

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  
Council Public Hearing  
May 11, 2009**

The following questions/comments were raised during the Chapel Hill Town Council's Public Hearing for a Public Hearing on the Carolina North Development Proposal that was held on Monday, May 11, 2009:

Interests Raised by Council Members

- Would like to be clear on the Site Plan Review by the staff for individual projects within the Development Agreement. Would like a description of that process.
- How does the general public learn that a project is being reviewed by the staff? Is there a vehicle for the general public or the Town Council to know that an application is being reviewed by the Town staff?
- Is a 12-month period of review an appropriate time frame for Carolina North?
- Should the Council zone the entire Horace Williams tract to the new University-1 (U-1) zoning district?
- Is there any way other than the annual report, to use the Town's online internet resources to let people know what is happening after 6 months (so many buildings have been reviewed, etc.)? Citizens will want to see what is happening. Would be nice to have more information and provide greater transparency several times throughout the year rather than just once a year. Would be nice if we had a "living document" to share information at regular intervals.
- Perhaps when the Town Manager receives an application for Carolina North Site Plan Review, it could be posted on the Town's website?
- Do either the Traffic Impact Analysis or Town Traffic Engineer's preliminary recommendation include increasing the length of turn lanes, or do they just recommend adding turn lanes?
- What is a "continental-style" crosswalk?
- What was the guiding principle from the Town staff's point of view regarding transit when working on the Traffic Impact Analysis? Did the staff have a number in mind regarding intensity of use? Number of parking spaces? What if we push the transit further? What impact would it have on the numbers? If this has not occurred, then feels like it needs to occur – we need to look at some additional scenarios and different mode splits. Concerned about getting feedback from NCDOT before the Town gets the chance to weigh in.
- How did we accommodate for the fact that regional rail might be included in the future as part of doing the Traffic Impact Analysis?
- What are the estimated Levels of Service (LOS) for nearby intersections in 2015 and 2025 under the no-build scenarios? What are the estimated Levels of Service (LOS) for 2015 and 2025 under the build scenarios?

- Regarding the Traffic Impact Analysis, confirmation that NC 54 was not included in the model as it is the longest potential entry route to Carolina North. Will subsequent Traffic Impact Analyses associated with Carolina North be required to include NC 54?
- What are the projected levels of service for the intersection of I-40 and US 15-501, and the intersection of I-40 and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard in 2015 and 2025 under the no-build scenario? What are the projected levels of service for these intersections in 2015 and 2025 under the build scenario? What are the existing 2009 Levels of Service at the intersection of I-40 and US 15-501, and the intersection of I-40 and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard? Do conditions deteriorate significantly from existing conditions? It appears that the assumed annual growth rates in the traffic model are fairly high and represent very significant growth in the traffic volumes for the baseline (no-build) scenario. If you take the current scenarios and apply the assumed annual growth rates, it appears that the most significant cause of congestion being illustrated in the model as contributing to deteriorating traffic conditions and Levels of Service is not Carolina North, but rather is assumed background growth.
- If you take the current no-build scenarios and decrease the amount of growth, would the severity of the congestion be anywhere near as great with Carolina North? Seems that the most significant cause of the congestion being illustrated in the Traffic Impact Analysis is in the no-build scenario from our own projected organic growth.
- Regarding our projected organic growth and the anticipated regional impact of Carolina North, it should be noted that 40% of the traffic growth due to Carolina North is estimated to occur inside our community and 60% of traffic growth due to Carolina North is estimated to occur outside of our community. It is important to think of traffic growth in these terms as 60% of the estimated traffic growth is occurring in areas over which the Town has no land use authority, and yet we are creating an employment generator in the center of our Town. Even if no more organic growth occurred in Chapel Hill, 60% of the traffic growth would still occur outside Chapel Hill's jurisdiction.
- Is the 60% estimated traffic growth from outside the Town headed straight for the Carolina North campus, or does this factor in park and ride lots and the use of transit?
- Roundabouts were suggested at some locations, but not at others. How come?
- Why were roundabouts not considered along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, similar to the roundabout on US 15-501?
- The trip generation table on page 4-2 of the Traffic Impact Summary talks about 23,261 vehicles trips at build-out. What assumption is associated with that number of trips as far as parking spaces?
- Would like to see the mode split changed in the Traffic Impact Analysis. In addition considering bicycles and pedestrians, would like to add transit. Have a 20% reduction at build-out and a 10% reduction prior to build-out, but still have 5,000 or so parking spaces. When you go back to the beginning of the dialogue regarding Carolina North, there was discussion that Carolina North presented the opportunity to be a game-changer for multi-modal transit in the community. Would like to see a different mode split that is doable and the constraint would be funding. Would like to see what it would look like, as it is hard to imagine what the Town will look like in 2025 with almost 24,000 more vehicle trips per day and 5,000 parking spaces at Carolina north.

Had thought all along that there would have been a more significant investment in multi-modal opportunities. Would like to see the Traffic Impact Analysis push this angle further.

- Need to better understand the alternatives to provide context for purposes of evaluating what is being proposed at Carolina North. Evaluation of different mode splits would help provide this context.
- Put me in a car and tell me how long it takes to get from A to B. Whether it is the time it takes to drive the length of Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, or the time it takes to get from Chapel Hill to Carrboro, we need to quantify some real examples so that everyone can better appreciate the amount of change being discussed.
- Based on the example prepared by the traffic consultant for the area along Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard from Eubanks Road to Carolina North, do not think people are going to want to work at or drive past Carolina North if this kind of decreased service is going to be experienced in this area. We need to look at mode split analyses to see if we can utilize transit, as well as bicycle and pedestrian alternatives, to improve overall service and free up capacity.
- When you utilize the more compact unsignalized traffic circles, like what is being suggested at the intersection of Rogers Road and Homestead Road, seems that what you really do is keep things moving – which is great for traffic but only make it harder for pedestrians to cross the street. So, recommend considering all modes of traffic as part of evaluating whether or not this type of approach is appropriate and/or desirable.
- In terms of the recommended mitigation measures in the Traffic Impact Analysis, how do they mirror or conflict with the kind of mitigation measures that we had been envisioning based on the Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard corridor study?
- Regarding the mitigation measures that the Traffic consultant and/or the Town staff is thinking of, how do they compare with what is generically referred to as “complete street design?”
- Regarding information that has been shared regarding the relationship between greenhouse gas emissions and how it changes with the number of parking spaces at Carolina North, how do these potential changes compare with the Town’s commitment to reducing our greenhouse gas emissions? We need to find some places where we can attack this problem rather than just standing even with the rest of the world. We need to take every opportunity to move closer to those carbon reduction pledges and take advantage of mitigation measures that will help us move closer to these goals.
- There are several roads in adjacent neighborhoods that will be impacted by Carolina North, many of which will need traffic-calming and other mitigation measures. Given that in the majority of these cases these are Town roads, how do we factor in the fiscal impact of these future traffic-calming activities that will be needed due to the impact of Carolina North? How do we document that these improvements are being required due to Carolina North traffic? There is language regarding cost-sharing; will this language be sufficient to obtain funds to cover these expenses? If they are not Town roads, how will we work with NCDOT to pursue any Town-requested traffic-calming efforts?
- Very concerned about the impact of Carolina North traffic on Estes Drive and Estes Hills Elementary School. Estes Drive is just a narrow, two-lane road, and there is going to be a major

traffic impact at the intersection of Estes Drive and Caswell. Perhaps we should pursue a designated signalized pedestrian crosswalk with a yellow bollard in the center of the street at that intersection given the large number of kids and pedestrians who cross the street at that intersection.

- Regarding the recommendations provide by the Neighbors for Responsible Growth (NRG), would like to endorse recommendations A through K in Section V. Have been wondering and would like for staff to address what happens if traffic impacts are not properly working out with too much traffic in a particular area and it becomes overwhelming. At what point can we hold up the site development permit application for a building? Need to insert some type of safeguard in the Development Agreement regarding traffic issues to cover instances where we are not pleased with how things are going.
- Regarding the University's presentation in April, there are maps with streets that are inconsistent with the streets utilized in the Traffic Impact Analysis. How do we work through these conflicts? Exactly what maps are going to be included at the back of the Development Agreement? Need to resolve.
- Regarding the Planning Board's idea of an interstate off ramp for the Eubanks Road Park and Ride lot, would like to know what the process would be for evaluating the possibility of doing this and how the Council would go about doing it if the Council were to determine that it is a good idea. Would be good to better understand.
- Do not entirely understand the connection between traffic and parking, but there is one. One concern is that even in the most constrained scenario that is presented in the Traffic Impact Analysis Executive Summary, where parking is constrained by 20% from the University's baseline ratios, we are still looking at a total of 4,700 parking spaces for the first 3 million square feet. Even though you can't do a straight line projection for the full build-out of 8 million square feet, if you did, you would be looking at about 12,000 parking spaces. The amount of traffic that would go with this number of parking spaces is alarming. If we are looking at 20% as if it is a really significant decrease from the main campus, where are we going to squeeze out even more decreases as this goes forward? Speaks to the necessity of designing Carolina North in a way that it really does encourage alternative modes of transportation. The purpose of the long range transit plan was to be sure that we did make the significant investments that needed to be made in order to take the pressure off of the car culture. Need advice as to how to balance these things out.
- How are we going to keep the campuses as one unit? A key concern that is important to both the Town and University.
- There are several recommendations from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board and the Greenways Commission that merit further analysis. One of the recommendations addressed the portion of Estes Drive Extension that has not had any improvements. The Greenways Commission proposed having basically paved greenways on either side of the road (that would be a combined bicycle and pedestrian facilities) since it appears that it is going to be a long, long time before the Town can get funding to put bicycle lanes on Estes Drive Extension. Would like to get staff analysis as to how reasonable and feasible this idea and others really are.

- There are some recommendations that were made by multiple boards, such as requiring the Transit Transfer Facility to be included in the first phase. Would be nice to make a chart comparing the recommendation like we do with individual development applications, if possible.
- Would like confirmation of where the Town's corporate limits are specifically located along Seawell School Road.
- What happens to the existing park and ride lot that is located off of Estes Drive near North Haven? Does it continue to operate in the future as it does today? What happens to this facility over the life the Development Agreement? If it is proposed to remain in place, will there be internal connections to it?
- What is the status of the landfill remediation and the waste site remediation?
- Why is there a piece of land along Estes Drive Extension, located just west of the intersection with Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard intersection, that appears to be left out of the proposed development area?
- Support the idea of having early bicycle access from northern Carrboro without having to go all the way to Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard in order to use the entrance across from Piney Mountain Road.

#### Interests Raised by Citizens

- The Town needs to apply the same planning principles for development to other areas of Town and Carrboro as well. There are real questions as to whether Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard can support the Town's plans to emphasize density along that corridor.
- Make sure that ongoing public participation is ensured within the Development Agreement.
- Engage in comprehensive transportation planning by (1) where appropriate, incorporate as many of the NRG recommendations as possible into the Development Agreement, and (2) the Town and University should provide feedback on all recommendations. If a recommendation is not approved, then citizens deserve to know why.
- Very concerned about the impact of development and the ensuing transportation that comes with development on the quality of life in Chapel Hill, particularly on Hillsborough Street.
- Different neighborhoods will feel the impact of Carolina North in different ways. Those neighborhoods on connector roads are worried about impact of traffic cutting through their neighborhoods. Neighborhoods near parking or bus routes are going to be worried about non-resident parking in their neighborhoods.
- Will be important for neighborhoods to be monitored, and resources should be provided to make sure that neighborhoods are not going to be negatively impacted by Carolina North.
- The impacts of cut-through traffic should be minimized and mitigated along connecting corridors such as Piney Mountain Road, Cedar Hills Drive, Lakeshore Drive, Rogers Road, Hillsborough Street and Northwood Drive.
- Non-resident parking in residential areas close to the Carolina North property and adjacent to

major bus routes serving Carolina North should be closely monitored and discouraged. The Town should work with neighborhoods such as Colonial Heights, Elkin Hills, Ironwoods, and those along Piney Mountain Road to explore solutions such as parking permit systems and neighborhood watch programs.

- The resources and manpower necessary to enforce laws at the neighborhood level should be reflected in fiscal planning for Carolina North.
- Concerned about the safety of kids getting to school in the vicinity of Carolina North given the anticipated increase in traffic impact.
- A lot of people are very excited about Carolina North and feel that it is going to be an asset to the Town, but traffic impact is a huge concern.
- Encourage the Council to continue to encourage fewer parking spaces and more people using buses and riding bicycles.
- Understand that roads will need to be widened and turn lanes will need to be added. Would like to make sure that citizens are aware in advance before such transportation improvements occur.
- Need to make sure that school bus schedules and safety will not be compromised due to additional Carolina North traffic.
- Make sure the road improvements are done correctly from the start for all modes of transportation. Need to factor concerns of school-age children (crosswalks), bicyclists (bike lanes), etc. as part of designing these improvements. Need to engage the appropriate groups and get feedback as part of the design process.
- Transportation planning for Carolina North is really just beginning, and it is going to be an ongoing activity. To really be effective, it is going to have to be approached incrementally. It is the goal of the local neighborhoods to be a bigger part of this process. In particular, the citizens in the surrounding neighborhoods would like to be at the table for all of the major transportation discussions throughout the build-out of Carolina North. Would like to have not just informed citizens, but more active involvement by citizens.
- Public participation requirements should be developed around each Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA), Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP), Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and other key milestones in the transportation planning process.
- The Mayor of Chapel Hill should appoint a citizen liaison to coordinate communication between local neighborhoods, the Town and the University on issues pertaining to Carolina North development. Re-appointment would be reconsidered annually with input from the public and the Town Manager.
- The Town and the University should adopt additional strategies for engaging the public at key points during the Carolina North build-out, including more emphasis on interaction and discussion during public meetings, leveraging social networks and other online resources, focusing events on specific topics, and exploring alternative times and locations.
- Transportation planning should be more transparent. Relevant information should be shared as early as possible and it should be clear how key decisions are being made and what other

options are being considered. The public should have opportunities to learn enough about the variables used in transportation planning to develop an appreciation for how changes to those variables will affect outcomes. Online tools should be explored that allow some degree of public interaction with the planning projections and assumptions.

- The Town should involve citizens and neighborhood groups such as NRG in the formulation of specific public participation activities, both before and after the adoption of the Development Agreement.
- Effective transportation planning depends largely on the accuracy of the assumption, the models and the data used by the planners. However given the complexity of the Carolina North development and the far-reaching impacts on the community of Chapel Hill and Carrboro, it is unrealistic to think that those assumptions will always be correct, no matter how elegant they look in an equation or a data table.
- Carolina North may be a 50 year project, but we need to focus on the needs of our families and the safety of our children going to school today.
- Citizens want safeguards in place that will protect them when planning decisions don't work out the way we thought they would even though based on well intentioned assumptions and the best efforts of all involved. We believe that a clearly articulated set of expectations and standards will benefit all stakeholders throughout the development process.
- Regarding the environmental impact, and the idea of a 6 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions – there is a difference between the mitigation and the no-mitigation scenarios. The no-build scenario includes increased carbon gas emissions of 30 percent. That's the figure we should focus on.
- While estimating the traffic flow of people going to work in the morning and trying to get home in the evening, the Traffic Impact Analysis does not seem to account for people trying to get back and forth between the main campus and Carolina North. How we are going to keep the campus as one unit is something that is not addressed in the TIA and needs to be determined.
- There seems to be an utter lack of imagination that goes into thinking about bicycle and pedestrian connectivity between Carolina North and the main campus. Rather than seeing this as a problem, need to view it as an opportunity to make Chapel Hill a more bicycle and pedestrian-friendly community. Need to think big, and need to do so at the beginning. Can't just think about creating a bike lane on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard to get bicyclists back and forth between Carolina North and the main campus, also need to think about how we could build off-road bicycle paths. There are routes that could be utilized such as connecting to existing bike paths in Carrboro and providing additional connectivity with Carolina North. Ideally, Carolina North could become a hub of bicycle paths that could make the Town a more bicycle-friendly place.
- The Planning Board believes that building the transit transfer station on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard should be a priority and occur in Phase I of Carolina North. Having this transfer station in place sends a clear message to both the University and Chapel Hill communities that this campus will be transit-oriented from the very beginning. The Chancellors Leadership Advisory Committee also recommended that Carolina North campus be transit-oriented from the very beginning.

- The Planning Board believes that the parking that will be required for Carolina North at outlying lots, such as the existing park-and-ride lots, should be built as structured parking on existing lots rather than building additional impervious surface on valuable and dwindling land. Such use of valuable resources, although more costly initially, shows a willingness to practice sustainable growth in developing this new campus.
- In expanding the Eubanks Road park-and-ride lot the Planning Board recommends that the University and Town should consider asking the North Carolina Department of Transportation to allow a direct access to this lot, and this lot only, from I-40. Such direct access would alleviate potential negative impacts upon Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd from Weaver Dairy Road north to I-40.
- In Table 10 of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Draft Executive Summary (page 4-9), the total number of parking spaces (bottom row) should be based on the constrained (-10%) ratio (or less) and should be 1373 or less. In Table 11 of the TIA Draft Executive Summary (page 4-10), the total number of parking spaces (bottom row) should be based on the constrained (-20%) ratio (or less) and should be less than 4668 spaces. The University is encouraged to achieve these numbers (or fewer) by creative use of shared parking on site between activities with different peak time requirements.
- The Planning Board believes that Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard should be made more pedestrian friendly by creating more pedestrian islands, signalized crosswalks and, ideally, a pedestrian bridge at its more heavily trafficked (vehicular, bike, pedestrian) location.
- The Planning Board recommends that construction traffic be minimized by requiring that as much activity as possible (e.g., cement mixing) occur on site during the build-out phases.
- The Planning Board believes that any elementary school built on the Carolina North site should be built in a way as to discourage parents driving their children to school.
- Recommend that Carolina North buildings that are adjacent to existing public roads or adjacent to existing residential areas require Community Design Commission review and approval of final plans for building elevations and Lighting Plan prior to Town approval of the development. Per the current development plan this would not occur, but the Community Design Commission believes that its charge is to review elevations and lighting plans that occur in Chapel Hill and part of the campus will develop on a public road that citizens will drive up and down and see every day.
- That Concept Plan Review by the Community Design Commission and Town Council occur for buildings adjacent to existing public roads or adjacent to existing residential areas.
- The Community Design Commission believes that buildings that are constructed along existing public streets should be no more than 4 stories at the street level with the height transitioning to multiple stories as you move away from the street and towards the center of the site. This particular concern stems from some of the concerns that citizens have been verbalizing regarding the East 54 development. Four stories is the height of the East 54 buildings at the street, and the Community Design Commission believes that this would be an acceptable height along the Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard corridor. The Commission is concerned however, as the University's design guidelines suggest the possibility of having 8-story buildings along the



Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard corridor, and the members of the Commission felt that this height was much too high along this corridor.

- The Community Design Commission believes that the street setback for buildings along public streets should be a minimum of 100 feet.
- The Community Design Commission felt that the Development Agreement should be reviewed more often than 20 years. In particular, the Commission felt that the Agreement should be reviewed and updated by the advisory boards and the Town Council at least every eight years. Some Council Members have suggested the idea of semi-annual reports, but notes that one of the concerns with having reports is that under the Development Agreement, although citizens would know what is happening, nothing could be done. The Development Agreement is a contract, and unless there is a violation of that contract, even though citizens would understand what is happening, there is nothing that could be done at that point in time. So, the Community Design Commission felt that 20 years was too long a time period for such an agreement.
- Regarding design standards and mitigation measures, the Community Design Commission felt that the current University design standards, while very good, were not as specific as they would like to see. Would like to see them tightened up before the Development Agreement is approved.
- Regarding water use, the Community Design Commission felt that Carolina North development should have no net negative impact on non-Carolina North property water rates, and that any increase in cost, either associated with rates or capital expenditures associated with the increased water usage as a result of Carolina North be borne by the University. This recommendation is based on an understanding that much of the revenue that goes to OWASA comes from site connections and that larger projects get reduced rates for site connections so therefore a large project that might be using as much water as a thousand homes but only has several large connections, would cause the amount of revenue going to OWASA to be much less. Also recommend that as part of the Development Agreement, that studies be regularly done to ensure that the water rates to the non-Carolina North citizens are not being adversely affected by water usage on the Carolina North site.

#### Interests Raised by Citizens (Written)

The following written comments and recommendations were prepared by and submitted by Neighbors for Responsible Growth. The comments and recommendations were submitted as a report titled "Transportation Planning and Carolina North – Recommendations of Citizens of Northern Chapel Hill and Carrboro." These comments and recommendations are provided below.

#### **Introduction**

This summary of findings and recommendations on transportation planning for the proposed Carolina North development is based on public opinion data gathered from residents of northern Chapel Hill and Carrboro between April 12 and May 6, 2009 by Neighbors for Responsible Growth (NRG). For the purposes of this report, the comments and ideas shared by citizens have been consolidated under five major themes that underscore their importance:

1. Engaging in comprehensive transportation planning
2. Monitoring and mitigating impacts on neighborhoods
3. Accommodating safe, sustainable mobility
4. Promoting active public Participation
5. Ensuring adequate safeguards and accountability

Many important issues are being addressed in deliberations between the Town of Chapel Hill and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as they work to craft a Development Agreement that will govern the initial phase of construction at Carolina North. Transportation planning has emerged as an issue of immense concern because 1) key transportation planning studies have been delayed and are only now being completed and presented to the public and 2) the additional traffic generated by Carolina North will have an immediate and significant impact on the greater Chapel Hill/Carrboro community.

The Chapel Hill-based grassroots organization Neighbors for Responsible Growth (NRG) undertook a targeted public outreach effort on traffic and transportation in order to complement an ongoing series of general public meetings on Carolina North sponsored by the Town and the University. NRG collected the information using a multi-pronged approach that included six facilitated neighborhood focus groups, an online survey completed by nearly 600 citizens from more than 50 neighborhoods, and a public forum attended by more than 100 citizens that provided opportunities for them to discuss transportation issues with other citizens, members of the Town Council and UNC officials. A map representing the residences of participants is included in Appendix A. Survey results and concerns about specific roads and intersections have been shared with the Town of Chapel Hill and are referred to in the recently completed Transportation Impact Analysis.

The results of the focus groups, the online survey, and concerns and suggestions raised during the May 3 public forum are available on the NRG website at [www.nrg-nc.net](http://www.nrg-nc.net).

Some of the recommendations in this report already enjoy the support of Town and University officials, while others may require additional discussion and clarification. NRG is presenting these recommendations to the Town Council and UNC Board of Trustees with the expectation that citizens will be provided with feedback on each of the recommendations before a final version of the Development Agreement is adopted. Formal feedback on citizen input promotes confidence in local governance and the process, and will set a positive precedent for public participation throughout the build-out of Carolina North.

## Recommendations

### **I. Engaging in comprehensive transportation planning**

- A. The Town of Carrboro should be made a more active participant in transportation planning decisions related to Carolina North.

- B. All new proposed development in northern Chapel Hill and Carrboro, including Carolina Commons, and all secondary development along main corridors like MLK Boulevard, should be included in assumptions and models for Transportation Impact Analyses, Short Range Transit Plans (SRTP), Transportation Management Plans and other key milestones in the transportation planning process.
- C. All future transportation planning for Carolina North should reflect broader planning efforts such as the Long Range Transit Plan and the recommendations of the new Sustainable Community Visioning Task Force.

## **II. Monitoring and mitigating impacts on neighborhoods**

- A. The impacts of cut-through traffic should be minimized and mitigated along connecting corridors such as Piney Mountain Road, Cedar Hills Drive, Lakeshore Drive, Rogers Road, Hillsborough Street and Northwood Drive.
- B. Non-resident parking in residential areas close to the Carolina North property and adjacent to major bus routes serving Carolina North should be closely monitored and discouraged. The Town should work with neighborhoods such as Colonial Heights, Elkin Hills, Ironwoods, and those along Piney Mountain Road to explore solutions such as permit systems and neighborhood watch programs.
- C. The resources and manpower necessary to enforce laws at the neighborhood level should be reflected in fiscal planning for Carolina North.

## **III. Accommodating safe, sustainable mobility**

- A. We applaud the Council's emphasis on sustainable public transit. The Town should expand park-and-ride facilities and other infrastructure improvements necessary to facilitate its utilization.
- B. The widening of roads, new road construction, and other activities that ultimately increase traffic on our roadways should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.
- C. Parking spaces at Carolina North should be added at constrained ratios, following the recommendations of the Sustainability Committee (proposed Section G.8.2.(a)).
- D. Transportation improvements that encourage walking and biking should be emphasized. Suggestions include continuous, fully connected sidewalks and bike lanes on MLK Boulevard and other corridors serving Carolina North, improved crosswalks, and upgrades and connecting extensions of existing facilities such as the Bolin Creek Greenway.
- E. Traffic impacts on school safety and operations should be closely monitored. Planning should minimize the disruption of school bus routes, provide safe routes for students walking or biking to school, ensure safe pick-up and drop-off options, and implement necessary mitigation measures on Seawell School Road, Estes Drive and other roads heavily used by children and parents during school hours.

- F. Construction traffic should be quarantined as much as possible. Effective staging areas should be created to minimize construction traffic and as much construction infrastructure as possible should remain within Carolina North.
- G. The Transit Transfer Station should be completed as soon as possible.

#### **IV. Promoting active public participation**

- A. Public participation requirements should be developed around each Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA), Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP), Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and other key milestones in the transportation planning process.
- B. The Mayor of Chapel Hill should appoint a citizen liaison to coordinate communication between local neighborhoods, the Town and the University on issues pertaining to Carolina North development. Re-appointment would be reconsidered annually with input from the public and the Town Manager.
- C. The Town and the University should adopt additional strategies for engaging the public at key points during the Carolina North build-out, including more emphasis on interaction and discussion during public meetings, leveraging social networks and other online resources, focusing events on specific topics, and exploring alternative times and locations.
- D. Transportation planning should be more transparent. Relevant information should be shared as early as possible and it should be clear how key decisions are being made and what other options are being considered. The public should have opportunities to learn enough about the variables used in transportation planning to develop an appreciation for how changes to those variables will affect outcomes. Online tools should be explored that allow some degree of public interaction with the planning projections and assumptions.
- E. The Town should involve citizens and neighborhood groups such as NRG in the formulation of specific public participation activities, both before and after the adoption of the Development Agreement.

#### **V. Ensuring adequate safeguards and accountability**

- A. New buildings at Carolina North should not be occupied until the transportation improvements designated through each Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA), Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) and Transportation Management Plan (TMP) are implemented and fully functional.
- B. Before each new TIA, the University should present the Town with the estimated increase in total occupancy expected during the period up to the next scheduled TIA. If occupancy exceeds the estimate at any point during that period, no additional occupancy should occur without the formal approval of the Town Council after a standard public comment period.
- C. A new TIA should be conducted every three years for the duration of the first Development Agreement for Carolina North.
- D. The accepted Level of Service for roads and intersections in the TIA study area should not be

- any lower than the Town standard, D.
- E. All future TIAs should factor in construction traffic.
  - F. All future TIAs should extend bicycle performance metrics to the boundary of the study area.
  - G. Four months before the end of the term of each TIA, public concerns and perceptions on local traffic conditions and pedestrian and bicycle safety should be solicited by the Town in coordination with the appointed citizen liaison and neighborhood representatives (see IIB).
  - H. At the end of each TIA period, the Town and the TIA consultant should produce a report that evaluates the accuracy of TIA projections and assumptions by comparing them against current conditions and levels of service. The report should be made available for public comment and put on the Town Council's agenda for discussion before work on the next scheduled TIA begins.
  - I. A report on statistics for vehicular crashes involving pedestrians, property or other vehicles within the boundary area of the Carolina North TIA should be produced and made available to the public at the end of each fiscal year.
  - J. Final recommendations for all SRTPs and TMPs should include discussion about how key decisions were made and about the options that were considered.
  - K. We applaud the inclusion of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions analysis in the recent Transportation Impact Analysis. Regular monitoring of vehicular traffic-generated GHG levels should be continued and expanded upon.