

MEMO

TO: CAMPO Executive Board

SUBJECT: 2055 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Development, Summer 2025,
Public Involvement Update

DATE: August 12, 2025

CAMPO staff began conducting public outreach for the 2055 MTP Preferred Alternative in early July. The overarching goal for this phase of public engagement was to share information about the Preferred Alternative and seek feedback. The specific goals were to

- Using clear, plain language, inform the public of the Executive Board's selection of the Preferred Alternative (previously known as the All-Together Alternative) and the financial constraint process
- Solicit input regarding the Preferred Alternative in general, any questions members of the community may have, and thoughts on the future of transportation funding in the region.

A table of all comments received follows this memo.

Overall Theme/s of Comment/s:

As shown in the attached spreadsheet, comments are generally positive with regard to the selection of the more ambitious All-Together scenario. There are several comments sharing ideas for alternative funding sources for transportation from tolls to a range of taxes.

2055 MTP - Preferred Alternative Public Feedback Results

Comments: TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, FUTURE REVENUE NEEDS, or anything else related to fiscal feasibility/fiscal constraint analysis	Comments: GENERAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS regarding the Preferred Alternative currently being analyzed for financial feasibility over the next 30 years	zip - live	zip - work	Demo-graphics (optional)
Bicyclists and pedestrians pay as much in fuel taxes per mile as motorists do, but that tax revenue is not being spent by governments on bike/ped transportation. Meals taxes and taxes on sport drinks and supplements should be diverted to transportation projects in proportion to the calories burned traveling by human power.	As long as NCDOT keeps building 50 mph traffic sewers between our apartments, condos, grocery stores, schools, offices, and BRT stops, families will continue to avoid traveling without a car. Wider and faster roads and interchanges just drive away pedestrians and bicyclists. Municipalities must take over control of our streets and design them for people if we want a more civilized environment for daily activities.	27511	27518	Man; Married; Child/ren
	i'm in full support!	27518	27518	
Transportation funding should come from less investments in road infrastructure. We should support a cleaner future with taxes on fuel consumption and road usage through tolls, especially on major highways.	The general plan is good, but more specifics are needed. We should reduce investments in highways and roads and instead focus on maintaining the existing road network. Transportation projects, like busses and rail, can help to bridge the gap on need.	27519	27513	Man; Minority Race
	This is typical gobbledegook that's not aimed toward the average person but fashioned in poli-speak to make it look "preferable" to the general population. Higher density? Really? Like the Triangle isn't crowded enough as it is? In other words, let's cram more people in to get more tax revenue. How about making things seem LESS like the typical city? Believe it or not, the people who want to live in cities are already there. Those of us in the outlying areas are VERY concerned already about urban sprawl. What about US?! Have you ever thought about what WE want? If you want to try to be NYC or Miami go ahead, but you're going to be less attractive to people, not more. Trying to attract people from other cities by making the Triangle look like other cities just means it's going to lose its reputation as being a city with small-town values and Southern charm. Why would you want to do that? Please reconsider.	27522	27522	

2055 MTP - Preferred Alternative Public Feedback Results

Comments: TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, FUTURE REVENUE NEEDS, or anything else related to fiscal feasibility/fiscal constraint analysis	Comments: GENERAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS regarding the Preferred Alternative currently being analyzed for financial feasibility over the next 30 years	zip - live	zip - work	Demo-graphics (optional)
Using taxes and toll roads to fund transit projects is A-Okay with me	I'm all for more mode of transit, especially trains, bicycle infrastructure, and better pedestrian stuff. Basically anything that isn't a car! I'm in Fuquay-Varina and I would love if we could have passenger rail here as well.	27526	27526	
This is outside my expertise, but I do want to encourage people to think of rail the same way as people think of roads. No one expects our roads to be profitable, but there are criticisms about trains that they don't generate revenue. This feels disingenuous and detrimental to me.	Just hoping we can properly emphasize transportation apart from cars (complete streets for walking and biking as well as trains). Of course we have to maintain our streets, but we're never going to be able to keep building lanes to keep up with population growth (plus, the idea of induced demand makes it counterproductive)	27526	27526	
Fuquay needs to have a bus service not one of those big major bus service like Raleigh but a small one like Apex and Cary that helps you get around a Fuquay-Varina, there's a lot of people that don't have transportation and really need to get to work, food Lion, Walmart and different surrounding areas. I've been here for years and I've seen this city grow just in the short time I've lived here. I can personally speak because my car broke down on me a few times and I really needed to get to work I couldn't afford to call Uber or a taxi so I had to stay home until I got my car fixed or someone with a good heart picked me up. Please consider a lot of people would gratefully appreciated it.		27526	27526	Senior; Woman; Minority Race
	The highest concern should be the impact of travel and transit on the environment. Investing in roads is a waste if they are being destroyed by severe climate events. The environment is the single most important factor to consider. Create ways to divest from fossil fuels - biking, walking, etc., as well as high speed trains and trams that can use solar or wind energy.	27529	27603	Woman

**2055 MTP - Preferred Alternative
Public Feedback Results**

Comments: TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, FUTURE REVENUE NEEDS, or anything else related to fiscal feasibility/fiscal constraint analysis	Comments: GENERAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS regarding the Preferred Alternative currently being analyzed for financial feasibility over the next 30 years	zip - live	zip - work	Demo-graphics (optional)
	I'm glad to see pedestrian and biking routes in focus. Knightdale could be really walkable/bikable with a safe way to cross Highway 64. As it stands now, I could physically do it, but I won't because I don't trust drivers to stop.	27545	27545	Woman; Disabled; Married; Child/ren

2055 MTP - Preferred Alternative Public Feedback Results

Comments: TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, FUTURE REVENUE NEEDS, or anything else related to fiscal feasibility/fiscal constraint analysis	Comments: GENERAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS regarding the Preferred Alternative currently being analyzed for financial feasibility over the next 30 years	zip - live	zip - work	Demo-graphics (optional)
<p>On revenue sources, i'd like to see us avoid planning for local sales tax. Planning for the General Assembly to allow that doesn't seem like a sensible option.</p> <p>I very much support the idea of changing the "gas tax" to be more slanted to transportation.</p> <p>Fees are generally just annoying, but some are worse than others. Changing milage based user fees sounds absolutely horrible. I am firmly against that idea. Adding on to the registration and local property tax would be tough too since it has gone up significantly recently. I certainly love the idea of trying to recoup some money from rental cars and tourism. Bringing new money into our area is definitely helpful.</p> <p>I would add these suggestions. 1. Adding a bike tax. Something small like 1%. It could be on all bikes or just on certain types of bikes meant for the road. The plan seems to be majorly focused on Bike/ped. And we are all encouraged to share the road. Let's share the tax burden as well with a 1 time tax on bike purchases.</p> <p>2. Include Johnston and Harnnet County in the tax base. Under current revenue sources listed, local sales tax in Durham, Orange, and Wake counties is included. I know this would need to go through the general assembly, but it would be pretty easy to show that both of those counties are now part of this plan. Even in the documents sections, the map includes those counties. If it would help make the process smoother, I'd even be for making guarantees that a few projects are prioritized for completion that would benefit the people in those counties.</p> <p>Overall, I appreciate the range of ideas proposed. They are all reasonable suggestions apart from mileage-based user fees. That one is a hard no. The others have a little merit to them.</p>		27592	27526	Man; Married; Child/ren
I ponder how reasonable it is to presume the availability of the additional revenue required. Perhaps it is, indeed, best to err on the side of optimism, just in case.	I like the density and strategy being strived for.	27601	27601	Man; Minority race;

2055 MTP - Preferred Alternative Public Feedback Results

Comments: TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, FUTURE REVENUE NEEDS, or anything else related to fiscal feasibility/fiscal constraint analysis	Comments: GENERAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS regarding the Preferred Alternative currently being analyzed for financial feasibility over the next 30 years	zip - live	zip - work	Demo-graphics (optional)
	I am so happy you are pursuing the ambitious All Together plan. This is what the region needs: transit, density, safe streets. Get it done!!	27605	27605	
Raising corporate income tax, raising the hotel occupancy tax by 1%	Affordability and accessibility should be front and center. This project is a public service and all public services should never be designed to turn a profit which means it will likely be a capital sink on the municipalities. But who cares that's the reason we even bother having cities and living in them, because the city invests in infrastructure. If residents feel the transit is too expensive and/or slow then the project will be double expensive as being both a capital sink AND under-utilized. Pay the transit workers well and you will notice a difference in worker morale and its effect on rider satisfaction.	27606	27601	Other Gender; Minority Race
	Your website is really confusing. I'd love to stay up to date, but I really don't know what it's trying to communicate at all. I know yall are trying to communicate something, but it's super in clear what it is.	27610	27610	Woman; Married; Child/ren
	This all together approach is a bold and needed step toward the multi-modal future that the Triangle needs	27610	27610	Man; Married
NC General Assembly needs to do their jobs and change tax policy to address revenue changes. Charging per mile usage fees is UNACCEPTABLE.	Too much money is being wasted on mass transit bus projects. Only poor people ride buses, not that mass number of professional job commuters.	27615	27615	
Please go forward with any necessary tax increases needed to complete Destination 2055 with tax increases and fees. Also consider a vehicle weight fee or tax to supplement the current gas tax to account for EV usage.	Please go forward with the All Together plan, but also consider a potential regional rail extension from Apex/Veredia development to Moncure/Sanford to provide further park and ride opportunities.	27513	27705	Man

2055 MTP - Preferred Alternative Public Feedback Results

Comments: TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, FUTURE REVENUE NEEDS, or anything else related to fiscal feasibility/fiscal constraint analysis	Comments: GENERAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS regarding the Preferred Alternative currently being analyzed for financial feasibility over the next 30 years	zip - live	zip - work	Demo-graphics (optional)
<p>I support the Preferred Alternative proposal, and recommend the following:</p> <p>* The region should explore all possible options, including a penny sales tax to support transportation investments, to increase revenue. When feasible, options that work in other places, like congestion pricing, accounting for vehicle weight in registration fees, and increases in the gas tax, should be utilized as well.</p> <p>* When possible, transportation investments should be made at the regional level, rather than deferring to individual municipalities and county governments. Additional funding should be reserved to reward local governments that work together on bigger projects, like a greenway that connects Carrboro and Chapel Hill, which will ensure that we deliver projects more quickly and at a lower cost per mile (due to more competitive bids and ensuring that we build what we can quickly to stave off inflation.)</p>	<p>* Regional Bus Rapid Transit is the most viable solution for increasing connectivity in our region. Moving all GoTriangle routes to 15-minute headways (like the 400/405) and extending service from 5 am to 2 am would make a world of difference. This is low-hanging fruit that should be prioritized.</p> <p>* Municipalities and counties should increase density around current transit stops (served by GoTriangle as well as other services) and greenways in order to continue receiving funding. Given how long it takes an area to densify, it's important to change the land use first, particularly if transit investments have already been made and are in a position to be upgraded. The minimum density for any place served by a high-frequency transit stop (15 minute headways) should be 10 units/acre; for stops with 30 minute frequencies, it should be 5 units/per acre). This is a very easy requirement for municipalities to meet, and will make a big different for our region's future.</p> <p>* Greenways should be seen as part of the transportation solution. With electric bikes, scooters, wheelchairs, etc., it is easy for people to access places two or more miles away in a reasonable time frame, and building connected networks will help our region densify in a way that is consistent with our urban form.</p>	27517	27517	Man; Married; Child/ren

2055 MTP - Preferred Alternative Public Feedback Results

Comments: TRANSPORTATION FUNDING, FUTURE REVENUE NEEDS, or anything else related to fiscal feasibility/fiscal constraint analysis	Comments: GENERAL QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS regarding the Preferred Alternative currently being analyzed for financial feasibility over the next 30 years	zip - live	zip - work	Demo-graphics (optional)
I am excited that this alternative was chosen. I hope that the funds can be raised in a way that is not a Regressive tax, like sales taxes or registration taxes. Though I do see the appeal of fees for road users that are applied by amount of mileage, this is likely a burden that is disproportionately felt by those with the least means - people who have to drive for work or live far from employment. I prefer Progressive taxes like property tax, even though that will mean higher takes for me and high-earners.	I am worried the federal DOT will not fund the things we need, like rail or BRT, and certainly not bike lanes, sidewalks, or projects to reconnect communities divided by urban renewal highway expansion. I hope we can get the funds needed to do all of the things, while maintaining fare free transit in Durham.	27705	27708	Man; Married; Child/ren
Is there a way for this to move forward in pieces? So that we can get things at least partially funded and completed to move people towards using and being aware of public transportation as an option?	I would love to not have to drive everywhere I go in the Triangle. It is mentally taxing, environmentally taxing, and I wish there was an alternative. It would be great to have an option to be able to move between cities and not have to worry about driving and parking. I would love to see it also connected to major bike routes to continue the carbon reduction of a public transit option.	27707	27701	Woman