AGENDA

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

6:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 14, 2016

COMMITTEE ROOM

Room 239, City Hall

__________________________________________

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:  Council Member Dan Besse, Chair
Council Member Derwin L. Montgomery, Vice Chair
Council Member Robert C. Clark
Council Member James Taylor, Jr.

GENERAL AGENDA

G-1. PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED STREET RENAMING OF "WAKEFIELD COURT" TO "ASPEN PLACE".

G-2. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH KIMLEY-HORN FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE DOWNTOWN PARKING ANALYSIS.

G-3. TRAFFIC CALMING POLICY REVIEW.

G-4. REPORT ON POTENTIAL BIKE SHARE PROGRAM.

G-5. REVIEW OF STORMWATER FEE CREDIT POLICY CONCEPT.

G-6. PRESENTATION OF THE DOWNTOWN STREETSCAPE PLAN REPORT.
CONSENT AGENDA

C-1. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS RELATED TO GRANTING PERMANENT UTILITY EASEMENTS TO DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC:

a. RESOLUTION GRANTING PERMANENT UTILITY EASEMENTS PURSUANT TO N.C.G.S. 160A-273 TO DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC FOR THE SITE OF POLICE DISTRICT THREE AT 2394 WINTERHAVEN LANE (SOUTHWEST WARD).

b. RESOLUTION GRANTING PERMANENT UTILITY EASEMENTS PURSUANT TO N.C.G.S. 160A-273 TO DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC FOR THE SALEM LAKE MARINA PROJECT AT 815 SALEM LAKE ROAD (EAST WARD).

C-2. RESOLUTION GRANTING THE CITY MANAGER AUTHORIZATION TO EXECUTE UTILITY EASEMENTS WITH DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC FOR UTILITY EASEMENTS LOCATED ON CITY PROPERTY.

C-3. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ACCEPTANCE OF A GIFT DEED FROM WILLIAM DOUGLAS CONRAD HEIRS (WEST WARD) - Property located between the east side of Silas Creek Parkway and Englewood Drive and Buena Vista Road.

C-4. RESOLUTION TO MODIFY AND RESTATE A WATER AND SEWER SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH THE TOWN OF KERNERSVILLE.

C-5. INFORMATION REGARDING CONTRACTOR SELF PERFORMING WORK.

C-6. APPROVAL OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE SUMMARY OF MINUTES - May 10, 21016.
City Council – Action Request Form

Date: June 14, 2016

To: The City Manager

From: Matthew Hamby, Addressing Coordinator, MapForsyth

Council Action Requested:

Public Hearing and consideration of an Ordinance to Change the Road Name Wakefield Court to Aspen Place.

Summary of Information:

MapForsyth Addressing Team is petitioning to change the road name Wakefield Court to Aspen Place. The road name Wakefield Court was recorded in condo book 1 page 70 on March 13 1981. Wakefield Court serves as access from Wakefield Drive to Section Two of Aspen Park Condominiums. Some of the residents of these properties have been using Aspen Place as their address. This has created confusion with service delivery and 911 response.

The MapForsyth Addressing Team notified the property owners that we would be visiting their property and collecting information about what street the residents were using. During the field visit the Addressing Team spoke with five residents and left letters at the properties of the residents that we did not speak to. Of the five we spoke with, four told us they used Aspen Place.

We spoke with one resident and they informed us that they used Wakefield Court, staff later got an email from the property owner stating that they wanted the street name to be Aspen Place. One resident contacted our office and informed us they were using Aspen Park as their street address.

It is the recommendation of the MapForsyth Addressing Team that the street name Aspen Place be adopted.

Committee Action:

Committee Action
For
Remarks:

Action
Against
ORDINANCE TO CHANGE A STREET OR ROAD IN WINSTON-SALEM

The street named Wakefield Court to be changed to Aspen Place.

BE IT ORDAINED, by the City Council of the City of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, after public hearing and notice as required by law as follows:

Section 1. The street name Wakefield Court to be changed to Aspen Place.

Section 2. Notice of this change shall be given to the local Postmaster, the North Carolina Board of Transportation and Highway Safety, and to any city or town within five (5) miles of the above named street or road.

Section 3. The ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

Adopted this the ________ day of ____________, ____.
Date: June 14, 2016
To: The City Manager
From: Gregory M. Turner, Assistant City Manager

Council Action Requested:

Consideration of a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to enter into an Agreement with Kimley-Horn for Professional Engineering Services for the Downtown Parking Analysis.

Summary of Information:

The Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership, Inc. initiated a Downtown Parking Analysis which was completed in 2005. The analysis examined the availability of short term and commuter parking spaces in the area bounded by Second Street to the south, Poplar Street to the west, Fifth Street to the north and Main Street to the east. The Department of Transportation requested proposals from professional engineering firms to further analyze the public parking in Downtown. The parking analysis area is expanded beyond the previous study area and will be bound by First Street to the south, Broad Street to the west, 8th Street/Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive to the north and Research Park Blvd./Chestnut Street to the east. The study will include an assessment of the current parking conditions and an analysis of future parking needs.

On March 9, 2016, the City of Winston-Salem Department of Transportation received proposals from four professional engineering firms stating their qualifications to be selected as the engineer for the Downtown Parking Analysis. After review of these proposals, City staff identified Kimley-Horn as the most qualified firm to provide professional engineering services for this project.

The City and Kimley-Horn will continue to negotiate the full scope of professional engineering services to be provided for this analysis for a fee not to exceed $210,000.

Committee Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH KIMLEY-HORN FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE DOWNTOWN PARKING ANALYSIS

WHEREAS, the Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership, Inc. initiated a Downtown Parking Analysis which was completed in 2005; and

WHEREAS, the analysis examined the availability of short term and commuter parking spaces in the area bounded by Second Street to the south, Poplar Street to the west, Fifth Street to the north and Main Street to the east; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Transportation requested proposals from professional engineering firms to further analyze the public parking in Downtown; and

WHEREAS, the parking analysis area is expanded beyond the previous study area and will be bound by First Street to the south, Broad Street to the west, 8th Street/Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive to the north and Research Park Blvd./Chestnut Street to the east; and

WHEREAS, the study will include an assessment of the current parking conditions and an analysis of future parking needs; and

WHEREAS, the City selects firms for professional engineering services in accordance with public policy established in N.C.G.S. §143-64.31, which provides for a qualifications-based selection process; and

WHEREAS, On March 9, 2016, the City of Winston-Salem Department of Transportation received proposals from four professional engineering firms stating their qualifications to be selected as the engineer for the Downtown Parking Analysis; and

WHEREAS, after review of these proposals, City staff identified Kimley-Horn as the most qualified firm to provide professional engineering services for this project; and

WHEREAS, Kimley-Horn will continue to negotiate the full scope of professional engineering services to be provided for this analysis for a fee not to exceed $210,000; and
WHEREAS, the selection process and fee negotiation followed public policy established in N.C.G.S. §143-64.31; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Council hereby authorize the City Manager and City Secretary to enter into an agreement with Kimley-Horn to provide professional engineering services for the Downtown Parking Analysis for a fee not to exceed $210,000.
TO: Lee D. Garrity, City Manager  
FROM: Gregory M. Turner, Assistant City Manager  
DATE: June 14, 2016  
SUBJECT: Consultant Selection Process for Parking Study

As requested at the May 10, 2016 Public Works Committee, attached is the detailed scoring sheet for the four firms who submitted proposals for the above work. Members of the Committee expressed concern that there were only five points separating the first and second place proposals.

As you will see in the scoring sheet, the top proposal scored better than the next proposal in four categories: past projects, staff qualifications, staff availability, and addressing the scope of services. The top proposal only scored worse than the next proposal in the distance from the work site. All four proposals received the maximum points for the M/WBE inclusiveness.

Additionally, the top firm, Kimley-Horn, provided information stating that “Davenport is on our team for important components of the project. They will be leading the data collection process for the project and will be assisting us with the Community Participation Task. We estimate Davenport’s fee will be 21% of the overall project.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name: Baseline Mobility Group</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Projects</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualifications</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the Scope of Services</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from project</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWBE Commitment</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>337.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max Score = 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name: DAVENPORT</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Projects</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualifications</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the Scope of Services</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from project</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWBE Commitment</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max Score = 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name: Kimley-Horn</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Projects</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualifications</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the Scope of Services</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from project</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWBE Commitment</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max Score = 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name: VHB</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Projects</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Qualifications</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff availability</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the Scope of Services</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from project</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWBE Commitment</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Score</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Max Score = 500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Mobility Group</td>
<td>337.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVENPORT</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimley-Horn</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHB</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Lee D. Garrity, City Manager  
FROM: Gregory M. Turner, Assistant City Manager  
DATE: June 14, 2016  
SUBJECT: Traffic Calming Policy Review

At the May Public Works Committee meeting, questions were asked about the existing Traffic Calming policy and procedures.

The Traffic Calming policy was originally adopted by City Council in 2003. The intent of the policy is to provide options that residents in neighborhoods can use to address traffic issues as they relate to quality of life. In December 2012, the policy was updated to include the following changes:

- **Allow residents to vote at the second residential meeting**: Two neighborhood meetings will be held. At the first meeting, City Department of Transporation staff and the Traffic Calming Task Force will create a concept plan. This proposed plan will be shared with the Council Member of the ward and other City and County service departments to ensure that recommended measures do not adversely affect their work or create safety hazards. If the plans are approved by these other departments and the Council Member, affected residents will be asked to attend a second meeting where the plan will be presented and they can vote on the measures.

- **Increase the number of votes needed for improvement implementation from 2/3 or 66% to 7/10 or 70% of the residents.**

- **Allow the current resident (if a renter) to vote on the recommendation, removing the requirement that it must be the property owner, if they do not live in the affected property.**

- **Reduce the length of time for the process**: The language which stated an anticipated timeframe to implementation is being removed. Additional measures that can be taken to reduce the timeframe of implementation were left in the document.

All other aspects of the policy remained the same.
BIKE SHARE IN WINSTON-SALEM

matthew burczyk

bicycle & pedestrian coordinator

city of winston-salem department of transportation
“Bike sharing is an innovative transportation program, ideal for short distance point-to-point trips providing users the ability to pick up a bicycle at any self-serve bike-station and return it to any other bike station located within the system's service area.”

--Pedestrian & Bicycle Information Center
BIKES IN THE SHARING ECONOMY

- Not a bike rental program
- Part of the sharing economy
  - Uber, AirBnB, TaskRabbit, etc.
BIKE SHARE IN THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

- Addresses the first and last mile of transit trips
- Ideal for short trips
- Convenience
  - Plentiful bicycle parking
  - Easy access to downtown businesses
- Recreation and tourism
BIKE SHARE BENEFITS

- Reduce driving trips downtown
- Improve access to transit and city amenities
- Enable healthy lifestyles
- Promote sustainability
- Stimulate local economic activity
Cyclists and Pedestrians Can End Up Spending More Each Month Than Drivers

They may buy less per visit, but over the course of a month, bikers out-consumed drivers at bars, restaurants and convenience stores.

EMILY BADGER | Dec 5, 2012 | 17 Comments
BIKE SHARE OPPORTUNITIES

- New technology
- Downtown revitalization
- Trail construction downtown
- Winston-Salem Cycling Classic and USA Cycling National Championships
- National Cycling Center
- Urban population and job center
- Visitors
- Universities
- PART/WSTA transportation hub
- Major employers
BIKE SHARE OPERATIONS

- Sharing economy enabled by advances in technology
- Manage bike reservations via cell phone or website
- Credit card to reserve bike and provide accountability
- GPS technology to track bikes
BIKES

CRUISER BIKE

- Adjustable seat fits adult riders
- Smart lockbox holds U-lock key
- Fenders & a chain guard keep riders clean
- 8 gears
- Bell
- Convenient front basket
- Automatic front & rear lights
BIKE SHARE TECHNOLOGY

- Expandable
- Easy to adjust
- No commitment
- Cool factor
- Turnkey service
  - Maintenance
  - Balancing
  - Customer support
  - Promotional materials
  - User analytics
- Pricing scheme fully customizable
BIKE MAINTENANCE & FLEET BALANCING

- Local mechanics employed to maintain bikes and balance the fleet
- Vandalism and theft
  - Less than 1% across fleet
  - Vendor fixes and replaces bikes as necessary
THANK YOU
At the April 12th meeting of the Public Works Committee information was requested on options for a stormwater fee credit policy that could be used to incentivize property owners with no current stormwater controls to install devices as a way of handling stormwater runoff. Many communities in North Carolina offer some type of stormwater fee credit as way to incentivize property owners to implement stormwater controls to reduce the amount of runoff and pollutants from impervious areas.

Under this concept, non-single family residential, commercial and industrial customers with current stormwater billing accounts that have taken measures to reduce the impacts of stormwater runoff to stormwater conveyance systems and surface water quality, may be eligible for a credit of up to 50% of their stormwater fee. Credits up to 50% could be given based on implementation and maintenance of the following:

1) Detention/ Retention Credit-The property has built and maintains an onsite stormwater detention or retention pond that reduces the impact of stormwater runoff from the property. A credit of up to 25% of the total stormwater fee may be available for a well-designed and maintained onsite detention/retention facility.

2) Water Quality Credit-The property has built and maintains an onsite stormwater best management practice (BMP) that reduces the pollution impact of stormwater runoff from the property. A credit of up to 25% of the total stormwater fee may be available for a well-designed and maintained onsite stormwater BMP.

Since the stormwater fee a property owner pays is proportional to the amount of impervious surface area on a given property. A fee credit policy could be developed in a way to allow reduction of fees proportional to the impervious area treated by a well-designed and maintained stormwater BMP. When determining if credits should be available to facilities that were initially constructed to fulfill a City of Winston-Salem development requirement the following is offered. Staff has reviewed all of the facilities that have applied for and received approval to construct a quality or quantity control stormwater management facility since Council approved the revised post construction stormwater ordinance in September of 2008. Since that time, over 66 facilities have constructed stormwater management facilities that control runoff from 10,885,183 square feet of impervious surface area. If those facilities were credited based on the above mentioned allocations at current billing rates, it would result in a known reduction of $110,784 in revenue. A 1.5% increase in the in the stormwater rate would offset this reduced revenue.
TO: Mayor Allen Joines and Members of the City Council  
FROM: A. Paul Norby, Director of Planning and Development Services  
DATE: June 1, 2016  
SUBJECT: Downtown Streetscape Plan Report  

The Legacy 2030 Update, adopted in 2012, includes a policy of encouraging pedestrian-friendly streetscapes throughout Downtown. The Downtown Plan, adopted in 2013, further recommends the development of a Downtown streetscape design standard and implementation of streetscape improvements following that standard to ensure a functional and attractive pedestrian environment.

A streetscape is defined as the visual elements of a street – the road itself, trees and other plantings, lighting, benches, bike racks, public art pieces, etc. – that when combined give the street a character and feel. A number of municipalities, statewide and throughout the southeast, have developed downtown streetscape master plans and standards as a means of creating a brand identity for their urban cores and establishing consistency between public and private investments, while still allowing for the unique elements that set each downtown apart from the others.

This report examines past planning efforts within Downtown and the existing conditions of the Downtown streetscape to address whether the City should undertake the development of a comprehensive Streetscape Master Plan and standards for design.
Introduction

A streetscape is defined as the visual elements of a street – the road itself, trees and other plantings, lighting, benches, bike racks, public art pieces, etc. – that when combined give the street a character and feel. While building facades impact the overall appearance of the streetscape, they are not part of the streetscape itself. When combined in an intentional manner, these elements create an atmosphere that is inviting, safe, dynamic and desirable to residents and visitors alike. Having a proper streetscape aids in creating a vibrant environment that encourages activity along the street and fosters economic development.

As part of the Downtown Plan, adopted in 2013, the development of a Downtown streetscape design standard and implementation of streetscape improvements following that standard was recommended to ensure a functional and attractive pedestrian environment. The standard should include all Downtown streets so that one cohesive image is developed throughout the area. The Legacy 2030 comprehensive plan further recommends as a policy the encouragement of designs that promote pedestrian-friendly streetscapes in Downtown and the Center City.

A number of municipalities, statewide and throughout the southeast, have developed downtown streetscape master plans and standards as a means of creating a brand identity for their urban cores and establishing consistency between public and private investments, while still allowing for the unique elements that set each downtown apart from the others. The purpose of this report is to investigate whether the City of Winston-Salem should undertake a similar process to develop a formal design standard for the Downtown area by examining past planning efforts in the Downtown over the last ten to fifteen years and the existing conditions within the streetscape. The report also looks at what other municipalities have done in regards to downtown streetscape planning. Recommendations for proceeding forward are also included at the end of the report.

The City-County Planning staff believe that a conversation on the overall design of the Downtown streetscape is needed before more resources are spent on separate individual projects. This report marks the initial step in beginning this conversation. For this report, the general boundary of the study area, shown on Map 1, is Eighth Street to the north, Patterson Avenue to the east, Business 40 to the south, and Broad Street to the west. Wake Forest Innovation Quarter, the West End Neighborhood and the Holly Avenue Neighborhood are not included in the study as individual standards have been established for these areas.
Map 1. Downtown Streetscape Study Boundary

STUDY AREA
Plot Date: 5/5/2016  GIS/Mapping, Planning & Dvpt Services

WEST END NEIGHBORHOOD

WAKE FOREST INNOVATION QUARTER

HOLLY AVENUE NEIGHBORHOOD

Plot Date: 5/5/2016  GIS/Mapping, Planning & Dvpt Services
Past Planning Efforts

Over the past several years, the City has undertaken numerous planning efforts within the Downtown that focused either on a particular area or a particular aspect of the streetscape. A comprehensive planning effort that looked at the Downtown in its entirety has not been undertaken. These plans range from landscaping plans along specific corridors and neighborhood design studies to transportation plans for the Downtown.

**Winston-Salem Downtown Street Study**
The most recent plan was initiated by the Winston-Salem Department of Transportation (WSDOT) to address changes to the Downtown street network with the reconstruction of Business 40. The *Winston-Salem Downtown Street Study*, completed in 2015, examined the viability, traffic impacts, and costs of implementing the street network recommendations from the Joint Chamber of Commerce/Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership Business 40 Task Force. It specifically addressed the viability of converting First, Second, Main and Liberty Streets to two-way streets. The plan also makes recommendations for shared lane markings within Downtown, enhanced traffic calming measures on Marshall Street, and on-street parking along Fifth Street.

**Creative Corridors Visionary Master Plan and Design Guidelines**
In response to planned improvements by North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) to the Business 40 corridor, as well as US 52, Martin Luther King Jr Drive, Broad Street, and the Salem Creek Connector, a group of civic leaders joined together to create the Creative Corridors Coalition (C3). In 2011, the C3 developed, with assistance of consultant Design Workshop, a master plan and design guidelines for the Business 40 and other major road projects in and around the downtown area. This master plan was adopted by City Council in 2011 and established the Creative Corridors Design Review Committee to oversee the implementation of the recommendations in the master plan. The *Creative Corridors Visionary Master Plan and Design Guidelines* provides recommendations for bridge design, lighting design, landscaping, and pedestrian crossings based on four guiding principles: Green, Artful, Iconic, and Network. The C3 is nearing completion of funding efforts to implement the special design features of the master plan.

**Business 40 Streetscape Design Plan**
As the NCDOT moved forward with the design/build process for the reconstruction, the WSDOT contracted with Stimmel Associates, P.A. to develop a detailed streetscape design plan for incorporating enhanced bicycle, pedestrian, and appearance elements into the design/build process. The *Business 40 Streetscape Design Plan* was completed in 2015 and includes recommendations for “betterments” to be included in the Request for Proposals for the Business 40 project. Betterments addressed in the plan include items such as increased sidewalk widths, crosswalk treatments, signage, lighting, noise barriers, retaining walls, and median treatments. Similar plans were completed for the Martin Luther King Jr. Drive project and the Salem Creek Connector.

**Technical Assistance Program Report for the Holly Avenue Neighborhood**
In 2009, a *Technical Assistance Program Report* was completed by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) – Charlotte District Council for the Holly Avenue Neighborhood in Downtown. The Report includes an assessment by the ULI panel that included a tour of the neighborhood and interviews with key
stakeholders and recommendations to address development and design of the area, branding and connectivity to other areas, and implementation. Some of the recommendations from the plan include converting First and Second Streets into two-way streets, renaming the area, creating a green street, adding bike lanes, and improving the existing infrastructure for sidewalks, roads, street trees, lighting, and utilities. The initial Holly Avenue Neighborhood Design Study was completed in 1992 (and reprinted in 1998) and provided recommendations for the neighborhood that include preserving of views and view corridors, providing street tree plantings and maintaining existing trees, preserving older buildings, repeating established building patterns, and improving pedestrian linkages with Downtown, the Strollway, and adjacent areas.

Fourth Street Streetscape Improvement Project
In 2002, the Fourth Street Streetscape Improvement Project was completed by the City. The project was centered on a five block area of Fourth Street between Spruce Street and Main Street. The $2,600,000 project consisted of replacing the existing eight-foot wide sidewalks with sixteen-foot wide, brick-paved sidewalks; installing stamped and colored asphalt crosswalks; planting Zelkova trees every thirty feet along with Holly shrubs, liriope, and bulbs; hanging flower baskets from decorative light poles, and adding street furniture such as benches, bike racks, lighted bollards, and trash receptacles. The project was funded through a combination of City funds, federal grants and loans, and the NCDOT Transportation Enhancement Grant Program. A street festival called “Rock the Block” was held in September 2002 to mark the grand opening of the new Fourth Street and the event continued for several years afterward.

Additional City Plans
Additional plans completed by the City include the Benton Landscaping Plan (2006), the Liberty Street Corridor Streetscape Improvement Plan (1999), the Burke Street Landscaping Plan (1998), and the Community Crossing Project (1994).

Other Agency Plans
Other plans have been completed by other agencies outside of the City that have influenced the appearance of Downtown. The Downtown Winston-Salem Trailblazer Wayfinding Signage Program was created by the Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership as part of the implementation of the Downtown Plan adopted in 2007. Informing Design was hired as a consultant to develop a comprehensive signage program that would direct motorists and pedestrians to various destinations within Downtown to improve the visitor experience and marketability of Downtown to investors. The signage includes pedestrian kiosks, vehicular signs, new banners, park and stroll signs, and direction blades. A streetscape plan was completed for what is now Research Parkway in the Wake Forest Innovation Quarter in 2011 and provided design guidelines for sidewalks, crosswalks, landscaping, lighting, and street furniture.
Existing Conditions and Limitations

Currently within Downtown a number of different elements exist within the streetscape including lighting, trees, crosswalks, sidewalks, benches and trash receptacles and bicycle racks. Given the variety of past planning efforts, these elements exist in different styles creating an overall disjointed appearance within Downtown.

Lighting

Two types of lighting exist in the Downtown: overhead street lights and lower pedestrian lighting. Within these two types of lighting, there exists multiple styles of lights. For overhead street lights, three different styles exist. Two of the styles are quite similar and are standard styles of street lighting. The other involves attaching light fixtures to utility poles.

Pedestrian lighting plays a large role in establishing a safe and inviting pedestrian environment which is a necessary component of a vibrant Downtown. Currently, multiple styles of pedestrian lighting exist in Downtown creating a disjointed aesthetic. In addition to having multiple styles of
Pedestrian lighting in Downtown
lighting, there are four distinct colors of lighting poles including black, silver, black with colored accents, and brown with colored accents. Also, some of the light fixtures contain one luminaire and others contain two, creating a difference in appearance even if the style is the same.

**Trees and Vegetation**

Trees are an important streetscape element for both aesthetics and the cooling effect of shade. Approximately twelve different tree species are utilized along Downtown streets. Most species alternate between blocks as is the practice of the City’s Vegetation Management Department. However, there are some blocks that have two or more varieties of trees. The presence of multiple tree species inhibits the development of a monoculture in the environment which can increase the susceptibility to disease.

The placement of trees on different streets and blocks are also very inconsistent. Over half of the street blocks have at least one tree along the right-of-way. In several cases, trees are only located on one side of the road or at one end of the block. In addition to trees, a few blocks also have shrubbery and ornamental grasses along the right-of-way, particularly at intersections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Tree Species</th>
<th>Notes on condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Zelkova, European Hornbeam, Crape Myrtle, Elm</td>
<td>Duke Energy has expressed concerns about the size of the Zelkova trees between Spruce Street and Pilot View Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Zelkova, Little Leaf Linden, Darlington Oak, Red Oak, Armstrong Maple, Sugar Maple</td>
<td>Some Lindens are in decline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four and One Half Street</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Street</td>
<td>Armstrong Maple, Princeton Elm, Zelkova</td>
<td>Most of the trees are Zelkovas along Fourth Street. The Zelkova are a nice, resilient tree that has done reasonably well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>Armstrong Maple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Avenue</td>
<td>Crape Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Crape Myrtle, Bradford Pear, Armstrong Maple, Cherry, Red Maple, European Hornbeam</td>
<td>Bradford Pears should be removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>Crape Myrtle, Armstrong Maple, Cherry, Zelkova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>Zelkova, Cherry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>Zelkova, Cherry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Armstrong Maple, Crape Myrtle, Elm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
<td>Little Leaf Lindens, Armstrong Maple, Willow Oak, Sugar Maple,</td>
<td>Willow Oaks too large for space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Street</td>
<td>Little Leaf Linden, Princeton Elm, Zelkova, Crape Myrtle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
<td>Bradford Pear, Little Leaf Linden, Zelkova, Crape Myrtle, Armstrong Maple, Willow Oak</td>
<td>Bradford Pears should be removed. Little Leaf Lindens drop sap so cannot be located adjacent to on-street parking. Willow Oaks will grow to be too large for space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Armstrong Maple, European Hornbeam, Willow Oak, Zelkova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Street</td>
<td>Armstrong Maple, Willow Oak, Crape Myrtle, European Hornbeam, Sugar Maple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Street</td>
<td>Red Maple, Crape Myrtle</td>
<td>Red Maple not the best tree for the location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Street</td>
<td>Red Bud, Bradford Pear, Sugar Maple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>From:</td>
<td>To:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Patterson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>Patterson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot View Street</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Buxton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade Street</td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Street</td>
<td>Poplar Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Patterson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>Poplar Street</td>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Way</td>
<td>Salem Avenue</td>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business 40</td>
<td>First Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business 40</td>
<td>First Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street</td>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business 40</td>
<td>First Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business 40</td>
<td>Second Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Street</td>
<td>Business 40</td>
<td>First Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Street</td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Holly Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton Street</td>
<td>Pilot View Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the variety of tree species along rights-of-way, there are a variety of planting area types including grass planting strips ranging from one foot in width to over three feet, planting boxes of different sizes and shapes, and actual tree planters. Some grass strips contain trees while others do not. Furthermore, some planting boxes contain additional materials beyond mulch, such as rocks, brick chips or ornamental grasses.
Examples of planting boxes for trees

Examples of planting boxes for trees
Crosswalks
Crosswalks are an integral element in establishing a safe pedestrian environment within a streetscape. Crosswalks delineate designated spaces for pedestrians to safely cross an intersection, as well as provide a visual cue to motorists that pedestrians may be within the right-of-way. Currently, there are four distinct crosswalk styles at Downtown intersections ranging in width from approximately seven feet to fifteen feet. Most intersections have crosswalks; however, some have become so faded that they are barely visible.

Examples of crosswalks within Downtown
Sidewalks
Sidewalks provide a designated place for pedestrians to safely congregate and travel while also allowing for additional elements that enhance the vibrancy of an area, such as outdoor dining, benches, and public art, to be incorporated into the streetscape. Sidewalks exist along all streets within Downtown in varying widths. Generally, the material used for the sidewalk is either a paver, such as brick, in various patterns, or concrete of various textures and colors. Some streets contain a mix of pavers and concrete.

Examples of sidewalk materials
Examples of sidewalk materials
Benches and Trash Receptacles
The presence of benches and trash receptacles, sometimes referred to as street furniture, are an integral component in establishing a streetscape that is inviting and clean. Benches provide a place where people can rest, enjoy a beverage or treat, and socialize with others. Trash receptacles are practical elements that allow for the streetscape to remain clean and free of litter. One style of benches and two styles of trash receptacles exist in Downtown.

Downtown Bench

Downtown trash receptacles
Bicycle Racks

Incorporating bicycle amenities, such as racks, into the streetscape is essential in creating an active transportation network within the Downtown. Currently, the Downtown has two types of bicycle racks: the standard “U” shaped rack and unique art racks. The standard racks are either in a single “U” installation or in a double “U” installation. The art racks were installed as part of the Centennial celebration and funded through private donations.
Banners and Signage
Banners are typically located on light poles and are used to highlight a particular time of year or district. In Downtown, banners are located on pedestrian light poles and are used to highlight the Downtown Arts District, events, and businesses. The actual design of the banners vary depending on the street but all are of a standard rectangular shape and are fifty-two inches by twenty and one quarter inches in size. Banners are not located on all streets.

Banners in Downtown
Beyond standard street signs, Downtown wayfinding signage also exists to direct motorists to parking and destinations and pedestrians to points of interest. The Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership established a comprehensive wayfinding signage program, The Downtown Winston-Salem Trailblazer Signage program, as part of the implementation of the 2007 Downtown Plan. The signs were designed by Informing Design of Pittsburgh, PA. The Trailblazer Signs have replaced the majority of previously existing wayfinding signage within Downtown.

*Winston-Salem Trailblazer Signage – photos courtesy of Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership*
Other Items
In addition to the items listed, there are other items within the existing streetscape that do not fit into a specific category but influence to the overall appearance of Downtown. These include newspaper kiosks, bollards, recycling centers, parking meters, public markers, and public art. There are many newspaper kiosks scattered throughout Downtown currently. Local public markers have been established by two organizations: the Historic Resource Commission and the Community Appearance Commission. There are a total of nine Historic Markers located within the study boundary with one additional marker located just outside the boundary at the corner of Patterson Avenue and Seventh Street. There is one Community Appearance Commission marker located at the corner of Sixth Street and Trade Street. There are State-sponsored markers within Downtown as well. Public art pieces are located throughout Downtown with the majority of them in the Arts District.
Limitations
There are many things that limit streetscape design including cost, public acceptance and safety. In regards to current infrastructure, utilities and available space create limitations on the type of design elements that can be installed Downtown. Overhead power lines exist along some of the Downtown streets which limit the type of tree species that can be planted along those streets. Furthermore, underground utilities exist in certain areas that also limit that type of vegetation that can be planted. For example, the corner of Trade Street and Fourth Street has underground utilities which prevent the planting of street trees at this location.

Spacing issues exist in Downtown in multiple respects. There is limited available right-of-way in Downtown that restricts the ability to widen sidewalks, allow for on-street parking, plant larger variety shade trees and other vegetation, and incorporate amenities such as outdoor dining, light fixtures and public art along the street. The placement of the buildings directly on or close to the right-of-way limits the ability to purchase additional right-of-way. The limited space between the buildings and the curb also controls the type of trees that can be planted given that it is undesirable and a maintenance issue if tree branches extend onto the buildings. Additionally, the existing planting boxes and grass strips are of such a small size that it creates a harsh living condition for the trees that are planted limiting their expected life span due to heat, drought and soil compaction. These conditions make it difficult to establish the expansive canopy of shade trees that provides the aesthetic appeal of other Downtowns like Charlotte, NC or Greenville, SC.
Other Municipalities’ Planning Efforts

A number of municipalities within the state and throughout the Southeast have already undertaken the necessary steps to establish a comprehensive streetscape master plan and standard within their respective downtowns and have begun implementing these standards with overwhelming success. While each downtown presents its own unique set of conditions and circumstances and each planning effort addresses a specific set of goals, the City of Winston-Salem can look to these plans for guidance and inspiration when considering the development of its own downtown streetscape master plan.

Communities such as Chapel Hill, NC; Cary, NC; Greenville, SC; and Albemarle, NC have completed detailed streetscape master plans for their downtowns. The Chapel Hill Downtown Streetscape and Lighting Master Plan was completed in 2009 and provides a design manual for a number of different elements including lighting, landscaping, sidewalks, nano parks, street improvements, cultural events, public art and sustainability. The sidewalk design manual separates sidewalks into two types and provides detailed schematics and visuals of the recommendations for each. The plan also includes detailed schematics on streetscape elements, a tree management plan, and specific details on lighting in the appendices of the Plan.

The Downtown Cary Streetscape Master Plan includes a prioritization plan for its streets with “A” streets being streets with high priority where the use of Town funds will be considered to build the recommended streetscapes, “B” and “C” streets are streets that will receive a high level of streetscape enhancement through property owners as development occurs. The plan provides streetscape guidelines that will promote consistency between public and private investment. Specific recommendations are provided for various streetscape elements such as lighting, benches, bus shelters, and a paver-grate suspension system. Street tree recommendations are provided by street. Public art opportunities are discussed in the plan. Perspective sketches are included to provide a visual of the potential outcome if the recommendations are implemented. Lastly, a phasing schedule with detour recommendations is included.
The *Downtown Streetscape Master Plan* for Greenville, SC was completed in 2010. The plan is focused on a framework plan that was created through analysis of each street’s function within the overall downtown area and centered on four key design influences: environment, cultural, social, and economic. The framework plan provides recommendations on streetscapes designs for five specific types of streets: ceremonial, ceremonial transition, urban fabric, urban fabric transition, and mobility. The overall goal of the plan was to extend the success of Greenville’s Main Street to the greater downtown area by humanizing the streets, creating an active transportation network, providing supportive edges for economic development, and creating green infrastructure downtown. Detailed drawings on improvements to street types, intersections, and green streets are included in the plan along with recommendations for street trees and furniture. The plan also includes an implementation strategy.
The *Downtown Streetscape Master Plan* for Albemarle, NC was completed in 2015. Like the previously mentioned plans, it separates the streetscape recommendations in to two types: Urban Core Streetscape A and Urban Core Streetscape B. The plan also discusses “alleyscaping” as a means of moving alleys away from their typical utilitarian function to being a key element in the overall design of the downtown streetscape for both aesthetics and safety. The plan also provides recommendations for public art and civic spaces and an implementation schedule.

While the Asheville, NC *Downtown Streetscape Plan* does not provide extensive details or schematic drawings like other plans, it does provide guidance on including artful elements into the streetscape like art benches, art racks, and art tree grates beyond what other plans provide.

While some communities have taken the approach of creating a separate downtown streetscape master plan, the City of Durham has taken a different approach. In 2000, the City adopted the *Downtown Master Plan* which broadly addressed development-related concerns and set the goal of making the downtown a place where people could live, work, and play. While improving the streetscape was addressed within the master plan, much of the streetscape improvements involved large transportation improvement projects. In 2007, the City adopted the *Downtown Master Plan Update* followed by the *Downtown Open Space Plan* in 2014. Greensboro, NC has taken a similar approach with their *Center City Plan*.

A common element among these and other streetscape plans, is the inclusion of public input into the planning process. Albemarle does a particularly good job of trying to gather as much public input from as many stakeholders from various groups as possible. Two inventive methods that they utilized were street interviews and a tactical urbanism event held during the Annual Craft Fair. The event involved constructing a parklet (a small, temporary park space) in a parking space and providing chalkboards for passersby to write what they liked and didn’t like within the Downtown. Greenville used a

---

*Urban Core Streetscape A: Second Street – Albemarle Downtown Streetscape Master Plan*
walking audit with City staff and the public to kick off the planning process and to educate on the fundamentals of walkability and livable transportation solutions.

Other downtown streetscape plans have been completed by communities throughout the state and region including the Garner, NC Downtown Streetscape Master Plan (2010); the North Wilkesboro, NC Downtown Streetscape Master Plan (2010); Raleigh, NC Downtown Streetscape Improvement Master Plan (1991); the Statesville, NC Downtown Streetscape and Land Use Master Plan; Matthews, NC Downtown Streetscape Improvement Plan (2015); and the Harrisonburg, VA Downtown Streetscape Plan (2014). Chattanooga, TN has established the Urban Area Sidewalk-Streetscape Policy Guide to guide the appearance of its downtown.
Recommendations for Creation of a Downtown Winston-Salem Streetscape Plan

In response to a number of local downtown revitalization initiatives and in keeping with national trends toward Center City in-migration, Downtown Winston-Salem has experienced a resurgence over the past decade. Many new restaurants, offices, and residences have been established within Downtown and the Wake Forest Innovation Quarter. Initially, this resurgence was centered along Fourth Street and Trade Street. Past revitalization or building efforts have only focused on specific sites, streets, and areas creating a disjointed and “hodgepodge” aesthetic along Downtown streets. However, the resurgence of Downtown is moving beyond the initial few blocks of Fourth and Trade Streets and will continue to expand into the future.

With continued private investment that has begun to move to streets like Seventh Street and Liberty Street, it is imperative that the City position Downtown for increased interest and economic growth. Furthermore, the upcoming changes to Downtown streets with the improvements to Business 40 and the two-way street conversions proposed in the Winston-Salem Downtown Street Study will have a dramatic effect on the area, as will the proposed Merschel Plaza and SciWorks projects and the new Forsyth County Central Library. It is therefore planning staff’s recommendation that the City take the necessary steps to hire a professional design consultant to develop a comprehensive Streetscape Master Plan for Downtown in its entirety and set aside funding for its implementation.

The plan will represent an intentional approach to design through the creation of standards. While the majority of the improvements would be implemented through a series of streetscape improvement projects funded through the Capital Improvement Program, private development would also be required to follow the standards when incorporating streetscape elements into their street frontages. The objective is to create a unified appearance throughout Downtown. The plan will deviate from past planning efforts by establishing a strategic approach to design rather than the site/street/area-specific approaches of the past that have created the existing aesthetic. However, such a plan should in no way create a monolithic feel to the area, but should rather reflect the various scales and uses of Downtown streets.

Downtown Asheville, Durham, and Greenville, among others, have each created a signature downtown that stands on its own as a destination. Winston-Salem should develop its own plan with the ultimate goal of creating a signature feel and look to Downtown that provides the sense of place necessary to make residents and visitors alike know that they have arrived at a unique destination that is not to be confused with other downtowns within the state or region.

Next Steps
In order for this recommendation to be achieved, there are four key steps much take place.

- **Gather Support**
  Support from the Winston-Salem City Council is necessary in order for funding to be allocated to hire a qualified consultant to complete the planning process.
- **Detailed Public Planning Process**
  Once support for such a plan is established, a Request for Qualifications should be publicized among experienced design firms to make sure that the best qualified consultant is selected to complete the plan. The planning process should be a public process that gathers input from multiple groups and stakeholders, such as Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership, Downtown business owners, the Arts Council, and others.

- **Funding of Public Streetscape Improvements**
  Once a formal plan and standard are established and adopted by the Elected Body, a funding mechanism should be established to implement the recommendations of the plan over several years. The majority of the implementation would be funded through the Capital Improvement Program and spent over the course of several years. Grant funding is also a possibility and every opportunity to utilize grant funding should be explored by staff.

- **Private Development**
  While most of the improvements to the streetscape will be through public projects, private development will also play a role in creating the desired intentional design throughout Downtown. Private development will be required to follow the same set of standards for projects with street frontage within the area. Therefore, it is imperative to involve private investors throughout the process and to develop a standard that is supported by all stakeholders.

**Scope of Streetscape Plan**
The plan should be developed through a public process with public input gathered from multiple stakeholder groups through various avenues including walking audits, public meetings/workshops, and interactive web pages. Public outreach should be undertaken at the start of the planning process and after a preliminary design has been created to ensure that support from stakeholders is secured. The plan should address all elements of the streetscape when creating the overall design. Special attention should be paid to the following items:

- **Vegetation**
  There is a mix of tree species and vegetation types existing in Downtown which have had varying degrees of success. While some trees appear to be doing quite well, such as the Zelkovas on Fourth Street, other species have fared poorly and need to be removed. The plan should address the space limitations, as well as overhead and underground utilities that have prevented the development of a canopy of shade trees. Methods for establishing a signature tree canopy within Downtown, such as enlarged planting boxes and suspended pavement (See Appendix B), should be addressed. In areas where trees are not a viable option, standards for other vegetation should be provided. A planting list for both trees, shrubs, and other vegetation should be included. Collaboration with the Winston-Salem Vegetation Management Department on the design and planting list is imperative.

- **Lighting**
  Pedestrian-scaled lighting exists in many styles along most Downtown streets. However, there are some streets that lack pedestrian lighting creating a potential safety concern. Standards for pedestrian lighting should be created that would limit the number of variations in style and would incorporate lighting along streets where it currently does not exist.

- **Sidewalk materials**
  There is a range of sidewalk materials along Downtown streets from brick pavers to concrete of various patterns, colors, and textures. While a subtle element in the streetscape, the range of sidewalk materials compounds the “hodgepodge” aesthetic of some of Downtown streets. The plan should develop standards for sidewalks in regards to material, color, texture, and pattern, as well as where and how those might vary.
• **Crosswalks**
  Crosswalks are a critical element in providing a safe environment for pedestrians and motorists. They delineate spaces at intersections and other points along a street where pedestrians are most likely to encounter vehicular traffic. Existing crosswalks are in multiple different designs and states of wear. Some crosswalk markings have faded to the point that they are difficult for a pedestrian to see let alone a motorist. A standard for crosswalks should be created for Downtown streets. The use of art crosswalks should be considered in the design standard.

• **Street Furniture and Kiosks**
  While there isn’t much variation in the style of street furniture currently existing in Downtown, a standard should be established for future installations that also considers artistic versions of each element. There are a number of newspaper kiosks scattered throughout Downtown. The plan should address a method of organizing these kiosks in a manner that will create attractive community gathering spots.

• **Public Art**
  As the City of Arts and Innovation, it is important to include public art of many forms and artfully designed amenities in the design of Downtown. The plan should include information on how public art can continue to be incorporated into the Downtown streetscape and potential locations for public art. Collaboration with the recently formed Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Public Art Commission is imperative to establishing a standard that can be successfully implemented.

The plan should develop a prioritization or typology of streets that will create a consistent design fabric throughout downtown similar to that of Cary’s A, B, and C street model and Greenville’s Ceremonial Street, Urban Fabric Street, and Mobility Street model. While each street has a specific purpose in Downtown, some streets experience a higher level of activity than others and should, therefore, be given a higher level of attention. As streets move up in the prioritization hierarchy, their design builds off of previous streets. **Figure 1** represents the idea of building a design fabric of amenities based on a three-tiered street prioritization model of primary, secondary, and tertiary streets. **Map 2** shows a possible typology of Downtown streets under this three-tiered model. Similar to both Cary’s and Greenville’s plans, designed cross-sections of each type of street should be included in the plan.
• **Primary Streets**: Streets with the highest level of pedestrian and sidewalk activity from a range of office, commercial and residential uses or potential for high levels of activity in the future that require the highest level of streetscape amenities.

• **Secondary Streets**: Streets with a medium level of activity mainly from offices and government agencies. Such streets require an elevated level of streetscape amenities but not to the extent of primary streets.

• **Tertiary Streets**: Streets with minimal pedestrian and sidewalk activity that function as connections to and from primary and secondary streets. These streets typically front the back side of buildings and entrances to parking areas.
Figure 1: Street Typology Model

**Primary:**
- Use Secondary Street Standards as base
- Focus on elevating streetscape design to highlight the City's motto of “City of Arts and Innovation” to create a unique environment and create a sense of place for the Arts District.
- Incorporate:
  - Art bike racks, art benches, and art crosswalks;
  - Commissions of various forms of public art;
  - Enhanced pedestrian lighting;
  - Enhanced tree canopy (potentially install suspended pavement, See Appendix B) and other forms of landscaping;
  - Incorporate location specific banners, and
  - Enhanced sidewalk materials (i.e. brick pavers) and increased widths.

**Secondary:**
- Use Tertiary Street Standards as base
- Focus on creating an inviting atmosphere for Downtown visitors that will add to the overall vibrancy of the Downtown core.
- Incorporate:
  - A consistent standard for bike racks, benches, and trash receptacles;
  - Tree canopy with larger planting boxes and other forms of landscaping, and
  - Incorporate banners for public events and holidays.

**Tertiary:**
- Focus on creating a safe environment for pedestrians and cyclists to travel through while maintaining vehicular movement
- Incorporate:
  - A consistent standard for pedestrian light design;
  - A consistent standard for sidewalk materials;
  - A consistent standard crosswalks, and
  - Bike lanes or shared lane markings per Downtown Street Study recommendations.
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Lastly, the plan should anticipate the upcoming changes to Business 40 with the new Strollway Bridge, the Multi-use Path, the new ramps, and the proposed two-way street conversions of Main Street, Liberty Street, First Street and Second Street. The plan should also complement the work of other agencies such as the Creative Corridors Coalition and the Downtown Winston-Salem Partnership. The Strollway provides an important north–south bicycle and pedestrian connection between Downtown and Old Salem, Salem College, University of North Carolina School of Arts, and the historic neighborhoods of West Salem, Washington Park, and Sunnyside/Central Terrace, as well as, provides a connection to the Salem Creek Greenway. As such, the plan should include special details on how to incorporate the Strollway into the Downtown streetscape as an inviting and easy-to-navigate bicycle and pedestrian corridor for residents and visitors alike.
Appendix A: Model Street Prioritization

**Primary Streets:** Streets with the highest level of current activity from a range of office, commercial and residential uses or potential for high levels of activity in the future that require the highest level of streetscape amenities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Second Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
<td>Fourth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Run Lane</td>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>First Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Second Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Second Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Street</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Patterson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Secondary Streets:** Streets with a medium level of activity mainly from offices and government agencies. Require an elevated level of streetscape amenities but not to the extent of primary streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Firth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Business 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Business 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Business 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Business 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Street</td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
<td>Second Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Business 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King Jr. Drive</td>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Patterson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
<td>Marshall Street</td>
<td>Patterson Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Cherry Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
<td>Patterson Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tertiary Streets: Streets with minimal activity that function as connections to and from primary and secondary streets. These streets typically front the backside of buildings and entrances to parking areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salem Avenue</td>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>Business 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
<td>Technology Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Street</td>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
<td>Seventh Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Fifth Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second Street</td>
<td>Business 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Second Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Pilot View Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Street</td>
<td>Sixth Street</td>
<td>Brookstown Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot View Street</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Buxton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth and One Half Street</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Poplar Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Avenue</td>
<td>Broad Street</td>
<td>Spruce Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>Church Street</td>
<td>Salem Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Way</td>
<td>Chestnut Street</td>
<td>Salem Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Suspended Pavement and Structural Soil

Charlotte, NC and Greenville, SC are often mentioned as examples of cities with desirable tree canopies within their downtown core. There is a reason why their tree canopies are fuller and more robust when compared to the tree canopy that exists within Downtown Winston-Salem: suspended pavement. Suspended pavement (sometimes referred to as cantilevered sidewalks) is a term for any technology that creates a subsurface volume of uncompacted soil necessary for proper root growth while supporting the weight of the surface pavement. The subsurface void is filled with either native soil or a specified mix of sand, silt and clay. The suspended pavement system creates the preferred environment of lightly compacted, high-quality soils in cities and other heavily paved environments that fosters growth of healthy trees. In addition to fostering the growth of a healthy tree canopy, suspended pavement can also act as a low impact development mechanism for managing on-site stormwater and minimizing non-point source pollution and flooding. Silva Cells are a type of modular suspended pavement system that provides unlimited amounts of soil while supporting the travel loads beneath the paving. Silva Cell systems have been widely used across the United States, Canada and Europe. Locally, Silva Cells were installed with the Wake Forest Biotech Place development.

Silva Cell System

A paper published in 2011 by Deep Root Partners, L.P. and the Kestrel Design Group, Inc. titled “Investment vs. Returns for Healthy Urban Trees: Lifecycle Cost Analysis” showed that, while the initial cost of installing Silva Cells is significantly higher than the cost of installing trees without Silva Cells, the monetary benefits of trees with Silva Cells is far greater and maintenance costs are less in the long term than that of non-Silva Cell trees.
leading to a cost savings. Benefits included reduced building energy costs, stormwater interception, increased property values, net value of carbon sequestration, bioretention, and stormwater utility fee credit.

An alternative to suspended pavement is structural soil. Structural soil is a planting medium containing crushed stone (typically limestone or granite), clay loam soil, and hydrogel that can be compacted to allow for the installation of pavement while permitting root growth. The method shifts from individual tree pits to a more integrated, root penetrable pavement system that essentially creates a rigid, load-bearing stone lattice with voids that are filled with soil. It addresses the lack of sufficient soil volume to allow for proper root growth found in traditional tree pit plantings which leads to poor tree growth in paved areas.
City Council – Action Request Form

Date: June 13, 2016
To: The City Manager
From: S. Kirk Bjorling, Real Estate Administrator

Council Action Requested:

Consideration of a Resolution Granting Permanent Utility Easements Pursuant to N.C.G.S. 160A-273 to Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for the Site of Police District Three at 2394 Winterhaven Lane (Southwest Ward)

Summary of Information:

The City’s construction of the new Police District Three at 2394 Winterhaven Lane, Tax PIN 6803-79-6781, will require the relocation of current underground electrical facilities and the construction of new electrical facilities to serve the site. Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) has not determined the precise location of the needed easements. Since time is of the essence, authorization is requested for the precise location of the easements to be determined by Duke Energy at a later date, but those locations must be agreed upon by the City Manager and the easement in a form approved by the City Attorney.

The attached resolution authorizes the granting of permanent utility easements to Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC as described herein.

Committee Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
RESOLUTION GRANTING PERMANENT UTILITY EASEMENTS PURSUANT TO N.C.G.S. 160A-273 TO DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC FOR THE SITE OF POLICE DISTRICT THREE AT 2394 WINTERHAVEN LANE

WHEREAS, the City’s construction of the new Police District Three at 2394 Winterhaven Lane, Tax PIN 6803-79-6781, will require the relocation of current underground electrical facilities and the construction of new electrical facilities to serve the site; and

WHEREAS, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) has not determined the precise location of the needed easements; and

WHEREAS, since time is of the essence, authorization is requested for the precise location of the easements to be determined by Duke Energy at a later date; and

WHEREAS, those locations must be agreed upon by the City Manager and the easement in a form approved by the City Attorney.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and the City Council upon the recommendation of the Public Works Committee, hereby authorize the granting to Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC permanent utility easements in locations to be determined by Duke Energy on property at 2394 Winterhaven Lane.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the location of the easements must be in locations agreed upon by the City Manager and the easement in a form approved by the City Attorney.
DUKE ENERGY EASEMENT

TAX PIN 6803-79-6781

NOT TO SCALE
City Council – Action Request Form

Date: June 13, 2016
To: The City Manager
From: S. Kirk Bjorling, Real Estate Administrator

Council Action Requested:

Consideration of a Resolution Granting Permanent Utility Easements Pursuant to N.C.G.S. 160A-273 to Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for the Salem Lake Marina Project at 815 Salem Lake Road (East Ward)

Summary of Information:

The City’s Salem Lake Marina Project at 815 Salem Lake Road, Tax PIN’s 6855-28-9161 and 6845-73-4519, will require the relocation of current electrical facilities and the construction of new electrical facilities to serve the site. Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) has not determined the precise location of the needed easements. Since time is of the essence for this bond project, authorization is requested for the precise location of the easements to be determined by Duke Energy at a later date, but those locations must be agreed upon by the City Manager and the easement in a form approved by the City Attorney.

The attached resolution authorizes the granting of permanent utility easements to Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC as described herein.

Committee Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-77-
C-1.b.      DRAFT
RESOLUTION GRANTING PERMANENT UTILITY EASEMENTS PURSUANT TO N.C.G.S. 160A-273 TO DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC FOR THE SALEM LAKE MARINA PROJECT AT 815 SALEM LAKE ROAD

WHEREAS, the City’s Salem Lake Marina Project at 815 Salem Lake Road, Tax PIN’s 6855-28-9161 and 6845-73-4519, will require the relocation of current electrical facilities and the construction of new electrical facilities to serve the site; and

WHEREAS, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) has not determined the precise location of the needed easements; and

WHEREAS, since time is of the essence for this bond project, authorization is requested for the precise location of the easements to be determined by Duke Energy at a later date; and

WHEREAS, those locations must be agreed upon by the City Manager and the easement in a form approved by the City Attorney.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and the City Council upon the recommendation of the Public Works Committee, hereby authorize the granting to Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC permanent utility easements for the Salem Lake Marina Project in locations to be determined by Duke Energy on property at 815 Salem Lake Road.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the location of the easements must be in locations agreed upon by the City Manager and the easement in a form approved by the City Attorney.
City Council – Action Request Form

Date: June 13, 2016

To: The City Manager

From: Gregory M. Turner, Assistant City Manager
       S. Kirk Bjorling, Real Estate Administrator

Council Action Requested:
Consideration of a Resolution Granting the City Manager Authorization to Execute Utility Easements with Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Utility Easements Located on City Property

Summary of Information:
Until 2015, Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) generally installed new electric facilities on City properties without obtaining an easement or right-of-way agreement. Duke Energy was generally operating on all City property under a very old franchise agreement that more particularly applied to City road rights-of-way. Duke Energy is now requiring a new signed utility easement agreement every time they install new primary power facilities on City property. Since the easement grants legal rights on City-owned property, the utility easement agreement must be signed and executed by the City Manager, after being approved by City Council. The new utility easement requirements by Duke Energy have already significantly negatively impacted City/County Utility Commission projects by creating delays and will likely impact all future City projects requiring new Duke Energy services, including most bond projects, road projects, etc. It should be noted that Duke Energy has been strengthening its corporate wide utility easement procedures and new utility easement rules are not specifically directed at the City of Winston-Salem. Due to activities such as bond projects, with strict schedules to meet, the City often experiences compressed time frames for utility easements to be executed. To help improve this situation and to avoid potential delays, it is requested of the City Council that easements and rights-of-way be granted to Duke Energy on City-owned property effective upon the designation of the specific location and rights-of-way by the City Manager who would be authorized to sign and execute the appropriate legal documents, after review and approval of the City Attorney.

The attached resolution authorizes the City Manager to sign and execute utility easements and rights-of-way with Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC as described herein.

Committee Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
RESOLUTION GRANTING UTILITY EASEMENTS WITH DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC FOR UTILITY EASEMENTS LOCATED ON CITY PROPERTY

WHEREAS, until 2015 Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC (Duke Energy) generally installed new electric facilities on City properties without obtaining an easement or right-of-way agreement; and

WHEREAS, Duke Energy is now requiring a new signed utility easement agreement every time they install new primary power facilities on City property; and

WHEREAS, the new utility easement requirements by Duke Energy have already significantly negatively impacted City/County Utility Commission projects by creating delays and will likely impact all future City projects requiring new Duke Energy services, including most bond projects, road projects, etc.; and

WHEREAS, due to activities such as bond projects, with strict schedules to meet, the City often experiences compressed time frames for utility easements to be executed; and

WHEREAS, to help improve this situation and to avoid potential delays, we are authorizing the granting of easements and rights-of-way to Duke Energy across City-owned property effective upon the designation of the specific location of said easements and rights-of-way by the City Manager who is hereby authorized to sign and execute, after review and approval of the City Attorney, the appropriate legal documents conveying to Duke Energy utility easements and rights-of-way on City-owned property.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Council upon the recommendation of the Public Works Committee hereby grant easements and rights-of-way to Duke Energy across City-owned property effective upon the designation of the specific location of said easements and rights-of-way by the City Manager who is hereby authorized to sign and execute the appropriate legal documents, after review and approval of the City Attorney, conveying to Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC utility easements and rights-of-way located on City-owned property.
City Council – Action Request Form

Date: June 13, 2016

To: The City Manager

From: S. Kirk Bjorling, Real Estate Administrator
       Timothy A. Grant, Recreation and Parks Director

Council Action Requested:

Consideration of a Resolution Authorizing the Acceptance of a Gift Deed from William Douglas Conrad Heirs (West Ward)

Summary of Information:

William Douglas Conrad Heirs (Conrad Heirs) owns 2.32 acres of vacant land between the east side of Silas Creek Parkway and Englewood Drive and Buena Vista Road. It is identified as Tax PIN 6816-64-9468. The owner has offered to gift deed this property to the City.

The Silas Creek Greenway currently ends at Robinhood Road, though the Winston-Salem Greenway Plan and the Wake Forest University/City of Winston-Salem Bicycle/Pedestrian/Transit/Plan call for an extension of that trail to provide connectivity to Wake Forest University and the nearby neighborhoods. The acceptance of the gift deed from the Conrad Heirs will provide the City with options in its efforts to construct future phases of the Silas Creek Greenway. In addition, North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) has begun planning a replacement bridge for Robinhood Road over Silas Creek Parkway, which could provide opportunities to connect the existing Silas Creek Greenway to proposed sections north of Robinhood Road. Taking advantage of these opportunities to acquire property and construct a bike and pedestrian friendly bridge on Robinhood Road could help the City extend the Silas Creek Greenway in what is otherwise a constrained area for greenway construction. The Recreation and Parks Director has reviewed the property site and is agreeable to the acceptance. The offer to accept the land has also been reviewed and approved by the Recreation and Parks Commission.

The attached resolution authorizes staff to proceed with the acquisition of the property.

Committee Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>Against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ACCEPTANCE OF A GIFT DEED FROM WILLIAM DOUGLAS CONRAD HEIRS

WHEREAS, William Douglas Conrad Heirs (Conrad Heirs) has offered a gift deed to the City of Winston-Salem 2.32 acres of vacant land; and

WHEREAS, the property is located between the east side of Silas Creek Parkway and Englewood Drive and Buena Vista Road and is further identified as Tax PIN 6816-64-9468, as shown on the attached map; and

WHEREAS, the acceptance of the gift deed from the Conrad Heirs will provide the City with options in its efforts to construct future phases of the Silas Creek Greenway; and

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Parks Director has reviewed the property site and is agreeable to acceptance; and

WHEREAS, the Recreation and Parks Commission recommended acceptance of the gift deed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Council upon the recommendation of the Public Works Committee and the City Manager, that the gift deed from William Douglas Conrad Heirs of 2.32 acres of vacant land identified as Tax PIN 6816-64-9468, is hereby accepted subjected to the City Attorney’s approval of the title to said property.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the appropriate City officials are hereby authorized to take the necessary action and to execute instruments required to complete the acceptance of the gift herein set forth.
ACCEPTANCE OF DONATION
OF VACANT LAND

TAX PIN 6816–64–9468
Date: June 14, 2016

To: The City Manager

From: Gregory M. Turner, Assistant City Manager

Council Action Requested:

Consideration of a Resolution to Amend and Restate a Water and Sewer Services Agreement with the Town of Kernersville and to Ratify Prior Actions Pertaining, Thereto, by the City/County Utility Commission and the Town of Kernersville.

Summary of Information:

On August 26, 1996, the City/County Utility Commission (the “Commission”), the Town of Kernersville (the “Town”), and the City of Winston-Salem (the “City”) entered into an agreement to allow the Commission to accept and operate the water and sewer systems previously owned by the Town (the “1996 Agreement”). The 1996 Agreement provided that the Commission would charge the Town’s customers a sewer rate that would gradually decline over a period of 10 years. The 1996 Agreement also stated that the factors used to determine rates charged customers within the Town were not foreseeable for the entire, perpetual term of the 1996 Agreement and that the Town and Commission would, therefore, periodically, review and renegotiate the rates.

In January and February 2003, the Town and Commission adopted resolutions to freeze the sewer rate at its 8th-year (FY 2002) level and to deposit the difference between the 8th-year rate level and the rate level for the ensuing years into a then newly-established “Rate Differential Fund” (the “Fund”). The money in the Fund would be held by the Commission for the use and benefit of the Town in future Town-initiated utility expansion projects, and could only be disbursed at the Town’s request.

In December 2011, the Town and the Commission entered into an agreement amending the 1996 Agreement and providing, in relevant part, that, unless the Town and Commission were able to negotiate a new, mutually satisfactory rate structure and consequent agreement, setting out the new rate structure, prior to June 30, 2012, the sewer rate charged by the Commission to the Town’s customers would revert, on that date, to the rate set out in the 1996 Agreement, and the Commission would disburse any money remaining in the Fund to the Town.

Committee Action:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On June 11, 2012, the Town and the Commission extended the date by which they would agree on a new rate structure until December 30, 2012. On January 27, 2012, the Town suggested that agreement on the rate structure be delayed until 6 months following the Town’s completion of its preliminary sewer plans, as both parties would be better able to estimate funding needs for future projects, once the plans were complete. The parties agreed to continue operating, in good faith, under their 2003 resolutions, until a determination could be made regarding the new rate structure and the Town’s contribution to the cost of future capacity upgrades.

The Town’s sewer plans were completed September 30, 2015 and entitled the “September 30, 2015 Strategic Sewer Investment Plan and Sewer Basin Study”. The plans were presented to the Town’s Board of Aldermen in September and the Board, thereupon, approved a reduction in the sewer rate multiplier from 2.487 to 1.6. The Commission, subsequently, also approved a reduction of the sewer rate multiplier to 1.6.

Staff anticipates that the Commission will vote, on June 13, 2016, to approve the amendment and restatement of the 1996 Agreement to incorporate the new rate structure and other terms. Water and sewer rates for customers living within the Town will be frozen until such time as they become equal to or less than 1.1 and 1.5 times the inside-City rates, respectively. The 1996 Agreement requires amendments to be approved by the Town, the Commission, and City Council, and executed by the Chairperson of the Commission and the Mayors of the Town and City.

Furthermore, on May 13, 2016, Edward and Debra Fasano filed a class action lawsuit against the Town and the Commission, claiming to be intended third-party beneficiaries of the 2011 agreement between the Town and the Commission to reduce rates and disburse money in the Fund. The money held in the Fund, however, was, as previously explained, generated by the adoption of a sewer rate multiplier requested by the Town to be charged customers within the Town limits, and can only be used at the Town’s request. The Commission is merely the administrator of the Fund. Moreover, the Fund, itself, will be abolished via the present amendment to the 1996 Agreement, and money generated by the application of the new 1.6 sewer rate multiplier will, thenceforward, be deposited in a reserve account.

Staff, therefore, recommends and requests that the City Council expressly and fully ratify, approve, and confirm, pursuant to North Carolina General Statute §160A-16: 1) the 2003 resolutions of the Town and Commission to freeze the rates charged to Town customers and to deposit the excess revenue into the Fund, 2) the 2012 verbal agreement to postpone the implementation of a rate reduction and disbursement of money from the Fund, pending completion of the Town’s sewer plans and a determination regarding rates, the Town’s contribution to capacity upgrades, and other material terms, 3) the September 2015 rate reduction that the Town and Commission approved, and 4) all water and sewer rates hitherto charged by the Commission to Town customers.

Staff also recommends and requests that the City Council agree that its approval and the Mayor’s signature, although previously required under the 1996 Agreement, will, thenceforward, no longer be required in connection with the provision of water and sewer service by the Commission to the Town, or any contracts or contract amendments, prior or current, in connection therewith. However, as a precaution, staff also recommends and requests that Council approve execution of the present amendment and restatement of the 1996 Agreement.
that the Commission will consider on June 13, 2016, in accordance with terms approved by the City Attorney’s Office. The amendment and restatement will supersede, restate, ratify, and revise all prior agreements between the Town and Commission pertaining to the subject matter, thereof.
RESOLUTION TO AMEND AND RESTATE A WATER AND SEWER SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH THE TOWN OF KERNERSVILLE AND TO RATIFY PRIOR ACTIONS PERTAINING, THERE TO, BY THE CITY/COUNTY UTILITY COMMISSION AND THE TOWN OF KERNERSVILLE.

WHEREAS, the City/County Utility Commission (the “Commission”), the Town of Kernersville (the “Town”), and the City of Winston-Salem (the “City”) entered into an agreement to allow the Commission to accept and operate the water and sewer systems previously owned by the Town (the “1996 Agreement”); and

WHEREAS, in 2003, the Town and Commission adopted resolutions to freeze the sewer rate at its 8th-year (FY 2002) level and to deposit the difference between the 8th-year rate level and the rate level for the ensuing years into a then newly-established “Rate Differential Fund” (the “Fund”).

WHEREAS, the money in the Fund would be held by the Commission for the use and benefit of the Town in future Town-initiated utility expansion projects; and

WHEREAS, in 2011, the Town and the Commission entered into an agreement amending the 1996 Agreement and providing, in relevant part, that, unless the Town and Commission were able to negotiate a new, mutually satisfactory rate structure and consequent agreement, setting out the new rate structure, prior to June 30, 2012, the sewer rate charged by the Commission to the Town’s customers would revert, on that date, to the rate set out in the 1996 Agreement, and the Commission would disburse any money remaining in the Fund to the Town; and

WHEREAS, execution of an amendment was delayed until the Town completed its September 30, 2015 Strategic Sewer Investment Plan and Sewer Basin Study, at which time the Study was presented to the Town’s Board of Aldermen and they approved a reduction in the sewer rate multiplier to be charged Town customers from 2.487 to 1.6; and
WHEREAS, the Commission, subsequently, also approved a reduction of the sewer rate multiplier to 1.6; and

WHEREAS, in the interim, the parties had agreed to continue operating in good faith, under the previously-adopted 2003 resolutions, until a determination could be made regarding the rate multiplier and the Town’s contribution to the cost of future capacity upgrades; and

WHEREAS, staff anticipates that the Commission will now vote, on June 13, 2016, to approve the amendment and restatement of the 1996 Agreement to incorporate the new rate structure and other terms; and

WHEREAS, the 1996 Agreement requires amendments to be approved by the Town, the Commission, and City Council, and executed by the Chairperson of the Commission and the Mayors of the Town and City;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Mayor and City Council of the City of Winston-Salem, hereby, authorize the City Manager and the City Secretary to enter into an agreement to amend and restate the 1996 Agreement, on terms approved by the Commission and the City Attorney’s Office;

BE IT, FURTHERMORE, RESOLVED that the City Council expressly and fully ratifies, approves, and confirms, pursuant to North Carolina General Statute §160A-16: 1) the 2003 resolutions of the Town and Commission to freeze the rates charged to Town customers and to deposit the excess revenue into the Fund, 2) a 2012 verbal agreement to postpone the implementation of a rate reduction and disbursal of money from the Fund, pending completion of the Town’s sewer plans and a determination regarding rates, the Town’s contribution to capacity upgrades, and other material terms, 3) the September 2015 rate reduction that the Town and Commission approved, and 4) all water and sewer rates hitherto charged by the Commission to Town customers, all as more fully described in the attached Council Action Request Form; and
BE IT, FURTHERMORE, RESOLVED that the City Council agrees that its approval and the Mayor’s signature, although previously required under the 1996 Agreement, will, henceforward, no longer be required in connection with the provision of water and sewer service by the Commission to the Town, or any contracts or contract amendments, prior or current, in connection therewith.
Memorandum

TO: Lee D. Garrity, City Manager
FROM: Gregory M. Turner, Assistant City Manager
DATE: May 12, 2016
SUBJECT: Contractor Self Performing Work
CC:

At the May 10, 2016 Public Works Committee there was a non-agenda item at the end of the meeting. Mr. Dwayne Crite with CriTek Engineering Group expressed to the Committee his concerns with contractors self performing work on some City projects rather than hiring subcontractors such as his company. He noted that he is not getting calls to quote on jobs as he once did.

Research by the City Attorney and conversations with Assistant City Manager Paige indicate that the allowance for contractors to self perform work and not hire subcontractors is set by State statute not City code. The City would not be able to change this allowance without a change in the State code. A copy of the statute is attached.

[Signature]

Greg Turner

Attachment
§ 143-128.2. Minority business participation goals.
(a) The State shall have a verifiable ten percent (10%) goal for participation by minority businesses in the total value of work for each State building project, including building projects done by a private entity on a facility to be leased or purchased by the State. A local government unit or other public or private entity that receives State appropriations for a building project or other State grant funds for a building project, including a building project done by a private entity on a facility to be leased or purchased by the local government unit, where the project cost is one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) or more, shall have a verifiable ten percent (10%) goal for participation by minority businesses in the total value of the work; provided, however, a local government unit may apply a different verifiable goal that was adopted prior to December 1, 2001, if the local government unit had and continues to have a sufficiently strong basis in evidence to justify the use of that goal. On State building projects and building projects subject to the State goal requirement, the Secretary shall identify the appropriate percentage goal, based on adequate data, for each category of minority business as defined in G.S. 143-128.2(g)(1) based on the specific contract type.

Except as otherwise provided for in this subsection, each city, county, or other local public entity shall adopt, after a notice and public hearing, an appropriate verifiable percentage goal for participation by minority businesses in the total value of work for building projects.

Each entity required to have verifiable percentage goals under this subsection shall make a good faith effort to recruit minority participation in accordance with this section or G.S. 143-131(b), as applicable.

(b) A public entity shall establish prior to solicitation of bids the good faith efforts that it will take to make it feasible for minority businesses to submit successful bids or proposals for the contracts for building projects. Public entities shall make good faith efforts as set forth in subsection (c) of this section. Public entities shall require contractors to make good faith efforts pursuant to subsection (f) of this section. Each first-tier subcontractor on a construction management at risk project shall comply with the requirements applicable to contractors under this subsection.

(c) Each bidder, which shall mean first-tier subcontractor for construction manager at risk projects for purposes of this subsection, on a project bid under any of the methods authorized under G.S. 143-128(a1) shall identify on its bid the minority businesses that it will use on the project and an affidavit listing the good faith efforts it has made pursuant to subsection (f) of this section and the total dollar value of the bid that will be performed by the minority businesses. A contractor, including a first-tier subcontractor on a construction manager at risk project, that performs all of the work under a contract with its own workforce may submit an affidavit to that effect in lieu of the affidavit otherwise required under this subsection. The apparent lowest responsible, responsive bidder shall also file the following:

(1) Within the time specified in the bid documents, either:
   a. An affidavit that includes a description of the portion of work to be executed by minority businesses, expressed as a percentage of the total contract price, which is equal to or more than the applicable goal. An affidavit under this sub-subdivision shall give rise to a presumption that the bidder has made the required good faith effort; or
   b. Documentation of its good faith effort to meet the goal. The documentation must include evidence of all good faith efforts that were implemented, including any advertisements, solicitations, and evidence of other specific actions demonstrating recruitment and selection of minority businesses for participation in the contract.
(2) Within 30 days after award of the contract, a list of all identified subcontractors that the contractor will use on the project.

Failure to file a required affidavit or documentation that demonstrates that the contractor made the required good faith effort is grounds for rejection of the bid.

(d) No subcontractor who is identified and listed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section may be replaced with a different subcontractor except:

(1) If the subcontractor’s bid is later determined by the contractor or construction manager at risk to be nonresponsible or nonresponsive, or the listed subcontractor refuses to enter into a contract for the complete performance of the bid work, or

(2) With the approval of the public entity for good cause.

Good faith efforts as set forth in G.S. 143-131(b) shall apply to the selection of a substitute subcontractor. Prior to substituting a subcontractor, the contractor shall identify the substitute subcontractor and inform the public entity of its good faith efforts pursuant to G.S. 143-131(b).

(e) Before awarding a contract, a public entity shall do the following:

(1) Develop and implement a minority business participation outreach plan to identify minority businesses that can perform public building projects and to implement outreach efforts to encourage minority business participation in these projects to include education, recruitment, and interaction between minority businesses and nonminority businesses.

(2) Attend the scheduled prebid conference.

(3) At least 10 days prior to the scheduled day of bid opening, notify minority businesses that have requested notices from the public entity for public construction or repair work and minority businesses that otherwise indicated to the Office of Historically Underutilized Businesses an interest in the type of work being bid or the potential contracting opportunities listed in the proposal. The notification shall include the following:

a. A description of the work for which the bid is being solicited.

b. The date, time, and location where bids are to be submitted.

c. The name of the individual within the public entity who will be available to answer questions about the project.

d. Where bid documents may be reviewed.

e. Any special requirements that may exist.

(4) Utilize other media, as appropriate, likely to inform potential minority businesses of the bid being sought.

(f) A public entity shall require bidders to undertake the following good faith efforts to the extent required by the Secretary on projects subject to this section. The Secretary shall adopt rules establishing points to be awarded for taking each effort and the minimum number of points required, depending on project size, cost, type, and other factors considered relevant by the Secretary. In establishing the point system, the Secretary may not require a contractor to earn more than fifty (50) points, and the Secretary must assign each of the efforts listed in subdivisions (1) through (10) of this subsection at least 10 points. The public entity may require that additional good faith efforts be taken, as indicated in its bid specifications. Good faith efforts include:

(1) Contacting minority businesses that reasonably could have been expected to submit a quote and that were known to the contractor or available on State or local government maintained lists at least 10 days before the bid or proposal, date and notifying them of the nature and scope of the work to be performed.
(2) Making the construction plans, specifications and requirements available for review by prospective minority businesses, or providing these documents to them at least 10 days before the bid or proposals are due.

(3) Breaking down or combining elements of work into economically feasible units to facilitate minority participation.

(4) Working with minority trade, community, or contractor organizations identified by the Office of Historically Underutilized Businesses and included in the bid documents that provide assistance in recruitment of minority businesses.

(5) Attending any prebid meetings scheduled by the public owner.

(6) Providing assistance in getting required bonding or insurance or providing alternatives to bonding or insurance for subcontractors.

(7) Negotiating in good faith with interested minority businesses and not rejecting them as unqualified without sound reasons based on their capabilities. Any rejection of a minority business based on lack of qualification should have the reasons documented in writing.

(8) Providing assistance to an otherwise qualified minority business in need of equipment, loan capital, lines of credit, or joint pay agreements to secure loans, supplies, or letters of credit, including waiving credit that is ordinarily required. Assisting minority businesses in obtaining the same unit pricing with the bidder's suppliers in order to help minority businesses in establishing credit.

(9) Negotiating joint venture and partnership arrangements with minority businesses in order to increase opportunities for minority business participation on a public construction or repair project when possible.

(10) Providing quick pay agreements and policies to enable minority contractors and suppliers to meet cash-flow demands.

(g) As used in this section:

(1) The term "minority business" means a business:
   a. In which at least fifty-one percent (51%) is owned by one or more minority persons or socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, or in the case of a corporation, in which at least fifty-one percent (51%) of the stock is owned by one or more minority persons or socially and economically disadvantaged individuals; and
   b. Of which the management and daily business operations are controlled by one or more of the minority persons or socially and economically disadvantaged individuals who own it.

(2) The term "minority person" means a person who is a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States and who is:
   a. Black, that is, a person having origins in any of the black racial groups in Africa,
   b. Hispanic, that is, a person of Spanish or Portuguese culture with origins in Mexico, South or Central America, or the Caribbean Islands, regardless of race;
   c. Asian American, that is, a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia and Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands;
   d. American Indian, that is, a person having origins in any of the original Indian peoples of North America; or
e. Female.

(3) The term "socially and economically disadvantaged individual" means the same as defined in 15 U.S.C. 637.

(h) The State, counties, municipalities, and all other public bodies shall award public building contracts, including those awarded under G.S. 143-128.1, 143-129, and 143-131, without regard to race, religion, color, creed, national origin, sex, age, or handicapping condition, as defined in G.S. 168A-3. Nothing in this section shall be construed to require contractors or awarding authorities to award contracts or subcontracts to or to make purchases of materials or equipment from minority-business contractors or minority-business subcontractors who do not submit the lowest responsible, responsive bid or bids.

(i) Notwithstanding G.S. 132-3 and G.S. 121-5, all public records created pursuant to this section shall be maintained by the public entity for a period of not less than three years from the date of the completion of the building project.

(j) Except as provided in subsections (a), (g), (h) and (i) of this section, this section shall only apply to building projects costing three hundred thousand dollars ($300,000) or more. This section shall not apply to the purchase and erection of prefabricated or relocatable buildings or portions thereof, except that portion of the work which must be performed at the construction site. (2001-496, s. 3.1.)
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PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
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COMMITTEE ROOM
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MEMBERS PRESENT: Council Member Dan Besse, Chair (out at 7:22 p.m.)
Council Member Derwin L. Montgomery, Vice Chair (out at 6:33 p.m.)
Council Member Robert C. Clark

OTHERS PRESENT: Council Member Jeff Macintosh
Council Member Denise D. Adams (out at 7:21 p.m.)

Chair Besse called the meeting to order and requested to pull Item C-1 for a brief presentation. No other Items were pulled.

Council Member Montgomery made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Taylor and carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

C-1. RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CHASE AT KINGSTREE NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC CALMING PLAN FOR FUNDING AND CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. Greg Turner, Assistant City Manager, reported the Kingstree Neighborhood has approached the City about traffic speeding in their neighborhood. A traffic calming policy has been approved and recommendation is for speed cushions at an estimated cost of $25,000.

Ms. Toneq’ McCullough, Transportation Director, gave the staff presentation on the type of devices to be used to reduce speeds.

Council Member Taylor made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Clark and carried unanimously.

Council Member Besse reiterated his opposition to vertical displacement traffic calming devices such as speed cushions, humps and lumps.

Council Member Clark expressed his concern with these types of devices in general but indicated he would support the Council Member of the ward.

Council Member Taylor noted that this item is what his residents have been asking for.

C-2. RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT WITH THE HILLCREST TOWNCENTER MASTER ASSOCIATION, INC. TO INSTALL AND MAINTAIN ADDITIONAL DECORATIVE STREETLIGHTS IN HILLCREST DEVELOPMENT.
C-3. CONSIDERATION OF ITEMS RELATED TO THE 28TH STREET STORMWATER DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AND WATER AND SEWER REPLACEMENT:

a. RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CHANGE ORDER TO CHARLES D. LOWDER INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF $308,000 FOR WORK ON THE 28TH STREET STORMWATER DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS AND WATER AND SEWER REPLACEMENTS PROJECT (NORTHEAST WARD).


GENERAL AGENDA

G-1. PUBLIC HEARING ON ORDINANCE TO NAME AN UNNAMED STREET OR ROAD IN WINSTON-SALEM (SOUTH EAST WARD).

Mr. Gregory Turner, Assistant City Manager, reported that Council approved the construction for the Quarry Project and an address has to be established for the project. A recommendation for Quarry Road has been made.

Council Member Clark made a motion to approve the item. The motion was duly seconded by Council Member Taylor and carried unanimously.

G-2. DOWNTOWN PARKING ANALYSIS PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING FIRM PROPOSALS.

Ms. McCullough gave a presentation on this item.

Council Member Adams requested information on the scoring process to see where the proposals failed.

In response to Council Member Montgomery's question, Mr. Turner stated, staff is required to give a professional recommendation based upon the qualifications of scoring. He also noted to M/WBE commitment requirements have to be consistent with what is used for the construction contracts. Currently, 20% of the points that are used in the evolution of the proposals are derived from the MWBE commitment. Beyond this flexibility staff has flexibility on the other elements.

Council Member Macintosh requested options for employee parking be included in the study.

G-3. UPDATE ON WINSTON-SALEM TRANSIT AUTHORITY'S RESPONSE TO THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION'S PARATRANSIT COMPLIANCE REVIEW.

Ms. McCullough introduced the Board Chair along with some of the Winston-Salem Transit Authority staff members and gave a presentation on this item.
In response to Council Member Taylor, Ms. Tilda Alston, 2042 Waterstone Lane, High Point, stated the current no-shoe policy is calculated by an individual's scheduled trips for one month and the number of no-shows are divided by the number of trips. If the percentage of those trips is 15% or more, the rider will receive a warning letter. The baseline is four no-shows. If the activity continues, suspensions are enforced.

In response to Council Member Montgomery, Ms. McCullough stated, there will be new routes established may affect the population of the ridership.

Council Member Adams requested data be given to the Committee on what led to the 16 violations, including all scenarios, and provide copies of old and new Rider's Guides for the Committee.

Council Member Besse requested that this item be put back on the Committee agenda for further discussion and review in August.

G-4. INFORMATION ON STORMWATER FEE CREDIT POLICY CONCEPT.

Chair Besse stated without objection, the Committee would hold Item G-4 for discussion at a later date.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:29 p.m.