The Durham City Council held a Work Session on the above date and time in the City Council Committee Room located at 101 City Hall Plaza with the following members present: Mayor Stephen Schewel, Mayor Pro Tempore Jillian Johnson and Council Members Vernetta Alston and Javiera Caballero. Absent: Council Members DeDreana Freeman, Mark-Anthony Middleton and Charlie Reece.

Also present: City Manager Tom Bonfield, City Attorney Kimberly Rehberg and City Clerk Diana Schreiber.

Mayor Schewel called the meeting to order and welcomed all in attendance.

Mayor Schewel announced that three Council Members had received excused absences and were out of town at National League of Cities Meeting (Middleton) and UNC- School of Government trainings (Freeman, Reece). All three members had already received excused absences.

Mayor Schewel asked if there were any announcements by Council. There were no announcements by Council.

Mayor Schewel asked if there were priority items from the City Manager, City Attorney and City Clerk.

City Manager Bonfield, City Attorney Rehberg and City Clerk Schreiber had no priority items.

Mayor Schewel announced each item on the printed agenda and the following items were pulled for additional discussion: Items #3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 21.

**SUBJECT: CITIZENS’ MATTERS: KATHRYN WOLF (ITEM 19/ PR 13771)**

To receive comments from Kathryn Wolf regarding Durham’s Jewish constituents.

Ms. Wolf spoke to anti-Semitism of Jewish persons.

**SUBJECT: CITIZENS’ MATTERS: CHRIS TIFFANY (ITEM 20/ PR 13772)**

To receive comments from Chris Tiffany regarding voter suppression and the suppression of our first right and duty as US citizens.
Mr. Tiffany spoke about his relationship with police officers and politicians and spoke to his desire to have freedom of expression.

[PUBLIC COMMENT SPEAKERS]

Rafiq Zaidi- asked about the DHA mandatory meeting held that day, explained there had been 24 hours of meeting notice and asked if this was a covert plan by DHA to not have residents appear.

Jackie Wagstaff- asked about McDougald Terrace’s 1900 violations, of which 25 apartments did not qualify for testing and explained that some residents did not want to return and asked where did rehab funding go and spoke to vacant units at alternate locations.

Jeff Durham- representing Durham Chamber of Commerce, addressed talent recruitment, expansion of industries and the commitment to community safety.

Nicole Thompson- President/CEO of DDI, addressed the topic of policing in Durham. She expressed concerns about the perception of increased crime and explained that an unsafe Downtown drove away customers and encouraged Council to give the Police Chief the tools needed.

Robert Gutman- 310 Watts Street, spoke to the national press editorial regarding Police in Durham; and noted that the City Manager supported the Police Department.

Sheila Huggins- Chair of the Friends of Durham, spoke to an editorial in USA Today regarding Policing in Durham and the City Manager’s response; addressed community safety and emphasized the need to build a trusting relationship between the poorest in the community and Police Department.

Ashley Canady- expressed concerns about a new channel posting that residents stipends would be handed out along with the date and location. She called for increased security at the DHA Office and hotel locations to protect residents.

It was confirmed that CJ Davis would take the appropriate actions.

SUBJECT: CONTRACT WITH THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF DURHAM FOR THE PROVISION OF TENANT BASED RENTAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES (ITEM 3/ PR 13768)

Reginald Johnson, Director of the Department of Community Development, responded to Council’s questions.

Mayor Schewel inquired about how did the HOPWA voucher compare to the Section 8 voucher and where could it be used.
Director Johnson responded that both vouchers were basically the same type of voucher and were used to rent market spaces. However, when underlying subsidies were already built into the rent at certain complexes, the vouchers would not be allowed to be used.

**SUBJECT:** CONTRACT PURCHASE OF SIX REPLACEMENT LIGHT TRANSIT VEHICLES FROM INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION SALES & SERVICE, INC. (ITEM 4 / PR 13674)

Sean Egan, Director of Transportation, responded to Council’s questions.

Mayor Schewel asked about the availability of hybrid vehicles that could be used for this purpose.

Mr. Egan responded that former hybrids had reliability failures due to intensive usage and that the breakdowns impacted service delivery. He stated that hybrid engines were replaced with gas powered for reliability and added that this year, in a move toward a more sustainable fleet, the City had been awarded a federal grant for electric bus purchases; and advocated for a Fleet Master Plan for sustainable transit services.

**SUBJECT:** INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH THE CAPITAL AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION FOR THE TRIANGLE BIKEWAY IMPLEMENTATION STUDY (ITEM 5/ PR 13769)

Dale McKeel, Transportation Planner, responded to Council’s questions.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson inquired if scooter and other motorized vehicles’ usage would be addressed in the Bikeway Implementation Study.

Mr. McKeel indicated that it could be considered.

**SUBJECT:** FY2019-20 CIP BUDGET AMENDMENT – PROJECT CLOSE OUT (ITEM 9/ PR 13749)

David Boyd, Director of Finance, responded to Council’s questions.

Mayor Schewel inquired about from where the increase in funding for year-end originated.

Director Boyd responded that the item involved housekeeping of the city’s finances; explained there could be extra funds at year-end that were gathered and reallocated to existing or other projects. He summarized that the item consisted of a combination of closing things out, allocation of funds and/or identifying excess capacity for future allocations.
Logan Small, General Services, introduced the item and deferred to a representative from SAS to respond to Council’s questions.

Jennifer Connor, SAS Senior Account Executive in the Government Business Practices Division, responded to Council’s questions.

Council Member Caballero inquired if SAS had contracts with the Department of Homeland Security and ICE (Immigration and Custom Enforcement) pertaining to detention and related tech support of any kind.

Ms. Connor stated that Don McCorquodale, Government Relations, would be emailing Council shortly to respond to questions.

Ms. Cotton responded that to her knowledge SAS had a contract for Homeland Security and border patrol but was not being used for detention center applications but rather focused on drug trafficking.

Logan Small, General Services, addressed Council’s questions and deferred to Chris Bell with Building Clarity- Account Executive, for response.

Mayor Schewel inquired about the company’s hiring and recruitment practices.

Mr. Bell responded that an African-American was recently hired as project manager, utilized the state’s HUB database for contacts, recruited on LinkedIn, participated in local job fairs and was interested in the City’s YouthWorks Internship program along with including Historically Black Colleges to their recruitment process.

Mayor Schewel requested that diverse recruiting plans by the vendor be expressed at the next Council Meeting.

Council Member Caballero emphasized that when vendors sought to promote institutional shifts within the corporate environment, it was advised to hire consulting firms to accomplish the shift.
[SUPPLEMENTAL ITEM]

SUBJECT: COMMUNITY SAFETY TASK FORCE BYLAWS (ITEM 21/ PR 13784)

Mayor Schewel stated there was speakers to the item.

Dannielle Purefoy - spoke to the proposed bylaws, stated the taskforce reviewed the bylaws, and encouraged Council’s funding for the taskforce’s research.

Manju Rajendran – named specific points that they hoped would be adapted into the bylaws; suggested the name of the taskforce be City of Durham Community Safety and Wellness Taskforce; urged support for stipends for taskforce members; wanted more community or justice involved seats along with more than one youth; and encouraged the taskforce be committed for up to five years and asked the vote on the taskforce be postponed until the Council voted on stipends.

Marcella Camara - read statement from a fellow DBPC member, AJ Williams, regarding modification to the bylaws and supported compensate volunteers for labor, creativity and time.

Stephanie Hopkins – noted that the preferred name of the taskforce was the Community Safety & Wellness Taskforce and urged accountability for its results.

It was the consensus of Council to put the Taskforce Item on the General Business Agenda at the February 17, 2020 regular Council Meeting.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson and Council Member Alston were partnering on the bylaw revision and intended to have revisions to Council prior to the next meeting; and mentioned the concept of stipends of $50.00.

[PRESENTATIONS]

SUBJECT: POLICE GANG UNIT UPDATE (ITEM 12/ PR 13774)

Chief CJ Davis made a PowerPoint Presentation on the Gang Unit Update; presented a statement on the shootings that occurred in October 2019 in Durham, killing 2 and wounding 10 others; and noted if Council was serious about investigating and solving this and other shootings, it was necessary to conduct the preliminary work on enhancing the Gang Taskforce. She spoke to the statistics on causes of shootings, gang members/activity, number of juveniles shot, and police staffing.

To conclude, Chief Davis spoke to the current composition being 1 sergeant, 2 corporals, 10 investigators and 6 patrol officers; and explained the proposed new model for the gang unit consisting of the ideal composition of two teams: each consisting of 1 sergeant, 2 corporals, 5 investigators and 5 patrol officers, resulting in an addition of 6 gang unit officers; current cost of supplemental shifts with overtime, 6 month cost of
$180,593 and full year cost of $361,187 compared to the cost of funding six additional officers for the gang unit at a 6 month cost of $209,715 and one full year cost of $419,430.

Council Member Alston requested that the Chief brief each of the missing Council Members.

City Manager Bonfield summarized the presentation was to update Council on the response by the Police Department to gang violence and in association with the Gang Unit; and to bring Council’s attention to staff bringing forth a budget amendment to cover the costs of additional overtime, or revisiting the staffing distribution in the Department to cover the needs of the gang unit. He also stated that the Chief’s recommendation could be reflective of the budgetary requests for the FY20-21 budget and requested Council’s feedback.

Mayor Schewel asked for clarification on the budget amendment would cover the additional supplemental costs (overtime) or for the additional officers; and encouraged the Chief to brief the absent Council Members on her request.

Chief Davis responded affirmatively.

Council Member Alston appreciated the discussion related to gang unit, and the department’s response to the brazen gun violence and thanked the Chief for the critical arrests and strategy for doing so; and asked about the meaning of a validated gang member.

Chief Davis responded about how to validate a gang member that consisted of the meeting of criteria and explained the term in identification of members.

Council Member Caballero inquired about the timeline regarding the amendment to the budget.

City Manager Bonfield responded that what would happen would be that staff would respond to the direction by Council, and that in May there would be an omnibus budget amendment brought forth and the item would be incorporated into it.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson requested information on how gang members were validated and data on the gang related arrests and validated gang members' arrests for the last several years.

Mayor Schewel asked the Chief to confirm the presented statistics: number of shootings and total homicides with guns; and asked the Chief to talk about the expected results by moving patrol officers.

Jason Schiess, Police Department, analyzed the rationale behind the statistics.
Chief Davis addressed the shooting trends and the successful arrests of individuals who were connected with the Downtown shootings; and explained the work of the officers to make quick arrests was able to quell the violence.

Mayor Schewel addressed the press conference and the strategy utilized to quell the violence being conducted by a small number of violent offenders.

Chief Davis compared the responsibilities of patrol officers with the duties of Gang Unit members.

Mayor Schewel addressed the effects of paid parental leave and asked about the impact on staff.

Sean Huey, Police Department, addressed FMLA leave taken in 2019, stated Human Resources conducted a study along these lines comparing sworn v. non-sworn usages of parental leave and would forward the statistics to Council.

Mayor Schewel inquired about how supplemental (overtime) staffing was arranged.

Chief Davis responded that it was voluntary and dependent on officer preference.

Mayor Schewel acknowledged it would be more beneficial to provide for the additional officers on a hiring basis rather than fund them with supplemental pay; and was convinced that officers who were working overtime were not at their best.

City Manager Bonfield stated the discussion could continue at the next Work Session with the full Council.

Council Member Alston asked if the Mayor wanted the funding be made available through the budget process or before.

Mayor Schewel clarified that he was asking for additional staff before the full budget process, the six officers were wanted now and was ready to fund the officers now rather than approving the supplemental, he was in favor of hiring the officers.

Chief Davis thanked the Budget staff for their support.

**SUBJECT:** R. KELLY BRYANT BRIDGE TRAIL AND THIRD FORK CREEK PHASE 2 TRAIL RECOMMENDED ALIGNMENTS AND EQUITABLE ENGAGEMENT RECAP (ITEM 13/ PR 13766)

Jessica Kemp, Senior Construction Project Manager with General Services, made a PowerPoint presentation titled *Alignment Selection & Community Engagement Recap* with photographs, maps and engagement data and referenced information in the 2/6/20 memo from Jina Probst, Director of General Services to the City Manager as follows:
Executive Summary
On April 1, 2019 City Staff received approval from City Council to proceed with engineering service contracts with Kimley-Horn and Associates (designer) for the above mentioned projects. The General Services Department also received approval from the NC Department of Transportation (NCDOT) to proceed with these projects and issued Notices to Proceed on June 29, 2019. The first task for both projects was to vet and present the City with alternative trail route alignments as informed by engineering opportunities and constraints along with input from the equitable engagement efforts.

Staff followed the recently adopted Equitable Engagement Blueprint process to inform residents who would be most impacted about the projects and seek their input on route alignment options posed by the designer.

Between July and December 2019, General Services Department project management staff engaged with multiple City departments, residents, advisory commissions, and the engineering team to collect feedback on proposed route alignment options. This feedback has been synthesized into a recommended alignment for each project.

Recommendation
The Department of General Services recommends that City Council receive a presentation on the recommended trail alignments and the equitable engagement efforts made to date for each project.

Background
R. Kelly Bryant Bridge Trail.
- FY16-17 – City Council approves CIP project funding in the amount of $557,500.00.
- March 2018 – The City enters into a Municipal Agreement with NCDOT to accept federal grant project funding in the amount of $3,989,621.00.
- FY18-19 – City Council approves additional CIP project funding in the amount of $921,910.00.
- April 2019 – City Council approves a professional engineering design services contract and contingency with Kimley-Horn and Associates in the amount of $569,000.00.
- June 2019 – General Services Department issues a Notice to Proceed to the designer.

Third Fork Creek Phase 2 Trail
- FY17-18 – City Council approves CIP project funding in the amount of $748,670.00.
- May 2018 – The City enters into a Municipal Agreement with NCDOT to accept federal grant project funding in the amount of $2,854,000.00.
- April 2019 – City Council approves a professional engineering design services contract and contingency with Kimley-Horn and Associates in the amount of $640,000.00.
- June 2019 – General Services Department issues a Notice to Proceed to the designer.

Issues and Analysis
The first task for both projects was to vet and present the City with alternative trail route alignments as informed by engineering opportunities and constraints along with input from the
equitable engagement efforts. The recommended trail alignment recommendations presented here are a synthesis of input and feedback staff received from the designer, multiple City departments, advisory commissions, and engagement with residents most impacted geographically by these projects.

Overview Summaries for Equitable Community Engagement for each project are available on General Services Department project websites under “Fall 2019 Survey Results”:

- R. Kelly Bryant Bridge Trail
- Third Fork Creek Phase 2 Trail

Alternatives
R. Kelly Bryant Bridge Trail
After reviewing planning documents, project goals identified in the federal grant process, and a field visit of the project area, four alignment decision points were identified by Kimley-Horn and Associates along the 3-mile trail route:

Segment 1A vs 1B – The trail in this segment will be a 10’ wide concrete sidewalk along NC-55 from Dakota St. north to Lawson St. Segment 1A is on the NCCU side of NC-55 (west) and requires much fewer easement acquisitions and private property infrastructure adjustments. Segment 1B is on the residential side of NC-55 (east) and is considerably more constrained. The engineering recommendation and final staff recommendation is Segment 1A.

Segment 3A vs 3B – The trail in this segment will be a 10’ wide concrete sidewalk connecting Lawson St. to Lakeland St. Segment 3A routes the trail on the west side of Burton Park and would require future City Council action to approve a Paper Street closure on a portion of Lakeland St. Segment 3B routes the trail on the east side of Sima Ave. at the McDougald Terrace Housing Authority. The equitable engagement process resulted in a strong preference for Segment 3A. The final staff recommendation is Segment 3A.

Segment 5A vs 5B – The trail in this segment will be an 8-10’ wide concrete sidewalk connecting Angier Ave. to E. Main St. Segment 5A routes the trail on the west and north side of the square block avoiding future Durham Housing Authority development. Segment 5B routes the trail on the south and east side of the square block. Coordination with Durham Housing Authority and a private developer resulted in a strong preference for Segment 5A. The final staff recommendation is Segment 5A.

Segment 7A vs 7B – The trail in this segment will connect Liberty St. to N. Alston Ave. Segment 7A would be a 10’ wide concrete sidewalk within the Right of Way of Liberty St. and N. Alston Ave. Segment 7B would be a 10’ asphalt path with boardwalks where environmentally necessary through City properties including Long Meadow Park, the former Sign and Signal Shop parcel, and East End Park. Feedback synthesized from the equitable engagement process and City department stakeholders resulted in a preference for Segment 7B. The final staff recommendation is Segment 7B.

Third Fork Creek Phase 2 Trail
After reviewing planning documents, project goals identified in the federal grant process, and a field visit of the project area, two alignment decision points were identified by Kimley-Horn and Associates along the 1.7-mile trail route:

Master Plan alignment – The 2011 Trails Master Plan alignment routed the trail along
Weaver St, through the Hillside Park Neighborhood terminating at the American Tobacco Trail (ATT) crossing on Otis St as a 10’ concrete sidewalk. It became clear early on during the Hillside Park Neighborhood resident engagement process that the initial project planning effort had not engaged residents that would be most impacted by the project’s development. The project alignment as identified in the Master Plan would result in eight private properties with trails on both their west (Third Fork Creek Phase 2) and east (ATT) parcel boundaries. Multiple factors including a lack of previous engagement, physical impacts to residential properties, and increased trail traffic resulted in a strong descent to a project alignment through the neighborhood. Staff received this resistance to the project and directed the engineering firm to develop an alternative trail route that would both serve the original Master Plan goal of a Third Fork Creek Trail extension connection to the ATT while reducing unwanted impacts in the Hillside Park Neighborhood. These alternatives alignments to the Master Plan are referred to as 2A and 2B.

Segment 2A vs 2B – The trail in this segment will connect Weaver St. to the ATT. Segment 2A is a 5’ wide concrete sidewalk and bicycle marked facilities on the road within the Right of Way through the Hillside Park Neighborhood on Pilot St. and Otis St. terminating at the ATT crossing on Otis St. Segment 2B is a 10’ asphalt path with boardwalks where environmentally necessary through the woods between Weaver St. and Fayetteville St. Segment 2B would terminate at the ATT crossing on Fayetteville St. near Food Lion. Feedback synthesized from the equitable engagement process and City department stakeholders resulted in a preference for Segment 2B. The final staff recommendation is Segment 2B.

Barnhill St. Spur – Staff identified a possible neighborhood spur connection to the future trail on Barnhill St. Residents were contacted about this opportunity and input was received. There was a strong preference to not connect Barnhill St. to the future trail. The final staff recommendation is to omit this spur connection.

**Financial Impact**

R. Kelly Bryant Bridge Trail  
The recommended trail alignment results in a total project expense that equal the current project budget in the amount of $5,414,031.00.

Following NCDOT administered federal grant protocol, staff anticipates requesting additional federal grant funding with the engineering estimate at 65% design such that the final funding commitment is 80% federal with a 20% local match. The City’s CIP project match exceeds federal grant requirements by $367,005.00. Staff does not anticipate requesting additional City funding for this project.

Staff will be working with Kimley-Horn and Associates in February 2020 to negotiate a scope and fee for additional work associated with the recommended alignment. This design amendment will be brought to City Council for approval.

Third Fork Creek Phase 2 Trail  
The recommended trail alignment results in a total project expense that exceeds the budget by $1,394,709.00.

Following NCDOT administered federal grant protocol, staff anticipates requesting additional federal grant funding with the engineering estimate at 65% design such that the final funding commitment is 80% federal with a 20% local match. The City’s CIP project match exceeds
federal grant requirements by $437,194.21. Staff does not anticipate requesting additional City funding for this project.

Staff will be working with Kimley-Horn and Associates in February 2020 to negotiate a scope and fee for additional work associated with the recommended alignment. This design amendment will be brought to City Council for approval.

**Equal Business Opportunity Summary**
This presentation was not reviewed by the Equity and Inclusion Department.

**Attachments**
Presentation

Nia Rodgers of General Services, addressed the Equitable Engagement Outreach goals that involved partnering with NIS and Parks & Recreation. She stated that bilingual emails, telephoning, posters were tools of outreach and that the next steps were focused on the Summer of 2020; and encouraged all to refer to the EngageDurham.com website.

Mayor and Council appreciated the nurturing of the close connections between staff and residents.

Taking the prerogative of the Chair, Mayor Schewel acknowledged that Council Member Alston needed to depart early and encouraged that the agenda be settled while there was a quorum.

**Settling the Agenda – February 17, 2020 City Council Meeting**

City Manager Bonfield announced that the Consent Agenda consisted of Items #1 through 15; General Business Agenda Item #21; and General Business Agenda – Public Hearing Items #16 through 18.

**MOTION** by Council Member Alston, seconded by Council Member Caballero, to settle the agenda as stated by the City Manager for the February 17, 2020 City Council Meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

**SUBJECT:** MOVE DURHAM TRANSPORTATION STUDY (ITEM 14/ PR 13767)

Ellen Beckmann, Transportation Planning Manager and Project Manager for the Transportation Study, introduced the item. A memo from the Transportation Director, Sean Egan, follows:

Date: January 21, 2020  
To: Thomas J. Bonfield, City Manager  
Through: Keith Chadwell, Deputy City Manager  
From: Sean Egan, Director of Transportation  
Subject: Move Durham Transportation Study
Executive Summary
The Move Durham Transportation Study is nearing completion. https://www.movedurham.org/
This study establishes a multi-modal transportation vision to maintain and promote a safe, reliable, convenient, connected, and equitable transportation network. The draft plan is in development and will identify future transportation projects needed in central Durham including an implementation plan for funding sources and approval agencies. A presentation will be provided to present the draft report. Alta Planning + Design, Inc., is the prime consultant for the study.

Recommendation
It is recommended that the City Council receive a presentation on the Move Durham Transportation Study.

Background
Downtown Durham has experienced significant growth in recent years, and more development is currently under construction or being proposed for construction. There are also multiple transportation projects that have the potential to affect transportation patterns in central Durham. The East End Connector is under construction with a 2020 completion date. One of the primary purposes of this project is to reduce the growth of through traffic on the major streets through central Durham and provide a faster and more convenient freeway-to-freeway connection between I-85 and NC 147. The widening of Alston Avenue from NC 147 to NC 98 is under construction with a 2020 completion date. Downtown parking is increasingly limited and more expensive for people who travel to Durham, and many developers and commuters are looking for lower cost alternatives to driving downtown, including park-and-ride lots and bus transit service. The residents of central Durham have increasingly requested more pedestrian and bicycle facilities, decreased traffic volumes and speeds through their neighborhoods, and the conversion of one-way streets to two-way traffic. The City is currently overseeing the design of many bicycle and pedestrian projects including the Durham Belt Line, the R. Kelly Bryant Bridge Trail, the Third Fork Creek Trail, 8 miles of bicycle lanes, 7 miles of neighborhood bike routes, and many sidewalks. The City, Durham County, Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization (DCHC MPO), and GoTriangle have also begun the process to develop an updated Durham Transit Plan to identify how future transit funding will be used to benefit residents.

Lastly, the legacy of NC 147’s construction through Durham, including the destruction of the Hayti community and urban renewal, still has a negative impact on the economy, safety, and connectivity of much of central Durham. Less of the economic growth in downtown Durham has extended south and east across NC 147 due to the physical barrier and lack of connectivity caused by the freeway. The NC 147 interchanges are frequent crash locations, mostly built without adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities and lacking basic ADA curb ramps, and with little regard to urban design or aesthetics. NC 147 itself is an outdated freeway design with narrow shoulders and closely spaced ramps and tight weaving sections. NCDOT submitted a project for auxiliary lanes and operational improvements on NC 147 to the prioritization process, and it was funded as a committed project in the TIP. However, the scope of this project has not been vetted through a local or MPO planning process, and the public may have different expectations for improvements on NC 147. Any changes to NC 147 ramps and interchanges will have a spill-over effect on downtown streets and circulation that has not been examined. NCDOT has begun project development for this project, but it has been temporarily suspended due to their cash shortfall.
The Move Durham Transportation Study was funded by the DCHC MPO, NCDOT, and the City of Durham, and plan development began in 2018. The study included extensive public outreach and data gathering with the intent of improving the City’s understanding of how people move to and through the central city. The recommendations consider all modes of transportation, including walking, biking, taking transit, and driving. The study included the following steps:

- Reviewed existing community plans and planned projects
- Examined current conditions and forecasted future transportation needs
- Identified ways to improve how we move, connect, and experience our streets and public places
- Evaluated and prioritized potential projects
- Developed an implementation plan including potential funding sources and approval agencies

The City Council received a presentation in December 2018 during Phase I of public engagement. The Study was expected to have been completed in 2019, but discontinuation of the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit project required some modifications to the schedule and direction of the study. The plan’s executive summary will be released in early February and a complete draft plan in mid-February. It will be posted on the plan website [https://www.movedurham.org/](https://www.movedurham.org/) as soon as it is available and a press release will be issued. There will be a final round of public engagement on the final plan before it is recommended for approval by the City Council in spring 2020.

**Issues and Analysis**

Move Durham began just after the Equitable Community Engagement Blueprint was developed, and thus provided an opportunity to apply many of the recommendations of the blueprint within the existing scope and budget of the project. Approximately 28 percent of the budget was dedicated to public engagement. There were two rounds of public engagement, in winter 2018/2019 and in summer 2019. The engagement process included measuring baseline demographic data, collecting demographic data of the participants in the planning process, and deliberatively focusing on more inclusive and effective engagement efforts that would reflect the demographics of the community. Move Durham included three traditional public meetings in Phase I, but the focus was shifted to utilize existing community events and organizations for engagement in Phase II. Phase II also piloted a multi-departmental engagement event, City in the Park, which is also an initiative in the Strategic Plan. Move Durham employed techniques such as Spanish translation, incentives for participation, raffles, targeted social media ads, online surveys and interactive maps, intercept surveying, direct mail, and coordination with other City departments and activities such as Participatory Budgeting. Staff analyzed and adapted our efforts during the plan development based on the data. This experience will also help inform future planning efforts such as the Durham County Transit Plan.

The engagement efforts centered on two surveys in Phase I and II that could be more easily quantified and summarized as well as many individual stakeholder conversations that yielded more qualitative data. In the first survey, most people responded that they currently drive alone all or most of the time, but would prefer to walk, take the bus, bike, then lastly drive alone. White residents expressed the highest preferences for walking and biking, and black residents expressed the highest preferences for taking the bus and driving. The highest priorities among all residents were to increase connectivity between downtown and surrounding neighborhoods, build a rail public transit system, and build more low-stress bikeways. This was the same order for white residents. For black residents, the highest priorities were to increase bus service, build more
sidewalks, and build a rail public transit system. This survey was taken before the Durham-
Orange Light Rail Transit project was discontinued.

In Phase II, the survey included more detailed questions about potential improvements on specific
corridors. These corridors were: Duke/Gregson/Vickers, Mangum/Roxboro, Elizabeth/Fayetteville,
Alston/Avondale, Holloway, West Chapel Hill, the Downtown Loop, and the Durham Freeway.
Overall, there was the highest support for building more sidewalks, repairing sidewalks, making
pedestrian crossings safer. This was consistent on all corridors and among all demographics. The
second highest priority among white residents was to improve bike lanes, while among black
residents was to improve bus stops. The preferences did vary by corridor. Again sidewalks and
safer crossings were high priorities along every corridor. Better bus stops and more reliable bus
service were of notably higher priority on Alston/Avondale, Elizabeth/Fayetteville, and Holloway
streets.

The presentation will include an overview of the corridor recommendations. These corridor
recommendations are responsive to the public engagement findings as well as technical data on
traffic flows, the width of the streets and the feasibility to make changes, and funding options. The
recommendations all are oriented towards fulfilling the vision statement for the plan:
“Whether traveling by bus, foot, bike or car, people in Central Durham will be able to move
safely and reliably. A more convenient and connected multimodal transportation network
will ensure that moving in Central Durham is affordable and equitable for all”.

All of the corridors are constrained and widening would likely have many negative community
impacts as well as greatly increase the cost. As a result, most of the recommendations include a
re-allocation of existing right-of-way from motor vehicles to public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian
facilities.

All of the corridors studied in detail in Move Durham are primarily NCDOT maintained roadways.
While NCDOT has stated that they are committed to improving streets for all road users, they also
emphasize that the “The State Highway system inside corporate limits is intended to consist of
major streets and highways necessary to move volumes of traffic efficiently and effectively from
points beyond the corporate limits to major business, industrial, governmental and institutional
destinations located inside municipalities.” NCDOT will not provide pre-approval of any of the plan
recommendations, and will consider approval on a case-by-case basis considering roadway
capacity, the need for turn lanes, and concern about changing the character of the roadway. It is
likely that NCDOT would not approve two-way conversions or road reconfigurations that reduce
capacity to a point that it may affect the efficient movement of through traffic. This is most likely to
affect the implementation strategy for Duke/Gregson/Vickers and Roxboro/Mangum streets.

As a result, the plan is structured to provide short-term recommendations that are lower cost and
more likely to be able to be implemented under state-maintenance and long-term
recommendations that are higher cost and/or are more likely to require a transfer of maintenance
responsibilities to the City of Durham. Transfer of maintenance responsibilities would have an
impact on the City’s future roadway maintenance and resurfacing budget and staff resources.
However, it would also give the City more direct control over these roadways, and allow the City
to make decisions that reflect its priorities for safety, equity, and economic and land use
development.

The plan includes an implementation strategy including the identification of potential funding
sources. Many of the recommendations of the plan could be implemented through existing
programs in the 10-Year CIP, but will require additional funding. These existing programs include
sidewalk repair, pedestrian signals and crosswalks, and sidewalk gaps and corridor construction. However, these programs are intended to fund improvements throughout the City and there are many unfunded priority projects already identified in the adopted Bike+Walk Implementation Plan. Bike facilities and roadway reconfigurations do not have funding in the 10-Year CIP that is not currently programmed to existing projects. As a result, most bicycle facilities or roadway reconfigurations only have the potential for implementation through the resurfacing schedule and using limited in-house design staff resources. Bus stop improvements, access to transit, and infrastructure improvements that can help the speed and reliability of buses (also called “transit emphasis corridors”) are currently funded in the existing Durham County Transit Plan. However, the scope and amount of funding for these corridor improvements are very limited in the current plan.

Potential options for funding the project recommendations of Move Durham include additional General Fund appropriations through the CIP, a transportation bond, state and federal grants, private development, and additional funding through the Durham County Transit Plan. There are many demands on the General Fund and a need to distribute projects equitably across the City. State and federal grant funding is limited for the type of projects in the plan and all would require a 20 percent minimum local match. Projects that decrease roadway capacity for motor vehicles do not score well in the State TIP process, and the federal BUILD grant has not prioritized bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects in recent years. Private development may help implement projects in a piecemeal way, but a corridor conversion is unlikely to be feasible for a private developer. However, the Durham County Transit Plan provides an opportunity to fund many of the recommendations of the plan that directly help transit riders access the bus and improve the speed and reliability of bus service. This plan is being updated and these projects should receive full consideration for funding.

Move Durham also included technical data collection and public engagement on the Durham Freeway. While the Durham Freeway provides an important connection between downtown Durham, Duke University, and Research Triangle Park, regional through traffic could be expected to divert to I-85 and the East End Connector. There is an opportunity to prioritize providing access to and from central Durham as the primary purpose of the Durham Freeway. In terms of public engagement, there was a clear consensus that improving the connectivity across the freeway was a priority including upgrading the bicycle and pedestrian facilities on existing under- and over-passes. However, the public engagement process and discussions with stakeholders also uncovered the significant amount of distrust and pain associated with the original construction of the freeway. Due to the scale of any potential changes to the freeway and the likely impacts on economic development, affordable housing, equity, etc., a more thorough and comprehensive study of the freeway is necessary before making specific recommendations. This study would need to be community-led and grounded in equitable engagement to help build trust around this issue. Move Durham recommends further study in the Comprehensive Plan and other future plans. NCDOT will also be advised that their project needs to consider a wider range of potential improvements to the freeway and that an equitable engagement strategy is critical to the success of any project that they wish to pursue.

**Alternatives**
The City Council could choose not to receive the presentation, and the study will continue without input from the Council.

**Financial Impact**
The total budget for the Downtown Durham Transportation Study is $399,923.64. The DCHC MPO and NCDOT are responsible for their financial obligations. NCDOT is providing $250,000
for this study. The DCHC MPO’s share of $149,923.64 is available within the MPO’s budget. The City of Durham funded the remaining $29,984.73 through the FY 2018 budget.

Projects recommended by the plan will require city, state, and federal funding to be implemented.

**Equal Business Opportunity Summary**

This agenda item presents the status of a planning project and was not reviewed by the Department of Equal Opportunity/Equity Assurance for compliance with the Ordinance to Promote Equal Business Opportunities in City Contracting. The approved consulting contract included subcontracting to a MUBE firm, BREE & Associates.

**Attachments**

Presentation

Jennifer Baldwin, representing Alta Planning + Design, made a PowerPoint presentation consisting of the following:

- Project Overview
- Scope
- Map of Study Area
- Equitable Access
- Move Durham’s Visio,
- Priority Corridors
- Existing Conditions
- Map of Pedestrian Crashes
- Trip Lengths- pedestrian, biking, and driving,
- Transit Access maps
- Priority Corridors
- Public Engagement in Phase II
- Process
- Outreach Summary,
- What was Heard by Travel Mode and Corridor,
- Quotes from users
- Recommendations:
  - **Short-Term Recommendations:**
    - Reduce speed limit to 25 mph and adjust signal progression
    - Repair sidewalks and fill in gaps
    - Improve pedestrian crossings:
      - Leading pedestrian intervals
      - Banning right turn on red
      - Pedestrian refuge islands, curb extensions, better crosswalks
    - Improve bus stop amenities
    - Add bike lanes and intersection improvements where feasible
  - Program funding ranged from $210,000 to $8 million
- **Long-Term Vision:**
  - Streetscape Improvements
  - Two-Way Conversion of DT Loop
Transit Priority
Separated Bikeways
Planning Level Total Cost Estimates: $35-52+ million
Implementation Considerations/Options
Durham Freeway Interchange Crossing Improvements

Ms. Baldwin explained that public engagement was a central tenant of the process; and identified major public concerns being sidewalk repairs, bus stop amenities (user experiences), lighting, parking and safe street crossings.

Mayor Schewel inquired about engagement related to the Fayetteville Corridor along with business engagement.

Staff indicated that NIS was contacted to assist in making contact along the corridor, acknowledged the background of the freeway’s impact on the Hayti Community and the desire of staff to rebuild trust.

Ms. Beckmann detailed the short and long-term improvement recommendations along with funding of design and construction.

Mayor Schewel inquired about the relationship between sidewalk ongoing funding and the ten-year CIP and corridor funding; and looked forward to staff’s budgeting recommendations. He asked about the what type of separated bikeway was planned.

Ms. Beckmann confirmed that the bikeway along Chapel Hill Street would be in the street with protective bollards; stated Avondale/Alston would have a sidepath with an expanded trail path over Avondale/Alston to the Beltline Trail.

Mayor Pro Tempore Johnson inquired about the process involved in converting a one-way road to two-way, such as Duke and Gregson Streets.

Ms. Beckmann stated that interchanges complicated changes in directional traffic and would involve cost; in regard to sidewalk repairs, Public Works established the repair schedule and Transportation would need to cross-check list with that of Public Works.

Council Member Alston departed the Committee Room at 3:57 p.m.

Related to funding, the FY20 Work Plan amendments for the current Durham County Transit Plan were scheduled to go to the GoTriangle Board later this month and additional funding sources include state and federal grant options. Other resource options include a potential future transportation bond. Pilot projects and equitable engagement would be pursued.

Ms. Beckmann provided an update on the Durham Freeway improvements by stating the interchange improvements were a high priority relative to safety ramp egress. Any improvements would be transformational and the level of engagement required to be led
by local government was not currently feasible. Public engagement would be critical for a successful project along the highway and encouraged NCDOT be informed of this fact.

City Manager Bonfield asked for an update on the East End connector traffic flow. The East End Connector was expected to open at the end of the calendar year. According to Streetlight Data was providing live traffic data on roadways and provided a resource for staff to model traffic routes.

Council appreciated the presentation.

SUBJECT: DURHAM COUNTY TRANSIT PLAN AND COMMUTER RAIL UPDATE (ITEM 15/ PR 13762)

Transportation Director Sean Egan and Aaron Cain made the staff report including Pat Young, Director of City-County Planning. A memo to the City Manager follows:

Date: February 6, 2020  
To: Thomas J. Bonfield, City Manager  
Through: Keith Chadwell, Deputy City Manager  
From: Sean Egan, Transportation Director  
        Aaron Cain, Planning Manager, DCHC MPO  
Subject: Durham County Transit Plan and Commuter Rail Update

Executive Summary
Durham Transit Team staff will provide an update on development of the Durham County Transit Plan and Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Study.

Recommendation
This update is provided for information only. Staff recommends that the City Council receive a presentation providing an update of the process for the Durham County Transit Plan and the Greater Triangle Commuter Rail (GTCR) Study. Staff requests that the City Council provide comments and questions regarding these initiatives. No further action is required.

Background
The Durham Transit Team presented a report on existing conditions and pipeline transit projects, as well as initial feedback from the November 2019 Listening and Learning Sessions of the ENGAGEDurham Comprehensive Plan community outreach in December 2019. Initial results regarding transit from the Listening and Learning sessions will be provided. In addition, initial results from the most recent study of the GTCR are also available.

Issues and Analysis
Though the Durham-Orange Light Rail Transit (D-O LRT) project was discontinued in 2019, work continues on other transit projects identified in the 2017 Durham Transit Plan. The projects include transit centers and bus stop improvements, transit emphasis corridors, and bus operations. Those efforts will be highlighted, as well as an update of the progress of the development of a new Durham Transit Plan. As part of that development, the initial results from
the Listening and Learning sessions provide a glimpse into the transit priorities of Durham residents; however, outreach is still ongoing.

Initial results from the most recent study for the GTCR identify a limited number of project scenarios that would be competitive for federal funding, which is necessary for financial feasibility for the project. Further study is necessary to determine the impacts that the project may have on issues that are important to the City of Durham.

Alternatives
The City Council could choose not to provide input on the Durham County Transit Plan and Greater Triangle Community Rail Update.

Financial Impact
There is no immediate financial impact. However, additional study on the GTCR will require additional funding from the Durham County Transit Tax Fund. That amount is not yet determined. The City of Durham is not a funding partner, and therefore does not have a vote on whether or not to authorize those funds (authorization is determined by boards of GoTriangle, the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization – DCHC MPO, and the Durham County Board of Commissioners.

Equal Business Opportunity Summary
There is no immediate equal business opportunity issue.

Attachments
Attachment: Durham County Transit Plan Process and Engagement Update Presentation

The staff presentation was titled, ‘Durham County Transit Plan, Process and Engagement Update’ and included the following:

Agenda
What Staff Heard from Engagement Efforts
Key Items to address in early 2020
  Amendments to the FY 19-20 Work Plan
  Upcoming interim decisions
Updated Preliminary Results from Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Study:
  Alternatives Analysis Update and Further Study
Engagement to Date – Forms/Types of Engagement
Themes to Inform Community Transit Goals and Equity Principles
  Improve frequency & geographic coverage
  Environmentally friendly transit
  Improve regional connectivity and bus stop infrastructure and connectivity to
    Bus stops
  Ensure Affordable Transit
  Improve information and its communication
  Ensure safe travel for youth
  Expand paratransit services
Current & Upcoming Fiscal Workplan Projects with costs
Interim Decisions for Mid- to Long-Term Projects
Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Study – Updates of Alternatives, Analysis and Further Study; updated draft/preliminary findings snapshot

NOTE: Greater Triangle Commuter Rail project needs additional study, coordination, and public engagement prior to project design and implementation. In the coming months, elected officials will consider whether to proceed with this additional study.

Commuter Rail Background with map

Study Partners

Timeline of the Study

Features of Existing Rail Corridor

Finding: All Scenarios Necessitate Another Track

Busiest Stations are in Raleigh and Durham and in Wake and Durham Counties

Preliminary Feasibility Study

Evaluated 8 scenarios

Funding Capacity

Project must meet set of criteria for Federal Funding in tandem with scoring

Project driven by six project justification factors

Lower Service & Higher Cost Scenarios do not score well

Peer Comparisons on key metrics:

- System Capital Cost
- Capital Cost per Mile
- Average Weekday Trips
- Average Trip Length
- Capital Cost per Passenger mile traveled
- Operating Cost per Passenger mile traveled

Charts: System Capital Cost 2020, Capital Cost/mile, Average weekday trips, Average Trip Length in miles, Capital Cost/Annual Passenger Miles Traveled (2018), Operating Cost (2019)/Annual Passenger Miles Traveled (2018) and the Percentage of Riders from Zero Car and One-Car Households

Remaining Study Effort

Types of Risks

Planning Timeline

- Next Steps: Present updated results and metrics
  - Present risk assessment - GoTriangle board workshop on Jan. 22
  - Primer on risk for transit capital projects
  - Walk-through of initial risk assessment findings
- Consider pursuing early project development activities necessary prior to initiating project design and implementation
- Consider adopting memorandum of understanding among project management partners for early project development activities
  - Roles, responsibilities, and goals of the project management partners, municipalities, and other stakeholders if moving forward

Risk Assessment:

- Public Participation Process
- Inclusion of Municipal Governments as Partners
- Roadway Interfaces
- Apportioning Capital and Operating Costs
Mr. Young addressed outreach efforts with Ambassadors who would collect information from 80 engagements with under-engaged communities. By April, feedback would be provided to Council in the form of Equity and Community Transit Goals. Staff would interpret what was heard, share the information with Council and then go back out to the community to ensure what was heard was correct. So far, the top three interests were improving frequency/reliability, improving geographic coverage and providing environmentally friendly transit.

Aaron Cain, representing the Durham Chapel-Hill-Carrboro Metropolitan Planning Organization, provided background on the Work Plan; and spoke to capital projects in the Work Plan of both GoDurham and GoTriangle including bus stop projects and access projects along with early project development activities for commuter rail.

Mayor Schewel asked when the City would be added to the Interlocal Agreement (ILA).

Transportation Director Egan responded that there had been discussions with GoTriangle about adding the city to the Interlocal Agreement and that there was consensus amongst the County leadership that the City be included and that discussions were occurring about how to update the ILA. City Manager Bonfield remarked that there had been discussions to this effect going on since March 2019.

Mr. Cain continued his report, addressed amendments going to the GoTriangle Board for approval in February and detailed the types of projects. He proposed adding $700,000 in this fiscal year and adding a significant amount in the FY20-21 work plan. The draft plan was to be presented to the GoTriangle Board on April 29, 2020.

Mr. Egan explained that each project consisted of a project sponsor and was discussed with the staff working group, then submitted to the relevant boards. The City of Durham was the project sponsor of the Transit Emphasis Corridor Program. The CRT had not yet been approved for funding.

Mr. Cain addressed project priorities and funding timelines/deadlines.

Jay Heikes, Transportation Planner with GoTriangle, provided an update on the Greater Triangle Commuter Rail Transit Study (CRT) consisting of 37 miles of rail from Garner, Raleigh, Cary, Morrisville, RTP and Durham. The project management partners were Wake, Durham, Johnson and Orange Counties. He spoke to the expected utilization of the existing rail corridor with a new track.

Council expressed appreciation for the comprehensive review.
SUBJECT: UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE TEXT AMENDMENT, SIGNS (TC1700002) (ITEM 16/ PR 13756)

Attorney Don O'Toole provided the staff update on the item and responded to Council’s questions.

Attorney O'Toole provided the background of the sign revision starting in 2014 due to the impact of the nefarious signs across the City; referenced the 2015 US Supreme Court Case Reed v. Gilbert, Arizona decision that upended the way local governments regulated signage. Since that point in time, Planning Department and the City Attorney’s Office has been partnering to update the UDO sign provisions and detailed historical data about the development of the text amendment.

Attorney O'Toole spoke to the US Supreme Court Case and provided its case history with special mention of the category, temporary directional signs. The Town of Gilbert had very restrictive signage allowances. Reverend Reed was the minister of a small church without a permanent home. His parishioners put up 15-20 temporary signs around the town directing folks to where the church would be held. The Town administrators noticed church members violating the sign ordinance due to exceeding the time limitation and failing to include date of event on signage. Content review was the crux of the argument that involved strict scrutiny, was struck down by the Supreme Court, against the Town of Gilbert. Attorney O'Toole explained the opinions by the Justices.

Mike Stock, Planner, stated the amendment included a reorganization to accommodate changes necessary to reflect the Reed Case; stated the Supreme Court Case focused on temporary signage in and those not within the right-of-way. There were no changes to lists of prohibited signs, standard sizes and illumination- no changes, and removals were not based on content. He introduced temporary and permanent sign categories; spoke to street memorials and ghost bikes; and addressed election signage allowances.

Mayor Schewel expressed appreciation for the presentations.

Being no additional business to come before Council, the meeting was adjourned at 5:26 pm.

Diana Schreiber
City Clerk