

PHILIP AZAR

917 Monmouth Avenue • Durham, NC 27701
(919) 491-6002 • Philip@philipazar.com
philipazar.com

DURHAM REAL ESTATE INVESTOR AND/OR DEVELOPER

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA (2013 - 2015)

Acquired and invested in 3 duplexes (6 units). Financed rehabs before deciding preference to acquire rental units requiring investment.

COMMUNITY ACTIVIST

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA (DATES NOT PARTICULARLY TRACKED)

President, InterNeighborhood Council of Durham

President and Past President, Trinity Park Neighborhood Association

Treasurer, Durham Affordable Housing Coalition

Board Member, Clean Energy Durham

Steering Committee, Southwest Central Durham Quality of Life Project

Steering Committee, Pauli Murray Steering Committee

Participant, Northeast Central Durham Leadership Council

Lead Team, Old East Durham Communities in Partnership

Steering Committee, Durham Neighborhoods United

Appearances before city council and board of county commissioners on various matters

Participation in Affordable Housing and Transit and other meetings

POLITICAL EXPERIENCE

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA (DATES NOT PARTICULARLY TRACKED)

Canvassed for President Obama

Supported Steve Hopkins for County Commissioner

Supported Wendy Jacobs for County Commissioner

Miscellaneous contributions to various candidates

Attendance at one PA endorsement meeting; various mixers, etc.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CLEAN ENERGY DURHAM

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA (JANUARY 2013 – MAY 2013)

Led energy efficiency non-profit toward greater emphasis on low-income households and advocacy.

Streamlined organization from six positions to two reducing unsustainable cost and complexity while maintaining transparency with board and staff and respecting staff member contributions.

ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR PROGRAMS, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF DURHAM

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA (JANUARY 2011 – DECEMBER 2012)

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS MANAGER, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF DURHAM

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA (OCTOBER 2009 – JANUARY 2011)

LEGAL ADVISOR / SPECIAL PROJECTS, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF DURHAM

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA (SEPTEMBER, 2008 – OCTOBER 2009)

PRO BONO STAFF MEMBER, HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF DURHAM

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA (FEBRUARY 2006 – SEPTEMBER 2009)

Coordinated construction, family services and land development functions. Played key role in raising and administering approximately \$3 million in federal and state grants and zero percent interest loans (number excludes second mortgage assistance for homeowners). Special projects included:

- Drafting and letting infrastructure contract for development of affordable housing subdivision
- Developing loan scenarios for acquisition of \$2 million retail building
- Drafting and facilitating joint venture agreement under which Habitat ReStore retail operation is run collaboratively by Habitat affiliates in Orange and Durham counties
- Co-leading program launches for a home repairs program and for program where neighborhood aspirations are surveyed, respected and championed in measurable manner
- Representing affiliate with community organizations and before local governments
- Designing dashboard management tool and financial sustainability tool

VICE PRESIDENT & GENERAL COUNSEL, FEDEX SUPPLY CHAIN SERVICES

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE (FEBRUARY 2001 – SEPTEMBER 2005)

VICE PRESIDENT & GENERAL COUNSEL, FEDEX GLOBAL LOGISTICS

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE (SEPTEMBER 2000 – SEPTEMBER 2005)

Part of leadership team responsible for running logistics subsidiaries. Headed legal department with offices in Memphis, Tennessee, Hudson, Ohio and Leiden, Netherlands.

- Worked closely with other disciplines across FedEx group of companies
- Performed wide range of legal services, including negotiation of sales, marketing, IT, confidentiality and other agreements. Supervised litigation. Advised on employment law matters. Supervised security personnel
- Significant exposure to the retention and management of legal and accounting professionals in the United States and abroad
- With assistance from local counsel, navigated European labor laws and works councils as part of reorganization of European operations

STAFF DIRECTOR, LEGAL CUSTOMER SUPPORT, FEDEX CORPORATION

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE (JUNE – SEPTEMBER 2000)

SENIOR/STAFF ATTORNEY, LEGAL CUSTOMER SUPPORT, FEDERAL EXPRESS CORPORATION

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE (APRIL 1997 – JUNE 2000)

Reviewed sales presentations, contracts, marketing copy, corporate identity logos, and operating manuals. Implement process improvements for those reviews. Provided proactive legal advice on product development launch teams. Drafted and reviewed shipping and package information agreements. Supported sales and marketing teams responsible for wholesale shipping discounts. Negotiated with United States Postal Service on agreement for locating FedEx drop boxes at post office locations.

LEGAL ADVISOR, OFFICE OF DIRECTOR GENERAL, ECONOMIC DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF DUBAI

DUBAI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES (1995 – 1996) (ONE YEAR IN POSITION)

Advised Dubai World Trade Centre and DUBAL (Dubai Aluminium Company). Matters included international litigation and arbitration, negotiation of rights to international rugby tournament, agreement for European PGA tournament.

OF COUNSEL, SAUDI-AMERICAN LEGAL CONSULTANTS

RIYADH, KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA (1½ MONTHS IN 1995)

Provided in-country leadership to firm in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia on short-term basis. Advised U.S. multinational corporations on doing business in Saudi Arabia including FCPA matters.

OF COUNSEL, LYON & MCMANUS

WASHINGTON, D.C. (1994 –1995)

Augmented international and regulatory capabilities of construction and government contracts firm in Washington, D.C. Focused on Office of Foreign Asset Control and Bureau of Export Control licensing. Drafted distribution agreement for use in Brazil.

ASSOCIATE, AFRIDI & ANGELL (SUCCESSOR TO CHADBOURNE, PARKE & AFRIDI)

DUBAI, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES (1991 – 1993)

Advised diverse range of clients on legal aspects on doing business in the Middle East from firm's Dubai office. General commercial practice focusing on distribution, agency, sales, franchising and licensing. Represented clients before local government licensing bodies. Instructed local advocates (barrister equivalent) on litigation matters.

ASSOCIATE, THELEN, MARRIN, JOHNSON & BRIDGES

WASHINGTON, D.C. (1989 – 1991)

Focused on international trade, including Customs, Office of Foreign Asset Control, and Bureau of Export Control matters in firm's D.C. office. Worked on domestic and international construction contracts.

EDUCATION

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER, *JD*, 1989

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, *BA, Foreign Affairs*, 1986

AWARDS

2012 Southwest Central Durham Quality of Life Proud Shoes Award

2004 FedEx Five Star Award

1996 (Founding Year) Dubai Shopping Festival Certificate of Appreciation



**ELECT
PHILIP AZAR**
DURHAM CITY COUNCIL

PA-PAC Questionnaire for Mayor and City Council Candidates - 2015

When answering this questionnaire, please repeat the questions in your response document with each question numbered and organized as it appears here. Type your responses in italics, bold, or a different font to distinguish your responses from the questions. Please do not use colors.

Please return completed form along with your resume describing education, work history, community service, and prior political experience as soon as possible, but by July 30, 2015, at the latest.

You may e-mail your responses to Tom Miller at tom-miller1@nc.rr.com or you may send a printed copy of your responses to Durham PA-PAC c/o Tom Miller 1110 Virginia Avenue, Durham, NC 27705-3262

Please note that following the July 30 deadline, the Durham People's Alliance PAC may publish your responses to this questionnaire and your resume.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire and your willingness to serve the people of Durham.

Candidate's name: *Philip Azar* _____

Office for which you have filled for election: *Durham City Council*

Address: *917 Monmouth Ave., Durham, NC 27701* _____

E-mail Address: Philip@philipazar.com or pazar@nc.rr.com _____

Phone: *919-491-6002* _____

Government and the Public Good

1. Of all the issues confronting city government, which single issue is most important to you and why? What would you do about it if elected?

Durham is changing! is an understatement. We need to do a better job of understanding the pace of our change, managing and channeling it, and explaining the benefits, risks and well-neighbor inevitability of it.

Our growth is changing our economy. We are a center of a knowledge economy exceeding the expectations of the people and jurisdictions that formed Research Triangle Park. RTP wants to have substantial numbers of residents, in addition to its centers of employment. High tech, bio tech, information tech and other highly skilled, highly globalized employment is spreading through downtown and urban, near urban and suburban neighborhoods faster than the arrival of high-speed fiber, whether supplied by Google, ATT&T, Frontier or anyone else.

Our growth is changing our demographics. We are adding population, adding it quickly, and in a different demographic mix.

Our growth is changing our neighborhoods, our built environment, our expectations of government and of ourselves. Neighborhoods and our built environment are changing through investment, displacement and gentrification. As we become denser, what happens in one neighborhood more directly affects the next, a region of the city or, potentially, the city itself. Downtown's success and swagger has led to excitement in Durham overall. Many parts of the city want to add similar levels of vitality, walkability and bikeability.

Our growth can be channeled through land use regulation, incentives, creation and preservation of affordable housing units, development of pocket neighborhoods, revising of master plans, and fixing of the loop (as most recently envisioned or otherwise) rather than continuing to talk about it. Growth might also be managed by development of new urban, walkable, bikeable areas and connections between them and downtown. Angier/Driver corridor and the Chapel Hill St. commercial corridor help stretch some of the urban fabric of downtown and associated benefits east and west. The Braggtown commercial and Northgate Park areas and the Fayetteville Street corridor can stretch that fabric and associated benefits north and south. There are other parts of Durham, new and old, that want a more walkable feel and more commercial opportunities. Eventually, we may have multiple mini-urban areas that compete with and complement downtown.

The benefits of growth and of change – if we do it well – are immense. Growth can add jobs. Growth can build a tax base that can help the schools and drive other investments. Growth, if coupled with density, can preserve environmentally sensitive land and can take some of the pressures of displacement off of neighborhoods. Assume for a moment that 100,000 people are going to move to Durham in the next 10 years and they can all afford to buy or rent someplace to live in Durham. Everything else being equal (and its not), that would mean that 100,000 people would need to leave Durham. One Hundred Thousand people would be displaced. Density – whether fixing vacant and boarded up houses, building on vacant lots, adding pocket neighborhoods and building larger or higher where possible can alleviate the pressures to displace.

Density is not our only tool to manage growth and it is hardly a panacea. The example used above was grossly simplified. Moreover, growth, displacement and gentrification are not about numbers. They are mostly about people and the dislocation and senses of displacement and dis-enfranchisement that way disproportionately affects the poor, affects people of color, and affects the need to intentionally preserve Durham culture.

What can the city do? It can disproportionately listen to those who are most susceptible to displacement. It can focus many of its affordable housing dollars to help people in areas most affected. It can seek to put programs in place such that when displacement occurs, people can find places to move into, can navigate changes that affect mail, medical and other benefits, and ability to visit relatives and

friends still living in the neighborhood. The city can make sure that public transportation provides access to jobs, benefits and places of political power from lower income areas of the city. The city can also revisit its existing housing policies to do a better job of reaching people living in areas where displacement is highest. If that means funding more robust repairs programs, that should be considered. If that means a displaced resident should have access to a city second mortgage to buy a home in another neighborhood, that should be considered.

The risks of uncontrolled growth are also immense. As of any moment in time, we have all of the architectural history that we will ever have. Whenever we let a historic building be torn down, we lose that history, and some of our sense of the past and our sense of self. Durham, all of Durham, has assets that we need to preserve, including values and culture.

What the city cannot do is stop growth. It cannot stop growth because it cannot stop the relative benefits of living in Durham compared to everywhere people are coming from. If we really want to stop or slow growth, we'd need to stop high-speed fiber, whether supplied by Google, ATT&T, Frontier or anyone else. This is not going to happen. We don't want it to. The greatest infrastructure of a knowledge economy is networks. Much of this infrastructure is already in place, is already part of our Durham DNA, and something we want reaching into every home, school, workplace, neighborhood, college and university.

Light rail and commuter rail are not growth. They may drive some growth, but mostly, they are tools. Tools to manage growth, tools to move people in a populated environment. Tools to help get to vital, walkable, bikeable neighborhoods in all parts of the city or even elsewhere in our region, tools to incent (and sometimes demand) jobs and affordable housing. Tools to help people access jobs, benefits and centers of power and tools to help keep us more engaged, more likely to interact with one another. If better tools are identified for that job, so be it.

If elected, I will work to see that public transportation in all its forms, from sidewalks, roads, bikepaths, greenspaces, to the presumably arriving light rail and possible commuter rail are built with as much equity as possible not only around the traditional axes of jobs and housing, but also access to places of work, benefits and centers of power. I will look at transit not as an end to itself, but as a way of improving our ability to manage our growth and to bring more equity into neighborhoods that are underserved by transit options.

If elected, I will continue to participate in Old East Durham Communities in Partnership, the Northeast Central Durham Leadership Council, the Southwest Central Durham Quality of Life Initiative, and other community and neighborhood groups so that I can continue to listen to those for whom growth may pose the greatest risks. I would also try to re-engage in the Southside Neighborhood Association as it tries to build relationship between long-standing residents and newer residents moving into housing the city made possible.

2. What are the greatest employment needs of Durham's residents? How can city government use its authority and its resources to direct jobs to those who most need them? Be specific.

The greatest employment needs of Durham residents are those that are unfilled by the market. Here, no reference is made to jobs that employers are hiring recruiters to fill -- other than to mention that Durham invested, wisely, millions in the creation of RTP and the recruitment of business to it and in and around Downtown. RTP has created jobs for people from around the world (including Durham and The Triangle).

Employment needs that the market is least likely to fill are most likely to be in lower income communities of color in urban neighborhoods. The types of jobs I have heard that these communities want are:

- *Jobs for youth.*
- *Jobs that prepare youth for the knowledge economy.*
- *Jobs that build on the assets of the community, which include sustainable jobs around urban agriculture, trees and the non-profits entering the community to help it.*
- *Jobs around infrastructure construction being built in the community.*

Whenever we look at funding, zoning and other requests that affect a portion of the city that has as yet unmet jobs needs, we need to look opportunistically to increase employment in the above categories. We should also realize that in addition to specific categories of jobs, communities are asking to have greater control and ownership of their economic future, and the city should hear and support that aspiration, even when it cannot claim credit for its achievement.

Similarly, when we look at funding volunteer-based programs, we should also look at funding those activities as paid programs. To the extent that we see tree planting, shrub trimming on city right of way, and community engagement as core government services, we should look for opportunities to hire people from high unemployment, low material wealth and high poverty rate areas, at living wages, to do so. Yes, this must be done consistent with our financial responsibilities, chiefly maintaining a AAA bond rating, and not unnecessarily tax burdening residents.

3. How can the City Council act to lift the wages of the lowest paid workers in Durham and reduce growing income inequality in our community?

- *Foster increased growth so that there will be greater demand for workers.*
- *Encourage the city manager and the administration to look for opportunities to hire people in living wage jobs.*
- *Explore the possibility and advisability of a higher local minimum wage. This is not a slam dunk. In addition to looking at whether we would be raising wages that might make some businesses less competitive, we'd need to consider whether employees in Durham might live and/or spend their earnings in other locations, and whether, even if state law might allow such action today, the general assembly might revoke our ability to do so tomorrow. Much the same might be said about a local living wage ordinance.*

4. Describe your interest in and commitment to public amenities such as playing fields, open space, and walking and biking trails. Are you willing to raise property taxes to provide for and maintain these amenities?

Yes, but. But we need to ensure:

1. That these amenities are broadly distributed and broadly used. A progressive real estate tax that is then used to fund amenities that are predominantly in wealthy neighborhoods is not really progressive. (There is a possible exception for amenities in wealthier areas that so raise real estate values or other sources of revenue that the amenity, over time, pays for itself and returns money to the city to use elsewhere.) Similarly, taxes (whether progressive or not) used to fund amenities that are way underutilized are a waste.

2. *We are making these investments for the public good. If the investment is for the public good, so should be their maintenance, at living wages. In either event, maintenance as well as creation of amenities must both be taken into account from inception.*
3. *Preference should be give to amenities that are in plans that focus on connecting playing fields, open spaces and walking and biking trails.*
4. *We need to ensure that tax increases do not make us uncompetitive or unfairly burden our tax base. Generally, Durham uses real estate taxes for such matters. My recollection of an older Bull City Rising blog, Durham real estate taxes have generally been somewhat higher than other jurisdictions in the area, but when real estate taxes, user fees and other taxes have been added together, we have had a competitive overall tax rate. We need to maintain that.*

Housing, City Planning, and Neighborhoods

5. What does “gentrification” mean to you? Where is it happening? What, if anything, should be done about it?

Gentrification means many things to many different people. For me, gentrification is not about neighborhood change per se, not about increased investment in, improvement of or addition to existing housing stock. It’s not even about urban neighborhoods becoming less majority minority and more white. It’s about real and perceived disempowerment, disenfranchisement and inequitable economic and political power, all of which does track race.

The concern about the pace of change means we need to listen more closely to those affected and to add equity back in where we can -- whether in the form of affordable housing, robust repairs programs, real estate tax value caps (to the extent allowed by law), and other creative solutions.

We also need to acknowledge some of the benefits of this change:

- *Aging housing stock, long owned by landlords unwilling or unable to invest in it is being fixed up, brought into compliance with minimum housing codes, with more lead abatement.*
- *Lower income people are moving into new housing stock, built after 1975, with fewer lead issues. (Assumption: Lower income people are move further from the city center, where housing stock is newer.)*
- *Increased real estate values are increasing our tax base.*
- *Mixed income is reaching more neighborhoods.*
- *For some neighborhoods, there is increased diversity and additional networks available to residents.*
- *The status quo has never been the friend of low-income communities, especially communities of color.*

It remains true that for many of these “benefits,” there are also downsides:

- *Housing stock moving from rental to homeownership, depleting rental supply.*
- *Lower income people feeling physical, emotional, psychological, familial and social dislocations are moving further from downtown, and ending up with longer transit distances, whether to work, services, city hall or the county courthouse.*

- *Some of the increased real estate values causing increased tax bills, making properties less affordable.*
- *Mixed income not reaching higher-income neighborhoods.*
- *Possible absence of increased diversity in higher-income neighborhoods.*

Based on my sense that growth, when coupled with density, is positive and a neigh-inevitable trend, I think we need to worry less about stopping gentrification, like it something that could be stopped in its tracks than channeling growth, using it to the best of our abilities and walking with those and finding ways with those affected to ameliorate its effects where possible.

Concerns about the pace of change happening in predominantly majority neighborhoods are a much lower priority. These concerns are offset by high rates of homeownership, ability to access capital, and the absence of long-term effects of discrimination undermining the ability to navigate these changes.

6. In 2012, the city completed a project to convert the Ninth Street Compact Neighborhood Tier into a design district. Do you support the planning department’s current initiative to create new compact neighborhood tiers and to convert compact neighborhood tiers into design districts? What is good about the initiative and what is bad about it? What should be done to fix what is bad?

In general, yes, I support the planning process. There are at least 3 challenges that need to be addressed:

1. *It is a complex process with a great deal at stake. Planning staff must engage community members where they are and not only be responsive to concerns raised, but be comfortable explaining what is at stake and what community concerns might potentially be so that the engagement process is robust and meets the needs of people not as equipped to navigate the complexity as, say, the development community.*
2. *To the extent that we want to engage developers in a discussion around commitments to affordable housing or other matters of concern in exchange for re-zoning, we need to ensure that the planning process outlined above does not give away density (mostly height) prematurely. The same might also be said about transition buffers from one type of zoning to another.*
3. *As planning, be it around zoning, transit or elsewhere, becomes more complex, there is an increased imperative for planning professionals, residents, neighborhoods, developers and other stakeholders to work together more closely and maintain high levels of mutual respect. Staff must participate and lead this effort, because they are the paid professionals. Without collaboration and respect in the planning process, we cannot manage or channel growth with integrity and credibility.*

The process provides more flexibility, allows for greater density, shared spaces and a focus on form rather than uses. It also moves some of the political decision making into earlier phases of the process so that greater levels of investment are made possible by more predictive outcome. It is important that we reserve some of what developers want until later on in the process so that more meaningful negotiation is possible after initial re-zoning occurs. This is a form of unpredictability and political negotiation that we need to preserve if we want to get affordable housing commitments as part of re-zoning.

7. In 2014, the city council adopted a resolution calling for affordable housing near planned transit stations. Do you support the resolution? Would you change it? Should the city grant developer

requests for rezonings near transit areas without commitments for affordable housing? Please explain your answers.

I support the resolution on affordable housing. Changes that I support would be at the margins, mostly around more inclusivism around development at transit stops, including commercial development.

The city should meet its goals around affordable housing at transit stops, and that very much does include negotiating for commitments to affordable housing. Although every transit stop is not the same, as a general rule, the city's re-zoning and/or investment as well as the developer's investment can create a great deal of value and it is appropriate to negotiate to ensure that some of the value created is used to meet affordable housing goals.

Note: All of Durham's low-income residents will not be able to live in the 15% affordable housing created or maintained around transit stops. The resolution and its goals are a partial solution. We should not oversell it.

8. What geographic area(s) in Durham need special attention from city government? In those areas, what are the problems and what action should the city take?

I am running for an at-large seat, and look forward to the possibility of representing as close to everyone as possible. Here are my impressions of areas that deserve special attention. If elected, prior to votes, I would get fresh input to ensure that my impressions matched those of residents and advocates on the ground. This means meeting with individuals as well as institutional and other stakeholders.

1. Environmentally sensitive areas. Here, density, rather than urban sprawl is something to pay attention to. In a geographically concentrated area, the Ellerbe Creek Green Infrastructure Partnership deserves special consideration.

2. Old East Durham. Based on what I have heard and seen, the main areas of concern are gentrification, including displacement and disenfranchisement, and the need for policing that is more responsive to community concerns. We need a more honest conversation with neighborhood residents, one that reflects the reality that there are long-term demographic trends changing the city that that the city cannot stop, and probably does not want to stop. Instead, the conversation should focus on the possible: support for community space in the midst of change, services to help long-term low income residents while they live in the neighborhood or in the event of displacement, repairs programs to reach residents where they are currently living, and improved quality of life for all residents. To the extent possible and lawful, affordable housing should meet the needs of existing residents.

3. Southwest Central Durham. Based on what I have heard and seen, the Lyon Park and the West End want to see continued success and utilization of programming in the Lyon Park community center, including the new commercial kitchen, and want long-term residents to participate area opportunities, including healthy living and healthcare. While the opening of the Durham Grocery Co-Op does not guarantee success of the Chapel Hill St. commercial district, it provides an important anchor, and is a great shared asset among Lyon Park and the West End, Morehead Hill, Burch Avenue, Tuscaloosa-Lakewood and other neighborhoods.

4. NCCU and the Fayetteville Street Corridor. I believe people in the area want to see a successful balance of development (whether market rate or affordable housing; traffic improvement or parking)

that complements and improves North Carolina Central University's historic standing. It, too, has commercial areas that may be future walkable, bikeable urban centers. I suspect New Visions of Africa and other businesses in the area would like increased residential density that would support local businesses and new businesses that might drive foot traffic.

5. *Downtown.* Downtown is one of Durham's greatest assets. We need to continue to grow it, try to maintain its "cool," and ensure that it includes public spaces that are genuinely welcoming and enjoyable to all – regardless of ability to pay. While "downtown belongs to everyone," downtown residents also sees themselves as an emergent neighborhood, one that everyone is planning, with the tensions inherent in being planned by others. The city has invested in downtown, and downtown needs to become an increasing source of revenue for investment in other parts of the city, and we need to be careful not to undermine our growth engine and a source of great emotional and economic energy. In that sense, downtown is already driving development elsewhere.

9. Under what circumstances would you vote to downzone a piece of property? By "downzone," we mean a rezoning action that would reduce the market value of the land being rezoned.

Downzoning can reduce the market value of land being rezoned both for the owner and for the community. I could see myself participating in a downzoning, but reluctantly. The community benefit must be substantial and lasting.

City Finances, Capital Improvements, Transportation, and City Services

10. The city manager recently gave city council members a list of potential capital improvement projects to prioritize. Of these, what are your top four priorities for capital expenditures? Is there something that you would include in your top four that was not on the manager's list? Would you be willing to raise property taxes to accomplish your priority projects?

The paired comparison worksheets provided by the manager do not provide sufficient information to make meaningful decisions about priority. In particular, there is no information about the relative financial or other benefits of a given project or the ability to phase multi-year projects and priorities. While one city council cannot bind another, I hope there is room for council to prioritize over multiple years even if multi-year prioritizations are not binding. As currently presented, it looks more likely to create a politically informed wish list. Here is my wish list:

1. *Planning (#4)*
2. *Sidewalks (Might have been number one, except for the risk that without adequate planning we'd have to do some sidewalks 2-3 times.) (#10)*
3. *Local use park in Twin Lakes – This area of Durham is way under-amenitied and fast-growing. (#1).*
4. *Fix The Loop – Funded at lower than a 70% synthetic TIFF, with the savings used to support development elsewhere. (#6) Likely follow-on beneficiaries being the Belt-Line and sidewalks and bikepaths on Fayetteville St. (#8 and #7)*

Without the benefits analysis, the other information, and more detailed plans, consideration of a tax increase is not appropriate. The only item deserving additional funding, if required, is Planning, but I don't think that would require a tax increase.

Rather than rank individual projects, it might be more helpful, if not already done, to reach broad consensus around the costs and benefits of a best in class transit system (sidewalks, streets, bike lanes, mass transit), a best in class downtown, a best in class parks system, a best in class trail system, and work together to understand the linkages between them, their affordability over time, and the best way to phase them. In that manner, the CIP informs long-range planning.

Other items worth considering:

- 1. Merger of private and public bus systems in Durham. Chapel Hill was able to leverage a state bond to do this, but some level of planning, potentially within the CIP process, might be needed in Durham. Unless there is at least some interest with NCCU, Durham Tech and Duke to do this, it's not worth devoting a great deal of resources to exploring this. (This is more of a long-term planning item.)*
- 2. Maintenance and growth of the Durham tree canopy. Some cities in North Carolina, including Charlotte, I believe, already do this. This one is potentially on par with sidewalks as it is a form of infrastructure, and might be planned and probably implemented with sidewalks.*
- 3. The Ellerbe Creek Green Infrastructure Partnership, or something comparable.*

11. The city council recently voted to provide \$11.25 million in public financial support to two private development projects in the downtown area. Did the council make the correct decisions in those cases? Are the projects equally deserving? As a council member, what philosophy will guide you in deciding whether to provide public financial support to private development enterprises?

The decision was definitely correct with regard to Chesterfield. The deal includes a repurposing, rehabbing of an important historical building in a location that suffers from the building's current state. There is has a strong, defined nexus with public good that is unique to the project.

The Durham Innovations District Phase I decision is more difficult. 1. Since there is new construction, there is less of a unique, site-specific connection with a public good. 2. The potential deal is more complex and the negotiating parameters do not seem to reflect the level of increased complexity. How are the incentives to address phasing or the failure to proceed with additional phases? What was council's direction with respect to the park? Is it to be well and truly public? Was it the quality and nature of the jobs portrayed as being attracted that warranted the level of incentives? If so, should the incentives be tied to mix of occupancy rate and value of the work? Why the fascination with a 70% incentive rate, especially as Durham becomes more and more desirable? Are we accepting incentives as a permanent cost of attracting business to Durham even as Durham becomes ever more desirable? Over time, shouldn't the expected incentive rate taper off or be set more in relation to what other jurisdictions offer?

For both these projects, I would have liked the administration to require the developers to include the latest green infrastructure and sustainable stormwater management practices as out lined in the Ellerbe Creek Green Infrastructure Partnership proposal. This would be particularly beneficial with regard to the Innovations District development since it is less elevated and new construction and therefore presumably more environmentally sensitive. I would also like the financial projections to use discounted cash flows for all incentives (city and county) and revenues (taxes and other projected revenues) so that the relative values of city and county contributions and expected revenues can be compared on more of a like to like basis.

Based on the information presented at the session, I would have approved the Chesterfield deal and deferred for a cycle or two on the Innovations District development until there was greater certainty regarding some of the questions raised. Going forward, I would hope that council is provided more information regarding green infrastructure and sustainable stormwater management practices, discounted cash flow projections for costs and revenues, and the ability to look at incentive levels lower than 70%, especially in the most desirable parts of Durham.

I think we need to look for good deals, with a defined public good. The more valuable the real estate and the lower or less defined public good, the less likely subsidy, especially at 70%, is appropriate. In time, the hope is that there would be more investment in other parts of Durham.

12. Under what circumstances would you vote to raise bus fares? Is the city's public transportation system being managed effectively? Is it serving the population which needs it the most? Please comment on your philosophy concerning Durham's public transportation system.

I might raise bus fares in order to keep a meaningful and reliable bus system and structure in place, but I think we are in transition to a much better bus system. The bus system is in transition as it seeks to better serve a number of populations: shoppers and commuters with an option to drive, users of need (whether commuting to work, accessing benefits or going to government buildings to advocate or maintain relationships with elected or other officials), and visitors to the area.

We will know that we are achieving our goals when parking is less frequently offered as an employment benefit, when free-fare bus systems do not link wealthier neighborhoods to centers of employment and barely touch low-income neighborhoods, and when bussing and walking take pressures off the construction of parking decks to house visitors' cars downtown. Public transportation, done right, can be one of Durham's greatest assets and can truly benefit everyone.

13. The City Council recently voted to approve a "road diet" for Highway 15-501 between University Drive and Chapel Hill Road. Did the council make a wise decision? In general, do you support or oppose reducing vehicular travel lanes to promote traffic-calming, parking, and bicycle and pedestrian travel?

In general, I support "road diets." More people support reducing vehicular travel lanes to promote traffic-calming, parking, and bicycle and pedestrian than might be conventional wisdom. Take the "Fix the Loop" movement. We all support the concept because we know that there is simply too much asphalt downtown. It inhibits business, makes downtown less walkable and less of a destination – even for people in cars.

Other than the amount of time devoted to a unanimous vote, city council made a wise decision regarding the "road diet" for 15-501. The traffic rates on that stretch of 15-501, the need for cars to narrow to one lane at University Avenue and the studies showing positive impacts on businesses pointed to the same decision. The city council hearing highlighted the need for Durham to be aware that we currently have residents who want alternatives to car transportation – even if the vast majority of those residents are also car drivers.

14. In general, do you support public funding of city programs and services through property taxes or user fees? Please explain your answer.

Generally, property taxes. Property taxes are a progressive way of raising needed revenue in that those who own more expensive properties (and who are generally wealthier/higher income households) pay more.

Law Enforcement

15. Is there a trust problem between the people of Durham and the police department? Are you satisfied with the department's responses to issues of use of force, racial profiling, searches, and communication with the public?

The people of Durham support the police department. The police have a hard job, do it bravely and do the right thing. To the extent that there is a trust problem between the people of Durham and the police department, it is comparable to that in the rest of America as we shift through a range of issues associated with policing and the justice system (many of which are actually beyond the control of the police). Disparities in drug sentences, the effects of the War on Drugs, de-criminalizing of marijuana in many states, treatments of minority students by school systems, militarization of equipment available to police forces, driving while Black/Brown and/or Muslim, these are all part of a national dialogue and one that is re-playing at community levels across the nation. Law enforcement and the police are expected to be able to participate effectively and sometimes lead in these conversations.

The issue is whether there is public and political trust in the police department's leadership, in light of traditional concerns around crime rates and police department leadership discomfort with participating in and leading conversations around issues such as the use of force, racial profiling, searches, etc. This issue is very real and needs to be addressed now, when we are not in emergency mode. Police leadership needs to be more aware of the pace of change that is happening in Durham and nationally and to be more willing and able to participate in discussion about it, and participate in that change.

16. Is the Civilian Police Review Board an effective tool for police oversight? If you perceive problems with oversight of the police department, what should be done to correct them?

The Civilian Review Board does a good job, including its leadership. Oversight of the police department is not solely the providence of the Civilian Review Board. It is also the responsibility of the chief, the city manager, and, at least in terms of strategic direction, city council. That said, city council should not micro-manage the police department. Doing so means that there are problems at other levels of police oversight. City council has responsibility for city governance, financial oversight and strategic direction. It should rarely, if ever, get involved at procedural levels. When it does, it is a sign of greater, non-procedural issues caused by a lack of leadership at another level.

17. Should the enforcement of laws criminalizing marijuana use be among the police department's lowest priorities?

Yes.

Civil Rights

18. Would you support legislation designed to protect gay, lesbian, and transgender people from discrimination in housing, employment, public accommodation, and access to government benefits and services?

Yes.

Personal and Political

19. Have you ever been convicted of any criminal offence other than a minor traffic offense? Have you ever been charged with a felony (without regard to the disposition of the charge)? If the answer to either of these questions is yes, please describe the charge or charges, the circumstances, and the outcome.

No.

20. Is there currently a judgment of debt outstanding against you? *No.*

If so, please explain the circumstances.

21. How are you currently registered to vote? *Democrat.*

Have you ever changed your registration with regard to party status?

Not that I can remember – and I would expect to remember. If so, when, and why?

22. For whom did you vote for in the 2008 and 2012 presidential and gubernatorial elections? *Barack Obama, Beverly Purdue and Walter Dalton.* For whom did you vote in the 2014 U. S. Senate election? *Kay Hagan.*