

MEETING MINUTES
ORANGE COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
AUGUST 19, 2020
SPECIAL MEETING

(Due to current public health concerns, this meeting was held virtually.
Members of the Planning Board, staff and public participated remotely)

MEMBERS PRESENT: David Blankfard (Chair), Hillsborough Township Representative; Adam Beeman (Vice-Chair), Cedar Grove Township Representative; Kim Piracci, Eno Township Representative; Susan Hunter, Chapel Hill Township Representative; Patricia Roberts, Cheeks Township Representative; Randy Marshall, At-Large Representative; Hunter Spitzer, At-Large Representative; Alexandra Allman, At-Large Representative; Melissa Poole, Little River Township Representative; Carrie Fletcher, Bingham Township Representative

MEMBERS ABSENT: Gio Mollinedo, At-Large Representative; Vacant, At-Large Representative

STAFF PRESENT: Craig Benedict, Planning Director; Perdita Holtz, Planning Systems Coordinator; Tom Altieri, Comprehensive Planning Supervisor; Michael Harvey, Current Planning Supervisor; Brian Carson, GIS Tech III, Christopher Sandt, Staff Engineer; Nish Trivedi, Transportation Planner; Tyler Sliger, Planner; Molly Boyle: Planner; Tina Love, Administrative Support; Steve Brantley, Economic Development Director, Amanda Garner, Assistant Economic Development Director;

APPLICANT AND ASSOCIATES PRESENT: Bill Aucoin, Vice President - Avison Young; Chris Bostic, Project Manager – Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.; Jack Graham, Principal – Avison Young; Michael Birch, Partner – Longleaf Law Partners; Christa Greene, Senior Principal – Stantec; Frank Csapo, CEO – Barrister Commercial Group; Rick Ogburn, Director of Construction – Barrister Commercial Group;

OTHERS PRESENT: Penny Rich (BOCC Chair); Earl McKee, (BOCC); Ronald Allen; Joy Alvis; Diane Anderson; Daniel Arneman; Gina Arnone; Susan Attermeier; David B.; Jill Bauer; John Boxter; Clare Brennan; Jessie Brinson; Dana Brinson; Ronda Buchanan; Bob Bundschuh; Stephanie Caler; Jocelyn Carbonara; Samantha Carney; Stuart Carr; Christina Casa; EJ Caughlin; Annie Caulkins; Tom Caulkins; Gayane Chambless; Susan Cheek; Michael Childress; Karla Childress; John Clayton; Carolina Colbert; Karen Coulter; Linda Crabill; Kaye Crawford; Vincent Credle; Betsy Crittenden; James Curtis; Beth Daniel; Jane Davis; Mary Therese Deegan; Dennis DeJianne; John Dempsey; Nora Dennis; Anne Derby; Adam Dickens; Cindy DiLiberti; Mike Dodson; Maria Dowle; DC Dowmont; Rebecca Drapp; Diane and Erik Dunder; Cedar Eagle; Marguerite Eaton; Richard Eckberg; Jeremy Edmondson; Dale Edwards; Brika Eklund; Robb English; Williams Evans; James Farrin; Kenneth Fath; Phyllis Fath; Clairece Feagin; Joe Feagin; Karen Fernandez; Larry Fernandez; Beverly Ferreiro; Hope Folsom; Andy Freeman; Madelyn Friedman; Nan Fulcher; Florence Garland; Franklin Garland; Lisa Garland; Isabel Garland; Betty Garland; Kris Garvin; Beth Gerall; Andrew Gillespie; Aleta Gillespie; Theresa Gilliam; Tom Gilliam; Joel Gillis; Amira Glaser; Sascha Godfrey; Tammy Grubb; Dore Gruener; Myra Gwin-Summers; Barrett Hahn; J Mathew Hamlett; Parviz Hatami; Bonnie Hauser; Charles Hecht; Jeanne Hecht; Amy Henes; James Henninger; Sarah Henshaw; Michael Henson; Lauren Herman; Melissa Hinson; Tom Howe; Teresa Howell; Lucas Howerter; Janet Huebner; Matt Hughes; Mark Hulbert; Anthony Isley; Marilyn Jacobs Preyer; Chloe Johnson; Frederic Jordan; Jared Jurkiewicz; Joan Kalnitsky; Andrea Kalokitis; Gloria Kammerman; Tony and Gail Kane; Jesse Kaufmann; Jeb Kelly; Shelley Kennedy; Michael Kennedy; Jay Kennedy; Claire Kern; Stephen King; Brenda Knowles; Matthew Kostura; Brenda Kross; Ed Kushner; Pattie Kushner; Margo Lakin; Wilson Lamb; Becky Laudicina; Laura Lipps; Traci Little; Jeff Lloyd; Jon Lorusso; Ashley Lorusso; Keith Luck; Laura Maile; Bradley Manton; Andi Mariategui; Janet Marks; Jeffrey Marks; Ralph Marshall; Margaret Matheis; Nicole Mayer; Ellen Mayer; Adam McGovern; Jane McMullen; Kathryn Mentz; Karin Michel; Joelle Miller; Matt Mitchell; Justin Mitchell; Bill Mitchell; Rena Mitchell; Kaila Mitchell; Amy Morrow; Erin Mullaney; Amy Mullenix; Miguel Munoz; Alice Murdoch; Virginia Nadworny; Wanda Neville; Sandy Newton; Kevin Nicholson; Davia Nickelson; Kailey Norman; Wendy Novicenskie; Eric Nowicki; Lynn Occhiuzzo; Colin OConnor; Amira Oguntoyinbo; Kelly Owensby; Tami Pfeifer; Keith Poole; Christine Poole; Kristi Price; Marcos Prieto; Lauren Procopio; Jean-Francois Provost; Erik Reavely; Linda Reed; Kim Reiman; L.A. Renn; Victoria Reynolds; Carl Richardson; William Riedel; Leslie Roberts; Nicole Robertson; Chris Rodermond; Stephanie Rogers; Payton Rose; Beth Rosenberg; Maryanne Ross; Andrew Rouse; Victoria Roy; Korinn Saker; John Saylor; Jennifer Saylor; David Scanga; Lori Scanga; Gerald Scarlett; Tracy Schaeffer; Kathleen Schenley; Mark Schueller; Geoff Sebesta; Patricia Sena; Jayse Sessi; Amanda Shakhoulou;

56 Michael Shannon; Claudia Shapiro; Karen Shelley; Sarah Shore; Joseph Shore; Doug Short; Ronald Sieber; Stanley
57 Smith; Lily Smith; Katie Smith; Angela Sneed; Brandon Sneed; Rich Sodemann; Bruce Spencer; Kathy Stanford; Lisa
58 Sutton; Frederick Tapp; Alison Taylor; Blake Tedder; Thelma Thomas; Paul Thomas; Bernard Thomas; Chip
59 Thrasher; Lee Thurston; Jane Thurston; Merideth Tomlinson; Ashley Trahan; Edward Triplett; Elizabeth Turnbull;
60 Catharine Vaughan; Rowdy Walker; Susan Walser; Sophie Wang; Judy Weinstock; Paul Werner; Deborah White;
61 Mary Whortan; Stephan Williams; Erika Williamson; Phyllis Wright; Edward Wright; Jeffery Wysocki; Dana Xiao;
62 Jenifer Yarnelle; Kenneth Yowell; Kurt Kulberg; Declan Cambey; "jdmmc"; "homevet"; 16 callers
63
64

65 **AGENDA ITEM 1: BRIEF SUMMARY BY STAFF ON TECHNOLOGY PROTOCOLS FOR MEETING**
66 **PRESENTER:** Perdita Holtz, Planning Systems Coordinator

67 *Perdita reviewed the technical processes and rules*
68
69

70 **AGENDA ITEM 2: CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

71 Chair David Blankfard called the meeting to order.
72
73

74 **AGENDA ITEM 3: INFORMATION ITEMS**

- 75 a. Draft Minutes for the August 5, 2020 Regular Meeting (to be approved at the next regular
76 meeting; provided here for information purposes)
77
78

79 **AGENDA ITEM 4: CONSIDERATION OF ADDITIONS TO AGENDA.**

80 There were none
81
82

83 **AGENDA ITEM 5: PUBLIC CHARGE**
84

85 **INTRODUCTION TO THE PUBLIC CHARGE**

86 The Board of County Commissioners, under the authority of North Carolina General Statute,
87 appoints the Orange County Planning Board (OCPB) to uphold the written land development law of
88 the County. The general purpose of OCPB is to guide and accomplish coordinated and
89 harmonious development. OCPB shall do so in a manner, which considers the present and future
90 needs of its citizens and businesses through efficient and responsive process that contributes to
91 and promotes the health, safety, and welfare of the overall County. The OCPB will make every
92 effort to uphold a vision of responsive governance and quality public services during our
93 deliberations, decisions, and recommendations.
94

95 **PUBLIC CHARGE**

96 The Planning Board pledges to the citizens of Orange County its respect. The Board asks its
97 citizens to conduct themselves in a respectful, courteous manner, both with the Board and with
98 fellow citizens. At any time, should any member of the Board or any citizen fail to observe this
99 public charge, the Chair will ask the offending member to leave the meeting until that individual
100 regains personal control. Should decorum fail to be restored, the Chair will recess the meeting
101 until such time that a genuine commitment to this public charge is observed.
102
103

104 **AGENDA ITEM 6: CHAIR COMMENTS**
105

106 David Blankfard: Please everyone in the public please be kind to everybody else. We are all citizens of
107 Orange County. If you have any comments, please direct them to the Planning Department and they
108 will get them to us. Contacting us through Facebook, LinkedIn, telephone calls is not appropriate.
109
110

111 AGENDA ITEM 7: CLARIFICATION OF PLANNING BOARD ACTIONS ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE TOWN OF
 112 HILLSBOROUGH/ORANGE COUNTY CENTRAL ORANGE COORDINATED AREA (COCA) LAND USE PLAN
 113 AND TO THE ORANGE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FLUM) - To review
 114 and make a recommendation to the BOCC on County-initiated amendments to the COCA and
 115 FLUM in the vicinity of the southern portion of the Hillsborough Area Economic Development
 116 District. To clarify the motion made at the August 5, 2020 Planning Board meeting and revote on
 117 the clarified motion regarding County-initiated amendments to the COCA and FLUM in the vicinity
 118 of the southern portion of the Hillsborough Area Economic Development District. This item is
 119 scheduled for BOCC public hearing on September 15, 2020.

120 PRESENTER: Tom Altieri, Comprehensive Planning Supervisor

121
 122 David Blankfard: Item 7 is to clarify a vote that we took on the 5th and any comments need to be in regards to this
 123 clarification. Comments pertaining to the RTL application are going to be at a later time which is up next. Can I get
 124 a new motion for Item 7?

125
 126 Randy Marshall: I believe the motion would amend Orange County's zoning atlas as established in Section 1.2 of the
 127 Orange County UDO and whereas the proposed rezoning consist of the 8 property owners and whereas the proposal
 128 has been found to be consistent with the 2030 Orange County Comprehensive Plan and whereas the requirement of
 129 Section 2.8 of the UDO has been deemed complete and whereas the Board has found that the proposed zoning atlas
 130 amendment to be reasonably necessary to promote the public health, safety and general welfare we recommend that
 131 the Board of County Commissioners rezone the areas described above and depicted on the attached map.

132
 133 Tom Altieri: Chair Blankfard, Tom Altieri, Orange County Comprehensive Planning Supervisor. Good Evening, if I
 134 could just say a few words about this item. I think it would be helpful and I can reference page numbers that are in
 135 your packet that I think would be helpful as well. So thank you for your service to the Planning Board members. The
 136 purpose of this item is to clarify the motion that was made at the August 5th Planning Board Meeting and to revote on
 137 the County initiated amendments to the Land Use Plans. In your agenda packet, this item is on pages 33-38. While
 138 the intent of the Boards' action was clear on August 5th , through review of the meeting recording, staff discovered
 139 that the motion included reading from materials related to a subsequent agenda item. Planning staff is not
 140 suggesting that the Board revisit its discussion but rather to repeat the correct motion and revote so that the minutes
 141 of tonight's meeting can be crystal clear. The draft minutes are an informational item in your packet. This item is
 142 discussed on pages 15 to 16, which would be the discussion that you had on this item at your August 5th meeting.
 143 The Planning Director's recommendation is included in your abstract which is on page 34 and that is to approve the
 144 resolution contained in attachment 1 which is right after the abstract, pages 35 – 37. What we need from the Board
 145 this evening is to recommend to the County Commissioners approval of the resolution, which is attachment 1,
 146 reflecting the proposed Land Use Plan Amendments. We need a second to that motion and then a roll call vote.
 147 That concludes my introduction.

148
 149 *(Randy Marshall nodded head in agreement to this clarifying language)*

150
 151 David Blankfard asked for a second to the motion, as clarified by Mr. Altieri. Adam Beeman seconded.

152
 153 **ROLLCALL VOTE:**

154 Melissa Poole: No
 155 Randy Marshall: Yes
 156 Adam Beeman: Yes
 157 Susan Hunter: Yes
 158 Patricia Roberts: Yes
 159 Carrie Fletcher: No
 160 Hunter Spitzer: No
 161 Alexandra Allman: Yes
 162 Kim Piracci: No
 163 David Blankfard: Yes

164 **MOTION PASSED 6-4**

165
 166 **AGENDA ITEM 8: ZONING ATLAS AMENDMENT (MASTER PLAN DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION – RESEARCH TRIANGLE**
 167 **LOGISTICAL PARK)** - To continue review and make a recommendation to the BOCC on a developer-
 168 initiated application for an MPD-CZ (Master Plan Development Conditional Zoning). The proposed
 169 project encompasses approximately 180 acres in the Hillsborough Economic Development District
 170 (EDD) south of Interstate 40 and west of Old Highway 86, within Hillsborough Township. 168
 171 acres are currently zoned MPD-CZ (Settler's Point) and 12 acres are currently zoned R-1 (Rural
 172 Residential). This item was continued from the August 5 regular meeting and is scheduled for
 173 BOCC public hearing on September 15, 2020.

174 **PRESENTER:** Michael Harvey, Current Planning Supervisor

175 *Michael Harvey reviewed the abstract and proposed changes to the Zoning Atlas Amendment*
 176

177 Craig Benedict: Good evening, just for the help for the Planning Board, when the Planning Board suggests
 178 conditions, it is good to make sure there's consensus amongst the Planning Board that these are newly imposed
 179 conditions that go beyond what was in the original abstract. If one of your thoughts is to vote on the three conditions
 180 at are on page 17 of the abstract and those three new conditions that were suggested by the Board at the last
 181 meeting, it wasn't necessarily a vote. We want to make sure that when the vote does occur that these conditions are
 182 clearly included in the other 50 plus conditions that are there. Of those 3 conditions that you mentioned a couple of
 183 weeks ago, as Michael said, energy for the building, fuel storage more than 30 feet away from a flood plain area and
 184 EV stations at the buildings. So, at some point in your deliberations or possibly now, you could at least make a
 185 motion that the Planning Board is in agreement to add these to the other 50 plus conditions we have for the project.
 186 That is one topic; another topic is tonight there is a lot of people that are participating in the meeting. It is up to the
 187 Board to listen to proposals, it's also up to the Board if there is some repetitiveness you can say that is clearly noted
 188 in the record and we will take that under consideration. The motion that is available in the agenda package that is on
 189 page 41 for this item talks about the Planning Board coming to a determination in enough time that it can reach a
 190 public hearing in September. Please keep that in mind. It is not unlimited in your time to have to make decisions on
 191 this item. If the Board feels like it would like another meeting to hear additional input from the public that is their
 192 prerogative. It would probably be just one more opportunity to do that before we need to conclude this item, approval
 193 or denial and move it on; and get the draft minutes of the meeting to move onto the formal public hearing which is
 194 schedule to occur in mid-September. Those are just some additional items and we will help guide you through as
 195 deliberations continue. The first item I brought up is just to get some clarity to get that behind us so that we do not
 196 lose those additional conditions that were suggested by the Board on August 5th.

197
 198 David Blankfard: Is everyone ok with the first condition about the fuel or chemical storage not occurring within 30 feet
 199 of the floodplain?
 200

201 *Planning Board Members were in consensus*
 202

203 David Blankfard: The next one is at least two electrical vehicle charging stations per building.
 204

205 *Planning Board Members were in consensus*
 206

207 David Blankfard: Ok, Hunter what did you say about the third one?
 208

209 Hunter Spitzer: I would like for it, instead of reading unnecessarily preclude, read necessarily prepare for
 210 incorporation.
 211

212 David Blankfard: So you want them to ...
 213

214 Hunter Spitzer: Necessarily prepare for incorporation of alternative energy systems.
 215

216 Adam Beeman: What does that mean?
 217

218 Hunter Spitzer: Well as it stated, they could necessarily preclude incorporation of alternative energy systems and it
 219 seems if they so choose they can make up any reason why they can necessarily preclude. I would like for it to be a

220 little bit more forceful than that. So necessarily prepare would mean that I would like for them to design an idea, I
221 would like for them to propose their site plan with provisions for how solar will be incorporated at such time as they're
222 prepared.

223
224 David Blankfard: So you're saying that you want them to design for it. Not necessarily install it?

225
226 Hunter Spitzer: Yes, I think that pretty much at least heavily encourages them to install at that point.

227
228 Adam Beeman: I am not understanding what you mean, during design for it? Would you like them to lay conduit and
229 put disconnects? Or are you just talking about, I'm not understand ...

230
231 Hunter Spitzer: During the architectural planning. Whether or not they lay the conduits at the time of construction or
232 after the fact it at their choice.

233
234 Adam Beeman: I still don't understand design for, any building if in the right sun location, we can put solar panels on
235 it and run conduit down the disconnects, that can all be done after the fact. I'm not sure what you mean about
236 planning for it ahead of time.

237
238 Kim Piracci: I want to back up what Hunter is saying. Building can be built in such a way that they don't have solar
239 panels today but it would be a lot cheaper to put solar panels on them tomorrow if that is desired, it just makes sense
240 to build building that way. Now, having said that I'm not an architect or an engineer or an electrician, it's just
241 something that seems to me makes sense to do in 2020. And so therefore, I feel like Hunter verbiage, his college
242 degree is in this so I feel like if he thinks that's what the verbiage should be, I kind of want to support him on that. I
243 would simply say, design would allow for future solar panel installation but the technology, the verbiage, I'm not an
244 attorney and so maybe we just need guidance on this.

245
246 Adam Beeman: I am an electrician and that is why I'm saying I'm not quite understanding what you're going after? If
247 you want to have like holes and penetration put through the roof so you can slide pipes through later, maybe I could
248 understand what you're saying.

249
250 Hunter Spitzer: That is what I'm, design and construction shall necessarily prepare for the incorporation.

251
252 David Blankfard: You could also design the roof for an extra 15 lbs. per sq. ft. to accept the panels for future loading
253 and they wouldn't even have to put in the conduit. The conduit could be put in later.

254
255 Adam Beeman: That I could understand and get behind. I just want clarification as to what we're talking about as far
256 as design. I can understand what you're talking about as far as rood load.

257
258 Kim Piracci: I just believe, you're an electrician, so you understand that part, wires going through pipes. I'm sure
259 there are other aspects of this we, Planning Board Members, don't and so if they're kind of required to be able to put
260 solar panels on in the future then that will take place at the architect level. And David came up with roof load
261 brilliantly, I didn't think of that and there are probably other considerations beyond our scope.

262
263 Randy Marshall: Can I just make a very simple rewording suggestion that says, building design/construction shall
264 allow for the incorporation of alternative energy systems such as solar panels. That gets the double negative out of it
265 and make it a positive but doesn't really change the gist of what's being said.

266
267 Michael Birch: On behalf of the applicant, we are absolutely amenable to that suggested word change.

268
269 Hunter Spitzer: I would still prefer necessarily prepare.

270
271 Randy Marshall: It shall allow for incorporation. Take out not necessarily preclude but more positively said shall allow
272 for incorporation of alternative energy systems.

273
274 Kim Piracci: I like Hunter's verbiage better. Any building could be built and allow for solar panels in the future.

275

276
277 Michael Birch: We were hoping to use Mr. Marshall's or removing the word unnecessarily from the proposed
278 language. Our concern with some of the other language that's being considered or proposed. As to structural
279 components, we don't know what the technology is going to be when this gets constructed so it's hard to talk in terms
280 of roof load, we don't necessarily know what type of alternative energy systems that we're talking about and so I think
281 what the intent of what we understood to be asked at the last meeting was that our building design was not going to
282 prohibit the building from being able to incorporate alternative energy sources in the future. With that understanding,
283 we said yes, we'll draft a condition around that. I think we're open to Mr. Marshall's language or also removing the
284 word unnecessarily from the proposed language.

285
286 Hunter Spitzer: I see, I would like you to necessarily prepare for current technology existing solar panels. I'm going
287 to leave it at that. I would like for you to prepare for existing technology. I think existing technology is effective and
288 valuable and I think preparing for that allows you to adapt further down the road as well. I would like necessarily
289 prepare. I have a secondary question, some of the comments that you've calculated that 40 EV stations would be
290 built under the proposed rule that I suggested and you can back with 2 which is fine but how did you calculate 40?

291
292 David Blankfard: So, you're going back to number 2, Hunter?

293
294 Hunter Spitzer: We don't have to talk about it. I really like to focus on the third point but I'm curious to know how
295 they calculated 40.

296
297 Michael Birch: We're proposing two per building and right now the thought is for four building so we would have eight
298 EV charging stations. I'm not clear where the estimate came from but I did want to clarify that it is two per building
299 and that would result in eight under the current plan.

300
301 David Blankfard: Back to number 3. Building design construction shall not necessarily preclude incorporation of
302 alternative energy systems such as solar panels.

303
304 Hunter Spitzer: The phrasing I was thinking was, building design and construction shall necessarily prepare for
305 incorporation of alternative energy systems specifically solar.

306
307 Randy Marshall: I think that sounds just fine, I'm not sure the word necessarily needs to be in there but otherwise I
308 think Hunter's wording is satisfactory.

309
310 David Blankfard: Would you say building design/construction shall incorporate provisions for accepting alternative
311 energy systems such as solar panels.

312
313 Craig Benedict: If I could suggest that the wording necessarily prepare for is voted on and then you would know that
314 the Board has consensus to include that. In most cases, its true building can be retrofit to include future solar panels
315 or other photovoltaic systems. It is just identification of a County goal and it could probably be accommodated within
316 the typical design of the building.

317
318 Michael Birch: I understand the Board may vote on it but just going back to something in Mr. Harvey's presentation
319 about the condition language which being something that is mutually agreed upon by the applicant and the Board.
320 We are willing to propose that condition either as drafted with the removal of unnecessarily with the Mr. Marshall's
321 original proposed language. Any of those 3 options, we're not sure on the applicant team what necessarily prepare
322 means and we don't necessarily know how to proof that up in a site plan so we would ask for the Board consideration
323 of one of those 3 options; as it stand today, removal of unnecessary, or Mr. Marshall's initial proposal.

324
325 Kim Piracci: I still keep liking Hunter's words. I've got building design and construction shall include

326
327 Hunter Spitzer: The phrasing I would like included as a condition is building design/construction shall necessarily
328 prepare for incorporation of alternative energy systems specifically solar panels. It does seem that the applicant will
329 be unwilling to agree to the condition. I don't think I would vote on it without this.

330
331 Kim Piracci: No, I think he is willing to agree on those words that you put forth just now.

332
333 Craig Benedict: No, it's my understanding that the applicant has not agreed to Hunter's verbiage but either what Mr.
334 Marshall proposed or a version of what was proposed. Allow for incorporation was one of those alternate proposals
335 or take the word unnecessarily out. In order to get this condition in there we have to come to an agreement with the
336 applicant so one version is take the word unnecessarily out, shall not preclude incorporation of alternate energy
337 systems. And the other one is Mr. Marshall's shall allow for incorporation of alternate energy systems. Those are
338 the two that are viable that if you want to include them with the other conditions the Board could vote on one of those
339 versions and then you would be able to attach these conditions to the other elements of the MPD-CZ.

340
341 Adam Beeman: I propose building design/construction shall not preclude incorporation of alternative energy systems
342 such as solar panels.

343
344 Hunter Spitzer: Second.

345
346 David Blankfard: All right, all in favor of that verbiage let me read it for you the way I understand it. Building
347 design/construction shall not preclude incorporation of alternative energy systems such as solar panels.

348
349 Alexandra Allman: Second

350
351 **ROLLCALL VOTE:**

352 Melissa Poole: Yes
353 Randy Marshall: Yes
354 Patricia Roberts: Yes
355 Carrie Fletcher: Yes
356 Hunter Spitzer: No
357 Kim Piracci: No
358 Adam Beeman: Yes
359 Susan Hunter: Yes
360 David Blankfard: Yes

361 **MOTION PASSED 8-2**

362
363 **MOTION** by Randy Marshall the addition of the three conditions be add to the proposal. Seconded by Adam
364 Beeman.

365
366 **ROLLCALL VOTE:**

367 Melissa Poole: Yes
368 Randy Marshall: Yes
369 Patricia Roberts: Yes
370 Carrie Fletcher: Yes
371 Hunter Spitzer: Yes
372 Kim Piracci: Yes
373 Adam Beeman: Yes
374 Susan Hunter: Yes
375 David Blankfard: Yes

376 **MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

377
378 *The Applicant/Associates for the RTLP proposal give a couple of presentations*

379
380 Kim Piracci: One clarifying question, when Frank was talking about the homes, the adjacent properties are mostly
381 vacant and there are a few that have homes on them. I think the closest he said was 100 ft. It was unclear to me did
382 he mean 100 feet from the property edge or that home to the building.

383
384 Michael Birch: To the building.

385
386 Kim Piracci: Ok, then the difficulties in our current economy were very nicely explained to us and how this
387 development will alleviate those problems but creating jobs and paying taxes and whatnot but I have to say that with

388 developers that don't have the vision to develop buildings for the future, with clean technology, and charging stations
389 for cars, that's all just asking too much, how do we know that these things aren't going to be built and partly build and
390 then left empty. We have to vote on this and not know what your plans are and I appreciate that you don't have to
391 tell me. I guess I'm just a little irritated that you gave a pretty speech and yet so far you haven't given anything so
392 that's all I have no more.

393
394 Michael Birch: I will say, Ms. Piracci, we given over 50 conditions that are a part of the case and that will be the law
395 that governs this property regardless of who owns it or occupies it. I will say that any developer will have to go
396 through the site planning process and with regard to the EV stations, also the buildings, and their use of alternative
397 energy sources, so much of that is driven by individual tenants. The needs for their building and also the types of
398 things that can be in and around their buildings. Some of these might be manufacturing uses, there are things that
399 we aren't telling you because they are unknown in terms of who the actual end users is going to be. I think that the
400 applicant has attempted to agree to the things as conditions written as a part of the ordinance that it has certainty
401 around and knows about today and can speak with certainty and yes has been reluctant to commit to things that it
402 doesn't know or can't know at this point in time. So it's not a game of hiding the ball, or withholding information but it
403 is a matter of in this rezoning process which is really early in the stage of the development process. We are where
404 we are in terms of what we know. I did just want to make clear that it's not a matter of us knowing and not telling you.
405 It is us operating with the information that we have.

406
407 *Continued presentations from the Applicant/Associates for the RTLP proposal*
408

409 Adam Beeman: I have a quick question for you Christa, I have read a lot of responses and maybe you can put to
410 rest. Your peak traffic value is cars, trucks, and all, it's not a peak of 200 tractor-trailers an hour or am I wrong. I
411 have been reading a lot of numbers and everybody has been throwing around that there's going to be 300 tractor-
412 trailers an hour or 200 tractor-trailers an hour and we are talking about all traffic not just tractor-trailers, correct.

413
414 Christa Greene: Yes, that is all traffic. Also, that is during the one peak hour. I think there was a misconception,
415 someone asked Matt how many vehicles are coming out in an hour and when he answered, 200 some people were
416 like 200 an hour over 24 hours that's thousands and thousands of trucks. That is not how it's done. Think about
417 going in and out of your neighborhood, you've got more people going out and coming in during the morning and
418 afternoon. There's a peak time so we have taken one snapshot of the worst time to look at it. We've assumed that
419 worst time is occurring at the worst time and it may or may not be. A lot of warehousing, manufacturing work on
420 shifts that purposely don't line up with the peak hours.

421
422 David Blankfard: You said that the letter grade for Davis Drive and Old 86 was a B, what is the letter grade as it
423 currently stands.

424
425 Christa Greene: It is un-signalized. For an un-signalized intersection if you were to take an average of everything.
426 The eastbound approach today as it stands is a level of service C.

427
428 David Blankfard: So, it's safe to say that the intersection is going to get better.

429
430 Christa Greene: You're going to be able to get out easier. You also have a sight distance thing going on there.
431 When you are looking back to the right, I think a signal, even NCDOT acknowledged that when we met with them.
432 Having a signal is going to make it safer for people exiting Davis because they're going to under a controlled
433 condition.

434
435 David Blankfard: The right turn only at the service road, does that have to happen on Day 1? Under Phase 1 of the
436 buildout? Or can it operate with a left/right turn for a certain amount of time?

437
438 Christa Greene: We did not look at any phasing.

439
440 Melissa Poole: So because it is not phased then the anticipation is when these building are built the traffic light will
441 be there?

442

443 Christa Greene: Yes, that's how the traffic study was done so this would assume the offsite improvement would be
444 done before the site opens.

445
446 Adam Beeman: I went through a lot of the email that residents have sent and I picked out a few questions that
447 maybe you could answer for me that may help some of these residents get an actual answer from you. Some were
448 random that were different than most everything. One was how do you plan to mitigate the construction traffic during
449 the build out, what's the plan for that?

450
451 Michael Birch: Construction traffic will use predominately utilize the service road.

452
453 Adam Beeman: Another theme that kept popping up was how many home will be destroyed in order to put these
454 building up and how many people will be displaced from their homes?

455
456 Michael Birch: Zero.

457
458 Adam Beeman: Thank you, one of the questions was is there a plan to mitigate crime if any, some people seem to
459 think that with this project you're going to draw some questionable behavior from others.

460
461 Michael Birch: I would say, first of all the folks coming to this site are coming to work. They are coming to work just
462 like you go to work every day, like I go to work every day, with the thought that they're going to put in their time and
463 go back to their family. We're not anticipating and if you look at your typical office parks where people go to work, or
464 even similar industrial establishments, you don't see crime like you might think of with a more retail focus, shopping
465 center focus type of development. It's an internally focused site and we don't anticipate any crime issues.

466
467 Adam Beeman: The last question I have, is the developer footing the bill for the water and sewer expansion and any
468 electrical power expansions?

469
470 Craig Benedict: Let me handle one part of that question. Orange County has a capital improvement program since
471 2013 to extend the sewer underneath the interstate. That was long before this development was there and will
472 continue to provide that design to get the sewer under the interstate. That's one element but on site the County
473 would not be doing something specifically for the project just to get the sewer and water underneath the interstate
474 and up and down the service road.

475
476 Melissa Poole: To go with what Adam was speaking, a recurring theme throughout the emails and contact were, and
477 I think it's been addressed but let's touch on it again, for all of the residents with the surrounding homes, how will
478 their property values be impacted? Positively or negatively?

479
480 Michael Birch: A couple of items on that question, first many of the homes in the surrounding area, particularly those
481 that are along NC 86 are already commercially zoned and so we expect positive impact to their property values that
482 there is now a commercial development that is a going concern that creates a catalyst in the area. Second, the
483 extension of utilities to extend if there's ever a need for an emergency extension or anything else it can be a benefit
484 to the area. Third, the perimeter buffer, the height limitations, the architectural controls, the other aspects of the 50
485 plus conditions that have been agreed to as part of the project are all intended to mitigate impacts on adjoining
486 properties and that includes on the value. One of the items identified early on was in issue with the flushing of water
487 and that water line, that as a result of our loop system will be improved. That's another benefit to the area. As well
488 as improved transportation infrastructure and signals.

489
490 Kim Piracci: I may have missed something because I didn't see the emails; I appreciate Ms. Greene's efforts to
491 educate us on transportation, architecture or transportation. However, I don't know if I'm missing out or slow but I
492 feel like the little maps you showed us, which for me are like an inch big. I feel like I would like to get a big picture, the
493 85 the 40, Davis Road, the on-ramps. I would like to see the whole map what you're proposing that the
494 transportation flow would look like. I can't put it together. I get there is going to be a red light at Davis and 86.

495
496 Christa Greene: This is run through some special software but I have those if there is a certain area I can blow it up
497 bigger. We've done level of service charts that were in the traffic studies too that I would be happy to run one of

498 these models right now and blow it up bigger. The areas of concern the ramp and the residents looking at Davis
499 Road that I can blow it up for you to see.

500
501 Kim Piracci: I don't even know if that would help me. I know in other applications, models are considered even more
502 accurate than actual measurements and I don't know if that is true in this case. What I feel like is I want to see a map
503 with arrows. This is where cars and trucks would go and this is where they would continue to go. It was mentioned
504 that there's only a certain number of sq. ft. where traffic would be affected when this development is put in. Didn't
505 DOT just put out some recent information?

506
507 Christa Greene: It was a response to what we submitted 2 weeks ago. It was a memo saying we concur with this or
508 we want an extra turn lane, it wasn't any figures. All the figures were in the study. I can try to pull one up.

509
510 Craig Benedict: In your PowerPoint presentation you showed one of the maps showed how much traffic in the
511 morning and how much traffic in the evening and how much total traffic. Maybe you could pull that PowerPoint back
512 up to show those are the type of site traffic volumes that are available for the project and are part of the TIA.

513
514 Christa Greene: I pulled something up. This is showing the traffic in 2023 and this is the total traffic so it's what's out
515 there today including the site traffic.

516
517 David Blankford: Does anybody else have conditions they would like to impose or have questions? I have one, I
518 have a problem with the exit onto Davis Road. I would like to impose a condition that exiting cannot happen onto
519 Davis Road and that a secondary entrance onto Old 86 be a condition. Whether somehow you take a right off the
520 service road and make a U-turn down the road or find another piece of property as time comes along, if you don't
521 have that, you can still have a left turn right turn off of the service road during the early phases of this project.

522
523 Adam Beeman: Can I ask what your reasoning is?

524
525 David Blankford: I think there's going to be a lot of inconvenience and traffic problems on Davis Road. I think we're
526 pushing for further and further into the Rural Buffer onto the greenway that's out there by pushing this development
527 further and further out into the County.

528
529 Carrie Fletcher: I have a question, so I agree with you and my question, with property owners is this, you can't tell me
530 who it is that is going to be your tenants, you can't tell me what they're going to make, or what they're going to be
531 putting in these trucks. How do you know many trucks are going to be leaving the facility and when. How can you
532 tell DOT how many trucks are going to be leaving at specific times to do these studies? I agree then stay off Davis
533 Road, leave the residents to do when they have to leave to go to work and to take their kids to school and do these
534 things because I see that as a hardship for the residents out there if this project does go through. I don't see a win
535 for the residents out there, because there are so many unknowns right now.

536
537 David Blankford: Not to speak for the applicant but for this type of construction, there's known quantities of what the
538 services can be and averages for all this kind of work. They've got a reasonable idea of what can happen inside of
539 that warehouse based on historical data.

540
541 Carrie Fletcher: I'm sure before they build out something as large as this they have to know statically how many
542 tenants can x number of shipments in and out under a certain amount of time every day, 365 days a year to make it
543 profitable for them. So they would have some kind of idea of what would need to come in and out of that building. I
544 agree, stay off Davis Road if possible.

545
546 Adam Beeman: I don't believe staying off Davis Road is an option for this project. I personally drove down Old 86,
547 Ode Turner, Davis Road, I drove the service road, I went down and checked off everything and I understand that the
548 residents enjoy their rural setting. I personally don't see any truck drivers choosing to swing a right on Davis and go
549 through down to Orange Grove Road, that's wasting their fuel and time and they don't have it. I really believe that
550 option off Davis, 1000 ft. they already have a church there it's not like there's not business coming off of that road as
551 it is. My opinion is that Davis Road is all or nothing for this project. I'm not against using Davis Road.

552

553 Michael Birch: Mr. Chair, if I may address your proposed condition. I understand and I know the issue of a driveway
554 on Davis was discussed last time but to be clear, DOT is requiring that cut on Davis. We certainly looked at the
555 possibility of access on 86 but we don't have frontage on 86, if DOT wants to use their power of Eminent Domain to
556 condemn property and provide us access to 86, would approve a driveway permit there, that's great. Forcing a U-
557 turn for those folks that are using the service road then you'll at about 200 U-turns in a peak hours because the
558 majority of the traffic is going north. We have added the condition to do what we can on Davis to install signage
559 prohibiting right hand turns onto Davis and we are installing a signal there at Davis and 86. But we are not in a
560 position to agree to a condition that prohibits access onto Davis.

561
562 David Blankfard: That's fine that is something that the County Commissioners would have to take up. We're only
563 doing recommendations. I understand that creates a challenge for the applicant for future but I think the County
564 residents like their intersection at Davis and Old 86 even though it's dangerous. They prefer it that way. Any other
565 thoughts about my recommendation?

566
567 Melissa Poole: If David's recommendation is not viable can there not be a sign placement coming out stating truck
568 have to turn a certain way so as not to go down Davis.

569
570 David Blankfard: I don't think they would ever turn right on Davis going down Davis. My concern is at that
571 intersection of Davis and Old 86. That's the bottleneck, no truck unless lost would turn right.

572
573 Kim Piracci: I feel like there was discussion of a traffic circle with Settler's Pointe. Wasn't that offered as a solution?

574
575 Christa Greene: A traffic circle would take a tremendous amount of right-of-way that would get out of the existing
576 right-of-way when it was easily handled by a traffic signal with the existing configurations.

577
578 Craig Benedict: If I could also add the 2 roads we're talking about Old 86 is an arterial road and DOT expects a
579 certain amount of traffic on it per day and Davis Road is not a residential road it's call a collector road. DOT does not
580 restrict a collector road to residential traffic. It is allowed mixed traffic with no prohibitions so when the County and
581 NCDOT and the metropolitan planning organization put together what is known as a comprehensive transportation
582 plan, they take a look at these road networks and designate them for a certain amount of traffic to handle the traffic
583 that is on land use plans. Davis Road is designated as a collector road and the traffic studies that have been put
584 together show that there is capacity in that roadway to accommodate this project and the residential traffic that is in
585 the general area.

586
587 David Blankfard: Let's open this up to the public, as a reminder to the public you will have a 3-minute window for
588 your comments. Please remember just to add new things, if we've already heard the complaints then please don't
589 repeat them, second is the last time allowed the conversation to become a little personal and not professional so I
590 want to remind everyone to be polite to one another. If that can't happen, I will mute you.

591
592 Stephen Williams: I just want to take to thank the Planning Board members here. It's been nice to be able to see
593 you on camera and to see the ones who are paying attention to what's going on and those who are distracted by
594 other things. I really appreciate the ones who have been involved and asked questions rather than just voting.
595 Taking a vote and saying yes or no. It is nice to know that some people are concerned. I wanted to point out that I
596 didn't realize there was a sales pitch on the agenda by the Barrister Corporation. I also want to point out that I don't
597 have time to tell you my life story, education unfortunately like Ms. Greene did, I have 3 minutes. First, I wanted to
598 say something about the map that the representative from Barrister shared with the stars on it about residences.
599 One of those stars where he says no one is building or no one lives. I am currently building, I just broke ground on a
600 new house last week. The star next to me, someone else just bought that property to build a house, not a
601 corporation. I want you to consider a Walmart 100 feet from your house and tell me would you be okay with that.
602 The closest building to a residence is 100 feet. That is the distance you're supposed to stop behind a school bus,
603 legally, 100 feet. Would you want your kid in that back yard? Would you want your mom in that back yard? Your
604 elderly parent? I really want you to consider that. Also, I want to applaud Ms. Piracci. She made it pretty clear, we
605 don't know what's going in these buildings but they do. No one builds 2.5 million sq. ft. at one time without knowing
606 the tenants. That is a poor business decision so I find it very hard to believe that they don't know. They don't have to
607 tell us, no legally, they don't but they know. They absolutely know who's going in there. The other thing I want to
608 point out is that it's not the traffic I'm worried about, it's not the cars, it's not trucks, its 18 wheelers that are going in

609 and out of this business. You're not just talking about a small vehicle. You're talking about a loud, large vehicle at
610 any time of the day. I will be asleep next door to this and I beg you to consider that. Also, in one of the slide shows
611 by Ms. Greene, she talked about averages of business on what this would look like. I am a former employee of a fast
612 food corporation, every business is different. Some Kentucky Fried Chickens I worked for averaged 50,000 dollars a
613 week, others 25,000 dollars a week. There is no way to know. Ms. Fletcher you put it best, there is no way to know
614 what we're going to be up against when they start building this. I don't think that they're giving us all the facts. I'm
615 done.

616
617 Bob Bundschuh: I'm actually a vice-president of supply chain and logistics have a million sq. ft. of warehouse and six
618 manufacturing things under my control so I know a little bit about this. Let's just start with the proposal starts off 2½
619 pages talking about the project is going to offer 2¼ million sq. ft. of health and technology, info sciences, engineering,
620 advanced manufacturing, science research and labs, warehouse and logistics and up to 4500 jobs. Then you
621 actually bring COVID of all things and say the solution in your quote "to bring more manufacturing of life saving
622 products back to the U.S." quite impressive but when you get further in your proposal, it has nothing to do with
623 manufacturing. You don't even talk about it, its 100% warehouse. And we know this because when you do the traffic
624 study, you use warehouse code 150, which is just warehouse. Not 140 which can be manufacturing or 130 an
625 industrial park and additionally, in your environmental assessment on section six it says "no production will take place
626 will occur on these parcels". That's what's in there, so which one is it? Is it manufacturing and R & D or is it a
627 warehouse complex? Or is it mixed use? The Planning Board needs to decide to approve or reject the zoning
628 change and they do that from the presentation. So what you've done is you've made a very nice, call it a time-share
629 brochure, and you've cherry picked your message. When it comes to job creation type of industry and the need, you
630 talk about high end R & D, health technology, which I'm sure comes across as a great fit for the area. You're thinking
631 high paying jobs and even hints of life saving products but then when you talk about traffic and environmental, you
632 pick the least impactful. The most benign possibility, no manufacturing, as far as traffic you use code 150 is towards
633 the bottom of traffic generations. The applicant knows that if they use the land use code for manufacturing or light
634 industrial, the ITE tables that you use show that peak traffic will go up and that would require recalculating the traffic
635 and it would go to the negative. Planning for manufacturing would also alter the water and sewer requirements. It's
636 not quite a true bait and switch but its close. They noted that if this zoning, as approved, we can't go back. Anything
637 allowed under the zoning can be built on this property, anything that's within the zoning. Absolutely nothing limits it to
638 what they proposed tonight. Like several people have said, we don't know what's going in and neither do they. Now
639 both the applicant and the staff have repeatedly used the reasoning that the development is just fulfilling what was
640 laid down 40 years ago but 40 years ago, there was no Highway 40, there weren't stores open on Sunday, there was
641 no Amazon, no next day delivery, tractor trailers weren't 53 ft. long. So justify a decision on rezoning because of
642 something 40 years ago makes no sense. You can recommend this tonight on the premises in line but the question
643 is based on what we know and what we don't know, more importantly, is it the right thing? I appeal to your sense of
644 what is right for the residents, what's right for the area and what's right for the County. Reject this and then work with
645 us on a different development that works for both us and the County. Thank you.

646
647 Sarah Shore: Hi, my name is Sarah Shore and I live 250 ft. away from the proposed development. One of the
648 places the developer said was vacant land just as an FYI. My home has been here since the 1980s. This is my
649 home, this is where I brought my babies to after they were born and now where they play outside. The land use plan
650 originally said Davis Road would be a suburban office not a warehouse. Suburban office draws to mind Monday
651 through Friday 9 to 5 cars, regular traffic not semis not three shifts of work. I have many concerns about this
652 nebulous development being feet from my back door. My first question is for the developer, have you actually been
653 to the parcels. We are not off of Davis Drive but Davis Road the Beaver Creek problems that you mentioned is 40
654 minutes away from us and we are not in a Raleigh metropolitan area, we are two counties away. Please understand
655 when you are speaking to us, where we actually live. Additionally, in regards to the jobs, I'm very concerned about
656 the numbers are inflated or simply made up because tenants are not lined up or you will not say. You cannot
657 guarantee that jobs are economic boom the only thing you can guarantee is raised land and empty warehouses. My
658 final comment is for the Planning Board and the County and the follow up of what David said because the question
659 was never answered. Is there a way to say Davis Road driveway is not a viable option and they must get Old 86
660 access instead? Because I would truly love an answer to that question. Thank you.

661
662 Ashley Trahan: Hi, my name is Ashley Trahan and I live with my family off Davis Road when we relocated from
663 Boulder Colorado in 2013. We chose Hillsborough as the best place to establish our life here in North Carolina even
664 though it meant one hour each day commuting to RTP where I work because its delineative native, quality of life

665 afforded by this small town and its rural surroundings. I must voice opposition to the zoning amendment being
 666 considered which will support the development of RTLP. Please give priority consideration to the local, rural and
 667 small town community and to the public interest at large over that of investors and developers. I now feel compelled
 668 to echo concerns expressed regarding the traffic impact analysis, conceptually I cannot understand how anticipated
 669 volume of traffic assessments matched the reality of how these roads are utilized or how the capacity and road
 670 designs regardless of designation allow for safety and driver comfort which is crucial to residents day to day. I cannot
 671 reconcile in my mind why a new analysis is not required prior to any recommendation of adopting the zoning
 672 amendments initiated by the applicant. Specifically due to the use of 2016 data exclusion of the impact from the
 673 Collins Ridge development and applicant's July request for an increase for area ratio it would allow, if I read this
 674 correctly in the agenda package, 4,586,868 sq. ft. of building square footage area. The TIA I read looked to be
 675 based on 2,400,000 sq. ft. of development so I can't reconcile in my mind why a new one is not required and
 676 clarification would be appreciated. Having reviewed the available online Comprehensive Plan, I'd argue that the
 677 presented industrial development supported by this rezoning is not fundamentally aligned with the current goals of
 678 Hillsborough and Orange County. The Statement of Consistency highlights the zoning amendment is consistent with
 679 selects goals but no available data has convinced me that this type of development is the best path forward for the
 680 area. Consider these objectives not mentioned in the consistency statement, community sustainability, how would
 681 this rezoning support a commitment to sustainability? How much water will be needed from the Town? Are we going
 682 to build something and not have a water system to accommodate it, not based on the current plans I found
 683 Strategic Growth Plan. Preservation of natural and cultural resources, how does this support protecting our Rural
 684 Buffer? It's too late to assess environmental impact on our natural settings after the fact. Economic growth over
 685 investor wealth, data showing specific economic benefits to our community is warranted. Increasing global jobs is
 686 not demonstrated value to the local residents. Since you're charged with advising on these strategies, shouldn't you
 687 be using all the relevant data to ensure compliance? I'm asking you to recommend failing this application fast.
 688 There's too many knowledge gaps, many inconsistencies and I hope upcoming meetings with the Commissioners
 689 can instead be about the community sharing our many ideas, establishing a task force and developing a relevant
 690 action plan for progress with other than having to oppose this one. Thank you for your time.

691
 692 Jon Lorusso: I wanted to point out before I begin, I started a petition and I have collected three, 873 signatures from
 693 local residents. Hopefully, that has some impact, some bearing on your opinion. My name is Jon Lorusso and I live
 694 off Davis Road. The intersection of Old 86 and Davis Road is very important to me, I use it to get to work, I use it to
 695 get food for my family to eat, I use it to access I-40, I use it to go see friends and family, I use it to get to the hospital. In
 696 fact, I have had to do that on several occasions with my children so it's pretty important intersection to my life, in fact
 697 it's my entire connection to the world. At the July 2th neighborhood information meeting someone asked what steps
 698 are being taken to preserve our safety from additional traffic on Davis Road, the applicant replied, very minimal traffic
 699 on Davis Road given that they have access to the service road. Another person asked why is this being used that it
 700 provides another point of access. County staff clarified that a secondary driveway access would require, quote
 701 "require secondary access point". In a letter to Chuck Edwards on August 5th, this was sent prior to the meeting on
 702 August 5th so Matt Peach already knew about this when he presented it to us, "all traffic exiting the site headed north
 703 will have to turn left out of David Road" so to just go to what Mr. Blankfard said, the issue is not that traffic will be
 704 making a right onto Davis Road. We know that it won't happen, very little, what the issue is, is that Davis Road will
 705 become a driveway for this facility, it will no longer be a public road, it will be an actual driveway for the facility. The
 706 website for this developer makes it clear they want access to I-40 so all the traffic coming out, 90% of the vehicle
 707 exiting will exit via Davis Road. They won't exit via service road they'll exit on their personal driveway which is not
 708 Davis Road. Mr. Peach said that acceptable levels of service on all approaches and note this 23.3 second delaying
 709 second per vehicle on Old 86 and Davis Road. 206 vehicles plus the existing 94 vehicles for a total of 300 vehicles
 710 will be headed east on Davis Road. That's five vehicles per minute, 1 vehicle every 12 seconds. If you have a 23.3
 711 second delay that means you can only clear 2.58 vehicle per minute from that intersection or 155 vehicles per hour.
 712 That means at the end of that hour, 145 vehicles will be queued at that intersection. Even if it's only, my estimate is it
 713 will be 960 trucks per day that means at the peak hour there will be 40 trucks, 1 truck every 1.5 minutes. That means
 714 20 trucks will be queued in the peak hour west of Old 86 on Davis Road, 20 trucks, if they are 72 feet long trucks,
 715 only 14 can fit if they are back to back on Davis Road. That means at least six trucks are going to back up into the
 716 facility.

717
 718 Ron Sieber: This is Ron Sieber, I live on New Hope Springs Drive which is right off of Davis Road. I wanted to say
 719 just to begin that the RTLP anticipated traffic data is undercounted because it's based on the Settler's Point traffic as
 720 previously mentioned and that project is distinctly smaller in scale to RTLP. Therefore, RTLP's data is deficient.

721 RTLP has based their traffic data using minimal traffic specs for a largely unspecified end user but we already know
722 that their touting having a warehouse when actually there might be more, we just don't know at this point. The State
723 Department of Transportation registered its concerns about traffic congestion in the general area of I-40 where it
724 crosses over NC 86 and the questions that they had were about the westbound ramp, the eastbound ramp, traveling
725 north onto Churton Street and onto 85 and maybe even into the town itself. These things have not really been
726 addressed carefully because we really don't know how many large trucks are going to be exiting this development.
727 Now if Davis Road were to be co-opted for this project this would present huge traffic and safety problems for this
728 area. The approach to the Davis Road intersection at Old NC 86 itself has four blind curves and two significant
729 upgrades on the approaches to this intersection. No traffic light is going to make this any safer for cars, large trucks
730 and school buses to be places together on any part of this road. The RTLP as proposed is too big of a project for
731 where it currently seeks to be placed. Two comparisons come to mind when I think about this, the UNC Hospital
732 which is big, it's 342,000 sq. ft. the RTLP project would be 6.5 times larger. The RTLP warehouse square footage of
733 55 acres would equal 92% of combined parking and building space of the Walmart/Hope Depot complex in
734 Hillsborough. Their total footprint is 60 acres. Now in concluding, many of the residents that surround the EDD that
735 is being discussed are in support of sensible development of this area. As we stand ready to work with the Planning
736 Department and the County Board of Commissioners to make this happen. However, the RTLP project is too big and
737 too overwhelming of a project to consider. We as a community urge the Orange County Planning Board to deny this
738 project's approval in its current state. We are opposed to its size and to its proposed use of Davis Road as an
739 entrance or exit for the development. Thank you.

740
741 Angela Sneed: Good evening, my name is Angela, I live out on West Scarlett Mountain Road. For reference, that
742 driveway is directly across from David Road and it will be right there where the proposed light is. It currently can
743 difficult to enter and exit with the blind curve and the hill coming from Old 86 south so a stop light will essentially
744 block that driveway and many others down Old 86 preventing residents from entering or exiting their homes safely
745 and consequently it can cause traffic backup in the opposite direction while they have to wait. My concern is traffic in
746 a different flow, the report and numbers provided don't seem accurate in that they don't currently include the projects
747 that are already approved and happening in Hillsborough right now. Collins Ridge for example, that project is around
748 1200 units and will have anywhere from 1200 to 2400 additional resident commuting through the Hillsborough area
749 many of which will head to Chapel Hill for work and the best route to get there in the morning is Old 86. This will add
750 to the number that will have to go through the I-40 intersection and the Davis/86 intersection along with the proposed
751 trucks and employees that will be getting there. Having the accurate traffic information and numbers is pertinent
752 because otherwise you're just pulling random numbers out of a hat from years ago and hoping that they stick. My
753 next concern is the I-40 intersection, I understand that the proposal was to have a light at the 40 eastbound ramps;
754 however, the 40 westbound intersection is dangerous as it is with existing traffic numbers. Adding the Collins Ridge,
755 increase and then potentially 100s of additional cars and trucks from this proposal make the area a death trap.
756 Existing 40 west, exiting there and trying to make a left onto Old 86 in the evening and you've got the sun in your
757 face, it's nearly impossible and then you add oncoming trucks and increased traffic from both directions and you're
758 never going to make that. The lane to enter 40 westbound right now, that turn lane is 280 long from start to the end
759 of the medium with and additional maybe 31 feet to the middle of the intersection. A truck and trailer on average is
760 70 to 78 feet. That means three trucks can be lined up waiting to make that left from Old 86 South, it's going to
761 bottleneck and eventually stop traffic. Cars aren't going to be able to more around because there's a bridge, traffic
762 exiting 30 East are going to have to wait through light cycles and the road is going to become a constant cycle of
763 traffic jams and increase the number of accidents for the residents, the truckers and even potential visitors so and
764 there's not currently a light proposed there so aside from the inconvenience that many residents will face due to the
765 increase of traffic, ultimately it safety risk on the road in this area. The intersections aren't designed for this type of
766 development, the proposal does not address the issues and numbers, and the tax dollars are going to be spent for
767 years to come attempting to fix this disaster.

768
769 James Henninger: My name is Jim Henninger, I live south of Davis just off Old 86 on Currie Hill Lane, I've lived there
770 for about 25 years. I've been proud to call Hillsborough home all this time but I'm not really in Hillsborough and I want
771 to point out that there's more people affected than just those that are in 1000 feet area that were notified. I like to
772 shop local, Weaver Street, Hillsborough Barbeque, Radius Pizza, Wooden Nickle, Paws at the Corner, Food Lion,
773 Steve's Market, Saratoga Grill, Hillsborough Wine, Hillsborough Yarn these are places off the top of my head. These
774 are the places where I spend my money in Hillsborough. These are the merchants that will be affected by any
775 impotence on the artery which is 86, 86 is the southern part of the County's way to get into Hillsborough. There isn't
776 any other practical way from the south to go into Hillsborough, it's 86 for us. For me to go into town, if I'm impeded

777 by going up 86, I basically have to go Chapel Hill and back to Hillsborough and in a practical matter, people don't do
778 that. Realistically, what would happen for me is that I would be shopping at Harris Teeter on MLK instead of Weaver
779 Street or Food Lion or Hillsborough Wine. I'd be hitting The Pig on Weaver Dairy Road instead of Hillsborough
780 Barbeque; I'd be shopping at Clifton Hills or Left Bank Butchery in Saxaphaw instead of Steve's Market. I sat down
781 and figured it out and I figured out that for every \$100 I spend in Hillsborough currently, on my daily shopping, that
782 would drop to \$20 and the other \$80 would be spread out between Chapel Hill, Carrboro and Durham and for me Old
783 86 which is Hillsborough Road to me, would become Carrboro Road. I'm not against developing that area because
784 it's inevitable but anything that's going to cut me off from what I consider to be my town, I have a problem with and
785 it's concerning to be that we can't really get a definitive answer on what exactly is going to be developed. I don't see
786 how the traffic plan is legitimate if we don't even know what is going to be developed. I understand the averages
787 thing but there's a lot of leeway going on in there. I agree with Ms. Fletcher, on her comments on that and that's all I
788 have, thank you.

789
790 Kaila Mitchell: My Kaila Mitchell I live on Jedi Way off Davis Road. I would like to speak about the impact to air
791 quality and potential health risk that RTLP poses to our neighborhood. We know that this project will significantly
792 increase the amount of big trucks, tractor-trailers on Old 86 and Davis Road. As many as 950 trucks per day. It is
793 also reasonable to think truck will increase on other roads nearby as they attempt to use alternate routes as Old 86
794 and Davis Road become clogged. A lot of these trucks will emit diesel exhaust that contains more than 40 toxic air
795 contaminants including cancer causing substances such as benzene, arsenic, formaldehyde. According to California
796 EPA's office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, long-term exposure to diesel exhaust poses the highest
797 cancer risk of any toxic air contaminant evaluated by their office. To the Planning Board, as you are considering this
798 project, I urge you to keep in mind some of our most vulnerable residents when we think of air quality such as
799 children, the elderly and those with chronic health conditions and think about the locations where these vulnerable
800 individuals are most likely to spend time. For distribution centers that accommodate more than 100 trucks per day or
801 more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units per day or where transport refrigeration unit exceed
802 300 hours per week the California EPA Air Resources Board recommends in their air quality and land use handbook,
803 that these distribution centers be farther than 1000 feet from sensitive locations such as residences, school, day care
804 centers, playgrounds and medical facilities. They also recommended that entry and exit points not be located near
805 these sensitive locations as well. We have a preschool, Sounds and Colors, right at the corner of Old 86 and Davis
806 Road and we have dozens of families living all around the proposed industrial park within 1000 feet many within 300
807 feet. California EPA Air Resources Board also showed the key findings from a number of studies which included
808 reduced lung function in children associated with traffic density especially trucks within 1000 feet and that association
809 was strongest within 300 feet. Also increased asthma, hospitalizations associated when living within 650 feet of
810 heavy traffic and heavy truck volume. Exposure to diesel exhaust can also have immediate health effects, it can
811 irritate the eyes, nose, throat and lungs and it can cause cough, headaches, light-headedness and nausea. In
812 studies with volunteers, diesel exhaust particles made people with allergies more susceptible to the things they were
813 already allergic to such as dust and pollen. Exposure to diesel exhaust also causes inflammation in the lungs which
814 may aggravate respiratory symptoms and increase the frequency or intensity of asthma attacks. I have a family
815 member who lives right here on Davis within 1000 of this as well who has chronic lung disease. He already suffers
816 enough on a daily basis, I urge the Planning Board to recommend that a risk assessment and a thorough
817 environmental analysis be performed before RTLP can move forward. Thank you.

818
819 Matt Mitchell: My name is Matt Mitchell and I'm an audio engineer living off of Davis Road less than 1000 from the
820 proposed development. I am going to talk about noise pollution and the impact on the residents and the preschool.
821 Orange County Noise Ordinances state it shall be unlawful for any person to make create permit or to continue any
822 source of a unreasonably loud and disturbing noise in Orange County and further any sound which is substantially
823 incompatible with the time and location where created and which is perceived by a person of ordinary sensibilities as
824 interrupting the normal peace and calm of the receiving land. The receiving land being all of the residential
825 properties surrounding this proposed development. Orange County does not allow noises above 60 decibels during
826 the day and 50 decibels in the evenings at the residential properties surrounding the proposed development. The
827 noise generated from a diesel truck is between 96 and 104 decibels. This is 60 times louder than the 50 decibels
828 that the evening ordinance permits. There are residences as close as 30 feet to the proposed driveway that will be
829 carrying as many as 950 trucks per day, house #1 is 30 feet away from this driveway that is being put in where these
830 diesel trucks will be queuing up. These distances are taken from the Orange County GIS and they reflect the true
831 impact to residences. Please don't be fooled into thinking that most residences are more than 1000 feet away. I'd
832 also like to add that none of these properties depicted are commercially zoned. Focusing on the resident

833 immediately beside the access point on Davis Road is only 5 trucks in the queue on this road, this resident will
834 experience 81 decibels of sustained noise, the equivalent of standing next to a lawnmower 24/7 and also loud
835 enough to cause hearing damage at 2 hours of exposure per the CDC. It doesn't seem possible that the developer
836 could possibly reduce noise to acceptable levels at the surrounding properties and the preschool. The preschool is
837 only 60 feet from where the trucks will be queuing up and their playground is 100 feet from where the trucks will be
838 queuing up on David Road. There was a similar development that was a third the size of this development and the
839 closest resident as 550 feet from the nearest loading dock. The noise impact analysis that was done still required
840 reduced traffic even at the greatly reduced numbers and distances compared to the proposed development. I'd like
841 to add that diesel trucks typically use engine breaking that create an extremely loud machine gun like noise as much
842 as 105 decibels. These noises are only regulated during the day in Orange County and stand to create massive
843 disruptions to the preschool and the residents especially on David Road.

844
845 Myra Gwin-Summers: I am Myra Gwin-Summers, we live two doors down from the proposed property on the corner
846 of Davis Road. We've been here for about 35 years and I see that I was down to speak on property values which
847 was not what I intended to speak on but would quickly say I cannot imagine that this project would enhance anyone's
848 property values. I have a questions and comments for Mr. Birch and I don't know if he's still present but I am going to
849 show this (visual of a mailing's return address). Why did we receive a letter regarding this project that says it is from
850 the City of Raleigh Planning Department? Who paid for the postage and does the City of Raleigh Planning
851 Department know that he has represented this project to us as if it were from them? I received an answer to that
852 today, the City of Raleigh Planning Department has no connection with the project and were very interested in the
853 fact that Michael Birch is sending out letters to residents in our county using their return address. I would like to be
854 sure and highlight that Mr. Birch has misrepresented himself here and possibly used their taxpayer money for a
855 private investment project without the knowledge or consent of the City of Raleigh. It shows poor judgement at best
856 and lack of integrity. Moreover, it's deceptive and it does beg the questions what else is deceptive about this project.
857 The next thing I wanted to address to Michael Birch, I'd like from you regarding your use of the City of Raleigh
858 Planning Department on your return mail address. I wanted to speak specifically to comment that you made that can
859 be found on page 25 of the draft minutes, lines 1226 thru 1230 when Mr. Birch was questioned about the buffers and
860 the encroachment of noise and vehicle lights due to the 24 hours 7 days a week activity. He responded that a lot of
861 the lots that surround us are deep lots with the houses situated far from the common boundary line. This is
862 completely false and the as speaker just pointed out, the driveway exit onto Davis Road runs right next to the
863 Barlow's house and will run right next to the house that will be built behind us. Next, I'd like to say that I spoke to a
864 senior engineer at Summit Engineering today who clarified for me that Summit has completely withdrawn their
865 project. They withdrew because the topography did not lend itself to large buildings it was going to be cost
866 prohibitive and they thought they would not actually be able to build the buildings. My final comment would be that
867 this is being addressed as if it is on zero grade, that's not true the corner of Davis Road is a steep hill and I wanted to
868 make the Planning Board aware in case you're not aware that Davis Road is closed for over 6 months last year due
869 to a sinkhole that is due to runoff on Davis Road. Once the corner of Davis Road is turned into an impervious
870 surface, the runoff is going to be more severe and could create more problems.

871
872 Michael Birch: I think there were two things to address, primarily about the return addresses. Let me be clear that
873 we paid, our firm paid for the postage, the City of Raleigh return address stamp was on those envelopes related to a
874 similar or prior projects that we were doing in Raleigh and was inadvertently used for the mailing for the notices for
875 this project. I will note that the letterhead, the letter the notice that was included in the envelope very clearly stated
876 that it was from Longleaf and didn't have any reference to the City of Raleigh. I apologize for the confusion that it
877 may have caused to have the return address say City of Raleigh but we did pay for the postage and I have reached
878 out to the City of Raleigh to their Planning Director to let them know. We didn't obtain any of their envelopes or
879 anything like that they have asked us in the past to put their return address on there for other mailings. The question
880 on the buffers, I want to be clear that when I was speaking to those in the last meeting we had the exhibit up showing
881 the buffers and the transition areas and again was very clear that the majority of our property does not abut parcels
882 with homes on it. The one that are nearby are deep lots but we did recognize that there is one existing home again
883 within 100 ft. of a proposed building and we did not shy away from stating that.

884
885 Joan Kalnitsky: My name is Joan Kalnitsky, I'd like to thank the Planning Board for listening to all of us this evening.
886 I doubt there're are too many of us who really don't believe the property in question will be developed but developing
887 it in the manner that has beneficial to the County and the Town of Hillsborough and the residents of Orange County is
888 really important. As almost immediate access to the highways and all four directions, with seemingly little impact to

889 the local area, with that said, I am seriously urging the Planning Commission to not support rezoning of this property.
 890 I am asking this for safety reasons, people on the Board of the Planning Commission and the applicant want us to
 891 believe that the traffic is going to go left onto Davis Road and left onto Old 86 and not impact the area but truth is
 892 traffic is also going to right down Old 86 and right down Davis Road. The roads we're talking about are part of the
 893 largest recreational area in Orange County. If you don't believe me go to the Tarwheels website and try to find a
 894 suggested bike ride that does not include at least two or three of these roads. The safety of all the residents and of
 895 Orange County and all those who come from the Triad and the Triangle to ride these roads is going to be severely
 896 impacted. If you're a doubter, drive by Mapleview Dairy any time any day and count the number of cars with bike
 897 racks on it parked there. If that's not enough of a safety concern let's just consider Davis Road itself. We've heard a
 898 lot about it tonight but for those of us who live off it, we know there are cyclists, walkers, joggers every day. You're
 899 going to have vehicles turning out of this development in front of people trying to get in and out of the daycare center.
 900 It's a recipe for disaster. What I'd like to urge each and every one of the Planning Board to do is to drive the 3 miles
 901 of Davis Road, count the cyclists, count the joggers, and the walkers and then realize there's shoulder and there's no
 902 sidewalk on Davis, Ode Turner, Old 86 none of them. When you get to the church, try to imagine a semi-truck in
 903 front of it and when you (bad connection/lost audio) 40, that's what rezoning is offering to do. Our safety in this
 904 corner of Orange County. Thank you all for your considerations.
 905

906 Janet Marks: I'm Janet Marks, I live in New Hope Springs right off Davis Road. Many of you that have traveled on
 907 Old 86 off I-40 know the beauty of the thick forest and the rolling hills along this road. You may have also notice the
 908 scenic by-way sign as you left the freeway traffic behind. What you may not know, is that starting at the exit from 40
 909 you are now on a historic road dating back at least to the 1700s. Prior to it being mentioned in historic records this
 910 was a Native American trail and was also used by early settlers. You are on the beginning of 10-mile stretch called
 911 the Scots/Welsh Heritage Byway. I'm going to take this from NCDOT description of this road, this byway travels
 912 through Orange County along trade roads used by American Indians and early backcountry pioneers. The King of
 913 England gave much of this land along this byway to the 18th Century Scots/Welsh settlers. Generation after
 914 Generation has lived and farmed this land, each leaving its own mark making this byway a unique journey through
 915 American history. Old NC 86 appears on Colonial maps dating back to 1770. Per NCDOT description of scenic
 916 byways, motorist will see little or no development along the routes enhancing the natural character and quality of the
 917 byways. They will experience North Carolina history, geography and culture while also raising awareness for the
 918 protection and preservation of these treasures. Limit the traffic using this historical route, reserve important
 919 landmark. Any development near this area should mindful of that is harmonious with the surrounding land and the
 920 rural neighborhoods and I want to make a note of an African American cemetery dating to at least 1900 at the corner
 921 of Davis Road and Old 86. When people drive on I-40 east from Alamance County, this exit is the first impression
 922 they get of Hillsborough. Do we want the gateway to Orange County and Hillsborough to be represented by vast
 923 warehouses, is this the Orange County that any of us know or can envision for the future. Thank you so much.
 924

925 Christine Poole: I'd like to start by reminding you that I'm Christine Poole and I live off Davis Road. I want to thank
 926 the Board of County Commissioners and the Planning Board for having developed many wonderful projects over the
 927 past several decades. Let's start with the creation of an attractive retail and residential zone on the east edge of
 928 Hillsborough, the Super Walmart and Home Depot along with all the other small business that surround this
 929 economic zone have definitely benefitted our community as we no longer have to travel to Durham or Chapel Hill.
 930 Then you added the Riverwalk and Weaver Street which merged the neighborhood goals of an open-air community-
 931 gathering place with retail while also providing a space for government offices then you created Gold Park with
 932 connects with the Riverwalk and then developed the historic industrial space in West Hillsborough on Nash Street
 933 that was brilliant. You added Hillsborough Barbeque and these other non-franchised eateries along with a beautiful
 934 events venue, the Cloth Mill at Eno River. Then north of Hillsborough on Hwy 70, you approved the Gatewood
 935 project which created a beautiful restaurant and evidentially retail, brewing and distilling and another event center
 936 that merges architecturally and culturally with historic Hillsborough. Even the Waterstone community and hospital
 937 improve the ugly eatery franchise oasis around the I-85 and Old NC 86 interchange. I understand the interest in
 938 developing an economic zone off of I-40 and 85 but Old NC 86 is the worst choice, as those of us who travel this
 939 road every day know. It's called old for a reason. Where in the County have we competed a successful industrial
 940 project? Let's consider Moninaga America. In 2013, the BOCC unanimously agreed to offer state and local
 941 economic incentives to encourage this company to build a new candy factory off of I-40 and 85 in Mebane. It was
 942 built on a 400 acre Buckhorn Economic Development District which leaves me wondering, if there is an economic
 943 zone where 2 interstates merge without significant residential development which is already invested in water and
 944 sewer why are we even considering this project where there is significant residential development on land that would

945 be incorporated into the historic Town of Hillsborough and is across the street from a church, daycare center and a
946 cemetery? Why are we considering a project that consist of four six-story buildings? What are the advantages?
947 Why is this location better than the Buckhorn Economic Development District? Lastly, I would remind everyone that
948 when go fishing for bass you don't settle for carp, you should wisely choose a development project that matches our
949 needs and our values. I would also remind everyone not to put the cart before the horse, until the issue of
950 improvements on Churton Street and Old NC 86 are addressed, further development around this outdated artery
951 should not be approved. I want to thank you for your time and the consideration of all the points we are making here
952 tonight.

953
954 Matthew Kostura: I just want to sum up a little bit what has been said so far. I also want to start at the top with jobs.
955 We had a really nice pitch at the beginning of there, it was a pitch, it was designed to be a pitch, its marketing. The
956 number thrown out for you guys to consider is 4500 jobs. Seriously, you guys just approved, recently a development
957 on West Ten Road that is very similar to this one. That's for the medical device distribution center. 150 jobs for 1.5
958 million sq. ft. that's about what you're going to be getting here x 2 ½ maybe so figure 450 so what this is all about
959 really is tax revenue, you know that, I think everybody else does. So, as the last speaker said there's other ways to
960 skin this cat and you can get your tax revenue with better development. Something that is more compatible with this
961 area. As far as the kind of development going in, again, as has been mentioned, they are using the code, they're
962 telling you what's going to go in here and it's LUC150. That's a warehouse; it's not going to be an office. It's
963 warehouse so your impact is traffic, it's trucks and you have to worry about trucks. How many trucks in and out?
964 Bob Bundschuh has basically said about 1000 minimum per day. That's a lot of trucks and they all come out on
965 Davis Road by the way every last one. Thirdly is I want to bring up something about Christa Greene, she made a
966 comment about the traffic impact on Davis is going to be minimal. Certainly, at the head that's going to be true.
967 When they did their traffic modeling what they did not do was include the biggest driver of traffic gain on that road in
968 the last 10 years or so and that's the school complex over on Grady Brown. All that traffic is being built up there is
969 going to school. It was not modeled, at all, into their models so that's not included, it's a lot of traffic. Finally, I want
970 to point out that Davis Road has been mentioned, Craig Benedict called it a collector road. That's what it's viewed as
971 by NCDOT. But basically, past Ode Turner where they have another counting station, it's about an annual average
972 1000 daily trips. You count the number of houses on Davis Road, the ones that access it from Tree Farm, that's
973 roughly 200 homes by 2 cars by 2 trips a day. Virtually every trip on Davis Road comes out of these development
974 and these homes. There is no through traffic here, it's very minimal. So, what you're asking now is to put a lot of
975 through traffic on it. Adam Beeman is going to sit there and say no, no, no; no truck driver is going to make a right
976 hand turn, fine. We had Michael Birch say they'd be willing to put a sign up that say no right turn for trucks out of the
977 development. Take him up on the offer, put that sign up and while you're at it put a sign up that says no right turn on
978 Old 86 either. You guys are pitching this all about 3000 linear feet of road, well keep the trucks there. Thank you
979 very much.

980
981 Gerald Scarlett: This is Gerald Scarlett, I'll make this as brief as possible. I live on West Scarlett Mountain, which is
982 30 feet south of the Davis Road intersection. I have been here for 65 years, which is my entire life. I'd like to make 2
983 points as quickly as possible, although I have 100s. Number one is the Rural Buffer, it makes no sense to be able to
984 stand in a Rural Buffer and move 6 inches north and now I'm in an industrial park. In most places there's a physical
985 soft approach to these types of divides and not just a line on a map. There is none of that here. If you approve this
986 then you should change the name of the Rural Buffer to just Buffer because that's what it is. It is nothing more than a
987 compression point between Chapel Hill, Carrboro, Hillsborough and 2 interstate systems. We have been involuntarily
988 drafted into perpetual service to provide guard duty to for the rest of the County and yet we still pay the same tax
989 rates as other outside the buffer who actually get to enjoy some of the rural setting that we no longer have. Point
990 number 2, we're talking about potentially 100s of trucks that have to drive through part of the Rural Buffer and each
991 one of those has got to stop and start somewhere between 6 and 24 times to enter and leave the Hillsborough area
992 leaving a trail of exhaust each time. I believe in a recent past budget cycle Orange County set aside half a million
993 dollars of taxpayer money to "fight climate change and global warming" this proposal seems counterproductive to the
994 stated goals bordering on being hypocritical. I've always found the easiest and cheapest solution to a problem is just
995 don't create it to start with. Also understand, as previously stated there is a daycare within 100 yards of 4 to 6 of
996 those stop and starts in addition to all the kids living in the immediate vicinity. On a personal note, I'll tell you that my
997 38-year-old son who lives here is right in intensive care in Chapel Hill. He had surgery yesterday to remove infection
998 from in and around his lungs, likely caused by aspergillus and other unknown environmental factors. You should
999 google aspergillus or look it up on the CDC website. In the next couple of days they'll likely operate again to remove
1000 2/3rd of one of his lungs because it's been damaged by the infection. There are a lot of factors in his current

1001 condition but I will for the rest of my life wonder what part interstate 40 has played in this. Interstate 40 is on my
 1002 property or what used to be my property, I hear the roar of traffic spewing exhaust 24/7 so the question is, are you
 1003 willing to gamble with the futures of these kids to attain an increased tax base and jobs neither of which do I ever
 1004 believe will every come to fruition in the levels that you're being led to believe. In closing, I'll say this, in the course of
 1005 my 40-year career at UNC and Duke, I've reviewed 100s of presentations and proposals, many worth 100s of
 1006 millions of dollars per year and I can tell you this proposal contains a lot of smoke and mirrors. There's a lot of
 1007 meaningless rhetoric in the narrative, if you remove the rhetoric and look at the details, that are available you'll see
 1008 the County will spend more money than will be recouped in taxes and you'll also find that the jobs that we all seek
 1009 don't actually exist and likely never will. No matter your perspective or goal, whether you're a community member or
 1010 a county official, if you look at it closely, it's easy to see no one's goals are met. Nobody win with this proposal, no
 1011 matter how you slice it, dice it, look closely, this proposal is nothing more that lipstick on a pig. If you take the lipstick
 1012 off and look at it, it's still a pig. Thank you.

1013
 1014 Franklin Garland: The reason (bad connection/unintelligible) it doesn't fit, it's not (bad connection/unintelligible). I've
 1015 been here since 1973 from Pittsburg and previously (bad connection/unintelligible), settled here bought some land,
 1016 bought a car. In 1981, I understand now was the first go round of establishing the EDD, I never knew about it. In fact
 1017 (bad connection/unintelligible) I didn't know about it until maybe 2 weeks ago, I can't be sure I was ever notified. If
 1018 that's a valid point about knowing, everything that has happened, (bad connection/unintelligible) I've never received
 1019 any notice. At the time, I'd probably said sure let's put a waste, let's put a dump out there that was 40 years ago.
 1020 Things have changed and I know I am repeating myself a little bit but me just thank the residents of the area that has
 1021 spoken so far and given you guys on the Board, we don't want this. Most of those numbers came off your literature
 1022 or the state's literature not ours, okay. Observation or different things, we know how many cars are on Davis, I live
 1023 on Ode Turner. I know how many cars are on Ode Turner. I really think that the guys that have presented for
 1024 residents out here, the numbers and have said so (bad connection/unintelligible). Also, I want to thank the people
 1025 from (bad connection/unintelligible) that gave us the projected numbers and models and let me put it even more
 1026 simple, simulations that's what they are simulations, they not real. We know what's real over here, we sent out a
 1027 petition it's called save Hillsborough.com out there. Everybody's welcome to go on there, we have people from
 1028 Hillsborough signing we have close to 4000 or so by now these are our neighbors. This is actually getting effective
 1029 by putting this (bad connection/unintelligible) not Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill is going collect money from that. We could
 1030 have some other alternatives, let me suggest something, we could put a visitor's center out there. Not a rest area,
 1031 not a place to go to the restroom and gas up but a visitor's center that has that presents for example, the artisans and
 1032 farmers that have goat cheese that sell here. Jewelers, we have marvelous that could sell the wares at a visitor's
 1033 center of an on/off ramp (bad connection/ unintelligible) and they could sell local wines in there, have a wine tasting
 1034 and that would bring revenue not only for the people that live here in this community (bad connection/unintelligible)
 1035 you could have people providing ...

1036
 1037 Ellen Mayer: I live off David Road and I don't have anything original after what everybody's talking about. I'd like to
 1038 thank the Mitchells for their talking about air quality air pollution and also noise pollution, which is very important. I'm
 1039 one of the elderly, in my 70s, I'm also a bit upset that I believe his name was Frank, not knowing the difference
 1040 between Raleigh and Hillsborough where they built things in Raleigh, I didn't buy a house in Raleigh, I don't want to
 1041 live there. I want to live in rural community, I worry about my grandkids visiting and living here and breathing in this
 1042 air from all these trucks that are polluting and also the safely. I'll never get out as those trucks on Davis to Old 86,
 1043 they're 72 feet. There's not going to be a light where they're coming out and turning. They're going to come out and
 1044 I'm going to try to get in between them and sometimes winter comes to North Carolina and the roads are icy. We're
 1045 just asking for a disaster. Any where near the preschool with cars turning with little kids and trucks coming out, good
 1046 luck. I appreciate you staying up this late, listening to us; I really hope you're listening. This does not belong in this
 1047 area or I don't know where in Orange County for something this big belongs but certainly not a that intersection and
 1048 on Davis Road which is a country road, I don't care what officially it's called. It's a winding country beautiful road.
 1049 Okay, thank you and have a good night.

1050
 1051 Joseph Shore: So my name is Joseph Shore and I live on Old 86 between Davis Road and interstate 40. The 3500
 1052 linear feet that the gentleman quoted earlier, the developer said it wouldn't affect anyone but this is literally in front of
 1053 my house so I'll be directly impacted by this. I believe something like 16 or 17 homes on this little stretch of road that
 1054 will be directly impacted by that so 16 families, once again he acted like it won't affect anyone but obviously that just
 1055 wildly incorrect. My biggest concern is with our home value. Someone mentioned this earlier but I have a proposal.
 1056 Like many people in the middle class, my home is my {inaudible} and I greatly fear that this development will make

1057 my home significantly worth less than it is today. You would want to buy a home where there's 18-wheelers on both
1058 sides of my house. They'll be behind my house and in front of my house, the noise traffic, the light pollution; it can
1059 literally make my home worthless. So, my proposal is this, I think, and this is directly to you Michael Birch, if you're
1060 still on. The developers should create a 1 million dollar fund, it should be held in escrow for at least the next 5 years
1061 and it should be there to compensate we homeowners for a likely decrease in our home values. For example, I think
1062 my home's probably worth around 275,000 dollars now, let's say 3 years from now I try to sell my home and I'm only
1063 able to sell it 150,000 dollars, I think that the developer should pay 125,000 dollars, they should pay the difference in
1064 the decreased value of my home. I think that's a very reasonable request, 1 million dollars held in escrow as a 150
1065 million dollar project, they should be required to compensate those of us that will be negatively impacted by this.
1066 Thank you.

1067
1068 Leslie Roberts: Thank you for taking my comments. I have two points that have not yet been brought up. These go
1069 back to the August 5th meeting. I was not able to speak at the end there, on the agenda notes from August 5th on
1070 page 258 there was an assessment from Christian Hirni and Peter Sandbeck from the DEAPR and they did a land
1071 conservation and cultural resource assessment but I noticed that was only done on parcel 1 and 2 and the Davis
1072 Road parcel is considered parcel 3. I have concerns about that not being done and if that can be done before this is
1073 moved forward with. There was identified to be part of a hard wood forest there that will be impacted and I think it's
1074 important to know what else will be impacted in that third parcel. The 2nd point is where I live on Old 86 I can't
1075 actually see light pollution on building that I cannot see at night and I think it would be nice to have that the lights that
1076 are put in both internally and externally at the site, if this goes through, be motion sensor lights. This is already in
1077 practice in perimeter parking Morrisville and I think it would be something that could really help reduce the light
1078 pollution for those of us that would have to see this at night. Thank you for your time.

1079
1080 Payton Rose: I appreciate your time, my husband and I own the historic Davis Farm just a mile down Davis Road.
1081 The heritage that Davis Road was named after. I'm sure you are all aware that this area is surrounded by historic
1082 farms well over 200 and 300 years old as others have brought up. Our main concern has not been brought up yet is
1083 the allowable use of light manufacturing; I've spent the last 10 years in global apparel development from private
1084 companies to a multibillion-dollar corporation. I know what apparel manufacturing looks like and its potential hazards
1085 to our environment. I appreciate that the applicant has provided a list for light manufacturing that will not be allowed
1086 however, the space for allowable businesses is wide. There are no protections in place, I urge you to consider that
1087 many of us in the Rural Buffer have private wells that we water our crops with, that we feed our families with, that we
1088 drink. I do not see any protections in place that protect us against any non-recycling of water, wastewater treatment
1089 or closed loop pollution systems. It's nothing that any of us could protect without knowing the specific tenants going
1090 into these spaces and exactly what they will be manufacturing. If the County votes to go ahead with this then we
1091 propose that light manufacturing is prohibited all together or that strict rules are put into place to make sure that our
1092 land, that our water aquifers will not be polluted. Thanks for your time.

1093
1094 Margo Lakin: Hello, thank you to the Board, I'm Margo Lakin and I am 100% for intelligent sustainable economic
1095 development that truly helps the people of Hillsborough. RTLP is a boondoggle with a dangling carrot of job creation
1096 to grease the wheels. With 250 parking spaces in the proposal, I'm going to be generous and assume that all 250
1097 represent jobs. If the facility runs 24/7 that's 250 times three shifts for a grand total of 750. 750 jobs for a 2.5 million
1098 sq. ft. facility that doesn't add up. Logistics in the title, I'm also assuming the purpose will also be a warehousing
1099 supply chain fulfillment center on a massive scale. Jobs in this sector are moving toward automation which would
1100 explain the low number of humans in relation to the square footage. These position tend to be low paying, lackluster
1101 benefits, little career advancement and high turnover. With at least ten empty warehouses totaling over 1.1 million sq.
1102 ft. laying empty just 13 miles west, why is this being built on speculation. I question if it is speculation, in the minutes
1103 from August 5th, Michael Birch, when responding to a question of electrical fleet management on the site said "our
1104 sense is that something like that or having that available will be driven by the end user, a particular end user that we
1105 don't have in mind right now or don't have at the table" so who do you have at the table? I find it hard to believe that
1106 Barrister is investing over 150 million dollars to build a 2.5 million sq. ft. industrial park with no client interest. Is there
1107 a client and Barrister isn't being transparent? Or is this site being prepped to be sold as a shovel ready package to a
1108 bigger entity like Amazon? High profile logistic centers like Amazon and UPS typically come with the demand on the
1109 local government for massive incentive packages that equate to years of tax breaks on the backs of the taxpayers
1110 like us with minimum job growth. I see no evidence of RTLP improving Hillsborough's job market or tax base in direct
1111 relation to the square footage it will occupy and the negative impact it will bring to Hillsborough once those 180 acres
1112 are destroyed to build this, we're stuck with it, we can't easily repurpose or reconfigure that footprint for businesses

1113 that are sustainable, that are better suited for the area, that are more in line with Hillsborough's values. There are
1114 better ways to develop that land for economic growth. Please let's investigate them together. Do not recommend
1115 that this project move forward. Thank you for your time.

1116
1117 Geoff Sebesta: My name is Geoff Sebesta, I'll be very brief. The first is the NTSBNHTSB released a study long ago
1118 that showed that the damage to a road increases by the fourth power of the size of the vehicles. That's the square of
1119 the square. These vehicles which will be on historical road will destroy your road. You'll pay a lot of money fixing
1120 and upgrading your road. This is completely unavoidable, there is absolutely nothing you can do about it, if you put
1121 this traffic on this road, you will be paying a lot to fix this road. Now the second thing I have to say is that in 2008, I
1122 had the pleasure and privilege of being involved with the city councils of both San Diego California and Lexington
1123 Kentucky as they both considered proposals from businesses that did not want to reveal the sources of their funding
1124 or their eventual tenants. San Diego took one look at the proposals, said if you're not revealing your tenants this is a
1125 joke. Lexington was not so wise, they got involved in something called the Center Point fiasco, you can look it up.
1126 It's destroyed the downtown of Lexington Kentucky to this day. If they're not willing to reveal who the tenants are, it
1127 is not a serious proposal, it should not be seriously considered. Finally, I will say that although I thank everyone for
1128 staying up so late, it's 10:40 at night and there's not been one single resident yet who has spoken in favor of this
1129 proposal. The Planning Commission is there as the representative of the people of Hillsborough, many people have
1130 mentioned that they don't have enough time to speak, I think it's odd that the Planning Commission is limiting the
1131 time of people to respond when they are not limiting their time after all you there, are you not, to represent these
1132 people? You should take this seriously, you should look at the fact that absolutely no resident appear to be in favor
1133 of this at all. You should consider that, thank you very much for your time.

1134
1135 Jean-Francois Provost: My name is Jean-Francois Provost and we just moved in last July on Old 86, we are south of
1136 Davis Road. I have several things to say, first we have (inaudible) of trucks coming into our driveway and a truck
1137 coming right angle you have to go in other lane so we had to stop the traffic on Old 86 to have some trucks on our
1138 property, that's the first thing. When we bought the land a few months after we got invited to a public hearing
1139 because there was already a project, that actual project is bigger than the previous one but it was just one project out
1140 of three projects so there was commercial zone on Old 86 near the exit of I-40 and there was a third one very close
1141 (inaudible), so the traffic, the lady who explains that the traffic is going to be ok, she doesn't take account the next
1142 project which is coming maybe. If there is three projects, the traffic impact created by this project, why we came
1143 tonight, is also two other projects so increase the traffic significantly. So we have to take account not only this project
1144 but the whole amount around the perimeter. Thank you for listening to me.

1145
1146 Jon Boxter: Good evening, thank you for your time, we really do appreciate you giving each of us an opportunity to
1147 share our feelings. I'm a middle school teacher and my wife, Shannon, is an ICU nurse, we live on Old 86 3 houses
1148 from Davis Road with our 3 year old son, we're one of the handful of houses in 1000 feet of the development that
1149 received the original notification letter. We live along the 3500 feet of linear road that has been quoted, the back of
1150 Building C as currently planned, would be highly visible from the Duke Utility road that runs beside our property
1151 where we watch our son and our neighbors children play every single night. The staggering amount of 200 vehicles
1152 that would be routed onto Davis Road during peak hours as has been quoted, would then pass directly in front of our
1153 home. So that's effecting, at least surrounding us on three sides. My family and I unequivocally disapprove of the
1154 actions being proposed, our opinion has been shaped not out of a hard line "NIMBY" attitude towards development of
1155 the area as many other people have pointed out, we bought our home with the understanding and tacit expectation
1156 that the area north of us would inevitably be developed as zoned. However, this sheer lack of adequate
1157 infrastructure surrounding this particular project make is impossible to support. The addition of Davis Road as a
1158 second access point has been admitted to be done after the fact in order to satisfy NCDOT. Anyone who lives near
1159 Old 86 has noticed the increase in traffic over the past few years. That road along with those that feed into it despite
1160 what cherry picked traffic study suggest about specific intersections we'll have trouble handling the number of cars
1161 and trucks that are being estimated. From a safety standpoint, it will be disastrous for those of us living along the
1162 route. After crossing under I-40 you pass that service road that's been repeatedly mentioned by a number of houses
1163 on both sides, you come a slight hill and there is essentially a blind curve that the utility line overpass, my home as
1164 well as two are located right after the Duke utility road. I find myself looking multiple times in each direction and
1165 saying literally a prayer before pulling in and out of my driveway. I signal a ¼ mile before I even turn so that cars
1166 don't rear-end me or side swipe my vehicle as I exit. Almost daily, horns honk, cars lock up their brakes as they
1167 speed south on Old 86 before coming upon a car turning past the blind curve in a driveway or onto Davis Road. It's
1168 incredible that more accidents don't already occur here and adding further traffic and stopped cars is a literal disaster

1169 waiting to happen if this plan goes forth as presently constructed. A red light is going to do little more than to cause
1170 those cars to slam on their brakes and cause bigger issues. I say all this to reaffirm my opposition to this plan as
1171 currently proposed. It makes no sense from an infrastructure standpoint to utilize Davis Road purely more that out of
1172 necessity or that portion of Old 86 for heavy truck traffic. Unless this can be remedied and a more logical solution
1173 can be found, I urge the member of the Planning Commission to deny this proposal. Please help to protect my family
1174 and my neighbors. Thank you.

1175
1176 Beth Rosenberg: Thank you for taking the time to listen to all of us. I know it gets old for you after a while but I think
1177 listening to our concerns and some of our suggestions should prove valuable. I just have a few points to make, first
1178 is that although the Rural Buffer portion of that Davis Road property is supposedly going to be left to be wild land or
1179 whatever, all the traffic from this development now will be exiting onto Davis Road and going through a Rural Buffer
1180 area which seems counter to the purpose of that zoning designation. Another point I want to make is that Mr.
1181 Beeman mentioned that he drove Davis Road and Old 86 and the service road, if that was any time after February or
1182 March of this year, it was during the pandemic and the traffic has admittedly been much less during that time even
1183 through this current period of time because there's no school traffic currently. Next point is that reading through the
1184 UDO, the purpose of the MPD-CZ zoning is to provide economical and efficient use of land, efficient land use,
1185 improve level of amenities, appropriate and harmonious variety, creative design and a better environment and I don't
1186 see where this project is likely to provide any of that for us. I, like everybody else tonight, urge you to not approve
1187 this plan and not sent it forward to the Board of Commissioners. Thank you for your time.

1188
1189 Declan Cambey: My name is Declan Cambey, I'm 18 years old and I've lived in Hillsborough my whole life. I've
1190 grown to know all my neighbors, have usual and local restaurants and I've walked down the Riverwalk with friends or
1191 into the new Orange County library to check out a new book probably 100s of times. Now both the Riverwalk and the
1192 new library and the development with Paw at the Corner and Whit's Frozen Custard, these have all greatly improved
1193 my quality of life so I'm all for development that can benefits the members of this community of this town. But from
1194 what I've read and what I've heard today this proposal for Research Triangle Logistics Park will actively hinder the
1195 quality of life for Hillsborough natives by increasing traffic, noise and pollution while simultaneously destroying
1196 precious green space along Davis Road and along Old NC Hwy. 86 which is a designated scenic byway and houses
1197 many cyclists as has been mentioned. Now I know the applicant team has brought many experts to try to address all
1198 of our concerns but that doesn't change the fact that this is not what our community wants. I found out about this
1199 meeting on Instagram and this account has 50 followers mostly young folks like myself that I went to school with at
1200 Cedar Ridge. The Facebook group against this industrial park has 386 members and there have been thousands of
1201 signatures on the petition that has been mentioned earlier. On another note, the possibility of jobs is not the promise
1202 of jobs. As has been mentioned, these developers have not shared any companies or agencies that will set up shop
1203 in this research park. Also, when many traditional jobs are transitioning online why are we investing in warehouse
1204 space that could just be bought over by large companies like UPS and Amazon, this is not a necessary project right
1205 now and I call on the Planning Board to reject its proposal. As a young person, I speak for all future generations that
1206 will suffer if this project is approved. Thank you.

1207
1208 Rebecca Drapp: I live off NC Hwy 86. I moved to Hillsborough like others have said for the community aspect of it. I
1209 feel like this is going to destroy our community for all the reasons other people have said, decreasing property values
1210 even when they were given that presentation they couldn't guarantee that this would raise the property values. I
1211 worry about the quality of life for everyone with the trucks with the big industry. I think the charm of Hillsborough is
1212 the very rural, local businesses that is how we make our community better. That's according to local businesses and
1213 reinvesting in small places and it sounds like this is just going to be a big warehouse where, I don't even know if it's
1214 going to have good quality jobs. I'll cede because it's late, thank you for listening. I just wanted to voice my dissent to
1215 this project.

1216
1217 Jeb Kelly: I live off Davis Drive, a couple things I wanted to point out that haven't been mentioned, the developer in
1218 their pitch tonight referenced the 40-year history of planned development here. I don't think that 40 years included
1219 routing 90% of the traffic onto Davis Drive. In Ms. Greene's presentation, she referenced the amount of traffic
1220 coming onto Davis Drive as approximately 1600 vehicles a day, I went back and reviewed the TIA from the DOT and
1221 they estimated over 3600 vehicles a day, 90% of that would be about 3100. I think we deserve a little more of an
1222 explanation on the discrepancy there. Ms. Greene also in her own words, mentioned that people will tend to find a
1223 different route of willing to drive further when traffic backs up and that's exactly our concern. When traffic backs up at
1224 that exchange of 86 and 40, regardless of the signage, they're going to be looking for other routes, they're going to

1225 come down Davis, Ode Turner they're going to head to that 4-way stop at New Hope. They're going look for other
1226 ways. On top of that there's a reason that they're looking at the 40 exchange here, a lot of people are skeptical of the
1227 jobs being created, I think we have a right to be skeptical, I think there's a lot of jobs would go to Mebane, Burlington,
1228 Durham. I think we've be compromising our community here for commuters and I think Orange County Planning
1229 Board should be looking out for Orange County residents, number one and that's why I'd like to echo the concerns of
1230 others and urge you to consider a plan that would limit the size and scope of this to what fits on the current acreage
1231 available for economic development access via the service road. Thank you.
1232

1233 Justin Mitchell: My name is Justin Mitchell, I own several acres of land on Davis Road adjacent to my brother's
1234 property and I've dreamed of one day living there near my family. The appeal of that dream would certainly be gone
1235 if there were huge warehouses peeking through the woods just a few hundred feet from my property. That said, one
1236 thing that we're concerned about is the runoff that will be generated due to the massive amounts of impervious
1237 surface that would be created by the project. The excess runoff would flow down Davis Road where we had a
1238 sinkhole last year where you can see the floodplain crossing Davis Road. That's due to the currently excessive
1239 amounts of water that flows down there. I think it's important that an analysis be done to assess the impact of the
1240 impervious surface. One other quick thing that I would like to add is about noise because I think it's serious, let me
1241 just point out Orange County specifically prohibits the use of lawn equipment after 9 p.m., if that's the case how can
1242 we possibly allow diesel trucks operating overnight creating noise that is up to 26 times louder than gas powered
1243 lawn equipment. I think it's imperative that a noise impact analysis the development is approved we need to protect
1244 the hearing of our residents and prevent the potentially massive disruption to the children at the preschool and of
1245 sleep, peace and the calm of the residents in the area. That's all thank you.
1246

1247 Nan Fulcher: My name is Nan Fulcher and I'm a resident of Cornwallis Hills that's on the north side of I-40 but
1248 according to the traffic predictions, there is an impact going up the corridor here of NC 86 about 20% of the traffic
1249 looked like on the traffic reports. Thank you for hearing everyone out tonight, as you, members of the Planning
1250 Board consider the project and make your recommendations to the Commissioners, please consider that the
1251 rezoning proposal at hand, or any proposal for that matter, please consider it from the standpoint of whether it can
1252 withstand legal challenge. The few things in this arena to think about are that rezoning is supposed to be based on
1253 the needs of the neighborhood and community not just secure special benefits for a single property owner. How can
1254 the County assure citizens this is not the case since the rezoning was requested by the applicant rather than being
1255 initiated by the County. Second consideration is whether there are other legitimate ways in which the property owner
1256 could develop the area for economic benefit without requiring rezoning. Third is that the rezoning must still maintain
1257 a harmonious land use pattern that is the juxtapositions still need to make sense. Does shoehorning a 300,000 sq. ft.
1258 warehouse and truck driveway next to private homes make sense? Also, ask whether the zoning change is in
1259 harmony with the legitimate expectations of the neighbors who live in a residential area next to Rural Buffer and part
1260 of the NC Scenic Byway. Lastly, in rezoning, the substantial benefit for one party cannot offset the substantial harm
1261 to neighbors. Even if you believe that a warehouse complex benefits the community, via job creation, or shoring up
1262 the tax base, the rights of the adjacent landowners cannot be ignored. As one Davis Road resident said, the County
1263 only gets one chance to zone this area appropriately so please consider carefully your guidance on this issue. Thank
1264 you.
1265

1266 Sascha Godfrey: My name is Sascha, I'm 16 years old, a student at Orange High and I grew up in New Hope
1267 Springs, a neighborhood off Davis Road. I first want to thank the Planning Board for allowing us to speak and
1268 secondly, I want to plead the Planning Board to really pay attention especially given that we have listened to 2 hours
1269 for our 3 minutes of time to bottle together all of our concerns. With my 3 minutes, I could speak about the for my
1270 safety as a probable collegiate runner training on Davis Road or I could speak about my concern as a new driver and
1271 for the safety of my younger sister who will be driving soon on a road with an influx of trucks at the upper end given
1272 that young drivers have a much higher rate of accidents. However, I have one main probably more practical point to
1273 make in the development presentation earlier, it was mentioned that the development will be 2.25 million sq. ft. of
1274 building area. In parentheses, it was listed initially and that the current traffic analysis that is being used for the
1275 approval of this project is based only on the 2.25 million sq. ft. In the News of Orange article posted today, Michael
1276 Harvey mentioned that this space could occupy up to 4 million sq. ft. The applicant refused to comment. So what is
1277 actually being approved here? Along with the proposed uses how can you be sure that we have control over the
1278 tenants and the size of this development once it's built? I am very concerned by the precedent this sets for rezoning
1279 a residential neighborhood into an industrial area. The developer seemed to try to slide through the idea that the
1280 closest home will be 1000 feet away, however, that will actually be walls of the warehouse 100 feet from the person's

1281 property. I cannot see a place for a 60-foot warehouse next to 10 to 20 foot one and two story homes. Harvey
1282 mentioned at the August 5th meeting that buildings must be kept in harmonious style with the surrounding residential
1283 areas. I'm asking that we flesh out the development ordinances so it's in cooperation with the surrounding residential
1284 area. Thank you.

1285
1286 Dana Brinson: My name is Dana Brinson and I live in rural Hillsborough off of Dodson's Crossroads. I'm about 10
1287 minutes' drive from the proposed development. I wanted to thank the residents on Davis and Old 86 for their
1288 thorough questioning of this project. An analysis of the concerns related to potential noise, air and water pollutions,
1289 traffic concerns and protecting the Rural Buffer. I wanted to share my voice and that of many of my neighbors here in
1290 Rider's Trail who stand with all who have spoken tonight about these serious concerns. I want to state clearly that
1291 this is not just a not in my back yard issue but a serious concern for all of Hillsborough and greater Orange County.
1292 Thank you.

1293
1294 Ashley Lorusso: My name is Ashley Lorusso, I live on Davis Road about two miles west of the proposed
1295 development. I am just calling in tonight to voice my opposition to the development. This is going a severe impact,
1296 not only on Davis Road, but on the surrounding community well beyond Davis Road, well beyond surrounding
1297 community, well beyond the intersection of Davis Road and Old 86, into Hillsborough and Chapel Hill. It has not
1298 been thoroughly vetted there are plenty of options that would explore further for development in this area and come
1299 to a conclusion that is much more suitable and harmonious for this area and the community. Thank you for your
1300 time.

1301
1302 Jesse Kaufmann: I agree with everyone who has spoke against this tonight. I want to add on to what they've said, I
1303 want to throw in small remark because I heard Adam say that he came down on Davis Road and checked it out and
1304 also, said he couldn't see why a truck would want to take a right on Davis Road because they want to get on 40 as
1305 quick as possible which would make sense unless he lived on Davis Road which makes no sense to me because I
1306 actually go the back way if I want to go to the Tanger Outlets for example, I don't go to Davis Road to Old 86 to 40, I
1307 go what I call the back way which I consider quicker through all these country roads and especially Davis to Orange
1308 Grove to Dimmicks Mill to then Ben Johnson Road gets you right to 40 and 85 very fast all through these beautiful
1309 country roads. I just wanted to throw that out to you. Thank you very much.

1310
1311 Amanda Shakhoul: I want to give my mom permission to speak for me, I agree with whatever my Mom's going to
1312 say. My mom lives in this area too. Yes, my name is Vicky Riley Berry, I'm 65 just like Gerald Scarlett we all grew
1313 up together here on Old 86. I'm a Hillsborough native and I just retired from Duke North University Hospital as an
1314 RN, BSN and I have several issues. I am heavily, heavily concerned with my husband, Ricky Berry and my
1315 daughter, Amanda Berry Shakhoul and her daughter and she's going to have a baby in a month. I am concerned
1316 about the destruction of life and many people may end up suffering with a lot of unnecessary cancerous diseases.
1317 We do want to preserve our very quiet, peaceful and clean living here. We do have a spring {inaudible} that is joining
1318 about 100 feet from the service road right here at I-40 and on up we have our own well and this was my childhood
1319 farmhouse that I grew up and lived. I know every inch and every piece of the woods here on Old 86 being a child
1320 here. I am concerned about noise pollution, the high decibel pitch sounds that can cause severe deafness and air
1321 pollution is not going to help the global warming situation either. All these warehouses that heaven knows there
1322 could 1000s of chemicals stored in them or nothing at all and because of the industry proposal, soil and water
1323 contamination, increased toxic, all kinds of horrible things that are in the soils that can cause a destruction and even
1324 animals, cats, dogs, lowercase animals, insects everything that's necessary to the ecology of life too. All these
1325 diverse cultural residents that are my friends that I went to school with, I work with for many years, everyone all of us
1326 can be {inaudible} affected because of this noise, air, the large trucks carrying all this horrible toxic products that in
1327 their trucks through the Town of Hillsborough.

1328
1329 David Blankfard: All right, are there any questions or comments or further from the Board?

1330
1331 Randy Marshall: I'll make some comments, first I'd like to say we've heard from about 60 folks over 2 different nights
1332 of hearing testimony and I want to tell people we appreciate them sharing the information with us and certainly
1333 understand and appreciate them sharing their concerns. Just a personal note, I've been in Orange County as a
1334 resident for about 50 years and in the time, I've been in Orange County there have been pressing concerns that have
1335 continually come before the governments in Orange County. One is that taxes are too high and the other is we don't
1336 have enough money for the schools. The Economic Development Districts have created, decades ago, to encourage

1337 commercial development in Orange County away from Chapel Hill and Carrboro who seem to take and send any
1338 proposal for economic development to Durham or Chatham County. Walmart went to Chatham County, Lowes went
1339 to Durham and there are numerous others that were not able to get a foot in the door in Orange County. These
1340 Economic Development Districts were created to provide commercial tax base, provide jobs and they were set up
1341 close to the interstates in areas that at the time they were established didn't have many residents. We understand
1342 that many of the people who have spoken, 2 weeks ago and tonight, have been recent residents moving into those
1343 areas and so we understand their concerns. On the other hand, there's been very little interest in developing these
1344 Economic Development Districts in the last 30 or 40 years and now we have a proposal which offers the opportunity
1345 to increase our tax base, take some other pressure off property taxes, increase the possibility of additional sales
1346 taxes even if it doesn't create 4500 jobs, the jobs that it does create will be beneficial. So, I would like to cast my
1347 views on what's going on and those terms that we serve all of the residents of the County and we'd like to be able to
1348 just serve a couple of neighborhoods at a time but the residents of all of Orange County those concerns of more
1349 money for the schools, more taxes and more job opportunities hopefully will serve the entire community. At some
1350 point I'm willing to introduce a proposal for us to vote upon when other people have spoken.

1351
1352 Kim Piracci: Nobody's going to be surprised when I disagree a little bit with Randy. Unlike Randy, I've only lived in
1353 Orange County 24 years and my husband moved us around a lot of places in the Country before we settled here. I
1354 never heard of a place that had enough tax base or small enough taxes. People's taxes can never be small enough,
1355 trust me it's a financial truth. So, although I know that is a persuasive argument, for many if not most people. For me
1356 it falls on deaf ears, what concerns me, actually a little more is there's a lot of things about this development that
1357 concerns me but I think the biggest one came very early in the comments when one of the residents said that they
1358 assured us that he lived on a property that the developer thought there was no house on. In fact, it seems that a lot
1359 of people live on properties that the developer thought there were no home on and so what it says to me is that either
1360 the developer is misinformed or disingenuous. In either case, I feel like we need to give them an opportunity to go
1361 back and maybe come to us with more correct facts. Also, the transportation continues to disturb me. I apologize to
1362 you all, I did not get the updated information, I don't know if it's the post office but I feel like I need to examine that
1363 better than on an inch of screen and like one of the homeowners said, that was very extremely cherry picked
1364 information that was provided. So, again, I just feel that to make a good decision, we all want what's best for Orange
1365 County, I feel like to make the best decision I can make, I need a little bit more time and I need them to provide a little
1366 bit more accurate information before I can comfortably vote to promote the project.

1367
1368 Adam Beeman: I want to state that for 13 years of my life, I lived less than 200 ft. from an industrial park. It wasn't
1369 the end of the world, the traffic wasn't the end of the world, the noise wasn't the end of the world and as a matter of
1370 fact, that was where I go my first job in high school. I would leave high school on work study and I would go work in
1371 one of those businesses in that industrial park that was right behind my house so for me I've lived there, I've dealt
1372 with it and dealt with the traffic, we dealt with diesel exhaust before they even came up with the DEF for the trucks.
1373 It's not as bad as people are making it out to believe. I believe we need the tax revenue in this county and I am for it
1374 all the way. That's the end of my pitch. Thank you.

1375
1376 Carrie Fletcher: My 2 cents is very simply that I have a hard time buying into it when I don't know what they're doing.
1377 I know Orange County needs the revenue, I know all counties in North Carolina, I know all counties everywhere
1378 needs the revenue but to say, here you go and we're going to offer this package to them and say go for it. I don't
1379 know what you're doing there and here's carte blanc to go for it. I don't know what they're going to manufacture
1380 there. I don't know what they're going to put in those trucks. I don't know what they're going to do a year from now
1381 once they open their doors. I don't know, I mean other than what the County say they can and can't do in that
1382 building, whether they tan hides or they... I think they know what tenants they have coming in there and I think they
1383 have a good idea. But, I just don't feel comfortable saying go for it guys and make it work. So be it, it's a huge
1384 project to put out there and I've seen, where I came from, in South Florida what happens when projects don't work
1385 and you end up with a very big, ugly, empty building that is good for nothing and nobody. I would hate to see that
1386 happen out there, five years from now and so I really need more information to really help to make me be persuaded
1387 to just say thumbs up and tally ho but I want to support it, I want to make sure that it's a good thing for Orange
1388 County. It's a hard thing environmentally for me to say that I'm behind it because it's a big decision to say that I'm
1389 going to tear down 50 acres of beautiful land out in Hillsborough to build a giant warehouse. It's a big decision. I
1390 want to make sure that it's right.

1391

1392 **MOTION** by Randy Marshall to recommend approval of the Statement of Consistency indicating the Zoning Atlas
1393 Amendments are reasonable and in the public interest as contained in Attachment 5. Seconded by Adam Beeman.

1394
1395 **ROLLCALL VOTE:**

1396 Randy Marshall: Yes
1397 Hunter Spitzer: No
1398 Melissa Poole: No
1399 Kim Piracci: No
1400 Susan Hunter: Yes
1401 Carrie Fletcher: No
1402 Adam Beeman: Yes
1403 Alexandra Allman: Yes
1404 Patricia Roberts: Yes
1405 David Blankfard: Yes

1406 **MOTION PASSED 6-4**

1407
1408 Craig Benedict: You also would need to vote on the proposed ordinance Attachment 6.

1409
1410 **MOTION** by Randy Marshall for approval of the Ordinance amending the Zoning Atlas as well as imposing
1411 development conditions as well as the ones we approved today for the identified parcels as contained in Attachment
1412 6. Seconded by Adam Beeman.

1413
1414 **ROLLCALL VOTE:**

1415 Randy Marshall: Yes
1416 Patricia Roberts: Yes
1417 Hunter Spitzer: No
1418 Melissa Poole: No
1419 Kim Piracci: No
1420 Susan Hunter: Yes
1421 Carrie Fletcher: No
1422 Adam Beeman: Yes
1423 Alexandra Allman: Yes
1424 David Blankfard: Yes

1425 **MOTION PASSED 6-4**

1426
1427 Randy Marshall: I was particularly persuaded by a couple of the things the Mitchell spoke to tonight and I
1428 would encourage the developer to get more information environmental assessment such as air quality,
1429 noise pollution and stormwater control. The three of those presentations that were presented to us tonight
1430 seem particularly important and well thought out. I don't know if they were included in the 100s of pages,
1431 we received but this has not been completely and fully addressed. I would hope that the developer would
1432 consider getting that information before the public hearing and the presentation to the Board of County
1433 Commissioners.

1434
1435 Craig Benedict: For the purpose of the Board, we've taken notes and minutes for the first meeting as we
1436 have with this meeting and we will be putting together a frequently asked questions document that will try to
1437 answer objectively the comments that have come up from both the Board and the public. September 15,
1438 2020 is the scheduled virtual meeting for the formal public hearing for the Board of County Commissioners.

1439
1440
1441 **AGENDA ITEM 11: ADJOURNMENT**

1442 Meeting was adjourned by consensus

1443
1444
1445

David Blankfard, Chair