## 3 A

## WIDE PAVED SHOULDERS



3 B
CURB \& GUTTER WITH WIDE OUTSIDE LANES AND SIDEWALKS


## TYPICAL HIGHWAY CROSS SECTIONS 4 LANES



## 4 B

## DIVIDED WITH MEDIAN - NO CURB \& GUTTER <br> PARTIAL CONTROL OF ACCESS



4 C
RAISED MEDIAN WITH WIDE OUTSIDE LANES AND SIDEWALKS


## TYPICAL HIGHWAY CROSS SECTIONS 4 LANES



RAISED MEDIAN - CURB \& GUTTER WITH BIKE LANES AND SIDEWALKS


## 5 LANES

## 5 A

## WIDE OUTSIDE LANES



# TYPICAL HIGHWAY CROSS SECTIONS 6 LANES 



## 8 LANES



# TYPICAL MULTI - USE PATH 

MULTI - USE PATH<br>ADJACENT TO RIGHT OF WAY OR SEPARATE PATHWAY

M A


## MULTI - USE PATH ADJACENT TO CURB AND GUTTER

M B


## Appendix E Level of Service Definitions

The relationship of travel demand compared to the roadway capacity determines the level of service (LOS) of a roadway. Six levels of service identify the range of possible conditions. Designations range from LOS A, which represents the best operating conditions, to LOS F, which represents the worst operating conditions.

Design requirements for roadways vary according to the desired capacity and level of service. LOS D indicates "practical capacity" of a roadway, or the capacity at which the public begins to express dissatisfaction. Recommended improvements and overall design of the transportation plan were based upon achieving a minimum LOS D on existing facilities and a LOS C on new facilities. The six levels of service are described below and illustrated in Figure 10.

- LOS A: Describes primarily free flow conditions. The motorist experiences a high level of physical and psychological comfort. The effects of minor incidents of breakdown are easily absorbed. Even at the maximum density, the average spacing between vehicles is about 528 ft , or 26 car lengths.
- LOS B: Represents reasonably free flow conditions. The ability to maneuver within the traffic stream is only slightly restricted. The lowest average spacing between vehicles is about 330 ft , or 18 car lengths.
- LOS C: Provides for stable operations, but flows approach the range in which small increases will cause substantial deterioration in service. Freedom to maneuver is noticeably restricted. Minor incidents may still be absorbed, but the local decline in service will be great. Queues may be expected to form behind any significant blockage. Minimum average spacing is in the range of 220 ft , or 11 car lengths.
- LOS D: Borders on unstable flow. Density begins to deteriorate somewhat more quickly with increasing flow. Small increases in flow can cause substantial deterioration in service. Freedom to maneuver is severely limited, and the driver experiences drastically reduced comfort levels. Minor incidents can be expected to create substantial queuing. At the limit, vehicles are spaced at about 165 ft , or 9 car lengths.
- LOS E: Describes operation at capacity. Operations at this level are extremely unstable, because there are virtually no usable gaps in the traffic stream. Any disruption to the traffic stream, such as a vehicle entering from a ramp, or changing lanes, requires the following vehicles to give way to admit the vehicle. This can establish a disruption wave that propagates through the upstream traffic flow. At capacity, the traffic stream has no ability to dissipate any disruption. Any incident can be expected to produce a serious breakdown with extensive queuing. Vehicles are spaced at approximately 6 car lengths, leaving little room to maneuver.
- LOS F: Describes forced or breakdown flow. Such conditions generally exist within queues forming behind breakdown points.

Figure 10 - Level of Service Illustrations


Source: 2000 Highway Capacity Manual

## Appendix F Traffic Crash Analysis

A crash analysis performed for the Davidson County CTP factored crash frequency, crash type, and crash severity. Crash frequency is the total number of reported crashes and contributes to the ranking of the most problematic intersections. Crash type provides a general description of the crash and allows the identification of any trends that may be correctable through roadway or intersection improvements. Crash severity is the crash rate based upon injuries and property damage incurred.

The severity of every crash is measured with a series of weighting factors developed by the NCDOT Division of Highways (DOH). These factors define a fatal or incapacitating crash as 47.7 times more severe than one involving only property damage and a crash resulting in minor injury is 11.8 times more severe than one with only property damage. In general, a higher severity index indicates more severe accidents. Listed below are levels of severity for various severity index ranges.

| Severity | Severity Index |
| :--- | :--- |
| low | $<6.0$ |
| average | 6.0 to 7.0 |
| moderate | 7.0 to 14.0 |
| high | 14.0 to 20.0 |
| very high | $>20.0$ |

Table 4 depicts a summary of the crashes occurring in the planning area between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009. The data represents locations with 10 or more crashes and/or a severity average greater than that of the state's 4.56 index. The "Total" column indicates the total number of accidents reported within $150-\mathrm{ft}$ of the intersection during the study period. The severity listed is the average crash severity for that location.

Table 4 - Crash Locations

| Map <br> Index | Intersection | Average <br> Severity | Total <br> Crashes |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NC 8 and Owens Rd (SR 1266) | 11.25 | 11 |
| 2 | NC 8 (Old Winston Rd) and Ninth St | 8.51 | 33 |
| 3 | NC 8 (Cotton Grove Rd) and Fairview Dr (SR 2212) | 8 | 14 |
| 4 | I-85 and US 64 | 7.29 | 30 |
| 5 | NC 8 and State St | 5.71 | 22 |
| 6 | S Main St (SR 3346) and Anna Lewis Dr (SR 3158) | 5.71 | 11 |
| 7 | Eleventh Ave and S Main Street (SR 3346) | 5.5 | 23 |
| 8 | NC 8 and NC 47 | 5.35 | 17 |


| Map <br> Index | Intersection | Average <br> Severity | Total <br> Crashes |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | Center St (SR 1243) and NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) | 5.32 | 12 |
| 10 | State St and Third St | 5.32 | 12 |
| 11 | NC 150 and Tyro School Rd (SR 1180) | 5.32 | 12 |
| 12 | NC 150 and Swicegood Rd (SR 1155) | 5.32 | 12 |
| 13 | South Main St (SR 3346) and Seventh Ave | 5.19 | 30 |
| 14 | First St and N Main St (SR 3346) | 4.98 | 13 |
| 15 | Eighth Ave and S Main St (SR 3346) | 4.7 | 14 |
| 16 | Fairview Dr (SR 2212) and NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) | 4.7 | 20 |
| 17 | S Main St (SR 3346) and Ninth Ave | 4.7 | 14 |
| 18 | Salisbury Rd (SR 1147) and Tryo Rd (SR 1213) | 4.7 | 10 |
| 19 | Fair Cir and NC 8 (Fifth St) | 4.7 | 10 |
| 20 | Business I-85/US 29-64-70 and NC 8 | 4.44 | 28 |
| 21 | US 52 and NC 8 | 4.36 | 11 |
| 22 | US 64 and Forest Hill Rd (SR 1237) | 4.17 | 14 |
| 23 | S Main St (SR 3346) and Tenth Ave | 4.17 | 21 |
| 24 | US 29 and US 64 | 4.12 | 19 |
| 25 | Sixth St and State St | 3.96 | 15 |
| 26 | Fairview Drive (SR 2212) and Lowes Blvd | 3.96 | 10 |
| 27 | NC 150 and Michael Rd (SR 1215) | 3.96 | 10 |
| 28 | NC 8 and Arrington Dr (SR 1846) | 3.96 | 10 |
| 29 | Center St (SR 1243) and Main St (SR 3346) | 3.57 | 23 |
| 30 | N Main St (SR 3346) and Second St | 3.47 | 15 |
| 31 | N Main St (SR 3346) and NC 8 (Sixth St) | 3.35 | 22 |
| 32 | I-85 and NC 8 (Cotton Grove Rd) | 3.18 | 17 |
| 33 | Fifth Ave and S Main St (SR 3346) | 2.95 | 19 |
| 34 | N Main St (SR 3346) and Third St | 2.56 | 19 |
| 35 | NC 8 (Cotton Grove Rd) and Plaza Pkwy | 2.35 | 11 |
| 36 | Second Ave and State St | 2.23 | 12 |

The NCDOT is actively involved with investigating and improving many of these locations. To request a more detailed analysis for any of the locations listed in Table 4, or other intersections of concern, contact the Division Traffic Engineer. Contact information for the Division Traffic Engineer is included in Appendix A.

## Appendix G Bridge Deficiency Assessment

The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) development process for bridge projects involves consideration of several evaluation methods in order to prioritize needed improvements. A sufficiency index is used to determine whether a bridge is sufficient to remain in service, or to what extent it is deficient. The index is a percentage in which 100 percent represents an entirely sufficient bridge and zero represents an entirely insufficient or deficient bridge. Factors evaluated in calculating the index are listed below.

- structural adequacy and safety
- serviceability and functional obsolescence
- essentiality for public use
- type of structure
- traffic safety features

The NCDOT Bridge Maintenance Unit inspects all bridges in North Carolina at least once every two years. A sufficiency rating for each bridge is calculated and establishes the eligibility and priority for replacement. Bridges having the highest priority are replaced as Federal and State funds become available.

A bridge is considered deficient if it is either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. Structurally deficient means there are elements of the bridge that need to be monitored and/or repaired. The fact that a bridge is "structurally deficient" does not imply that it is likely to collapse or that it is unsafe. It means the bridge must be monitored, inspected and repaired/replaced at an appropriate time to maintain its structural integrity. A functionally obsolete bridge is one that was built to standards that are not used today. These bridges are not automatically rated as structurally deficient, nor are they inherently unsafe. Functionally obsolete bridges are those that do not have adequate lane widths, shoulder widths, or vertical clearances to serve current traffic demand or to meet the current geometric standards, or those that may be occasionally flooded.

A bridge must be classified as deficient in order to quality for Federal replacement funds. Additionally, the sufficiency rating must be less than $50 \%$ to qualify for replacement or less than $80 \%$ to qualify for rehabilitation under federal funding. Deficient bridges within the planning area are listed in Table 5.

## Table 5 - Deficient Bridges

| Bridge Number | Facility | Feature | Condition | Local ID |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Belmont Rd } \\ & \text { (SR1133) } \end{aligned}$ | I-85 | Structurally Deficient | I-2304 |
| 7 | Yadkin College Rd (SR 1194) | Dykers Creek | Structurally Deficient | B-4740 |
| 11 | Swicegood Rd (SR 1155) | First Potts Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 17 | NC 47 | Swearing Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 18 | I-85 NBL | Southern Railway | Structurally Deficient | I-2304 |
| 20 | NC150 NBL | 1-85/US 29-52-70 | Structurally Deficient | I-2304 |
| 22 | I-85 SBL | Southern Railway | Structurally Deficient | I-2304 |
| 25 | $\begin{gathered} \text { S Main St (SR } \\ 3346) \end{gathered}$ | Winston Salem SB RR | Functionally Obsolete | DAVD0010-H |
| 27 | NC 8 | I-85 Bus/US 29-64-70 | Structurally Deficient | B-3159 |
| 29 | NC 49 | NC 109 | Structurally Deficient | DAVD0005-H |
| 31 | NC 8 | Lick Creek | Structurally Deficient | R-2300 |
| 39 | US64 EBL/WBL | I-85 Bus/US 29-70 | Structurally Deficient | B-4497 |
| 41 | I-85 SBL | US 29-70/NC150 | Structurally Deficient | I-2304 |
| 42 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hampton Rd } \\ & \text { (SR 1485) } \end{aligned}$ | Muddy Creek | Functionally Obsolete | B-5165 |
| 44 | NC150 | US 64 | Functionally Obsolete | DAVD0006-H |
| 52 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Old Mill Rd (SR } \\ 1445) \end{gathered}$ | Reedy Creek | Structurally Deficient | B-4694 |
| 53 | US 64 WBL | N Main St (SR 3346) | Functionally Obsolete | DAVD0001-H |
| 55 | NC 47 | Flat Swamp Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 58 | NC 109 | US 64 | Structurally Deficient | R-4734 |
| 63 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dr. Zimmerman } \\ & \text { Rd (SR 1472) } \end{aligned}$ | Reedy Creek | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 67 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I-85 Bus/US 29- } \\ & 70 \text { NBL } \end{aligned}$ | Old US 64 (SR 1192) | Structurally Deficient | R-2808B |
| 68 | I-85 Bus/US 29- 70 SBL | Old US 64 (SR 1192) | Structurally Deficient | R-2808B |
| 69 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Carver Rd (SR } \\ \text { 1502) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Reedy Creek | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 79 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Happy Hill Rd } \\ \text { (SR 1231) } \end{gathered}$ | Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 80 | US 64 WBL | I-85 Bus US 29/70 NBL | Functionally Obsolete | R-2808B |
| 82 | NC 47 | Lick Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 86 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Wilson Rd (SR } \\ 1158) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | First Potts Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 87 | I-85 Bus/US 29- 70 NBL | Winston Salem SB Railroad | Structurally Deficient | R-2808B |
| 89 | $\begin{gathered} \text { I-85 Bus/US 29- } \\ 70 \text { SBL } \end{gathered}$ | Winston Salem SB Railroad | Structurally Deficient | R-2808B |
| 94 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Tall Pines Rd } \\ \text { (SR 1822) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Winston Salem SB Railroad | Functionally Obsolete |  |


| Bridge Number | Facility | Feature | Condition | Local ID |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 95 | Lake Leonard Rd (SR 1838) | Creek | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 99 | Clodfelter Rd (SR 1810) | Bushy Fork Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 106 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 10th Ave (SR } \\ 3345) \end{gathered}$ | Southern Railway | Functionally Obsolete | DAVD0007-H |
| 118 | I-85/US29-70 NBL | I-85 Bus/US29-70NBL | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 121 | $\begin{gathered} \text { I-85 Bus/US 29- } \\ 70 \text { NBL } \end{gathered}$ | Leonard Creek | Functionally Obsolete | R-2808B |
| 122 | $\begin{gathered} \text { I-85 Bus/US 29- } \\ 70 \text { SBL } \end{gathered}$ | Leonard Creek | Structurally Deficient | R-2808B |
| 128 | I-85 Bus/US 29- 70 SBL | Abbotts Creek | Structurally Deficient | R-2808B |
| 130 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I-85 Bus/US 29- } \\ & 70 \text { NBL } \end{aligned}$ | Abbotts Creek | Structurally Deficient | R-2808B |
| 180 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E Holly Grove } \\ & \text { Rd (SR 2010) } \end{aligned}$ | Hamby Creek | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 195 | John Black Rd (SR 2263) | Flat Swamp Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 199 | $\begin{gathered} \text { E Center St (SR } \\ 1243) \end{gathered}$ | Abbotts Creek | Structurally Deficient | B-4498 |
| 230 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Beck's Church } \\ & \text { Rd (SR 2250) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pounder Fork | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 235 | Hedrick Mill Rd (SR 2255) | Four Mile Creek | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 249 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Holloway Ch. Rd } \\ & \text { (SR 2294) } \end{aligned}$ | Abbotts Creek | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 258 | Jersey Church Rd (SR 1272) | Swearing Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 271 | Lick Creek Ch. Rd (SR 2501) | Lick Creek | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 274 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Denton Rd (SR } \\ 1002) \end{gathered}$ | Lick Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 277 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Hunt Rd (SR } \\ & 2504) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Lick Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 282 | Jackson Hill Rd (SR 2533) | Cabin Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 286 | Slate Mine Rd (SR 2545) | Beaverdam Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 338 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fred Miller Rd } \\ & \text { (SR 2265) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Flat Swamp Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 349 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Blackberry Rd } \\ & \text { (SR 2099) } \end{aligned}$ | Plumbers Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 361 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Bud Sink Rd } \\ \text { (SR 1837) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 405 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Old Salisbury Rd } \\ \text { (SR 1147) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Potts Creek | Functionally Obsolete | B-4097 |
| 410 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Old Greensboro } \\ & \text { Rd (SR 1844) } \end{aligned}$ | Leonard Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |


| Bridge <br> Number | Facility | Feature | Condition | Local ID |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 415 | E Center St (SR <br> 1243) | Southern Railway | Functionally Obsolete | B-3446 |
| 417 | Badin Lake Rd <br> (SR 2550) | Badin Lake | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 424 | E Center St (SR <br> 1243) | NC 8 (Talbert Blvd) | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 431 | Old US 64 (SR <br> 2205) | Abbotts Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 444 | Wth Ave (SR <br> 1192) | Winston Salem SB <br> Railroad | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 447 | Pine Ridge Rd <br> (SR 1454) | Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 471 | Old NC 109 (SR <br> $2416)$ | Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 504 | Handy Rd (SR <br> 2522) | Creek | Structurally Deficient |  |
| 513 | NC 8 | US 52 | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 522 | Arnold Rd (SR <br> 1457) | US 52 | Functionally Obsolete |  |
| 535 | Leonard Rd (SR <br> 1417) | US 52 | Functionally Obsolete |  |

## Appendix H Public Involvement

This appendix documents the public involvement process, including steering committee members, the goals and objectives survey results, and public workshops held throughout the development of the CTP.

## Listing of steering committee members

Guy Cornman - Davidson County Planning Director
Tammy Kepley, AICP - Lexington Community Development Director
F.E. Isenhour - Denton Town Manager

Hanna Cockburn, AICP - Piedmont Triad Rural Planning Organization Coordinator

## Goals and Objectives Survey Results

Transportation Goals
Total responses ranking each goal as 'Important' or 'Very Important', in rank order.

| Goals | Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Support economic growth | 78 | $98.7 \%$ |
| Improve services for special needs populations | 75 | $94.9 \%$ |
| Preserve community and rural character | 74 | $93.6 \%$ |
| Protect the environment | 73 | $92.4 \%$ |
| Increase access to regional transit service | 72 | $91.1 \%$ |
| Increase access to park and ride lots | 70 | $88.6 \%$ |
| Create a bicycle and pedestrian friendly community | 69 | $87.3 \%$ |
| Improve automobile travel times | 68 | $86.0 \%$ |

## Strategies for increasing road capacity

Total responses ranking each strategy as 'Important' or 'Very Important', in rank order.

| Strategies | Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Make intersection improvements like turn lanes and <br> signal timing | 76 | $97.4 \%$ |
| Build additional travel lanes on major roads | 65 | $83.3 \%$ |
| Control the number and location of driveways and cross- <br> streets accessing major roads | 64 | $82.0 \%$ |
| Control to location of left turns with medians | 64 | $82.0 \%$ |

## Safety concerns

$68 \%$ of respondents indicated they had safety concerns about specific locations. Of those locations identified, the top five are listed below.

| Rank | Location | Responses |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | US 64, in various locations | 7 |
| 2 | NC 109, in various locations | 5 |
| 3 | US 52, in various locations | 3 |
|  | NC 150, in various locations | 3 |
|  | Talbert Boulevard, in Lexington | 3 |

## Key transportation issues

55 respondents identified a wide range of transportation issues facing Davidson County.
The top three 'themes' found in the responses are identified below.

| Rank | Issue | Responses |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Enhance alternative transportation options | 34 |
| 2 | Road improvements and maintenance | 18 |
| 3 | Traffic concerns | 3 |

## Accessibility

Total responses indicating how 'Critically' or 'Very Critically' enhanced access to specific areas and road corridors are needed, in rank order.

| Areas | Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Winston Salem | 32 | $46.3 \%$ |
| Charlotte | 29 | $42.0 \%$ |
| High Point | 23 | $33.3 \%$ |
| Greensboro | 20 | $28.9 \%$ |
| Triangle | 13 | $18.8 \%$ |


| Roads | Responses | Percentage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| US 52 | 33 | $47.8 \%$ |
| Interstate 85 | 32 | $46.3 \%$ |
| US 64 | 28 | $40.5 \%$ |
| Interstate 40 | 25 | $36.2 \%$ |
| US 311 | 12 | $17.3 \%$ |
| NC 49 | 9 | $13.0 \%$ |

## Alternative Modes

Respondents were asked about their usage and desire for more pedestrian, bicycle and transit services.

- $\mathbf{5 0 . 7} \%$ of respondents walk for fitness or exercise, typically a mile.
- $21.9 \%$ of respondents bicycle for exercise or recreation.
- $85 \%$ of respondents indicated they would use bicycle facilities, if provided.
- $75.8 \%$ of respondents indicated they would use a greenway or off-road trail, if provided.
- While a small number of respondents currently utilize PART express service, $33 \%$ of users utilize the service more than once a week.
- $\mathbf{5 2 . 4} \%$ of respondents indicated they would use AMTRAK service, if provided.


## Public Workshop \#1 at the City of Lexington Public Works Building

The first public workshop took place at the City of Lexington Public Utilities Building on January 22, 2009 from 7:00-9:00 pm. This workshop introduced the CTP process as well as what can be expected of the final plan. Over a dozen citizens were in attendance. They were divided into workgroups to help identify the needs of the different modes of transportation in the county. A main issue identified was the need for an Amtrak stop in Lexington.

## Public Workshop \#2 at Denton Town Hall

The second public workshop took place at Denton Town Hall on November 16, 2009 from 6:00-8:00 pm. There was a presentation that detailed the preliminary recommendations for the rural portion of the Davidson County CTP, specifically Denton. Ten citizens were in attendance. They were given the opportunity to look through the recommendations and give additional feedback if anything needed to be added, removed, or changed. Several different pedestrian facilities were identified to create a network of sidewalks within the Town of Denton.

## Public Workshop \#3 at West Davidson County Library

The third public workshop took place at West Davidson County Library in the Tyro community on December 3, 2009 from 6:00-8:00 pm. There was a presentation that detailed the preliminary recommendations for the rural portion of the Davidson County CTP, specifically for the communities of Tyro and Welcome. Four citizens were in attendance. They were given the opportunity to look through the recommendations and give additional feedback if anything needed to be added, removed, or changed. As part of the feedback from this public workshop, new pedestrian facilities were requested to link the West Davidson County Library and West Davidson High School to NC 150 in Tyro.

## Public Workshop \#4 at Lexington Municipal Club

The fourth public workshop took place at Lexington Municipal Club on September 16, 2010 from 6:00-8:00 pm. There was a presentation that detailed the preliminary recommendations for the Lexington portion of the Davidson County CTP. Eleven citizens were in attendance. They were given the opportunity to look through the recommendations and give additional feedback if anything needed to be added, removed, or changed. Part of the discussion revolved around the potential interchange at Interstate 85 and Old Linwood Road (SR 1104) and what the potential impacts would be on surrounding land use. Resulting from feedback from the city as well as the public workshop, a feasibility study will be requested to study the feasibility of this interchange.

## Appendix I <br> Existing Transportation Plans

The following CTPs or Thoroughfare Plans for areas within the County that are not included as a part of this plan are listed below and may be viewed at the following websites:

- 2009 Winston Salem CTP
http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/tpb/PLANNING/WSCTP.html
- 2010 High Point CTP
http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/tpb/PLANNING/HighPointMPOCTP.html


## Appendix J <br> Additional Transportation Alternatives \& Scenarios Studied

This appendix includes documentation for alternatives and scenarios that were studied but not included in the CTP.

## Proposed Improvements to Old Linwood Road (SR 1104)

Access to central Lexington from Interstate 85 is restricted to one interchange at NC 8.

The project proposal is to upgrade the existing two-lane thoroughfare to a fourlane divided boulevard from the proposed Southwestern Connector to I-85, including the construction of a new interchange at Interstate 85.

The proposed improvements to Old Linwood Road (SR 1104) would provide better access to central Lexington from Interstate 85.


A feasibility study should be requested to further study this alternative. It shall be the responsibility of the City of Lexington to request this study via the Piedmont Triad Rural Planning Organization.
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