

**THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA**

Monday, June 14, 1999

5:00 P.M. – 6:30 P.M. Public Hearing

**MINUTES**

Place: Commissioners' Room, second floor, Durham County Government Administrative Complex, 200 E. Main Street, Durham, NC

Present: Chairman MaryAnn E. Black, Vice-Chairman Ellen W. Reckhow, and Commissioners William V. Bell, Joe W. Bowser, and Becky M. Heron

Absent: None

Presider: Chairman Black

Chairman Black opened the meeting.

**Public Hearing on the Proposed Northern Durham Parkway (“Eno Drive”)**

As per the County Commission's directions at the May 24 meeting, a public hearing has been scheduled to hear citizen comment regarding the proposed Northern Durham Parkway. The Joint City-County Planning Committee (JCCPC) unanimously recommended that the Board of County Commissioners and the City Council adopt the resolution. Staff recommends that language be added to the resolution asking that copies be forwarded to: The Secretary of Transportation, Durham County's member of the State Board of Transportation, the Board of County Commissioners, the City Council, the Transportation Advisory Committee, and members of the Durham Delegation.

Resource Persons:

John Hodges-Copple, TJCOG  
Wesley Parham, Transportation  
Dick Hails, City-County Planning

Receive citizen comments and direct staff.

Chairman Black asked John Hodges-Copple, Triangle J Council of Governments, to make a presentation on the proposed Northern Durham Parkway (“Eno Drive”).

Mr. Hodges-Copple served as the facilitator to the Joint City-County Planning Committee Northeast/Northwest Loop Sub-Committee that looked at different alternatives.

The presentation began with a brief overview of what the subcommittee did.

The overview follows:

JOINT CITY-COUNTY PLANNING COMMITTEE  
NORTHEAST/NORTHWEST LOOP SUB-COMMITTEE

Overview of Subcommittee Work

The subcommittee met 11 times between July 1998 and May 1999. The subcommittee adopted the following goal and objectives to guide their deliberations:

Goal: "To reach consensus on a set of transportation actions—both road and non-road—that can support the policies of the Durham 2020 Plan and recommend these actions to the City Council and Board of Commissioners."

Objectives: "Recommended transportation actions should:

- Support economic development in appropriate places consistent with the 2020 plan
- Protect the natural environment from negative impacts of transportation facilities
- Protect neighborhoods from negative impacts of transportation facilities
- Result in a multi-modal transportation system for the County"

Meetings #1—July 29, 1998

1. Agreement on goal of the subcommittee and objectives of the meetings
2. Recent History & Current Status of North Durham Transportation Planning
3. Land Use and Environmental Conditions, Plans and Projections
  - a) Durham 2020 Plan
  - b) Small Area Plans
  - c) Transportation model socioeconomic forecasts
  - d) Watersheds and environmentally sensitive areas
4. Overview of the 1996 Report from the Northeast/Northwest Alternatives Committee

Meeting #2—August 4, 1998

1. Summary of Industrial Land Use in Durham
2. Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro Transportation Plan Tasks & Schedule
3. Travel Patterns and Behavior
4. Focus on specific transportation proposals and reviews:
  - a) Summary of NC DOT loop road alternatives
  - b) Eno River Association Proposals
  - c) Durham Chamber of Commerce Proposal

Meeting #3—August 17, 1998

1. Update from the Environmental Affairs Board
2. Location of Industrially Zoned Land that is Currently Vacant

3. Review of Map Showing Roadway Deficiencies and Maps Summarizing Alignments Proposed by NC DOT, the Eno River Association, and the Durham Chamber of Commerce.

Meeting #4—September 25, 1998

1. Overlays of Industrial Land and Forecast Growth in Durham
2. Report from the Environmental Affairs Board

Meeting #5—October 19, 1998

1. Follow-up/Comments on the Environmental Affairs Board Report
2. Committee discussion of corridor segments
  - a) West of Roxboro Road
  - b) “northern route” between Roxboro Road and Old Oxford Highway

Meeting #6—November 10, 1998

1. Planning Staff Report:
  - a) Response to EAB Report
  - b) Environmental Conditions in Area
2. Discussion of Corridor Segments:
  - a) Old Oxford Highway to I-85
  - b) I-85 to US 70

Meeting #7—December 10, 1998

1. Review and Discussion of Corridor Segments using aerial photographs

Meeting #8—January 27, 1999

1. Deficiency Analysis of existing plus committed transportation network
2. Discussion of Corridor Alternatives

Meeting #9—February 12, 1999

1. Development of alternative corridor alignments for analysis

Meeting #10—April 16, 1999

1. Staff presentation on analysis of alternatives
2. Discussion on proposal for a single alternative

Meeting #11—May 17, 1999

1. Overview of Water Quality Concerns
2. Discussion of Proposed Resolution
3. Recommendation to Endorse the Northern Durham Parkway Alternative and Innovative Measures to Increase Transportation Options

The Committee developed three different alternatives that they asked the staff to analyze in terms of transportation impacts.

The Committee settled on a compromise proposal largely due to some very good work by environmental organizations and the Chamber of Commerce. The new compromise proposal has been labeled the Northern Durham Parkway, which is coming forward to you for a public hearing.

John Hodges-Copple spoke about the major elements of the proposal by using a map and the "Resolution Concerning the Durham Northwest and Northeast Loop and to Endorse the Northern Durham Parkway and Innovative Measures to Increase Transportation Options."

The Commissioners asked several questions and made comments about the proposed resolution to which John Hodges-Copple responded.

Chairman Black opened the public hearing that was properly advertised.

Mr. Ralph McKinney, 500 Fairfield Road, commended the Commissioners for getting to this level on the proposed road. The purpose of the road was discussed by Mr. McKinney. He felt that the proposed road was a good idea to provide transportation to northern Wake County and the Research Triangle Park.

Mr. Paul P. Wang, 2709 Montgomery Street, urged the County Commissioners to adopt the plan under consideration. He commended the Planning Committee for developing the proposed plan that is being considered tonight.

Mr. David Page, 4509 Cheshire Street, Vice President, Eno River Association, discussed the process that was used over the last year to develop the Northern Durham Parkway. He urged the Commissioners to accept the proposal and send it forth unanimously to Raleigh on behalf of the Eno River Association and me.

Ms. Laura Tucker, 304 S. Mineral Springs Road, said the taxpayers should have a detailed map showing where the road will actually be. The public should be able to ask questions to the County Commissioners.

Ms. Mary C. Wilson, 3504 Horseshoe Road, Creedmoor, NC, urged the Commissioners to make a decision on the road as soon as possible. Due to a decision not being made, there is land in the proposed right of way that cannot be sold. Land use decisions cannot be made. Landowners are waiting for a decision from Durham. She urged the Commissioners to make a decision about the proposed road.

Mr. Ben Wilson, 3504 Horseshoe Road, Creedmoor, NC, said he can support the proposal from what he has seen. The main point is for the Commissioners to do something quickly.

Mr. Patrick Byker, 2614 Stuart Drive, speaking on behalf of the Durham Chamber of Commerce, said the Chamber is in support of the resolution before the Board. This project should be moved forward.

Ms. Barbara Tidewell, 3106 Swing Road, stated she was disappointed that we do not have a detailed map to look at. A detailed map should be available at the public hearing. I want to know how the road will affect us as homeowners and individuals. I want to know how many people will be displaced in the Hamlin Road Area.

Mr. John Morgan, 2308 Vintage Hill Drive, congratulated the Commissioners for doing something. It is a major step in the right direction to put a proposal on paper. I want north/south traffic relief. I don't know how much relief we will get on US 501 from the Northern Durham Parkway.

Mr. Brian J. Morton, 4417 Sunny Court, an active member of the Eno River Association, spoke about what has been learned from this experience. He told the Commissioners he strongly supports the Northern Durham Parkway and he urged the Commissioners to support the resolution.

Mr. Milo Pyne, 806 Vickers Avenue, member of the Eno River Association, said he will work to implement the Demand Management Plan and the resolution. We will work to be sure the old freeway and the west portion of Eno Drive are removed from the transportation plans. We support the road and urge that it be built correctly and in a timely manner.

Ms. Frances Lynn, 1401 Virginia Avenue, did not speak.

Ms. Jackie Brown, 3005 Davie Drive, talked in opposition to the proposed parkway since it is in the eastern part of the County near her home. The people in the area do not know how this road will affect them since they don't have a detailed map of the corridor. These residents have not been to the "table" as have the other speakers. There is no consensus on this map and resolution.

Mr. Claiborne Hudson, 1200 Hamlin Road, commented his biggest complaint is that the residents of the area did not know the parkway proposal was being considered in the Hamlin Road area.

Chairman Black closed the public hearing and referred the matter back to the Commissioners and staff for additional questions and comments.

Mr. Wesley Parham, City Transportation Department, explained the process that will happen in the next twelve months if the resolution is adopted. The NC Department of Transportation will have to inform the citizens of the findings and a public hearing is required before a final decision is made by the NC Department of Transportation as to the preferred corridor.

The Commissioners made comments and suggestions about the proposed resolution and procedures to follow. Comments were made about the hard work that has occurred over the last several years relative to the proposed road.

Chairman Black stated the last whereas in the resolution will be changed to read as follows:

“WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners and City Council have come to an agreement on the preferred solution to transportation problems in northeastern Durham.”

Chairman Black also stated that in Appendix 2, Item 8, the wording will be changed to read “higher, wider, longer.”

Chairman Black requested the following statement be added to the resolution:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND CITY COUNCIL, DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA, THAT copies of this Resolution, adopted this 14<sup>th</sup> day of June 1999, shall be transmitted to the Secretary of Transportation, Durham County’s member of the State Board of Transportation, Durham City Council, Transportation Advisory Committee, and members of the Durham County Legislative Delegation.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Reckhow, to accept the Resolution with the changes that were stated.

The motion carried unanimously.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DURHAM NORTHWEST AND  
NORTHEAST LOOP (“ENO DRIVE”) AND TO ENDORSE THE NORTHERN  
DURHAM PARKWAY AND INNOVATIVE MEASURES TO INCREASE  
TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS

WHEREAS, the controversy over the Durham Northwest and Northeast Loop (“Eno Drive”) has lasted more than three decades; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners and City Council strongly encourage protection of the Eno River basin and parklands, Little River basin, Penny’s Bend, rare plant habitats, and residential neighborhoods as transportation improvements are designed and implemented; and

WHEREAS, transportation solutions must include measures to increase transportation options by promoting alternatives to single-occupant vehicles; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners and City Council have come to an agreement on the preferred solution to transportation problems in northeastern Durham.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND CITY COUNCIL, DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA, THAT:

1. As the substitute for the Northwest and Northeast Loop (TIP Nos. R-2630 and R-2631) and proposed Durham Northern Freeway, the Board of County Commissioners and City Council endorse the Northern Durham Parkway and associated road improvements, as specifically described in the map and list that are attached as appendices to this resolution; and
2. The Board of County Commissioners and City Council endorse a sequence of road construction that simultaneously begins with construction in the north, i.e., in the vicinity of the proposed Red Mill extension at US 501, and in the south, i.e., in the vicinity of US 70; and
3. The Board of County Commissioners and City Council recommend that the Durham representatives on the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) to make a motion and advocate adoption at the TAC's next meeting that endorses the substitution and construction sequence described in the previous paragraphs (1 and 2); and
4. The Board of County Commissioners and City Council endorse the road construction performance standards and measures for mitigating water quality impacts from road construction that are listed in appendix three to this resolution, stipulate these standards and measures as the minimum that are necessary, and call for full funding and the most stringent adherence to these standards and measures; and
5. The Board of County Commissioners and City Council endorse a well-funded, inclusive planning process that within one year will develop a Durham Transportation Demand Management Plan which seeks to reduce travel by single-occupant vehicles by at least 10 percent in no more than five years; and
6. The Board of County Commissioners and City Council strongly recommend that the City and County jointly fund a Durham Transportation Demand Management Plan described in the previous paragraph (5) and seek federal and state funding to the maximum extent feasible.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND CITY COUNCIL, DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA, THAT copies of this Resolution, adopted this 14<sup>th</sup> day of June 1999, shall be transmitted to the Secretary of Transportation, Durham County's member of the State Board of Transportation, Durham

City Council, Transportation Advisory Committee, and members of the Durham County Legislative Delegation.

## APPENDICES

Note: Appendix 1 is the map "Northern Durham Parkway: Preferred Conceptual Alignment."

### APPENDIX 2. DESCRIPTION AND DESIGN OF NORTHERN DURHAM PARKWAY AND ASSOCIATED ROAD IMPROVEMENTS

1. 4-lane Class I rural arterial (parkway) with 45MPH speed limit (capacity per direction of 19,700 ADT), limited access to newly-constructed segments, landscaped median and right of way, turn bays, bus pull-outs, sidewalks, facilities for bicycles, and maximum use of noise mitigation measures
2. Alignment begins at US-70 at proposed extension to Aviation Parkway and follows NCDOT's preferred alignment (alternative 3) to Hamlin Road
3. Alignment follows Hamlin Road to Red Mill Road, then follows Red Mill Road north
4. A new segment links Red Mill Road with Roxboro Road (Thoroughfare Plan alignment), extending across the Little River and passing north of existing Snow Hill Road
5. Alignment follows existing Roxboro Road/Duke Street south to I-85 and existing intersections are upgraded, as needed
6. Extend Carver Street as 3 lanes to link up with Hamlin Road at Old Oxford Road
7. Upgrade Old Oxford Road but retain 2-lane cross-section for this road, until demand warrants a wider cross-section.
8. Replace the Old Oxford Road bridge across the Eno River by a higher, wider, longer span bridge to improve the river as a wildlife corridor
9. Relocate intersection of Snow Hill and Old Oxford Roads to a point north and east of the diabase glade sites (Thoroughfare Plan alignment)
10. Upgrade other existing intersections, using roundabouts where they are beneficial

### APPENDIX 3. ROAD CONSTRUCTION PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND MEASURES FOR MITIGATING WATER QUALITY IMPACTS FROM ROAD CONSTRUCTION

1. Ensure complete protection of Penny's Bend and Snow Hill diabase glades
2. Prevention of adverse water quality impacts, prevention of adverse wetlands impacts, and full mitigation of water quality and wetlands impacts with penalties for poor performance by highway contractors
3. High Quality Waters best management practices (BMPs) for surface water protection throughout the entire corridor
4. NC Wildlife Commission biologist (at least one working full time) to help provide continuous surveillance of susceptible biota in Eno River and Little River and water quality, to help ensure that all possible steps are taken to protect the



- susceptible biota in Eno River and Little River and water quality, to help ensure that contractors incorporate all feasible prevention and mitigation measures during construction, and to help ensure proper maintenance of sediment control structures
5. Enhanced City/County protection against water quality impacts of secondary development and more City/County staff
  6. Additional prevention and mitigation measures in the Durham Environmental Affairs Board's report *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Northwest/Northeast Corridor*
  7. Enhanced Stream Watch program for Eno River and tributaries
  8. Routine, post-construction stream maintenance to remove trash

**Closed Session**

Commissioner Bell moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Reckhow, to adjourn to closed session in order to consult with an attorney and to preserve the attorney-client privilege and to discuss *In Re: Glaxo Wellcome Inc.*, 97 PTC 418.

The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Garry E. Umstead, CMC  
Clerk to the Board