

To view a complete listing of all questions/comment received at the various Carolina North meetings, please visit [Summary of Key Interests - Carolina North Planning Process](#) (pdf) or [Summary of Key Interests - Carolina North Planning Process](#) (MS Word).

**Summary of Key Interests  
Carolina North Informational Meeting  
Traffic Impact Analysis  
May 7, 2009**

The following questions/comments were raised during the Carolina North Informational Meeting that was held on Thursday, May 7, 2009:

Interests Raised by Citizens

- Does the Traffic Impact Analysis include the finding that there were 40-70% increases in carbon dioxide emissions in 2015 and 2025?
- Regarding the sensitivity analysis for the various parking scenarios, is it possible to do a similar analysis of various bike and pedestrian facilities? For example, communities that have built pleasant, really nice bike and pedestrian facilities that can get people from neighborhoods to a site like his, how much does traffic go down? We currently don't have the type of facilities that make people want to walk or bike. So, if we did, is there any way to get any idea as to if and how much so would this affect the findings? In other words, is it possible to do a similar sensitivity analysis based on pedestrian and bicycle facilities and what reductions in traffic might result from the availability of such facilities?
- Would be worth looking at other communities that have very advanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities to better ascertain what impact such facilities might have regarding Carolina North.
- There are studies that have been done in other communities regarding the concept of car-sharing. Was car-sharing explored as a way to reduce traffic associated with the envisioned residential areas at Carolina North?
- It seems that there are no improvements or amenities being discussed for the portion of Estes Drive Extension between Airport Drive and North Greensboro Street. If you go there at 5 PM in the evening, you will see a scenario that indicates that it is currently broken, and that is just for traffic capacity – there are no pedestrian or bicycle facilities available along this stretch of road.
- Regarding areas where turn lane increases are being discussed along Estes Drive Extension, is sufficient right-of-way available?
- What about pedestrian and bicycle improvements along the stretch of Estes Drive Extension close to North Greensboro Street?
- Did the traffic impact analysis only look at bicycle facilities within one-half mile of the site? A half-mile is not a bicycle trail. This range is too small and is not an acceptable range to accurately reflect bicycle usage.
- Although a half-mile service area is reasonable for pedestrians, it is not appropriate for bicycles. The two modes are very different and should be analyzed accordingly.

- When you say that the TIA looked at facilities within one-half a mile of the site, is this a linear distance on actual streets or an aerial distance as the crow flies?
- On the maps, there is a small strip of Carolina North property that extends north up to Homestead Road. As any thought been given to using this land for a north-south corridor paralleling Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard?
- The half-mile area is the mitigation area, but does not reflect the actual commuting routes?
- Regarding the trip generation numbers, are all of these trips in addition to what we have now, or does the analysis assume that some of the existing trips to the main campus will alternatively be diverted to Carolina North? If this is the case, has this existing activity been subtracted from the projected numbers?
- Curious about the number on the mode split, show 36% of the students arriving at campus by car? Seems very high. Based on statistics from UNC main campus?
- Does the analysis take into trips that might be generated by an elementary school on the site?
- What level of service are the proposed mitigation recommendations proposed to achieve? Does it vary by phase and AM or PM peak?
- Does the report show anticipated Levels of Service if suggested mitigation measures are implemented?
- Why can't there be some preferential bicycle and pedestrian access from the west (e.g. Carrboro)?
- What are the various traffic impact analysis zones? Are there any implications resulting from having various existing neighborhoods included in the Carolina North analysis zones?
- The TIA provides projected Levels of Service for several key intersections. Is it possible to translate these designations into minutes of commute?
- Would be nice to understand how much the overall length of certain trips, for example from I-40 to Carolina North, would increase under the modeled scenarios.
- Chatham County will have hundreds and maybe thousands of new residents in the coming years. This development will require wider roads. Is there any accounting of the need for wider roads? Do the traffic forecasts account for large scale growth anticipated in Chatham County?

#### Interests Raised by Citizens (Written)

- Does the TIA specifically take into account construction traffic generated by the development?
- Will the TIA make recommendations for maintaining safety in relation to construction traffic, especially for vulnerable road users?
- A bike buffer of ½ mile for the study is completely insufficient. It should include a minimum of 2 miles from the site.

- What does the town consider to be an unacceptable level of service for an intersection - D or F? I understand that the goal is not to have a level of service of A or B as it means we've built the road over capacity.
- Community members need to understand the goals, so they don't try to demand something unrealistic or undesirable.
- For pedestrians and bicyclists, a poor vehicle level of service can be safer, as vehicle speeds are lower.
- Does the TIA examine different "peak hours" for transit trips? My observation on the NS & T routes is that they easily reached capacity in the hours from 9 to 11, as students are the predominant users. Transit peak hours may be different than driving peaks.
- What is the impact for people on transit not going to the site, but past it?
- Your report does not recommend any accommodations for bicyclists through intersections.
- Bike boxes at the front of intersections, bicycle turn lanes, colored bike lanes and bicycle signals are all options available in the U.S. Please consider additional discussion of this.
- Why do you only recommend 4 to 5 foot wide bike lanes on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd? This is a higher speed road (people routinely go 40-50 mph) and there is space for 6 to 7 foot wide lanes. Four foot wide lanes are insufficient, especially with the current lack of maintenance which renders much of the gutter area not usable by bicyclists.
- In considering travel modes, the report should acknowledge that nearly all transit trips (9% of employees and 32% of students) begin with walking & bicycling trips, so improvements for transit should be coordinated with pedestrian and bicycle improvements.
- The study recommends numerous improvements to mitigate vehicle delay – signal timing, additional turn lanes, roundabouts, etc. Can you describe how these "improvements" for drivers may impact the safety of pedestrians & bicyclists since you expect such a high mode share?