

Executive Summary

A second round of public engagement was conducted from January through February of 2026 to collect feedback on the draft Gaston County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) recommendations. Advertisements were released during the month of January announcing a public meeting as well as an online survey and webpage. Engagement activities included a joint public meeting with the Envision Gaston 2050 Comprehensive Plan, an online interactive mapping site, and a bilingual survey available in English and Spanish. The public meeting was held in Gastonia on January 15th, 2026, at the Gaston County Public Library. Maps showing the draft CTP recommendations and a smart screen with interactive recommendation maps to submit feedback on each recommendation were available to the public. Staff from the NCDOT Transportation Planning Division, Division 12, the GCLMPO, the County, and the consultant project team were present to answer questions.

An online website containing the draft CTP recommendation maps and a link to the public involvement survey was also available to help gather feedback from those that could not attend the in-person meeting. The online survey was available from January 15th, 2026, to February 13th, 2026, in both English and Spanish. A total of **225 residents participated in the online survey**, contributing **1,465 comments and votes** across highway, bicycle/pedestrian, transit, and rail recommendations. The survey results can be viewed online at <https://engagegaston.com/gaston-CTP>.

The table below provides an overview of the total number of contributions (votes and comments) by mode submitted by respondents within Gaston County.

Table 1: Public Input Survey Results

Mode	Number of Contributions
Highway	772
Bicycle and Pedestrian	544
Public Transportation and Rail	149
Total	1,465

Upon processing and analyzing the results from the online survey and the feedback recorded at the public meeting, several key themes were identified revealing the general public opinion on projects in the CTP from the data obtained in this public involvement effort. These key themes include:

A. General Support for Many Projects

- a. Several corridors identified as high priority including NC 273, NC 279, and the Catawba Crossings project

B. Concerns about Property Impacts and Community Engagement

- a. Potential impacts to adjacent homes and businesses
- b. Desire for more public engagement in some areas; questioning the need for projects in some areas
- c. Concerns were mainly expressed for widening and multi-use path projects

C. Strong Support for Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety

- a. Need for sidewalks near schools; safety concerns in locations without pedestrian infrastructure
- b. Value of multi-use paths for recreation and connectivity
- c. Nixon Road, South Point Road/Central Avenue, and Julia Avenue received high levels of support

D. Mixed Support for Transit and High-Capacity Projects

- a. Desire for improved transportation connections between Gaston County and Charlotte
- b. Concern that transit investments would not meet ridership demand
- c. Noted light rail challenges in Mecklenburg County
- d. Fear of increased congestion or parking pressures

E. Frequent Desire for Congestion Relief

- a. Emphasis of peak-hour congestion, traffic increases due to growth, and need for increased accessibility and intersection improvements
- b. Roads with the most cited congestion concerns include NC 273, NC 279, Cox Road, and Armstrong Road

The second round of public engagement provided meaningful insight into community priorities and concerns. The positive support for many of the proposed projects along with targeted concerns about community impacts and project viability will guide refinement of the draft CTP. These findings help ensure that the final plan reflects local values while accommodating future growth, safety, and mobility needs across Gaston County.

Public Involvement of Draft CTP Results

Below is feedback received on each draft CTP project.

Highway Project Recommendations

- I-85 (I-5719A) - Map No. 1
 - This proposal was rated by 13 participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that they were glad that NCDOT was moving forward with this project, but that they did not think additional lanes on I-85 would ease traffic.
- I-85 (I-5719B) - Map No. 2
 - This proposal was rated by 16 participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment expressed support for this project.
- US 29/74 (U-6043) - Map No. 3
 - This proposal was rated by 10 participants. 90% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that they support the addition of sidewalks, but that the project should extend to the McDonald's in Belmont.
- US 29/74 (U-6146) - Map No. 4
 - This proposal was rated by 17 participants; three participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 14 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 88% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Four comments were left on this project. Two comments expressed support for the project and noted the need for pedestrian facilities. Two comments expressed opposition for the project and noted that other roads need improvements more and that this project will create more traffic and accidents.
- NC 274 (U-5961) - Map No. 5
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that the existing roadway is narrow and dangerous.

- NC 279 (U-5821) - Map No. 6
 - This proposal was rated by ten participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and nine participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 90% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Five comments were left on this project. One comment stated that roadway improvements are needed along this corridor due to existing traffic conditions. One comment wants sidewalks included as part of this project. One comment stated that the project should continue to the State Line. One comment stated that this project would negatively impact adjacent properties and that existing communities should be improved instead of investing to accommodate new developments. One comment expressed support for the project due to the existing congestion.
- NC 279 (U-2523B) - Map No. 7
 - This proposal was rated by seven participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and six participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 86% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. One comment noted that wider lanes will promote speeding through the Town Square. Another comment stated that widening would improve this roadway due to significant congestion and nearby population growth. A third comment noted that this project is needed but that it has been postponed a few times already.
- Cox Rd (SR 2200) (U-6044) - Map No. 8
 - This proposal was rated by 11 participants. About 91% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. One comment noted that this is one of the worst corridors in Gastonia. One comment stated that improvements are needed at the Cox Rd/Franklin Blvd intersection and that the U-turns permitted on Franklin Blvd should be removed. One comment stated that they do not think a center turn lane will work in this area and that another I-85 on ramp is needed near the Lowes. It also expressed support for sidewalks and bike lanes.
- I-85 Corridor - Map No. 9
 - This proposal was rated by nine participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- I-85 Corridor - Map No. 10
 - This proposal was rated by six participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
- US 74 Corridor - Map No. 11
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
- US 321 Corridor - Map No. 12
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. The comments noted pedestrian safety and that connectivity and accessibility are needed more than widening roads.
- US 321 Corridor - Map No. 13
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this road needs to be widening and that it is dangerous to turn left and right while exiting businesses.
- US 321 Corridor - Map No. 14
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
- US 321 Corridor - Map No. 15
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
- US 321 Corridor - Map No. 16
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
- US 321 Corridor - Map No. 17
 - This proposal was rated by six participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that the County is growing and there is currently heavy traffic on US 321 South.
- US 321 BUS Corridor - Map No. 18
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment expressed support for the project but noted that it should be extended to Ratchford Road.
- NC 7 Corridor - Map No. 19
 - This proposal was rated by 21 participants; eight participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 13 participants

rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 90% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Four comments were left on this project. One comment noted that sidewalks are desperately needed at this location and that people currently walk along the shoulder. One comment that disagreed with the proposal noted that other projects were needed more. One comment noted that the project should try to avoid old and already established neighborhoods in the area. One comment noted that congestion is currently bad along this corridor and that sidewalks are needed in this area.
- NC 27 Corridor - Map No. 20
 - This proposal was rated by ten participants; three participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and seven participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 80% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. One comment noted that this project is a low priority. One comment stated that there was no need to widen the corridor, specifically stating that this was due to lack of congestion, population growth, or need for safety enhancements. One comment stated that multiuse paths are needed.
- NC 27 Corridor - Map No. 21
 - This proposal was rated by five participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and four participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 150 - Map No. 22
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 23
 - This proposal was rated by 23 participants; seven participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 16 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 91% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that they do not oppose the project but are unaware of any major safety issues along the corridor. They feel it is more important that existing issues are addressed before additional facilities are added.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 24
 - This proposal was rated by 42 participants; eight participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 34 participants

rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 90% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Seven comments were left on this project. Three comments mentioned that this area is not congested or only congested during school hours. Two comments noted that there is no space to widen this corridor or that widening would be very impactful to surrounding properties. Three comments noted this area needs help reducing congestion, two specifically noted the new development in the area leading to increased traffic.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 25
 - This proposal was rated by 47 participants; 15 participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 32 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - 12 comments were left on this project. Two comments noted that this area is not congested. Six comments noted that this project was needed due to the existing congestion issues along this corridor. One comment expressed concern over the impacts to adjacent residential properties and suggested staggering school times instead of widening the roadway. Two comments noted that this project is a top priority, noting the need for congestion relief, bike lanes, and multiuse paths. One comment noted that kids walk to and from school along this corridor.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 26
 - This proposal was rated by 46 participants; 17 participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 29 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 91% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Six comments were left on this project. One comment noted that children are always using this corridor to walk to and from school. Two comments noted the existing congestion and the need for the project. Two comments mentioned that people use this corridor to cut through and drive too fast. One comment stated that this project would be unnecessary if the Catawba Crossings project were to be constructed.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 27
 - This proposal was rated by 43 participants; 28 participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 15 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 93% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Seven comments were left on this project. One comment noted that medians are aesthetically pleasing and multiuse paths are needed for both recreation and connectivity. One comment expressed support for the addition of bike lanes. Two comments expressed disagreement with the addition of bike lanes. Two comments mentioned the need for improvements along this corridor including additional turn lanes and extended turn lanes. One comment stated that it seems like this project is reducing the number of travel lanes and is not a good idea.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 28
 - This proposal was rated by 33 participants; five participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 28 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 97% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Four comments were left on this project. Two comments expressed support for improvements in this area. One comment stated that this project was not a priority and that the only problem in this area was the pavement. One comment expressed the need for public transportation in this area, specifically noting connectivity to grocery stores, pharmacies, and restaurants.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 29
 - This proposal was rated by 15 participants; four participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 11 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 87% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Four comments were left on this project. One comment noted that a sidewalk is really needed at this location. One comment noted how dangerous this corridor is currently. Two comments expressed concerns over the addition of a median, one specifically noting removing the ability to turn left out of driveways.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 30
 - This proposal was rated by 11 participants. About 91% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment noted that the railroad crossing and adjacent homes could pose a challenge to this project. One comment stated the project was not needed and would impact a lot of homes.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 31
 - This proposal was rated by seven participants. 100% of participants agreed with this proposal.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 32

- This proposal was rated by eight participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and seven participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 88% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this project was not needed.
- NC 273 Corridor - Map No. 33
 - This proposal was rated by four participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and three participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 274 Corridor - Map No. 34
 - This proposal was rated by four participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and three participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that congestion backs up heavily when drivers try to make a left turn along this corridor.
- NC 274 Corridor - Map No. 35
 - This proposal was rated by five participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and four participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 80% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that the proposed widening is needed, but there should also be beautification considerations as part of the project. It was also noted that sidewalks are preferred to multiuse paths due to safety concerns.
- NC 274 Corridor - Map No. 36
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 80% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that this project would impact minority groups and that they have not been allowed adequate opportunities for engagement and participation.
- NC 275 Corridor - Map No. 37
 - This proposal was rated by three participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and two participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 275 Corridor - Map No. 38

- This proposal was rated by six participants; two participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and four participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 67% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Two comments were left on this project. One comment expressed support for the project. One comment stated that there is no need for the project.
- NC 279 Corridor - Map No. 39
 - This proposal was rated by 26 participants; six participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 20 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 96% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Six comments were left on this project. One comment noted that this project is a top priority. Three comments expressed support for the project and stated that it was needed. One comment stated that this is a residential area and should have lower speed limits and less traffic. One comment stated that widening is needed to support commercial freight in the area and reduce congestion.
- NC 279 Corridor - Map No. 40
 - This proposal was rated by five participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and four participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment expressed support for the project, noting that additional turn lanes are needed.
- NC 279 Corridor - Map No. 41
 - This proposal was rated by eight participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and seven participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 88% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment expressed support for the project, noting existing congestion, increased population, and the need to enhance safety. One comment stated that New Hope Road from Hudson to Cramerton needs to be improved before this project.
- NC 279 Corridor - Map No. 42
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- One comment was left on this project. The comment noted two intersections that need improvements as part of the project – N Modena St/NC 279 and NC 7/NC 279.
- NC 279 Corridor - Map No. 43
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 80% of participants agreed with the proposal; three participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and two participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that sidewalks would be preferred instead of multi-use paths, specifically noting safety concerns for cyclists.
- Catawba Crossings - Map No. 44
 - This proposal was rated by 18 participants; four participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 14 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Six comments were left on this project. Two comments noted that this project should be a high priority, with one noting that multiuse paths are needed. Four comments expressed support and noted the importance of the project, two of which noted that this is the most important improvement in the County.
- Belmont Mt. Holly Loop/South Fork Parkway - Map No. 45
 - This proposal was rated by 23 participants; four participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 19 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Five comments were left on this project. All five comments expressed support for the project. One comment noted that a new facility is preferred to prevent all traffic from needing to use South Point Road. One comment noted that the project would reduce risk in emergency situations.
- Stanley Truck Route - Map No. 46
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. Both comments expressed support for this project with one noting that more detail about the potential impacts to adjacent properties is needed.

- Armstrong Ford Rd (SR 2519) - Map No. 47
 - This proposal was rated by 15 participants; five participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and ten participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 93% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. One comment noted that this road is very busy and needs more lanes and space. One comment noted the need for the project due to existing traffic and the new housing developments. One comment stated that other roads need improvements before this one.
- Armstrong Park Rd (SR 2200) - Map No. 48
 - This proposal was rated by four participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and three participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Athenia Pl/Edgewood Rd (SR 1307) - Map No. 49
 - This proposal was rated by six participants. About 83% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that community engagement and consent were lacking. It stated that the project should not be slowed to occur without proper engagement.
- Beaty Rd/Lowell Bethesda Rd (SR 2439) - Map No. 50
 - This proposal was rated by seven participants; three participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and five participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 88% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. One comment stated that bicycles should have their own lane and not be part of the main road. Another comment noted that the Kendrick Rd intersection has too much traffic for a roundabout. The third comment noted that this project needs to be done due to increased development but that Titman Rd and Cramerton Rd have too much traffic for roundabouts.
- Cox Rd (SR 2200) - Map No. 51
 - This proposal was rated by six participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. Both comments noted the need for this project due to existing congestion and safety concerns with one noting they often avoid this road.

- Cramerton Rd (SR 2209) - Map No. 52
 - This proposal was rated by six participants. About 83% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment noted the existing congestion, specifically surrounding Cramerton Christian School. One comment noted this project is a low priority.
- Davis Park Rd/S Myrtle School Rd (SR 1136) - Map No. 53
 - This proposal was rated by three participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and two participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Hwy / Old Dallas Hwy (SR 2278) - Map No. 54
 - This proposal was rated by four participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and three participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- E Maine Ave (SR 1484) - Map No. 55
 - This proposal was rated by seven participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and six participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 29% of participants agreed with this proposal.
 - Five comments were left on this project. All five comments expressed concern about the potential impacts to adjacent properties, with one noting the lack of meaningful public engagement. Three comments also noted that bike lanes and sidewalks are not needed as they would increase property impacts and pose safety issues for bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Eagle Rd (SR 2565) - Map No. 56
 - This proposal was rated by 25 participants; 13 participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 12 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment noted that medians are aesthetically pleasing and multiuse paths are needed for both recreation and connectivity. One comment noted that increased safety is needed for sidewalks.
- Gaston Ave / W Airline Ave (SR 1339) - Map No. 57
 - This proposal was rated by three participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and two participants

rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Gaston Day School Rd Extension (SR 2200) - Map No. 58
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 75% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this project will alleviate the existing issues with the Kendrick Rd/Beaty Rd intersection.
- Groves St (SR 2213) - Map No. 59
 - This proposal was rated by nine participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Hickory Grove Rd (SR 2000) - Map No. 60
 - This proposal was rated by three participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and two participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Hickory Grove Rd (SR 2000) - Map No. 61
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. About 67% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this project is a low priority.
- Hoffman Rd / Robinwood Rd (SR 2446) - Map No. 62
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Lakewood Rd (SR 2014) - Map No. 63
 - This proposal was rated by 19 participants; five participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and 14 participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 79% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. Two comments noted that this project is not a priority and that this area is not congested or only congested during school hours. One comment stated that this project could be more dangerous for pedestrians and more complex for a high school driver.
- Linwood Rd (SR 1131) - Map No. 64
 - This proposal was rated by four participants; one participant rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and three participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Linwood Rd (SR 1131) - Map No. 65
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- N Myrtle School Rd (SR 1136) - Map No. 66
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Neal Hawkins Rd (SR 2400) - Map No. 67
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Philadelphia Church Rd / N Oakland St (SR 1001) - Map No. 68
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. About 67% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment asked if there were pedestrians on this road or if people were asking for sidewalks at this location.
- Redbud Dr (SR 2329) - Map No. 69
 - This proposal was rated by 12 participants; two participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and ten participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. One comment noted that roadway improvements are needed along this corridor and that non-auto travel should be protected. One comment stated that bicycles should have their own lane and not be part of the main road. One comment stated that this roadway needs more lanes to accommodate the existing traffic conditions.
- Robinson Rd (SR 2416) - Map No. 70
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Robinwood Rd (SR 2446) - Map No. 71
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that the Neal Hawkins Rd/Robinwood Rd/Union Rd intersection needs to be improved.
- S Main St / Belmont Mt Holly Rd (SR 2093) - Map No. 72
 - This proposal was rated by 13 participants; four participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and nine participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 85% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Four comments were left on this project. One comment stated that this roadway needs to be widened or turn lanes needs to be added from Ferstle Ave to Belmont Ave. One comment stated that other areas should be addressed first. One comment stated that the project should connect to the boulevard the City of Mount Holly built a few years ago. One comment said this project is not needed.
- Spencer Mountain Rd (SR 2200) - Map No. 73
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Spencer Mountain Rd (SR 2000) - Map No. 74
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Forbes Rd Extension (SR 2418) - Map No. 75
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- W Catawba Ave (SR 2040) - Map No. 76
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 75% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. This comment noted that this project is not needed.
- Wesleyan Dr (SR 2209) - Map No. 77
 - This proposal was rated by five participants; two participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and three participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Woodlawn St (SR 2021) - Map No. 78
 - This proposal was rated by ten participants; four participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and six participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. This comment noted that this project aligns with residents' goals of improving connection between North Belmont and Downtown.
- N Modena St - Map No. 79
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Rankin Ave - Map No. 80
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- W Hudson Blvd Extension (SR 1255) - Map No. 81
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- East-West Connector - Map No. 82
 - This proposal was rated by ten participants. 80% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Five comments were left on this project. Three comments expressed support for this project, noting future developments and existing traffic congestion in other areas. Two comments noted that the project conflicts existing and approved developments with one noting the lack of community engagement.
- NC 274/Union New Hope Rd (SR 2435) - Map No. 83
 - This proposal was rated by eight participants; three participants rated the proposal on the bike/ped recommendations map, and five participants rated the proposal on the highway recommendations map. About 88% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment expressed support for this project and noted that a signal is needed at Union New Hope Rd/S New Hope Rd. One comment expressed opposition, noting the existing quiet, rural community and the potential impacts to the adjacent properties.
- Southern Bessemer City Bypass - Map No. 84
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 50% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. Both comments note the lack of community engagement, and the toll new development can have on the community.
- Southern Corridor - Map No. 85
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Robinson Rd (SR 2416) - Map No. 86
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 275/N 279 Intersection (HN-0027) - Map No. 87
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 27 and Hawthorne St (SR 2234) Intersection (U-5819) - Map No. 88
 - This proposal was rated by six participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that this intersection is very dangerous and needs improvements.
- US 74 and NC 274 Intersection (U-5965) - Map No. 89
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that this project is a lower priority.
- NC 275 and NC 274 Intersection (U-6078) - Map No. 90
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- US 74 and NC 279 Intersection (U-6138) - Map No. 91
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- US 74 and NC 7 Intersection (U-6143) - Map No. 92
 - This proposal was rated by nine participants. About 56% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. Two comments noted the potential issues with the off-set intersection included in the project. One comment noted that bike lanes are a nuisance and should not be included in high traffic areas.
- I-85 and NC 74 Interchange - Map No. 93
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 161 and NC 274 Intersection - Map No. 94
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that a rail crossing is needed.
- NC 273 and Lucia Riverbend Hwy (SR 1992) Intersection - Map No. 95
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- US 29/74 Bridge over Catawba River (B-6051) - Map No. 96
 - This proposal was rated by 13 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. All three comments noted that the existing bridge is dangerous.

Standalone Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Recommendations

- NC 274 (GAST30010-BP) - Map No. 3
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Cherryville Connector - Map No. 6
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. No participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that development should fund trails and path as part of project plans as well as fund vehicle infrastructure improvements resulting from the proposed development.
- Gaston County Electric ROW - Map No. 10
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. No participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. Both comments expressed concerns for adjacent property owners with one stating that there would not be enough usage to justify this project.
- Long Creek - Map No. 11
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 25% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Three comments were left on this project. All three comments expressed concern about the existing agricultural uses adjacent to the project. Additionally, they expressed concern for additional access to these properties and potential safety concern for users.
- NC 274 & Dameron Rd (SR 1443) - Map No. 12
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. No participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Five comments were left on this project. Three comments noted concerns with users damaging adjacent properties. Two comments noted that a multiuse path would not be safe in this area. One comment noted a lack of community engagement and a history of unsupported development. One comment stated that they support sidewalks in residential areas, not multiuse paths.
- W Maine Ave (SR 1484) - Map No. 16
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. No participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that the project would displace low- and middle-income households and create safety issues.

- Carson Rd (SR 1134) - Map No. 36
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 275 - Map No. 41
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Phillips Center - Map No. 55
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Jule Allen Branch Greenway - Map No. 62
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- US 321 BUS - Map No. 64
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Dallas Park Greenway (BL-0105) - Map No. 70
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- N Summey St - Map No. 78
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Garrison Blvd (E & W) - Map No. 82
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that bicycles should have their own lane and not be part of the main road.
- Gaston Day School Rd - Map No. 103
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Hoffman Rd (SR 2446) - Map No. 104
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Ellamay Dr - Map No. 107
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 7 – Map No. 112
 - This proposal was rated by eight participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Central Lowell Connector – Map No. 117

- This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Westover St/Gaston Rd (SR 2481) - Map No. 131
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. No participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that this road is not safe for bikes and that they would slow down traffic.
- Market St (SR 2209) - Map No. 134
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 7 - Map No. 138
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Lowell Spencer Mountain Rd (SR 2201) - Map No. 143
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- South Fork Catawba River - Map No. 144
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 50% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that project is tied to high density development and should be provided by developers.
- Gastonia Proposed Greenway - Map No. 147
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Gaston County Regional Trail Concept 3/10/2005 - Map No. 148
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Fairview Dr/Rankin Lake Park Multiuse Path - Map No. 149
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Cramerton Greenway - Map No. 151
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Long Creek/Rankin Lake Park Multiuse Path - Map No. 155
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Norfolk Southern Rail Corridor - Map No. 159
 - This proposal was rated by ten participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this project was ideal for recreation.
- Nixon Rd - Map No. 160
 - This proposal was rated by 18 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Four comments were left on this project. Three comments expressed support and noted the need for safety improvements. One comment stated that bicycles should have their own lane and not be part of the main road.
- South Point Rd/Central Ave (SR 2560) - Map No. 162
 - This proposal was rated by 19 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment stated that bike lanes are necessary as the roads are not currently safe for cyclists. One comment noted this project is a top priority.
- Julia Ave - Map No. 163
 - This proposal was rated by 23 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment expressed support for this project noting it is very needed due to the existing dangerous conditions.
- S Main St (SR 2519) - Map No. 164
 - This proposal was rated by seven participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Catawba Creek Greenway - Map No. 167
 - This proposal was rated by seven participants. About 86% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this project would cause this area to be too crowded, ruin the natural surroundings, and disturb wildlife.
- Keener Blvd (SR 2594) - Map No. 168
 - This proposal was rated by 15 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 7 - Map No. 170
 - This proposal was rated by 13 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 7 - Map No. 171
 - This proposal was rated by 12 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that they live in East Belmont and would benefit from this project.
- Abbey Creek Greenway - Map No. 172
 - This proposal was rated by 14 participants. About 93% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment stated this project is needed for recreation and connectivity. One comment stated that this project is not needed.
- US 29/74 - Map No. 173
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 80% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this is a very congested area and that the focus should be on drivers, not pedestrians.
- Mayflower Ave - Map No. 176
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Lakewood Rd (SR 2014) - Map No. 177
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Belmont Rail Trail - Map No. 179
 - This proposal was rated by 12 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this project is long overdue and is needed for recreation.
- N Central Ave (SR 1634) - Map No. 180
 - This proposal was rated by 18 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment expressed support for this project, noting these improvements would be appreciated and frequently used.
- 2007 Mount Holly - Map No. 183
 - This proposal was rated by eight participants. About 88% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment noted that pedestrian facilities are hard to come by and would promote activity and connectivity. One comment stated this project is not needed.
- Cramerton Connector (C-5704) - Map No. 185
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that they are in support of all greenways.
- NC 7 (BN-0029) - Map No. 186
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 7 - Map No. 187
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Hickory Grove Rd (SR 2000) - Map No. 188
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that this project is needed for the safety of cyclists.
- Tuckasee Rd (SR 2044) (EB-5912) - Map No. 191
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Mount Holly Trail - Map No. 192
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Catawba River Bike & Ped Bridge and Paths - Map No. 193
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that this is a needed connection from Gaston County to the Whitewater Center.
- Perfection Ave - Map No. 196
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that this project will help with connectivity and the promotion of healthier lifestyles. It also noted that sidewalks should be added to Acme Road.
- Main St - Map No. 202
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 27/Catawba River Bridge - Map No. 205
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 273 - Map No. 212
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Mount Holly Trail – 4.6 miles - Map No. 215
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that this project was needed for recreation.
- 2007 Catawba River & Greenway Plan - Map No. 216
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Lucia Riverbend Hwy - Map No. 217
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 275 - Map No. 225
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 274 - Map No. 226
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Old Mt Holly Rd (SR 1918) - Map No. 227
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- NC 27 - Map No. 228
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Mauney Rd (SR 1831) - Map No. 229
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Catawba Creek Greenway Extension - Map No. 231
 - This proposal was rated by eight participants. About 88% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that they support sidewalks in residential areas, but not multiuse paths. They also noted that developers should be required to build trails or multiuse paths.
- Unnamed Tributary East of Gastonia Municipal Airport Greenway - Map No. 250
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Steeplechase Rd/Catawba Creek Greenway - Map No. 251
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- One comment was left on this project. The comment expressed support for extensions to the greenway.
- Long Creek Multiuse Path - Map No. 252
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. No participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Five comments were left on this project. All five comments expressed concern for impacts to adjacent properties as well as the natural environment.
- Hartford Trail/Indian Spr. Tr. (1) - Map No. 258
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Chestnut St - Map No. 261
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Furnace Trail - Map No. 262
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. About 33% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment noted adverse impacts to existing agricultural land and operations. One comment noted that this project would encourage too many “bad actors” and no protections for private property owners.
- Pavilion Trail - Map No. 263
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- York Chester Middle School/Oakwood Cemetery Multiuse Path - Map No. 264
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Catawba Creek Greenway - Map No. 265
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Cherryville Multiuse Path North of NC 150 - Map No. 266
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Ferguson Park/Blackwood Creek Greenway - Map No. 267
 - This proposal was rated by two participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Indian Creek Greenway - Map No. 268
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. About 33% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Two comments were left on this project. One comment expressed concern for impacts to existing agricultural land and operations. One comment stated that facilities should not be funded at the expense of the public.
- Stonewater Walking Trail Extension - Map No. 272
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Crowders Creek/McGill Branch Greenway - Map No. 279
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Taylors Creek Greenway - Map No. 280
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment stated that multiuse paths are needed in Mt Holly.
- NC 27 - Map No. 283
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Northwest Belmont Multiuse Path - Map No. 287
 - This proposal was rated by one participant. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Stowe Point Multiuse Path - Map No. 291
 - This proposal was rated by 15 participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment noted that they live in East Belmont and would benefit from this project.
- River Link Greenway Connector - Map No. 296
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Riverside Greenway Crossing - Map No. 298
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - One comment was left on this project. The comment expressed support for the project, stating that better connectivity is good for the economy.
- Southfork Drive Connector - Map No. 300
 - This proposal was rated by six participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- South Fork Catawba River Greenway - Map No. 302
 - This proposal was rated by three participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

- Timber Ridge Rd Greenway - Map No. 303
 - This proposal was rated by four participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.
- Tucker Rd Multiuse Path - Map No. 304
 - This proposal was rated by five participants. 100% of participants agreed with the proposal.

Public Transportation and Rail Project Recommendations

- US 74 West High Capacity Transit Corridor - Map No. 1
 - This proposal was rated by 25 participants. 68% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Ten comments were left on this project. Seven comments expressed concerns regarding impacts to adjacent properties, noted that the need for this project does not exist, and mentioned that existing safety and ridership issues with the light rail in Charlotte would be mimicked in Gaston County. Three comments noted that this project is a priority and more public transport is needed between Belmont and Charlotte, with one noting a preference for a light rail. One comment noted a lack of community engagement and involvement in the planning process.
- NC 16 Northwest High Capacity Transit Corridor - Map No. 2
 - This proposal was rated by 11 participants. About 64% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Four comments were left on this project. One comment noted that light rail was preferred. Three comments stated that the benefits of this project will not outweigh the costs or adverse impacts. One comment noted a lack of community engagement and involvement in the planning process.
- Belmont Park and Ride - Map No. 3
 - This proposal was rated by 20 participants. 80% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Two comments were left on this project. One comment noted there is too much congestion. One comment stated that this project is redundant and a waste of public funds, specifically noting that owner agreement should provide maintenance for the existing park and ride.
- Belmont Trolley - Map No. 4
 - This proposal was rated by 36 participants. 75% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Ten comments were left on this project. Two comments expressed support, with one noting it would be best used in conjunction with a light

rail from Gaston County to Charlotte and the other noting that blending history with modern amenities is a great idea. Six comments stated that this project is a waste of resources and will not be used by very many people. Two comments just stated that there was already too much going on in this area.

- Belmont Park and Ride – McAdenville Rd - Map No. 5
 - This proposal was rated by 16 participants. About 63% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Five comments were left on this project. Three comments stated that they do not want the trolley and the benefits will not justify the costs. One comment expressed concerns about the incidents that occurred in Mecklenburg County. One comment stated that the trolley will create too much congestion.
- Belmont Park and Ride – Trolley Car Barn - Map No. 6
 - This proposal was rated by 23 participants. About 57% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Ten comments were left on this project. Five comments stated that they do not want the trolley. One comment noted that Belmont should fund projects that only benefit their residents. One comment stated that parking Downtown is already scarce and is worried the trolley would take away essential parking for business owners. Two comments noted that this project would increase congestion in the area. One comment stated that the park and rides should be moved to the outskirts of central Belmont. One comment noted that a place to safely leave a car to commute to Charlotte would be great.
- Belmont Park and Ride – RL Stowe Rd - Map No. 7
 - This proposal was rated by 15 participants. About 53% of participants agreed with the proposal.
 - Four comments were left on this project. Two comments stated that the focus should be on easing congestion in this area, which this project would not do. One comment stated that there was too much in one place. One comment stated that the park and rides should be moved to the outskirts of Belmont.