

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  
November 18, 2008**

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 Tuesday, November 18, 2008:

Interests Raised by Council Members

- How are we going to have the staff collect and catalog the questions and provide the Council with responses? Can we keep a spreadsheet of these questions and answers?
- Responses to questions at meetings need to be on the website as soon as possible.
- What happened to the questions that were asked at the last meeting?
- Airport issue is imbedded in Carolina North negotiations, but Town does not have any further information and does not know any more than the citizens at this point in time. Also, anticipate that if the University has something further to say regarding the airport, the Council expects that they will do it at a different time other than one of the Carolina North meetings.
- The group needs more time for public comments. Suggestion that 20 minutes at the start of the meeting and another 20 minutes at the end of the meeting would be more desirable.
- Purpose of public information sessions are to make sure that everyone has enough information to be fully informed so as to help the Town and University make good decisions regarding the future of Carolina North.
- When would the proposed Transit Center be built?
- How much housing needs to exist before the University will build the daycare center?
- Is the University contemplating any housing associated with the Law School?
- Law School is being discussed as the second building, yet it is 2,000 feet away from the Innovation Center and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The Council has received petitions from law students about the distance between the new law school and the nearest bus stop on Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. Does not seem transit-friendly. Would like for Law School to be successful from the start.
- Concern that Law School faculty and students see moving to Carolina North as a way to get more parking for the Law School. How will the University deal with this issue five years down the road? Seems that it might be better to plan for people to ride to the new Law School on the bus from the beginning, otherwise the Town “may eventually have a mutiny on its hands.”
- Concern that the University Board of Trustees is going to approve the proposed design guidelines without public feedback or input from the Town, and then going to resent it later when they get feedback and requests to make changes. Would be better to have an

opportunity to talk about these proposed guidelines and get some feedback before the Board of Trustees approves them.

- Should consider taking the approach “let’s serve Carolina North with the existing transit system from day one.” Rather than putting money into parking and then subsequently transitioning into increased transit service, why not establish the right precedent from day one and save the University some money?
- More development requires more transit. Recommends planning for and implementing transit in the first place.
- The proposed north-south road is symbolic of transit not working – you are basically saying that you have so many cars that you need to get in and out of this site that you need to create a new road in order to accommodate them.
- How will transit enter and exit the site?
- When does the proposed ‘C’ Road (which is proposed to run from Piney Mountain Road to Estes Drive Extension and back to Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard) exist in its entirety?
- Does the University intend to design in a way to accommodate a fixed guideway?
- Recommend that the Town and the University have a vision, recognizing that what you do in the early years will affect what you can do in the later years.
- One of primary concerns for the Town is whether transit mitigates or exacerbates congestion. Dedicated bus lanes could mitigate automobile traffic, but they are not likely to be available for a long time. Suggestion that putting Road ‘C’ in early may be desirable.
- All of University’s presentation materials and background materials, including draft guidelines and ecological assessment report, have been posted on the Town’s web site and are available for review.
- Carbon Reduction standards (CRED) seem to have morphed into carbon credits, but need to remain as an independent measuring tool to confirm that we are on the right track.
- Interest was expressed regarding the preservation of undeveloped areas of the site for research value and habitat preservation.
- How will areas not subject to the original Development Agreement be zoned? Need additional information before understanding which choices are best.
- Recommendation that the calendar be adjusted when various studies and events do not arrive or occur as anticipated.

#### Interests Raised by University Participants

- Delay in the timetable of the Innovation Center is a good thing as it removes an uncomfortable situation for the Town, by allowing more time to consider the Center prior to finalizing the overall Carolina North condition between now and June.
- Would like to move to the stage where the Board and the Council could ask the staffs to put specific issues together for the next meeting, ideally framing those issues with some parameters so that the Board and Council could discuss them with appropriate context.

- Construction of Transit Center is dependent on amount and rate of development at Carolina North.
- University has tried to listen carefully regarding comments about density, height and the desire for an urban edge along Carolina North's Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard frontage.
- Law School faculty members want to be in the heart of the new campus, and not on the edge of the development. Also, the intersection at the Law School will be a very important intersection and the Board foresees the Law School as being a big building with signature architecture that sets the tone for the academic central core of the campus.
- Receiving the Traffic Impact Study and determining the evolution of how people move around Carolina North along with the addressing the fiscal impacts are the two biggest issues that need to be negotiated from the University's perspective. As is the case on the main campus, the University remains committed to transit and anticipates that the ratio of parking per employee will widen as Carolina North evolves.
- Need to plan for the future, but need to focus on the pace of development, not points in time. Need to talk about the critical mass they are creating and a transportation plan that evolves with the development over time.
- University participants are incredibly frustrated at how long the transit study is taking to be completed.
- Important to categorize key issues for discussion and develop a schedule that will allow the Council and Board to discuss these issues in "bite-size chunks."

#### Interests Raised by Citizens

- Airport is directly related to Carolina North, as plans to close Horace Williams have placed rural areas in southwest Orange County directly under scrutiny as potential new airport locations. This displacement would have a direct impact on these communities. NC legislature has approved a relocation process that does not involve public input from the potentially affected property owners. Thus, the Carolina North discussions are the only avenue to speak to this issue. Recommend moving and keeping AHEC at RDU.
- Concern that public input received thus far has not been posted on the Town's website. Will the questions raised by the community be put on the website?
- Now that we know that the Innovation Center has been delayed, would the University consider further delaying this process and agreeing to abide by the outcome of the Carolina North Development Agreement process?
- Based on the suggested list of buildings at Carolina North, is the University viewing Carolina North as an "overflow" campus?
- With the Innovation Center being delayed, it would also appear that the timeline for airport closure is up for debate. Would like to hear the University's comments on this issue.
- The Chancellor has noted that the Fiscal Impact Study and Transit Study are on the way. Would like to request that as soon as these studies are released that they be immediately made available to the public, even if the Council is not in session.

- Incorporate environmental standards beyond the current Land Use Management Ordinance standards in the Development Agreement.
- Rather than adhering to the Land Use Management Ordinance's lighting standards, consider idea of looking at the International Dark Skies Initiative and possibly consider using their sample ordinance (or could look at ordinances adopted in Arizona and Hawaii) as part of the Development Agreement.
- Need to look at alternative standards for particulates for the new methane facility. Although this facility is not necessarily part of Carolina North, we need an agreement to adhere to particulate standards beyond what the Town and the State normally require.
- Regarding building heights, the University has previously mentioned human-scale buildings (3-5 stories), but the current proposal talks about up to 8-story buildings in the center of Carolina North. Need to further discuss building height and density and be very specific regarding these issues.
- Request that at least the questions being asked at these various meetings be acknowledged by being listed on the Town's website, preferably with answers.
- The table provided by staff comparing the Horace Williams Citizens Committee to the Leadership Advisory Committee indicates that partial agreement exists but a number of issues remain unresolved. This description is an understatement as the quantity and timing of housing at Carolina North has not been resolved and remains the single most important unresolved issue. It is important to create a model of sustainability by providing the opportunity for employees to live on the site and walk to work and achieve carbon reduction and reduce dependence on the automobile. To say that Carolina North is sustainable development requires that off-campus impacts be addressed. The more employees who live off-site, the great the cost of providing additional transit opportunities to get these employees to Carolina North. Accordingly, request that the Council insist that at least 25 percent of employees be housed on the site.
- Request that a future opportunity be provided to have a discussion regarding the airport.
- In the background materials submitted by the University on October 31<sup>st</sup>, there is only one sentence regarding the airport, and it mentions a study done by Talbert & Bright in 2005. Is it possible to get a copy of this report? What is the timetable for closure of the airport? What is happening with the AHEC operations that are currently based at the Horace Williams Airport?
- Request that the University agree to implement some of the fundamental transit and bicycle facilities at the beginning of development, rather than at the end. Implement the greenway plan and install sidewalks, bus shelters and pull-offs, pedestrian crosswalks, signal heads, and refuge islands sooner rather than later. It is important to make the development transit-friendly as early as possible.
- Minimize the footprint of development.
- Incorporate affordable housing opportunities.
- Appreciate the opportunities for public comments at both the beginning and end of joint Council-University work sessions.

- The Development Agreement will give the University a lot of flexibility, while the Town will have the ability to ask for standards above and beyond those included in the Land Use Management Ordinance. It is important to utilize this opportunity to the community's best advantage.
- Why was the expansive nature of the University's proposals not discussed? Have grown from 3 to 8 story buildings, and parking areas look more expansive than before.
- Concerned about University's interest in performance based rewards. The Town needs to understand smaller incremental inputs and associated community benefits and/or rewards. Need metrics for these rewards. Should have a detailed list regarding what the community gets and what the threshold is for receiving each reward.
- Carrying capacity concept is important – it is not clear what the cumulative incremental impact is as buildings get built and the number of trips and transit riders increase, the amount of water usage increases, etc.
- Concern that our decisions now are going to be based on our current zoning requirements, and do not anticipate the next crisis or the next big issue. Recommends preserving the opportunity for both parties to make mutually agreeable changes over time, if and when needed.
- Suggestion that construction management should be an item on the list for discussion. Construction on the main campus has had a major impact on vehicular, bike and pedestrian circulation. This project will impact two major transportation corridors (Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Estes Drive Extension). It is important to contemplate who is going to have the final say regarding how much construction is allowed at any given time, and what the impacts may be.