

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-Trustees Work Session
February 11, 2009**

The following questions/comments were raised during the Chapel Hill Town Council/UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees Joint Work Session that was held on Wednesday, February 11, 2009:

Interests Raised by Council Members

- Regarding the compilation of questions and comments on the Town's web site, what is the relationship between these questions/comments and the answers they are getting at a staff level, and how are these issues going to be identified and addressed by the Town Council? Confused as to when discussions on various topics like public art and fiscal equity are going to occur, and generally feeling disconnected with where the questions are going at the staff level.
- Questions and comments from citizens will not be responded to, but rather will be able to point to where the particular comment or question is addressed in the development agreement.
- When will the Council discuss public art? Where is this identified in the schedule?
- Council needs to have conversations on many issues within itself, and just because someone asks a question or makes a comment does not mean that the Council has had the chance to have a discussion on that respective question or comment.
- The proposed list of permitted uses in the LUMO text amendment of the new zoning district merits serious discussion and consideration.
- Important to recognize that the draft text amendment for the new zoning district and the draft of the development agreement have not been reviewed by the Council, thus need to be careful how these draft documents are described and represented at the upcoming public meetings.
- Is it possible to carve out time in the meetings to discuss these various issues? Need for staff to figure out an approach.
- Housing still seems to be addressed by square footage in the draft development agreement, rather than as a percentage of jobs created (as previously suggested). Needs to be reviewed and corrected.
- Concern that using an assumed 1.5% growth rate may not be best assumption given nature of recent growth and limited prospects for future annexation. Also, concern that projected amount of employment growth in the community and on the main campus may not be accurate either. Important to scrutinize these projections as they will have a major effect on the long term transit plan, even if it means having to re-run the model.
- Transportation is a key issue that a lot of people in the community want to discuss. Given that we do not have all of the information that is needed to have a meaningful conversation regarding transportation tonight, recommend that the Council review its schedule and find an opportunity for a daylong session for the discussion of transit and related transportation issues.

- Will the Council be able to have more detailed discussions regarding vehicles and parking after receiving the Traffic Impact Analysis?
- What does it mean on the schedule where it says “Transportation impact analysis submitted?”
- Need to discuss level of transit that can be funded and agreed upon in order to do the transit plan. Not sure when this discussion can occur on the schedule.
- When does the investment in transit occur, and how does the investment in transit occur?
- Traffic projections clearly indicate that Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard needs to have significant changes with regard to its transportation infrastructure, whether it is buses because that is all we can afford, or whether it is light rail. In order to carry the anticipated capacity, it is going to take a large investment – one that will involve Chapel Hill Transit as it is the only entity that can get Federal and State financial participation. Need to give the staff some sort of guidance as to where we are headed – not sure we can wait for the details.
- Regarding transit, always planning 20-30 years out. Major investment in transit will make Chapel Hill a better community economically, environmentally and a stronger community if we make this kind of transit investment. Ready to say that this is a reasonable step for the community to take, and that it is a question of what UNC can afford to pay.
- The availability of transit may potentially alleviate the need for so many parking decks, which cost a lot of money. If you can avoid the cost of building these decks, you have saved a lot of money. Transit would be a way for the University to not have to find and spend all of this money.
- The ultimate goal is not to have people getting out of their cars at the Chapel Hill border and riding transit into town, but rather is to have people be able to have an option for alternative transportation that is a little bit more seamless.
- Is the approach that we are taking regarding transit one of linking improvements to various thresholds as new people and new jobs are added?
- Understanding with the University that more parking would exist in the early phases of the development, and then development would occur on these lots as the development moves along. This would result in fewer spaces per employee as Carolina North grows. This is an important part of funding transit improvements.
- The location of the Law School building does not seem to necessarily support linking the location of the early buildings to the proximity and availability of transit. Experiences on the main campus make it clear how difficult it is when you take parking away. As exemplified by Southern Village, if a parking lot exists, then people think of it as a right. Would seem better to just put a building there and limit parking from the beginning if that is the long-term plan.
- Concern that Carolina North may not be transit-friendly from the beginning. May require a higher level of investment from the beginning to make this the case.
- The first phase buildings may not be able to be served by transit in the short term in the same manner that they may be served in the long term. May need to make some adjustments in this regard though, as once such parking is there, it may never go away.

- Would like for the University to participate in the Town's stormwater utility.
- The Town wants the University to think about its impact on the community as a whole with regard to clean water. The Town requires all new development to manage stormwater regarding quality and rate of flow. Key issue is cleanliness of the water that the Town and the University discharge downstream.
- Regarding the University's NPDS stormwater permit, it is a water quality permit, not a water quantity permit. The Town's stormwater utility regulates both quality and quantity. NC State is a financial contributor to the City of Raleigh's stormwater system, and it would be desirable for UNC to financially contribute to the Town's system.
- Town requires private developers to pay for their own stormwater management and to also pay to the Town's stormwater utility. Payments to the utility specifically mitigate off-site stormwater impacts and are not related to fiscal impact contributions that will be discussed.
- Fire protection is an example of a service that the University benefits from, but does not directly pay for. Although there is a financial contribution from the General Assembly that is utilized by the Town to help cover the cost of fire department expenses, this amount is not linked in any way to the actual level of service needed or provided. For example, if the contribution was linked to the amount of square footage on the main campus, then it could go up or down based on the amount of development being served. We have the chance to specifically link Carolina-North related contributions to stormwater expenses, and this seems like a practical and desirable choice for the Town.
- Need to better understand where overlap exists regarding stormwater management, and what amount of money would be involved with such contributions.
- Look at transportation impact analysis schedule, and determine when an additional meeting could be scheduled.
- There seem to be enough issues and sufficient complexity that additional meetings should be scheduled now.

Interests Raised by University Participants

- Why is it taking so long to get the results of the transit study?
- Need to have a deadline with the selected traffic consultant regarding when the Traffic Impact Analysis will be completed.
- The issues with the Traffic Impact Analysis are really what assumptions should be used. What is the internal capture rate assumption? What is the assumed ridership rate? These kinds of issues determine what results come out of the study and what types of improvements you need to have in place at certain points in time, based on levels of growth. Can then figure out appropriate contributions, but is a bigger issues that just the Town and the University – will need additional funds from other sources.
- The University's long-term goal is to move towards something similar to what currently exists on the main campus; but, transit does have to come along and evolve. The University wants transit and supports this goal, as the connection between Carolina North and the main campus will be

incredibly important. However, the University has to be careful in case anticipated federal funding for transit does not occur.

- The University is fully committed to being a financial partner in the stormwater utility management program as it pertains to Carolina North. Clearly a lot of the stormwater from Carolina North will go through the Town's system. Figuring out a fair contribution should be fairly simple. Bigger question is whether or not there is any benefit to the Town or the University that is gained by incorporating the University into the Town's existing system, or is it better for the University to manage the on-site stormwater system at Carolina North in the same manner that it handles stormwater on the main campus as required by Federal and State law. Some at the University are concerned about ceding control of the system to the Town and losing control of something that the University has a responsibility to maintain.
- If the University comes up with a fair contribution, is it important to the Town for the University to actually put the on-site portion of Carolina North into the Town's stormwater system?
- The University does a very good job of regulating stormwater on the main campus. Requesting a financial contribution feels like a separate fiscal impact issue. Why would this issue be separated from other off-site fiscal impacts?

Interests Raised by Citizens

- Challenge the committee and both the Town and the University to get information out sooner, rather than right before a meeting.
- Need to keep the public informed with the latest information.
- Belief that the text in the draft LUMO Text Amendment and the draft Development Agreement is going to be harder and harder to change as we move forward with the planning process.
- Concerned about lighting – "A dark skies standard should not be applied to the campus as a whole." Would like to know why not? Building Carolina North is kind of like building another downtown. Currently if you are at the airport, we do not have light spillover into the adjoining neighborhoods. But obviously, if the University builds the tall buildings that are being discussed, there will be issues regarding lighting. Need some more information. Wants to understand why this element was dropped and why we are not holding the University to a higher standard.
- There is no recognition that the length of Bolin Creek along this property is a unique feature of this property. Would like for the University to begin monitoring Bolin Creek off-site and downstream of this property. Does not see this addressed in draft agreement.
- Talk about text amendments is premature. Has not been enough public input. Has not been enough time to review the recently provided material and react to it in an informed manner.
- Document says what we are not going to do. Would like to see more of what we are going to do, and justification for both.
- The University's Carolina North plan should leave a portion of the site permanently undeveloped, rather than for just 50 years as proposed. It is important that the University meet the community's expectation to preserve a portion of the site in a protected and undeveloped state. These areas contribute to the widely-shared view that Chapel Hill is a beautiful place.

The University's approach to only preserve undeveloped areas for 50 years is a business manager's approach, and does not fulfill the community's overall expectations. Also the State's environmental bill of rights discusses the "common heritage of this state" and the need to "preserve forests, open lands, and places of beauty." Encourages the University as part of our heritage to preserve a portion of Carolina North as permanent undeveloped land. This is not just a University and Chapel Hill issue, it certainly also involves Carrboro as well as the State of North Carolina. Recommends that the Council support Jim Ward's position regarding the permanent preservation of open space at Carolina North.

- Homeowners in neighborhoods located north of Homestead Road along Weaver Dairy Road Extension are concerned that the proposed northern exit from Carolina North will create increased traffic on Weaver Dairy Road Extension and also create possible safety issues.
- Notion that increased traffic on Weaver Dairy Road Extension will be created is based on assumption that a northern connection to Carolina North will provide a shortcut to I-40 and allow drivers to bypass 3 stoplights on Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
- Jack Evans previously stated that the recommendation for the northern exit to Carolina North came from the University's traffic consultant. Is the applicable section of the consultant's traffic report available to the public so that they can understand the basis for that recommendation?
- Did the University's traffic consultant consider the impact of a northern exit on neighboring neighborhoods? Are the other results of the traffic study in? If so, what do those results indicate regarding Weaver Dairy Road Extension? Also, if the northern exit is going to be a part of the plan, would the Town Council and the University Trustees consider a transit-only exit?
- Protection of existing neighborhoods is one of the foundations of Chapel Hill's Comprehensive Plan. When the master planning process for UNC's main campus was ongoing a number of years ago, the Council reinforced that concern for neighborhoods by passing the following in July of 1999: "BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council opposes mass transit routes and technology, including rail, that would have serious adverse impact on any Chapel Hill neighborhood." Hopefully, concern for neighborhood protection is still part of the Town of Chapel Hill's primary goals. With this in mind, our growth, which will in the future include Carolina North, has and will continue to have impacts on neighborhoods in many respects, including transportation. A transportation system that has the least impact on existing neighborhoods should be the goal of the Council and this should be clearly stated in any development agreement.
- Based on the Town's history, one cannot overemphasize the importance of having something agreed to and in writing about the protection of neighborhoods related to both campuses. It was stated over and over again during the Master Planning process that Pittsboro Street would be the dividing line between the main campus and the Cameron McCauley Street Historic District. This was said often enough and in different places and heard by enough of us keeping up with the process that we thought it was so. Then we found nothing was in writing when the University bought the Dobbins property in our neighborhood. Please put in written protections for all Chapel Hill neighborhoods, not only for encroaching by the University, but also protections from transportation systems invading neighborhoods.

- A number of years ago, the Mayor, several Council members, the Town Manager and several others visited Ottawa to see that Town's bus rapid mass transit system. We were led by John Bonsall who had developed the system, and well as systems for other areas. It is an impressive system and many of us came away convinced that something similar could work for our area. A bus rapid mass transit system allows for greater flexibility to meet the needs of existing as well as future ridership; allows for greater interconnection with Chapel Hill Transit, which is essential for an effective regional mass transit system; allows for greater interconnection with park and ride lots and commuter traffic; allows for use of advanced traffic signal technology to reduce auto congestion, among other reasons, and none of these would be possible using the existing railway.
- John Gardner, a UNC transportation planner in 1990, wrote an article that is pertinent to our present situation. He advocated for a bus rapid mass transit system. He does mention a dedicated bus way that might be hard to achieve on Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard, but a bus system here still seems superior rather than the use of the rail line that is fraught with complications.
- Thanks for making the January 29th public information session a successful and interactive opportunity for citizens.
- Nice to have copy of revised timeline in advance. When will the Traffic Impact Analysis actually be finished? Would be nice to have a date regarding this event in the timeline. The surrounding neighborhoods will be very interested in seeing the results of this study.
- This process and the associated issues are very complicated. What do you comment on? Hard for the public to follow. Important to emphasize the meetings that are most important for the public to get to. The matrix of meetings on the Town's website is completely overwhelming to the public.
- What is going to be done with the public comments? Where do they go? Do they go to the staff? Do they inform the staff regarding the recommendations they make to the Council? Or, do they go to the Council?
- Recommend including work sessions on specific topics, so that the public can come to a meeting and be able to react to something specific. Give specific bullet points so that citizens know what to focus their attention on. Right now, it is very hard for the public to know what to react to.
- Really important that transit be built in from the start at Carolina North.
- Should not live with just a promise of fixed guideway.
- Does not believe it is fair to hold the University to a higher standard, however, does not believe that Jim Ward's request that the University limit growth and preserve open space at Carolina North is really a higher standard. If the University will not consider limiting the amount of build-out to the currently indicated area associated with the proposed 50-year time frame, then would encourage University representatives to think about what is an appropriate boundary, and to establish such a boundary and then figure out ways to grow in a smarter and more creative manner within those limitations. Not any different than what we would ask of any other developer. The University is in a position to take a leadership role in this regard.

- If you can set aside all of the open questions about how UNC and Chapel Hill are going to grow, what the citizens really want to know is how the Town is going to design transportation infrastructure around Carolina North. If the University truly wants to be a world-class educational and research center, then the University needs to make sure that the transportation infrastructure works.
- Increasing the transit system proportionally as development occurs is a reasonable approach, but the financial investment in transit, and fixed guideway infrastructure in particular, is huge. If this is the goal, then need to start educating the public now as they are going to be the ones who approve the tax increases that provide the funding.
- All the roads around the entrance (Estes Drive, Estes Drive Extension, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard) are roads that are constrained now. Whatever is built, whether a little or a lot, you are going to need to widen the roads, and that is going to take time. So, these improvements should be on the table for discussion now.
- Believe that Town should hold the University to higher standards as it helps them sharpen their game, if nothing else.
- The proposed document is fast-drying concrete. Very suspicious that any game-changing comments that arrive late in the process will not really be entertained.
- We are talking about 3 million square feet, and it is time to know what the obligations, responsibilities and the outcomes of this project are, as well as the community benefits.
- Lessons from the OI-4 zoning district and development process should have taught us about the need for a robust underlying zoning district at Carolina North. Concerned about the permitted uses in the proposed U-1 district.
- The staff process is very opaque. It is hard to tell why so many elements have been moved or not put in tonight's document like housing or lighting. Some things have been totally missed like noise. The draft only talks about construction noise. But what about the chiller plant, Mason Farm, etc.? Noise is not just about construction and needs to be more completely addressed.
- At what point does the public submit specific technical requirements for the development agreement? For example, if somebody wanted to submit technical requirements regarding energy, when do they submit such comments and who do they submit them to? What kind of follow-up should they expect? Do they receive a yes or no?
- Who is footing the bill for meetings like tonight?
- The PDF document on the website is a really poor format for sharing the public's questions and comments. Need to get more creative in how the staff makes this information available.
- In terms of the key documents, need to redline draft documents so that everyone can tell what has changed from one version to another, and also should provide specific reasons why something changed.
- Still not getting email notifications regarding updates.
- Regarding the foundation studies that are way, way delayed, we need these studies as these numbers will be very important and we don't have them.

- Need more frequent updates. Make a commitment to update and publish the draft document once every week with all the changes that have been made.
- Open records request – (1) would like to see every email that a citizen has sent to the Carolina North website, and (2) would like to see every work product that the staff has generated in the last 2 months that relates to the development agreement and transit study.
- Discussions need to be reality-based not faith-based. Citizens need the numbers and complete information to give constructive input and help to help make decisions.