

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 125

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, met in regular session on Monday, October 9, 1978, at 8:00 o'clock p. m., in Dana Auditorium at Queens College (District 6), with Mayor Kenneth R. Harris presiding, and Councilmembers Don Carroll, Betty Chafin, Tom Cox, Jr., Laura Frech, Harvey B. Gantt, Ron Leeper, Pat Locke, George K. Selden, Jr., H. Milton Short, Jr. and Minette Trosch present.

ABSENT: Councilmember Charlie Dannelly.

\* \* \* \* \*

INVOCATION:

The invocation was given by Councilmember Milton Short.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Leeper, and carried unanimously, to approve the minutes of the Council meeting of October 2, 1978 with the following corrections:

- Page 114, Paragraph 7 of second item - add "and precision";
- Paragraph 10 - add "to be completed".
- Page 115, Bottom of page - add "minimum" after "percent".

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE PROPOSED SALE OF PROPERTIES IN THE FIRST WARD URBAN RENEWAL AREA TO THE UNITED HOUSE OF PRAYER FOR ALL PEOPLE, DEFERRED UNTIL NOVEMBER 6, 1978.

On motion of Councilmember Gantt, seconded by Councilmember Chafin, and unanimously carried, the scheduled public hearings on the proposed sale of properties in the First Ward Urban Renewal Area to the United House of Prayer for All People were deferred until 8:00 o'clock p. m., November 6, 1978, on recommendation of the Community Development Department.

NAMING OF INNER BELT ROAD SENT BACK TO PLANNING STAFF FOR RECOMMENDATION ON AN OVERLAY OR SECONDARY SIGNAGE SYSTEM.

The scheduled public hearing was held on the naming of the Inner Belt Road.

Mr. Fred Bryant, Acting Planning Director, stated that sometime ago he received a memorandum from the City Manager's Office to look at and take into consideration the fact that very shortly the much discussed, over a long period of time, belt road was about to be opened and that it had been noted for sometime that this would create a number of inter-connected name situations that perhaps needed some investigation and some look. That, as a result, the staff of the Planning Commission along with representatives of the Public Works Engineering Department and the Traffic Engineering Department, looked at this matter and submitted back, through the Manager's Office, and in turn to Council, a report which tied together some of the facts that seemed relevant as far as the situation was concerned, along with a recommendation of possible action that could be taken concerning it.

Using a schematic map, he described the circumstances as they exist now and as proposed. Presently there is continuous alignment from North Tryon Street to Sharon Road - Eastway Drive to Independence Boulevard; then Brookhurst to Monroe Road; from there the new, un-named, section to Randolph Road where it picks up Wendover Road to the intersection of Sharon Road.

Sharon Road represents about the only real break in the continuous alignment because it does turn sharply at that point and follows Sharon for a distance to Runnymede Lane; follows Runnymede to Barclay Downs Drive where it picks up a small section of that street to over near Briar Creek, to another new, un-named section, and then picks up on Fairfax Drive and curves over to

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 126

Selwyn. From there it clarifies and gets fairly simple. From Selwyn Avenue it follows the name Woodlawn Road all the way to South Tryon Street which is the physical termination of the roadway at the present time. However, there is a segment which, hopefully, very shortly will be under construction from South Tryon all the way to Interstate 85, generally referred to as Airport Parkway.

He stated that in looking at the situation and trying to bring a little bit of order to it, they considered the only real break point in the circulation - at Sharon Road. They considered where there could be one name to this point and another name from that point on out. That would be the most ideal from the standpoint of the primary objective being to eliminate continuous alignments changing from one street name to another.

He stated there are some significant factors represented in the road names at the present time. For example, Eastway Drive is a very firmly established name. It extends along all types of land use from single family residential, to office, to commercial, to multi-family - a very significant situation as far as that name is concerned. The same thing is true with Wendover - it is a very significant name, very complimentary to the area through which it is located. Then, there is Woodlawn Road and the new section, which if you called it Woodlawn from the break point all the way over, you would lose the advantage of perhaps denoting the airport location with the association of the name "Airport Parkway".

Mr. Bryant stated that to back up just a bit from this most ideal position, he would point out to Council that it would be possible to carry about four names on this entire alignment and still have a reasonable situation as far as identification of location is concerned. That recommendation would be to consider leaving Eastway Drive as it is presently. Then using Independence Boulevard as the break point because of the very significant interchange situation there - a physical identification which is more significant than just a simple street intersection as such - pick up the name Wendover Road at that point and make it the same all the way over to Sharon Road. This would mean changing Brookhurst Drive and the very small section of Beal Street and naming the new sections "Wendover".

On the other end, there is a bit more significant situation by way of change, the suggestion being to extend the name Woodlawn Road continuously from Sharon Road to South Tryon Street. The most significant change there would be changing Runnymede Lane to Woodlawn Road. It would also involve changing a small portion of Barclay Downs although there are no residences or number identifications on that segment. It would also change a small segment of Fairfax Drive and there are a few houses there.

The Airport Parkway indication from South Tryon Street on over would involve no change - it is still to be built, has no official name at the present time and would not affect any changes as far as addresses are concerned. If this type of system was adopted it would, they felt, cause a minimum of disruption in terms of changing existing names.

Mr. Bryant stated there has been a considerable amount of discussion about some alternatives and this bears some investigation and thought. The comment has been made that instead of changing the base names perhaps there could be some sort of overlapping designation such as "Inner Belt Road" assigned. He pointed out that if Council does that he would assume they would leave the base names in place and there would still be the confusion of about ten or so different names.

He stated that over the years one of the things they have had more complaints about, and the type of thing that causes some confusion in the City, has been street names. That in about 1960 something like four hundred names were changed in order to eliminate duplications - this was a very massive undertaking. This is something that, off and on, has required attention as far as name relationships are concerned.

He pointed out that in the process of preparing for the hearing today, they did attempt to send notification to every property owner along streets that would be affected by this type of action, so there should have been ample notification of the intent of this study.

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 127

Mr. Charles Klapheke, 1701 Runnymede Lane, stated the proposal that Mr. Bryant has just given has some heavier implications than he alluded to. First, there is the expense to the people who have businesses in their homes, like name and address recognition and changing letterheads and all the mailing requirements. Secondly, there are two schools on the roads which would have the same problem, and they are both large schools - Selwyn and Alexander Graham. A third point is that all of these roads have names that are meaningful, not only to the residents who live there but to the neighborhoods they define. That point was alluded to in the case of Eastway and it is true of Barclay Downs too.

He stated that all three of these points end up being weighed against one single potential benefit - a more continuous name for a big road. There are no degrees of continuity there; it is very much like squareness. Either something is square or it is not. And, this road is either continuous or it is not. It does not make any difference if there are two names or twenty - if there are more than one you have the same problem. The City Council, or someone, is going to have to come up with some other scheme, unless they come up with one name. They will have to have a secondary name, a color code or some other scheme to get around the road.

He stated this proposal is the first road controversy he has been involved in that gives the maximum aggravation for the minimal amount of benefit. That this proposal contradicts itself; it goes through a discussion of how nice it would be to have continuous names, and all that sort of thing, and therefore all the people who have homes and businesses and residences on some of those segments should give in for the common good; but then, in the interest of the airport, who go to a road that is virgin territory and it gets to pick a new name. What he thinks he wants to say is if he has to give up the name of his road, then the airport ought to give up their selection too. That at least would give consistency to the application of this procedure.

Ms. Pat Rodgers, 4910 Carmel Park Drive, stated the problem we are having on this road really represents a much larger problem. We have at least three major thoroughfare systems at this time, all of which will probably involve name changes since we have taken existing streets, widened and combined them. She stated that what we need is for City Council, or the Planning Commission, to come up with a system of naming these major thoroughfares.

As an example, she stated that no one is complaining because Route 16 starts out as Providence Road, changes its name to Hawthorne, to Elizabeth, to Trade, and to goodness knows what else before it goes out of the northwest side of the City. With these thoroughfares that we are cutting across - this Eastway-Wendover is one; we also have the Rama-Sardis-Fairview, etc. and another one at Kings - we need a citywide system to do this.

Her suggestion is - and she is sure that the Planning Commission can come up with something that will work - is to keep all of the existing names for the people who live along the streets. This way you do not have a disruption of the neighborhoods. There are historic names - Carmel Road was named because of Carmel Presbyterian Church. The church is no longer there and that part of the road is no longer there, but if they could keep all the names the same and then superimpose another quick, simple, easy method - numbers would perhaps get confused with our State highway system; she would propose a color. That, for example, Mr. Klapheke, who just spoke, could live on the Runnymede section of the Blue Route. It is a long road, and dividing it into sections would make it easy to identify segments of it.

She stated this is going to come up again and again; and if we had a citywide system that could take all of these thoroughfares into consideration, they could come up with something that would really be workable.

Mrs. Fran Jenkins, 2919 Sharon Road, stated she has lived in Charlotte for thirty years, and as a citizen would urge Council to try not to destroy neighborhoods but to come up with a color code or another name. She wonders if anyone has tried to find out how much it would cost to put another sign up on the corners where someone might get lost. That she had guests from Los Angeles last week and they found her house on Sharon Road from Woodlawn without any trouble.

October 9, 1978

Minute Book 69 - Page 128

Mr. Lloyd Caudill stated he speaks on behalf of some people on Runnymede who do not wish to live on Woodlawn. He filed a petition with the Clerk, stating it had been signed by most everyone on Runnymede and listed five specific reasons why they were requesting Council not to change the name of Runnymede to Woodlawn. He stated he would urge Council to conclude that Runnymede is as significant a name historically, as well as where it is located, as any other street name we have in Charlotte. That the residents like living on a street with such historical meaning.

Mr. Robert Graney, 1731 Shoreham Drive, stated he lives just around the corner from Wendover where all of the beautiful oaks are. That there is something Council is doing which really bothers him; they bandy this word beltroad around just like it was a penny; they just sort of flip it here and there where it sounds good. That these three major streets they are talking about, they zig-zag and wind, they go up and down and around through all kinds of neighborhoods. The streets are plastered with traffic lights; they pick up every crossroad, side street and driveway they come to. That is not a beltroad! A beltroad is a limited access roadway, of fairly high speed. The term beltroad should be forgotten and done away with. You have a boulevard that picks up all of the streets. You could have the Woodlawn Boulevard, Wendover Boulevard, and Eastway Boulevard. Any reference by the City engineers or the Council, talking about those three streets as a whole, would say the "eastside boulevards". That could be the top sign for the beltroad.

He stated when you say "beltroad" to a lot of people, the first thing they think of when they get in a car is "it's a beltroad, no speed limit, we can go as fast as we want". That is what they are doing down Wendover. When you get away from that term beltroad and call it a boulevard it seems to automatically tell the person they have to slow down a little bit - they are not out there to just go wide open.

He stated that in Lexington, Kentucky, they have an innerbelt and an outerbelt which are true beltroads - they are limited access, fairly high speed and are not full of zigzags and up and down hills. Instead of thinking about beltroad, we should start thinking "boulevard," a nice, pleasant, cleancut name.

Mr. Beverly Freeman, 3049 Fairfax Drive, stated he has written each of the Councilmembers a personal letter expressing his views; that the poor people on the little section of Fairfax really caught the brunt of this beltroad. He stated he had asked each of the Councilmembers to go by and see what was done there. He stated he would like to see that segment, from Sharon Road to Selwyn Avenue named Runnymede Lane.

Councilmember Chafin stated she agrees with what most of the speakers tonight have said. She is not comfortable with the proposal received from the Planning Commission - the four segments, Eastway, Wendover, Woodlawn, Airport Parkway - because in many cases the current street names have special significance to the residence who live there. She also would have to agree with the editorial in the Charlotte News tonight suggesting that in lieu of renaming these various segments, they consider using some kind of secondary signage. She is not sure they should call it the Inner Belt Road; that she agrees with one of the speakers that it is perhaps not a true beltroad. She suggested that they ask the Planning Commission to come back to Council with a recommendation for either a color signage, or some kind of secondary name signage. That clearly, they will have to rename those portions of the road which currently have no names, including the Beal Street portion.

Ms. Chafin moved that they not rename the streets, as recommended, but ask the Planning Commission to come back to Council with a recommendation on a secondary signage system. In other words, they should leave the names as is, with the exception of those portions that are currently un-named and the Beal Street portion as Wendover.

Councilmember Gantt stated he agrees with Ms. Chafin; that the editorial in this afternoon's paper did seem to make a lot of sense. That what Ms. Rodgers just said about a color coding of various routes in the City that tend to

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 129

inter-connect - we have a lot of radials that do that. That this is probably the first circumferential - hence the reason for "beltroad". Even if they were to follow the idea of superimposing an overall name to this but leaving the base name, some of what Mr. Bryant presented would make some sense, in addition to the un-named streets. For example, there are some relatively short segments of streets in there that, because they lack a number of residential units, could be changed to improve the identification process. He would like Ms. Chafin to add to her motion that they look into the areas that do not have large residential areas.

Councilmember Chafin stated they would really be talking about Fairfax and Barclay Downs and she could certainly incorporate that. Councilmember Selden seconded the motion.

Councilmember Short stated the idea of some overlay, some designation, would encompass a variety of names under some systematic type of nomenclature, colors or something and is a good one. That they may recall that he gave Councilmembers a memorandum back in August that suggested they might use some kind of alphabetical system, not only for this but for certain other situations in Charlotte - Third Street, Queens, Selwyn, etc.

That he would hope as a result of this motion that the Planning Commission would consider the overlay idea, not only for this but for possible general use. He stated that Mr. Corbett has advised that this will be rather expensive because of the tremendous number of signs that would have to be done. He would hope that the motion would relate to the idea of the overlay - the color, the alphabetical or whatever - but would not make a determination as to what names would be used and what would be deleted. It seems to him that this matter is important; they have had no reaction time at all on the public hearing. Would Council be interested in just simply letting the name matter not be finally and conclusively handled in this motion, but rather let that matter just go over for a week or so and let the Planning Commission give Council some comment about the overlay type system with colors, alphabet, etc.

Responding to a question from Mr. Gantt on clarification, Mr. Short stated that Ms. Chafin's motion has stated the names of the streets that would be discontinued and he feels it is a little too quick in naming and conclusively designating the names that would be used in this rather confusing situation. He suggested the motion be re-worked a little bit to emphasize the overlay idea, but not conclusively designate the names tonight.

Councilmember Cox stated that basically Ms. Chafin expressed some kind of concern with the staff's recommendation and is giving it back to staff, with the thinking of what he presumes to be most of the members of Council that they would like for staff to take another look at some kind of overlay sequence. In addition to that, come back to Council with another recommendation, or rethinking of the Fairfax-Barclay Downs-Beal Street segments. That he did not hear any kind of decision in that motion. He thinks Ms. Chafin's motion is the proper thing to do - give it back to staff and let them come back.

Mr. Cox stated that, personally, he prefers the thoughts that Councilmember Gantt expressed - that there are just too many segments on that road, and he would think that some consolidation would be in order. That he would personally prefer that they take a hard look at consolidating Fairfax, Barclay Downs and Beal Street into some kind of Runnymede or Wendover segment. That he has not heard too much in this public hearing against that.

Councilmember Selden stated, that in that context, he would like to ask if there are addresses facing on Beal Street and Brookhurst, as well as Fairfax and Runnymede, etc. Mr. Bryant replied there are a number on Brookhurst; there are a few on Beal; that they need to be aware that the section of Fairfax that is now related to the new road is physically separated from the remaining segment and it is not possible to gain access from one section to the other, so certainly a situation like that does need some attention. There are some residences on Fairfax.

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 130

Mr. Burkhalter stated that if the staff goes back and looks at this they should remind Council that if they extend Runnymede up to Selwyn they will cut Barclay Downs in two; and they could keep Barclay Downs as an entity, have Fairfax become Woodlawn and the only change you would have would be the little section of Fairfax. Otherwise, they will change two or three.

Councilmember Chafin stated that what she is really asking is essentially what Mr. Cox said; that her wording may not be as precise as it should be but in response to Mr. Short, she is asking that they send this back to staff to take another look at the naming and that they recommend to Council an overlay or secondary signage system.

Councilmember Trosch stated she would prefer to keep the Brookhurst name, but if, in fact, there is going to be a division there has come to her attention from many residents of District 5 that the logical break there is not Independence Boulevard since you are just riding over an overpass and you would not be aware of where it began and stopped. That Monroe Road just prior to the new portion would be the more appropriate place, if it had to be consolidated. She conceded that the residents do not want Brookhurst changed.

Councilmember Gantt requested that when the Planning Commission looks at this again they keep in mind some of the comments that Mr. Short made about the cost of an overlay system throughout the entire city. That he personally thinks it makes a lot of sense for them to analyze how many of these situations we do have; that it is the kind of thing that can be phased over a period of years, so that a name given to what they have been calling the inner belt ought to have some relationship to the degree of change or the number of similar situations that we have in other parts of the City. That it is something that they can phase over a period of time because we have lived with the Kings Drive, Third Street, etc. for some time and people are more familiar with it, but over the long haul it may need changing - but they need to start with this inner belt situation.

Councilmember Short stated it would certainly help newcomers - Gold Bond, IBM, etc. (and we will certainly have more of them in the future) if we had something on a number of our confusing street continuancies.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF A CONTRACT WITH R. L. POLK & COMPANY FOR STATISTICAL SERVICES FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING DEPARTMENTS, DEFERRED ONE WEEK.

Councilmember Locke moved approval of a contract with R. L. Polk & Company for statistical services for the Community Development and Planning Departments, for a total of \$21,180, in addition to sales taxes. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Chafin.

Councilmember Selden pointed out that in examining the Special Neighborhood Reports included as an agenda attachment, the name of Kings Drive is not included among the streets that should be the ACG. That this is a statistical analysis that he feels warrants some other close examination before they vote it in as the base substance of future decisions. That he would like the opportunity to examine this package in closer detail with respect to the sources, the income data, the accuracy and realisticness of the figures. He made a substitute motion that this matter be deferred for one week. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Gantt.

When asked by the Mayor, Mr. Sawyer indicated that deferral for a week would cause no problems. The vote was taken on the substitute motion and carried unanimously.

PILOT PROGRAM OF ROLL-OUT CONTAINERS FOR RESIDENTIAL REFUSE COLLECTION APPROVED FOR IMPLEMENTATION FOR A THREE-MONTH TEST PERIOD.

Councilmember Chafin moved approval for the implementation of a Pilot Program of Roll-Out Containers for residential refuse collection for a test period of three months on four collection routes, at a cost of \$25,000, as recommended

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 131

by the Public Works Department. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Gantt.

Mr. William B. A. Culp, 700 Mt. Vernon Avenue, stated he represents the Board of Directors of the Dilworth Development Association. That they met the other night and had a very fine presentation from the Public Works Department and the Clean City Committee on the Roll-Your-Own container operation and the Board overwhelmingly voted on a motion to approach the City and be a volunteer neighborhood for a pilot project for this system.

He stated that the Dilworth community is very pleased with all the help that City Council and various City departments have given Dilworth; that their attention to their special needs has always been appreciated; that the Board of Directors felt that this would be an opportunity for Dilworth to volunteer for something that the City was hoping to study with the possibility of implementation at a later date. He recommended that Council vote for this pilot project and, furthermore, that the Dilworth community does volunteer to be a pilot project neighborhood.

Councilmember Gantt asked Mr. Culp if this means that the Dilworth community is in favor of this before they have had the actual experience with it.

Mr. Culp replied that the Board of Directors themselves are in favor of a pilot project in order for the Public Works Department and the Clean City Committee to properly evaluate whether this would be a system that Charlotte would want to implement. That the Board does speak for the Dilworth neighborhood in that they intend to lead the neighborhood in accepting a pilot project of this sort and giving it a fair test. Insofar as to whether it would work in all neighborhoods in Charlotte, that certainly would be something for the professionals and City Council to make a determination on and not the DCDA Board.

Mr. Gantt stated he wonders if they could be considered a disinterested party and whether the information gotten from their neighborhood would be valid if, in fact, they had a preconceived notion that this is what they wanted.

Mr. Culp replied he feels Dilworth is a neighborhood that has a lot of variety in terms of the residents of the neighborhood. They certainly would have ample opportunity to try things such as the special pick-up for elderly and disabled people. They have all income levels. It would be a way of really testing the system and seeing if it could be effectively used all across the City.

Mrs. James M. Gandy, Jr., 1211 Shady Bluff Drive, stated she realizes that this is a recommendation for a pilot program only, but she would like to voice her objections to the idea of curbside pick-up. She is afraid that once the pilot program starts, it will be harder to get this stopped than it would if they would never vote for it in the first place. She enumerated the reasons for her objections.

First of all, she has lived most of her life in Charlotte and has been very proud of Charlotte's ideas of what a beautiful city should be. That for five years she lived in another very beautiful city - Wilmington, North Carolina. She stated that during the time she lived there, Wilmington began a program of curbside garbage collection. There were no uniform cans, as there would be here, but whether those are used has very little to do with what she observed. That these are what she found to be some of the negative aspects of curbside collection.

She stated that as she drove to and from work she was aware that there was one dominant feature on the landscape, and that was garbage cans. The cans were often on the curb for most of the week. There were working people who came home late and either forgot or neglected to take in the garbage cans. The next morning, early, left them out again the next day. So, there were cans out there much more than just the days of garbage collection. She can personally recall days when she carried her own garbage out to the curb and put it in the can because she had left the can out there instead of bringing it to the backyard.

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 132

That in a city like Charlotte, this would mean that if we have two days of garbage collection and a third day of trash collection, and if people do not bring in their cans, there would be cans on the street virtually Monday through Friday.

Another problem that she saw was that it was not the most suburban neighborhoods that seemed to be the most affected by the use of curbside collection - it was the areas closer into town where the lots were small and where there seemed to be just lines of garbage cans. They were usually on the sidewalks; it was a problem for pedestrians, whether they be children on tricycles or elderly walkers or joggers - the cans were just in the way. Sometimes they were damaged, sometimes they were turned over, and it really destroyed the appearance of these neighborhoods.

She has always been very proud of Charlotte's commitment to being a beautiful city; she realizes that they have said in the past that it is important to have the aesthetics to make our environment a comfortable place to live. That they all realize that it costs money; that the amount of money that would be saved on garbage collection does not seem to her to be a major factor. She says that because we have been willing to spend money in the past for such things as lining our streets with trees, with flower beds and with developing beautiful parks such as Marshall Park and many others. All of this has taken a commitment that she hopes Charlotte will continue to have. That if we have street garbage collection, we will undo much of what we have done and we will destroy much of our image as a beautiful city. She says this not just because of what she saw in Wilmington, but recently she visited in Atlanta - her first trip there since they began their service of curbside collection. She commented to her sister who lives there that the first thing she noticed was the garbage cans; then she saw the houses and the lawns. At that time she also commented that Charlotte has done a lot to make garbage collection better; we have worked hard at bagging our garbage and trying to make some things work a little better. She stated she feels Charlotte is committed to keeping the garbage in the backyard. She hopes that Council's vote tonight will prove that she is right.

Councilmember Selden stated that over the last week-end he received thirty-five calls in connection with this situation. The overwhelming predominance identified the appearance at curbside. That in each discussion he pointed out to the constituent that it was very necessary to run the pilot program and see what the situation would be, to see what the appearance would be. He stated that if it is to be introduced, all of the advantages and disadvantages should be identified in public relations material so that the whole city can understand this while the pilot project is going on.

He stated that two questions were raised to him on several contacts. One was "What is the age assumed to be for the elderly in terms of backyard pick-ups?" and "Does the City contemplate replacement of damaged "herbie-curbies" at a later date or is it necessary for the residents to replace them?"

Mr. Robert Hopson, Public Works Director, stated when they studied the other seven cities recently, the ages of course, were divergent; some people at sixty are quite old; and some people at eighty are quite young. In fact, he remembers talking with a young lady of eighty-three down in Atlanta, and she was very happy that at eighty-three she was able to push her herbie-curbie. He stated it should not be tied to a definite age; they should check with the people involved if they go through with the pilot project. They would see if there is someone in the household who can push the container out; if they cannot, they will go ahead and collect it from the backyard. They have found that in the cities where they surveyed, less than 3 percent were not able to pull their containers to the curb.

He stated that if the City decides to go with this program, he would recommend that unless it is run over by an automobile or something - if it is just the normal wear-and-tear, that the City would keep it replaced. Of course, if the City enters into a contract, as the other cities have done, the first five years would be guaranteed - the 80,000 or 100,000 containers. He is concerned that as we go out of that five-year period into the next



October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 133

five years that they go out with excellent containers. That would be part of the contract that he would hope to recommend to City Council, if the pilot project is successful. But, if someone runs over a container or it is damaged by someone beating on it or something like that, then certainly the householder should be responsible for it.

Councilmember Cox stated he received thirty-one calls - thirty, no's and one yes. That he is going to vote to do this because he thinks we need to give it a try - just to get the facts straight. That the point Mr. Selden made is an excellent one - most of the people who called him, or whom he asked about it (80 percent) were confused about the facts. That the City needs to do a "bang-up" job of getting the facts straight with the people as the pilot program is going along.

Another point he would like to make which will indicate his current feeling about the matter is whether or not there is a way it could be deferred until after Christmas. Mr. Burkhalter replied they can do it whenever Council says to. Mr. Cox stated the schedule they had been given indicated a start time of around December and the Christmastime would be a very inconvenient time to have it. This is just a question he would like to raise to see what others think about it.

Councilmember Frech stated she has an open mind as to whether this would be a good idea for Charlotte, although she feels we should try it and she intends to vote for the pilot project. She suggested that having these cans on the street might not be much worse than what we now have sitting out for the Wednesday pick-up. That they are sitting out now much longer than the 24 hours they are supposed to be - assorted boxes, bags, everything under the sun. It is very unsightly on many streets. She is debating whether they can somehow try a penalty for leaving them out, but she knows that is hard to enforce.

She asked if the possibility was considered of the householders having these but still have the sanitation workers go into the backyards and roll them out and back. That would eliminate a problem that has not been talked about - the backbreaking job that the men face. She stated that one of the reasons they are thinking about this is that it is nice to have a beautiful, clean city but she does not know that you can do it by expecting people to do the kind of work that the sanitation workers are having to do, with the risk of injury to their backs, etc.

Mr. Hopson replied that this does away with that from both the householders' viewpoint and the collectors because the garbage is never lifted up into the trucks. He stated there are several reasons for not recommending even a test of the backyards being serviced by these containers. First, there would be no financial saving whatsoever. This has been gone over with the other cities, with the venders and with other people who have tried the product. Secondly, and this is one of their biggest complaints at the present time, is the banging of the smaller containers into automobiles or something. If the householder wheels that container out, he is sure that he or she will take a lot more care than the collectors are "accused" of. He uses that word because a lot of times his workers do not do the damage that they are accused of. That eliminating the need for going into the backyards is one of the biggest things that might be in favor of this system. It would get their collectors out of the backyards, of damaging azalea plants and damaging water spigots and things like that. That they get innumerable complaints of that sort. That if they are going to test the system, let's do it under the best of conditions and then see if we wish to have it.

Ms. Frech asked if Mr. Hopson has an idea how the workers themselves feel about this? Mr. Hopson replied that the newspaper, unbeknownst to him, went out and talked with some of their people and they found them all in favor of it. That WSOC talked with the collectors in Albemarle and apparently, unsolicited, all of the workers over there were in favor of it; that the ones he has talked with are in favor of it, provided none of them lose their positions. He stated that could easily be taken care of because it would take them at least one year after final approval by Council, to get it fully implemented. It will not be an easy job to implement this kind of program. That one of the cities found that just getting the cans

October 9, 1978

Minute Book 69 - Page 134

delivered is a major operation. Another favorable thing would be that the cans will be uniform. He stated he agrees with Mrs. Gandy that we do not want curb service per se; he would not recommend that to Council unless we had a terrible labor shortage as we had in 1970 - they had to do something to get the refuse collected during that time.

Councilmember Leeper stated he was impressed with the criteria they plan to use for the pilot program - trying to identify a broad cross section of the community. He asked if that recommendation will come back to Council on October 30 when the lease arrangement will be considered for approval?

Mr. Hopson replied they will recommend that to Council before they go forward with it; if they cannot get it by October 30; it might push them up a week or two and they would get into the Christmas season. He thinks certainly he wants to advise Council of what they recommend, and if Councilmembers have suggestions, they should give them to the City Manager because they would like to look into these things. That Ms. Williams, the coordinator of the project, is getting calls from people in the neighborhoods stating they would like to be considered. That this is very important - if there are volunteers like Dilworth that they be considered, but they do want a cross section of the city.

Councilmember Leeper asked if at this point citizens have been identified who will not be able to participate by rolling their containers out front? Mr. Hopson replied no, but wherever the areas are designated, they will check each home and if there is a complaint that they cannot roll it out, then they will look into that and if they cannot do it, then they will certainly go into the yard and get it.

Mr. Leeper stated that looking ahead, even if Council decides to implement this program, we would have to identify each home where this would be the situation? Mr. Hopson stated that some of the cities had a small mark on the curb - some objections to that is that it tells where handicapped or elderly people live; some have a wooden stake set up by the house. They would devise some way like that so that a new collector would know this. They would, of course, have this information in the record books also.

Mr. Leeper stated he really does not feel too comfortable with that identifying of where handicapped people live, by giving someone else this same opportunity to identify that. He hopes we can find some other way of doing this. Mr. Hopson stated they will need some easy method for their old and new crews; that they will work on that problem.

Mayor Harris asked if they will be able to identify the cans by address? Mr. Hopson replied the cans will be numbered consecutively and this will be kept in their records. If someone moves, that number will either be designated back to that home or they will put it at the end of the system again. He stated the cities which have implemented this have found very few cans stolen, although they have found times when people put them on the moving vans and took them with them.

Mr. Graney, a citizen who had spoken earlier, asked if a special type of pick-up truck would be required to handle these cans? Mr. Hopson replied the present equipment can be used with a special hoist installed - the present load packers are serviceable. Responding to another question from Mr. Graney, Mr. Hopson stated this system should make the Wednesday trash pick-up much simpler. That the wives who do most of the shrubbery work around our homes, will certainly want to use these containers to push around - that they will be a real help in that area.

Councilmember Carroll asked, if the program is adopted, how does he propose to finance the implementation of the program (after the pilot)? Mr. Hopson replied he would have to defer that to the budget officer; that he does not know that a decision has been made on that yet.

Mr. Finnie stated this is something that has not been studied thoroughly yet; that, of course, there are some large savings that have been identified with this type of service. That generally speaking, the other cities they have talked with, or have statistics from indicate that the system will pay

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 135

itself off over a three-year period. That in some tentative discussions he has had with Mr. Hopson, their idea has been that this system itself would be implemented over a period of years - two, three or something like that - because you simply cannot attrition off people that fast. It may well be that the savings will pay the system off as you go. He will not promise that, but there will be some overlapping and some savings as you go along.

Mr. Carroll asked if the Budget Director is visualizing, if the program is implemented, doing it without any additional increase in the budget? Mr. Finnie replied he cannot say that, because, particularly in the first year, they are going to have to have some initial start-up costs that savings will not offset, but he thinks it will not be a matter of having to come up with the start-up costs for the entire system all at one time. That after the first year the savings should start paying for subsequent years. That he will say, from a very rough rule-of-thumb, that perhaps a third of the total cost, or as much as a half, might have to be put up on the front end. The rest of it should pay for itself.

Mr. Carroll asked how much that would be, and Mr. Finnie replied he does not know; that they have talked about a total cost of roughly \$3.0 million for the entire system, so they would be talking about somewhere around \$1.0 or \$1.5 million start-up cost, for the first year. That is a very, very rough estimate - all they are coming with now is the test program.

Councilmember Cox stated that is working capital type money; not gone-forever type money? Mr. Finnie replied that is correct; it will pay itself off, of course, very rapidly; in fact, after the first year, the savings will probably pay for the second and third years, and after that it would be "gravy all the way."

Councilmember Carroll stated it is his understanding that the appropriation that would be necessary to carry out the pilot program will come out of the existing budget? Mr. Finnie replied that is correct.

Mr. Floyd Fowler, 5901 Idlebrook Drive, stated that some of the concerns he had have already been raised, but in this discussion they are saying that we will realize a savings. He would like to ask who will realize a savings, and if, in fact, this is a savings? Are they not actually saying that we are calling on each and every resident who is able bodied to perform increments of work that we have been able to have done for them by the City Sanitation Department. They are paying their taxes; they are asking that the City remove the garbage from their backyards; now the City is asking them "Why don't you do part of the work for us; we will call this a savings." Where do we get the savings? The citizens will be doing the work. He does not understand the savings.

Another point - the citizen is to pay for this herbie-curbie if it is damaged. He stated they cannot keep a mailbox on their street; people ride down the street with a baseball bat and remove the mailbox from its position. This would be a much larger target. Will the citizen be responsible for this kind of damage? He agrees with Mr. Cox that some public education is in order; he certainly does not understand the facts; he is bitterly opposed to it. He stated he travels, he has seen this in Cherryville, N. C., in Lancaster, in Albemarle - it is unsightly. The comment was made that the first thing you see is this trash container - that is factual, it is the first thing you see at a house. This is not the way he wants his home represented. He wonders why Christmas is a bad time - why is this Christmas bad? What about next Christmas? If we have these on the curb, it will be every Christmas. He wants to go on record as being bitterly opposed to it, and would like to explore further these savings, which have thus far eluded him.

Mayor Harris stated to Mr. Fowler that he has not had the privilege of the hour and a half meeting that Council had on the subject. That will be the benefit of the trial period. That the savings that will be realized is of course, to reduce the possibility of increased taxes for any of our services that are of heavy labor intensity. This is really what they are talking about.

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 136

Councilmember Cox stated to Mr. Fowler that the reason he is voting for it is that he has heard a lot of people say that they are opposed to it and he wants to see exactly what the installation experiences of these people are. That it is like selling; this is what the salesman promised, and he wants to see what it is really like. It is the only way that he knows how to make a decision regarding this kind of issue. That the three-month trial period is for him a good investment of our money to see whether the three-year payback is a good investment.

Mayor Harris stated that this experiment really came out of the Productivity Study by the business community. It was felt that this would be a more productive method of collecting garbage in our city.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

POLICY FOR STORM DRAINAGE REPAIRS AND CONSTRUCTION APPROVED UPON APPROVAL OF THE BOND REFERENDUM ON NOVEMBER 7, 1978.

Motion was made by Councilmember Chafin and seconded by Councilmember Selden, to approve a policy for storm drainage repairs and construction to be effective upon approval of the bond referendum on November 7, 1978.

Councilmember Trosch asked why the entire cost of the special assessment method is born by the property owners, and not the same proportional cost as in the petition methods? It would be the same type of dealing with the problem, but one would be brought on by a specific incident of danger or health? Councilmember Short replied that the full assessment procedure is really just an exercise in open government. The Legislature has given this power and this authority. We have it. Council does not really have to vote it; they just have it, and if they are going to lay out policies and make citizens think Council is presenting to them the full statement or policy about how drainage could be handled, then he thinks we owe it to them to include this full assessment procedure the Legislature has made available to all cities. It is intended to be upon vote of Council time by time, or episode by episode, to handle rather critical situations such as terrible floods that are endangering homes and so forth. If Council is going to present the entire story of flooding in their policies, they should include this because the Legislature, in effect, wished it upon us, and we have it.

Councilmember Trosch asked if you had a health condition or a problem in a neighborhood, and they decided to petition to get a 2/3-1/3 division as opposed to the full assessment? If you had a situation where you had a particular problem where there is a health condition that you had to correct, and you went to that area and what she reads this to say is the total project cost will be assessed to all property owners in the drainage basin. Then the people found that out and said they would petition to correct their problem, and get a 2/3-1/3 division of the cost with the City paying the 2/3 by the petition method? Councilmember Short replied if citizens want to do it, he feels they should have the option to do it. On the other hand if there is an extreme situation, and we have to jump into it, then we might as well use the policies the Legislature has stated. They are available if we want to use them.

Councilmember Gantt stated he has some of the same questions. That he kept reading the petition method and the special assessment method. And he wondered, unless there was a geographical distinction between, in terms of the size of the drainage basin, to cause one method to be chosen over another. He would always as a citizen in a community having some problems choose the petition method simply because he is going to get help, and he only has to put up 1/3 of the amount of money. It occurred to him he was missing something in terms of distinction between drainage problems that would come under a special assessment method and the drainage problem that would be handled through the petition of the citizens. He asked Mr. Readling, City Engineer, to explain. Or are we simply talking about one would be where the City itself defined there was a problem related to the public's health and safety of a community, and they went in and specially assessed that property or handled the property, and allocated the cost equally among the citizens. In that case it would be Council's initiative to resolve the problem. If the citizens are active enough,

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 137

and he guesses the reward is to the citizen group that defines the problem and brings it to our attention, they then will get 2/3 help. Somewhere along the line, equity does not seem to be quite there, and he has a problem with that.

Mr. Reading replied what Mr. Gantt said last is correct. In the case of a petition, the initiative is with the citizens. City Council would receive a petition, and then there would be a 2/3-1/3 sharing of the cost. In the second case, there is no petition. The Council may find in the case of a health condition or a problem injurious to property and/or life safety. Council may find that this project must be done, and that the cost should be shared by the citizens in the basin, and the cost paid 100 percent by the citizens.

Councilmember Gantt stated a smart district councilmember would notify his neighborhoods and get a lot of points by telling them to hurry up and petition the Council because they are about to be specially assessed.

Councilmember Leeper stated one of the reasons they came to that conclusion was at some point in time there may be a number of citizens living in a particular drainage basin where one citizen feels there is a need to do some improvements, and a number of others who live in that particular basin who say they are not affected as bad as the other, and they can live with their problem. That way the City can come in and say this is a real problem and the city is going to have to rectify the problem, and they will be included in the payment plan. This is sort of a back-up.

Councilmember Leeper stated he has one concern about paragraph (e) in the On-site residential matter. That is property owners will be required to supply the deposit for the estimated cost in advance of construction. He would like for them to take another look at that even though there might be some citizens who have some real problems and need some help from the City in terms of trying to rectify that problem. He is concerned they might try to look at some other way in terms of trying to give that citizen some relief without asking him to put all the money up front. He is not sure Council can do that; but that is his area of concern.

Councilmember Frech asked, pertaining to the difference between the petition and the special assessment, if perhaps even in a special assessment project the City should agree to their part of the cost? Councilmember Selden replied no; the City does not have anything to do with the assessment of the property. Ms. Frech replied she understood; but she is wondering whether it would be fair for the City to say it would pay part of it.

Councilmember Selden stated first of all if we only had the petition method there would very likely be a high degree of resistance on the part of some who actually contribute to the problem, and who are not in the immediate area of damage. On the other hand, if the applicability of damage is severe enough where-by the Council would take action and assess all the persons in the basin, this in itself would be persuasive of those persons on the periphery. The ability to get a 51% on the petition is jeopardized without the special assessment method.

Councilmember Frech stated this is in the way of a threat, then! Councilmember Selden replied it is not a threat; but is a means of accomplishing something that needs to be done. Councilmember Frech asked if he is saying this would have to be left as it is in order to persuade people they should petition? Mr. Selden replied it is an encouragement; not a threat.

Councilmember Gantt asked why we cannot specially assess and say we will bear two-thirds of the cost? Councilmember Selden replied that would still put Council in a position of deciding what is a problem, and what is not a problem.

Councilmember Frech stated that this is what Council is going to do. If Council is going to decide there is a health condition or a problem injurious to property, she thinks maybe the City should say it will bear one-third of it. Councilmember Selden replied there are those areas which really need to be treated which are not in danger of health or property so to speak. In other words, there are various stages of criticalness of the situation; there are varying portions of the population within the area of stress. There are practically no situations where the persons directly affected are anywhere near 51% of the total population

in the basins; yet there needs to be some way to accomplish this. They will not get the petition if they do the assessment on a 2/3 basis.

Councilmember Carroll stated he thinks Councilmembers Frech and Gantt have a good point which he does not believe the Committee focused on too much. That he thinks at this stage, somewhat a mute point in that the special assessment methods as he understands it is not a policy that Council is about to adopt; it is a policy we have. We want to enforce it. The question they have raised is perhaps if the other two methods are not fruitful after our bonds pass, do we want to also put a little carrot in with the special assessment. As he understands from the city attorney it would be possible for us to pay 1/3, 1/2 or 2/3 and assess the rest to the people in the basin. It would seem to him we want to get a little track record on this new proposal first; but we may very well want to come back and re-examine it later. Councilmember Frech asked even with the policy as worded, we could do it? Mr. Carroll replied yes.

Councilmember Frech stated under the petition method, it says the city will pay for the entire cost of drainage facilities in city maintained streets. Does that include the right-of-way, which is not actually the street? Mr. Readling replied it does. Mrs. Frech stated below it says that maintenance of pipe improvements would be by the city on a called basis, open channels and ditches will be maintained by the property owners. Again will the ditches and channels on the city right of way be maintained by the city? Mr. Readling replied on the city right of way it would be maintained by the city.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

#### ACTIONS TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT FOR THE CHARLOTTE FIRE DEPARTMENT TO ACT AS FIRST RESPONDERS TO EMERGENCY MEDICAL CALLS.

The following actions were taken to enter into an agreement with Mecklenburg County for the Charlotte Fire Department to act as first responders to emergency medical calls:

1. A motion was made by Councilmember Short, seconded by Councilmember Gantt, adopting Ordinance No. 352-X to transfer funds from the General Fund Contingency for additional equipment and personnel in the Fire Department for a total of \$58,096.

Councilmember Carroll asked that the motion include an amendment, which had been listed separately, providing for the reimbursement of costs for the services to the City by Mecklenburg County on an annual basis. He stated that although these were given as two separate items, they are most easily dealt with as one in the sense that you do not appropriate the money and then ask the County to reimburse us - that it should be done at the same time.

Mr. Short stated he felt that if Council adopted the three separate items at one meeting, synonymously, it would really constitute one action. Mayor Harris asked for clarification from Mr. Burkhalter, stating that he feels the amendment is really for operating costs as such, not for additional people. Mr. Burkhalter replied he thinks they are the same; that the positions are necessary to do the operating. Mayor Harris stated he was talking about the additional cost over and above that; in other words, the higher number of calls, etc. from the standpoint of responses. That these positions are dispatchers. Mr. Burkhalter stated they are necessary because of the additional number of calls which is operating cost, really.

Mayor Harris asked if he was saying that the amendment is charging and asking the County to pick up additional costs for the number of calls made by the trucks? Mr. Burkhalter's answer was that it is for the additional manpower necessary to respond as the contract calls for.

Mr. Burkhalter stated that perhaps some explanation is in order. That the amendment was included when the Mayor and others indicated to him

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 139

that there had been some indication on the part of the County Commissioners to pay for the cost of operating this system. That in the negotiations at the staff level stage, they talked about the cost at all times, but the staff did not recommend to the County that they pay the cost. That they were asked to provide this amendment in order to ask the County to reimburse us for the cost - they have the opportunity to pass it without this amendment, or with it.

Mayor Harris stated the only question the County Commissioners he talked with had was whether the City Manager could give an estimate of the annual figure - the additional cost; how much the County would pay annually under this total agreement. Mr. Burkhalter replied that for this year it will be \$58,095. Councilmember Gantt asked if that was from November 1 through June 30?

Mr. Tom Finnie, Budget Director, stated that is correct; it would be for the remainder of the year and the additional cost would be approximately \$58,000. Mayor Harris asked if they were going to charge for the additional operation of the trucks, etc.? Mr. Finnie replied yes, that includes some additional costs for the operation; it does not, of course, include a cost for the firemen who are on the trucks or anything like that, but it does include some additional money for gas, equipment, bandages, etc. and the four additional positions; also preventive maintenance on those trucks and equipment.

Mr. Burkhalter stated that maybe the confusion exists because originally they were given the overall cost of the firemen - what it actually cost everytime they went out, but obviously we are not adding any firemen; but they will have to add dispatcher service and will have to add mechanical service if they run these trucks.

Mayor Harris stated then the \$58,000 figure would be the total cost to the County this year; they are not going to charge them with a "per call"? Mr. Finnie replied that is correct, for the remainder of this year only. The Mayor stated that the question the County has raised is what is the annual estimate for next year - for a full year's operation under this agreement? Mr. Finnie stated it would be a little under \$100,000; and confirmed the Mayor's statement "\$100,000 on the outside".

Councilmember Carroll stated he just wanted to know if Councilmember Short would mind making his motion to adopt the ordinance subject to the amendment which would be added as Paragraph 7 of our agreement with the County? Mr. Short agreed to include the amendment.

Councilmember Leeper stated he would just like to ask one question of Chief Lee; that it is in regard to Dispatcher 2. That it seems to him that they are requesting a position to simply serve when other supervisors are on vacation, sick leave, or times when the supervisor is off. They are talking about a \$3,000 difference between a Dispatcher 1 and a Dispatcher 2. Chief Lee stated that is correct.

Councilmember Leeper asked if he ever used a Dispatcher 1, serving in a supervisory capacity, just for a time when someone was on vacation or something? Chief Lee replied yes, they have; this personnel request does not reflect a growth; it represents a stabilization across the 24-hour spectrum of all positions. Councilmember Leeper asked the number of shifts they operate and the Chief replied three. Councilmember Leeper asked then he would need an additional supervisor even though he is not increasing the number of shifts? Chief Lee replied they are increasing the traffic; that where they have not had to have a Dispatcher 2 at all times on the console, because of the increase in traffic, they feel it incumbent on them to do so as the growth is perpetuated. He stated they are not planning to do this at one fell swoop, but as the need is indicated - as the build-up of traffic occurs.

Councilmember Leeper asked what a Dispatcher 2 would do if no one was on vacation or out on sick leave? Chief Lee replied this is getting into a rather complex operation, that they are not talking about just

dispatching, they are talking about increasing the work load where a substantial work load already exists. They do things other than dispatch fire apparatus. They carry out other functions.

Mr. Leeper stated he just needed to clear that up in his mind; that he had one other question. That we are probably getting a lot of calls now and probably the need for an additional dispatcher is there because people understand that the Fire Department is first responder. That once the County sets up their system and gets a central dispatching system somewhere, would we expect to see a decrease in phone calls to the Fire Department? Chief Lee replied no, they will still receive every phone call for emergency assistance by telephone. They will merely be intercepted; they will, in fact, be dispatched by the County C-MED.

Councilmember Frech stated that in the agreement, in the section that talks about insurance, it is not quite clear to her at that point. That it says the Fire Department will not enter into this unless the activities are covered by general liability insurance, medical errors and omission insurance (giving the amounts); that errors and omissions insurance should be furnished by the County. Does that also mean the general liability - that the County is furnishing all insurance? Chief Lee stated that they are already covered for general liability.

The vote was taken on the motion as amended and it carried unanimously.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 26, at Page 299.

2. An agreement with Mecklenburg County to allow the Charlotte Fire Department to act as first responder to emergency medical calls was approved with the amendment that costs for the services will be reimbursed to the City by the County on an annual basis, on motion by Councilmember Trosch, seconded by Councilmember Carroll, and carried unanimously.



October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page -141

APPOINTMENTS TO CHARLOTTE AREA FUND, BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

(a) Councilmember Locke moved that City Council suspends its rules and elect Mr. Thomas Ingram to a one year term on the Charlotte Area Fund, Board of Directors. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Short, and carried unanimously.

Mayor Harris advised that Mr. Ingram has been re-appointed to the Charlotte Area Fund Board of Directors for a one year term

(b) The following nominations were considered for a one year term to fill Edna Gaston's expiring term:

- 1.) Edna Gaston nominated by Councilmember Dannelly
- 2.) Delores Smalls nominated by Councilmember Gantt
- 3.) Paul McBroom nominated by Councilmember Carroll

The results of the first ballot are as follows:

- 1.) Edna Gaston - 3 votes - Councilmembers Short, Chafin and Locke.
- 2.) Delores Smalls - 3 votes - Councilmembers Gantt, Cox and Selden
- 3.) Paul McBroom - 4 votes - Councilmembers Frech, Carroll, Leeper and Trosch.

The nominees receiving the tie votes were considered with the following results:

- 1.) Edna Gaston - 3 votes - Councilmembers Chafin, Locke and Short.
- 2.) Delores Smalls - 7 votes - Councilmembers Carroll, Gantt, Trosch, Cox, Selden, Frech and Leeper.

The two nominees receiving the highest votes were considered on a second ballot with the following results:

- 1.) Paul McBroom - 6 votes - Councilmembers Carroll, Chafin, Short, Leeper, Frech and Trosch.
- 2.) Delores Smalls - 4 votes - Councilmembers Locke, Gantt, Cox and Selden.

Mayor Harris advised that Mr. McBroom received a majority vote, and has been appointed to the Charlotte Area Fund Board of Directors for a one year term.

(c) The following nominations were considered for a one year term to fill Art Lynch's expiring term:

- 1.) Freddie Dewalt nominated by Councilmember Leeper.
- 2.) Ella Talley nominated by Councilmember Dannelly.
- 3.) Eddie Byers nominated by Councilmember Short.

The results of the first ballot are as follows:

- 1.) Freddie Dewalt - 3 votes - Councilmembers Carroll, Leeper and Cox.
- 2.) Ella Talley - 2 votes - Councilmembers Chafin and Gantt.
- 3.) Eddie Byers - 5 votes - Councilmembers Short, Locke, Frech, Selden and Trosch.

The two nominees receiving the highest votes were considered on a second ballot, with the following results:

- 1.) Freddie Dewalt - 4 votes - Councilmembers Gantt, Carroll, Leeper and Cox.
- 2.) Eddie Byers - 6 votes - Councilmembers Short, Chafin, Locke, Selden, Trosch and Frech.

Mayor Harris advised that Mr. Byers received a majority vote and has been appointed for a one year term to the Charlotte Area Fund Board of Directors.

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page -142

CONTRACT WITH STROUPE SECURITY PATROL, INC. FOR SECURITY GUARD SERVICE FOR AMAY JAMES, BELMONT AND GREENVILLE NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS EXTENDED FOR ONE YEAR.

On motion of Councilmember Chafin, seconded by Councilmember Selden, and carried unanimously, approval was given to a one-year extension to the contract with Stroupe Security Patrol, Inc., in the amount of \$2,366.95 per month, for security guard service for Amay James, Belmont and Greenville Neighborhood Centers.

CONTRACT WITH SDI SECURITY SYSTEM FOR ELECTRONIC SECURITY AT AMAY JAMES, BELMONT, GREENVILLE AND ALEXANDER STREET CENTERS EXTENDED FOR ONE YEAR.

On motion of Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Short, and carried unanimously, approval was given to a one-year extension to the contract with SDI Security System, in the amount of \$60.00 per month, for electronic security at Amay James, Belmont, Greenville and Alexander Street Centers.

AWARD OF CONTRACTS.

(a) Upon motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Selden, and carried unanimously, contract was awarded the low bidder, L. B. Foster Company, in the amount of \$27,301.65, on a unit price basis, for various sizes of galvanized steel pipe.

The following bids were received:

L. B. Foster Company	\$27,301.65
Parnell-Martin Company	27,336.47
Atlas-Ferguson Supply Company	27,663.60
Noland Company	27,934.00
Crane Supply Company	28,086.31
Dillon Supply Company	33,064.54

(b) Upon motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Chafin, and carried unanimously, contract was awarded to the only bidder, Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, in the amount of \$26,004.31, on a unit price basis, for Scotchlite material.

(c) Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Frech, to award a contract to the low bidder, Crouch Brothers House Moving Contractors, Inc., on a lump sum price basis, in the amount of \$52,050.00, for the relocation of five houses in the First Ward Community Development area.

Councilmember Selden pointed out that this was the low of three bids and it represents an average of \$10,400 per house to be relocated. That in their calculations of cost of rehabilitation they have generally assumed \$5,000 for relocation in relation to rehabilitation. That this is a more realistic evaluation of cost of relocation and that their data with respect to relocation and rehabilitation has been understated.

The vote was taken on the motion to award the contract and carried unanimously.

The following bids were received:

Crouch Brothers House Moving Contractors, Inc.	\$52,050.00
Bare Brothers, Inc.	73,780.00
Widenhouse House Movers	84,000.00

CONSIDERATION OF CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY LOCATED ON ALBEMARLE ROAD BELONGING TO JUNKER HEIRS, DEFERRED FOR ONE WEEK.

Motion was made by Councilmember Chafin, seconded by Councilmember Gantt, to authorize condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Elizabeth C. Junker; R. Norman Junker; George C. Junker; Harrell McDonald Junker; Carolyn J. Irwin and Rebecca J. Griffin, located at 7400-7408 Albemarle Road, in the City of Charlotte, for the Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer Project, as recommended by the Utility Department.

Councilmember Short made a substitute motion, seconded by Councilmember Locke, that the matter be deferred for one week. Mr. Short stated that this is a matter that has been before the City Council for some years. That he does not think it will do any harm and he would like to talk with Mr. Norman Junker again about this and was unable to reach him today. That Mr. Junker claims that this sewer line does not serve his property, but runs across his property and that there are certain reasons why it could be re-routed to property that it will be serving.

Councilmember Trosch stated that in the information they received it states there are a number of heirs and "the ones contacted" - does that mean we only contact a few heirs and that several of them will get this notice of condemnation and that perhaps the others could have been convinced if they had known it was going to happen?

Mr. Short stated the person who is handling this is a local attorney and he is one of the heirs and confirmed a statement by Ms. Trosch that, in essence, then they had all been contacted.

Mr. Lee Dukes, Utility Director, stated he has no objection to Mr. Short's request. That it is one that Mr. Short was approached on in 1974 in trying to get this property for a development. Then the gentleman who wanted to develop it backed out. It has come up now as an annexation project. They have no objection whatsoever if it is deferred so that Mr. Short can contact Mr. Junker.

The vote was taken on the motion for deferral and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY BELONGING TO LEROY CLARK AND WIFE, EDITH M. CLARK, ON DOGWOOD DRIVE, FOR THE ANNEXATION AREA 8 SANITARY SEWER PROJECT.

Motion was made by Councilmember Chafin, seconded by Councilmember Trosch, and carried unanimously, adopting the subject resolution to authorize condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Leroy Clark and wife, Edith M. Clark, located at the 2500 block of Dogwood Drive, in the City of Charlotte, for the Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer Project.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 467.

CONSENT AGENDA APPROVED WITH DELETION OF CERTAIN ITEMS.

Motion was made by Councilmember Frech, seconded by Councilmember Selden, and unanimously carried, to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Items 20(g) through (q).

The following items were approved:

- (a) Resolution of Intent to close a portion of West Stonewall Street and setting the date for a Public Hearing as November 6, 1978, at 8:00 o'clock p. m.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 468.

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 144

- (b) Adoption of a Resolution authorizing the refund of certain taxes, in the total amount of \$2,458.39, which were collected through clerical error and illegal levy against fifteen tax accounts.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 469.

- (c) Approval of a Loan Agreement with Lee's Plastering Service, Inc., Sylvester Lee, Jr., President and Owner, in the amount of \$40,000.
- (d) Approval of a contract for Real Estate Broker's Services with Mr. William H. Troutman, in Brooklyn Urban Renewal Project.
- (e) Adoption of the following ordinances ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash, rubbish, junk and abandoned motor vehicles from properties in the City:

- (1) Ordinance No. 353-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 2034 Artwood Lane;
- (2) Ordinance No. 354-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish from premises at 2628 West Boulevard.
- (3) Ordinance No. 355-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish at 1614 Pondella Drive.
- (4) Ordinance No. 356-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 6735 Glenmoor Drive.
- (5) Ordinance No. 357-X ordering the removal of rubbish and miscellaneous junk at 400 block of Alcott Street.
- (6) Ordinance No. 358-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish at 3723 Monroe Road.
- (7) Ordinance No. 359-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass and miscellaneous junk at 2520 Laburnum Avenue.
- (8) Ordinance No. 360-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass at 3131 Monroe Road.
- (9) Ordinance No. 361-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish at 1244 South Kings Drive.
- (10) Ordinance No. 362-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 320 East Park Avenue.
- (11) Ordinance No. 363-X ordering the removal of an abandoned motor vehicle at 3401 Rogers Street.
- (12) Ordinance No. 364-X ordering the removal of abandoned motor vehicles at 1319 Karendale Avenue.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 26, beginning on Page 300.

- (f) Adoption of the following ordinances affecting housing declared "unfit" for human habitation:

- (1) Ordinance No. 365-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 5219 Hoover Drive.
- (2) Ordinance No. 366-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 1209 North Allen Street.
- (3) Ordinance No. 367-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 800 Woodside Avenue.
- (4) Ordinance No. 368-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 1030 Roy Street.
- (5) Ordinance No. 369-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 1229 Louise Avenue.
- (6) Ordinance No. 370-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 131-33 South Irwin Street.
- (7) Ordinance No. 371-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 332-34 Lillington Avenue.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 26, beginning on Page 312.

- (g) Approval of the exchange of Right of Way Agreement with Duke Power Company for right of way that is no longer needed for the Independence Freeway in Pearl Street Park.

(h) Approval of the following property transactions for Douglas Municipal Airport expansion:

- (1) Acquisition of 21,900 sq. ft. of property, with one story, single family brick residence, at 3821 Besser Drive, from Henry L. Cox and wife, Kathy C., at \$46,000.
- (2) Acquisition of 38,750 sq. ft. of property with one story, single family brick residence, at 3620 Besser Drive, from Wyatt E. Nance, and wife, Ruby P., at \$40,000.

(i) Approval of the following property transactions:

- (1) Acquisition of 15' x 21.58' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 5848 Freedom Drive, from Gary Y. Greene, at \$114.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (2) Acquisition of 15' x 422.14' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement at 567 Lundy Lane, from Eugene C. Williams and wife, Ethelene G., at \$7,500.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (3) Acquisition of 15' x 272.99' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement on 20.77 acres at end of Barcliffe Drive, at \$273.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.
- (4) Acquisition of 15' x 505.21' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement at 4900 block of Hobbs Hill Road, from W. T. Minor, Jr. and wife, Kathleen M., at \$506.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.
- (5) Acquisition of 15' x 439.89' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement at 1228 Marlwood Circle, from C. C. Austin and wife, Ruth H., at \$1,000.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.
- (6) Acquisition of 15' x 350.04' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement at 5600 block of Robinhood Road, from C. C. Austin and wife, Ruth, at \$1,000.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.

ACQUISITIONS OF PROPERTY FOR BUS RIDER SHELTERS AND BENCH SITES.

Motion was made by Councilmember Trosch, seconded by Councilmember Gantt, to approve the following property transactions:

- (a) Acquisition of 5' x 10' of perpetual easement at 301 Billingsley Road, from Mecklenburg County, at \$1.00, for Proposed Bus Passenger Shelter.
- (b) Acquisition of 5' x 10' of perpetual easement at northeast corner of Scott Avenue and Blythe Boulevard, from Charlotte Mecklenburg Hospital Authority, at \$1.00, for Proposed Bus Rider Shelter.
- (c) Acquisition of 5' x 12' of perpetual easement on northeasterly side of Blythe Boulevard, across from Memorial Hospital Service Entrance, from Charlotte Mecklenburg Hospital Authority, at \$1.00, for Proposed Bus Rider Shelter.
- (d) Acquisition of 10' x 15' of perpetual easement at 1620 Booksvale Street, from The Housing Authority of the City of Charlotte, at \$1.00, for Bus Passenger Shelter Site.
- (e) Acquisition of 6' x 15' of perpetual easement at 1301 South Boulevard, from The Housing Authority of the City of Charlotte, at \$1.00, for Bus Passenger Shelter Site.
- (f) Acquisition of 6' x 15' of perpetual easement at 821 Seigle Avenue, from The Housing Authority of the City of Charlotte, at \$1.00, for Bus Passenger Shelter Site.
- (g) Acquisition of 6' x 15' of perpetual easement at 3400 Griffith Street, from The Housing Authority of the City of Charlotte, at \$1.00, for Bus Passenger Shelter Site.
- (h) Acquisition of 4' x 10' of perpetual easement at 1201 Elizabeth Avenue, from Central Piedmont Community College, at \$1.00, for Bus Passenger Shelter Site.
- (i) Acquisition of 2' x 6' of perpetual easement at 1001 Beatties Ford Road, from Emery L. Rann, M. D., at \$1.00, for Bus Passenger Bench Site.

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 146

- (j) Acquisition of 2' x 6' of construction easement at 1506 West Boulevard, from Westover Shopping Center, at \$1.00, for Bus Passenger Bench site.
- (k) Acquisition of 2' x 6' of construction easement at South Kings Drive, at Luther Street, for John M. Dwelle and Elephare D. Zimmerman, at \$1.00, for Bus Passenger Bench site.

Councilmember Trosch stated she is very excited about seeing this happen. She asked about the number of locations yet to be decided on; and about the "Mean Green Shuttle Machine" - stating a lot of people wait in certain areas for that and if there is any particular location that these would be appropriate for, since that is the highest bus ridership route that we have with a large number of people standing on the edge of Sharon Amity.

Mayor Harris expressed surprise that this item was on the agenda as he has not seen a report. Mr. Burkhalter indicated that a report had been made showing the sites but he does not know that it told how they were chosen.

Mr. Mike Kidd, Transit Planner, stated some proposed service standards came to Council in the past month or so that speak to location of shelters and benches. The Transit Development Program also set up some criteria which were repeated in the service standards, based on boardings and other factors. These were taken into consideration in the placement of these first fourteen shelters. They were in a grant from two years ago.

Mayor Harris stated that is very good and he is glad to see them moving ahead.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

#### COUNCIL RULES SUSPENDED TO CONSIDER NON-AGENDA ITEM.

On motion of Councilmember Chafin, seconded by Councilmember Locke, and unanimously carried, Council rules were suspended in order to consider the following item.

CONTRACTS FOR THE CONTINUATION OF PROGRAM OPERATIONS OF CETA TITLES I, II, III, AND VI RETROACTIVE TO OCTOBER 1, 1978 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 1978, AS AUTHORIZED BY THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, UTILIZING CARRYOVER FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,385,674, PENDING CONGRESSIONAL ACTION TO APPROVE THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION FOR OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY FOR FUNDING ALLOCATION TO THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1979.

Councilmember Locke moved approval of the subject contracts with the attachments. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Chafin.

Mr. Robert Person, Employment and Training Director, expressed appreciation to Council for considering this matter tonight, because they have been operating illegally since October 1st. That, of course, Congress still has not acted. He stated they have worked pretty diligently to pull together what they think is a good package for continuing. That even though they have received information from the Department of Labor that they have permission to borrow money from wherever they can - banks, city, or whatnot - they have gone through all of their budgets and all of their titles; that the information Council has before them is pretty accurate. That is, that they are able to use existing funds, carryover dollars for Titles I and III for the first quarter of this year (through December 31). They have enough dollars in the Public Service Employment Program, Title II, to carry them through the first week in November. For Title VI they have enough dollars to carry them through November 16.

He stated that they have been told by the Department of Labor that on or before the expiration of these funds that they will give us a special appropriation which will carry them through December 31. They are very hopeful, and have been told, that certainly no later than next week, before Congress adjourns, they will have appropriations. They will know then the dollars that will be allocated. He stated there is no doubt or no concern about

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 147

the continuance of CETA. It has been passed by the Congress and the CETA legislation has been extended through 1982; it is just a matter of the appropriation - the House and the Senate committees cannot get together as to how much money they really want to make in certain allocations.

He stated he knows that Councilmembers will be getting some calls because they are already getting them from some of the people who have been employed, for example in the Sugar Creek project. They have gone down to the Employment Office to sign up for unemployment benefits because they are unemployed. They are affected because the dollar allocations that Congress has not approved are attached also to the legislation for funding of UI benefits. He stated his people are telling these CETA employees (as they have been told by the Employment Office) that they should continue to sign up on a weekly basis and as soon as the funds are appropriated they will be paid retroactively. That they are on a very sound footing for continuance.

Mr. Person reminded Council of their meeting at Eastland Mall in June when Councilmember Leeper asked about some \$300,000 that he was projecting as carryover funds at that time. He stated little did he know that these funds were going to come in so handy. At that time they called it good planning; right now it is a matter of continuance without the necessity for borrowing money from any other source - they have their own resources.

Responding to a question from the Mayor, Mr. Person stated Title VII is tied to the new legislation and they cannot really talk about it until the appropriation is made, but there will be a new Title VII as a part of the CETA legislation.

Mayor Harris asked if he will have some notification of the subject appropriation by next Monday since Congress adjourns this week-end? Mr. Person replied that he hopes so, but right now what is pending is a continuing resolution to appropriate dollars based on hold-harmless clauses in Title I in the event they do not make an appropriation.

Councilmember Trosch stated Council has no evaluation as to performance, yet in the contracts there seems to be very definite performance standards. She asked if they can depend on evaluations next year as they get into the CD contracts? That the contracts say that the monitoring and evaluation would be done by the Prime Sponsor.

Mr. Tom Finnie, Budget and Evaluation Director, stated he has talked with Mr. Person and his department will be evaluating each and every one of these contracts; that this particular group of contracts came through under rather unusual circumstances and to date the only evaluation they have been able to do on them is just the matter of making sure that the arrangements made with the attachments will cover us, so that everyone understands what the financial backing is. The future contracts will be evaluated just as is done on CD contracts.

Ms. Trosch stated then these contracts have written in them, to his satisfaction, the kinds of standards that he can evaluate and come back with meaningful data to Council? Mr. Finnie replied yes, they were not designed by his staff and the prime contractor is the City - Mr. Person; but they will be doing their evaluation of them.

Councilmember Frech stated that in the Agreement with the Employment Security Commission it says "in keeping with the provisions of the Prime Sponsor's fiscal year 1979 Manpower Plan." She asked if that is a plan Council has seen? Mr. Person replied it is a plan they should have seen; it is one that was developed back in July and August; it is the Title I Plan of operation that covers the period of October 1 through September 30 of next year.

Ms. Frech stated Councilmembers just received these contracts on Friday; that maybe it is not necessary to read and study them all; that if other Councilmembers want to go ahead and approve them it is all right, but she just wonders if anybody else has the feeling that they need another week to study them. Would it cause great problems?

October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 148

Councilmember Chafin stated she does not like operating illegally, and in fact we are; that in fact they are really just extensions.

Mr. Person stated the Title II and Title VI are extensions through December 31 of this year; the Title I and Title III are planned for twelve months, contingent on the funding (the Mayor added contingent on the passing of legislation and several things and his signature). Mr. Person stated there is no doubt about the funding of Titles I and III, because under these Titles the hold-harmless provision applies - in other words, we will be funded at 90 percent of the funding level for this fiscal year even if the programs were going to be terminated permanently. That under the Title III format they were told to develop twelve months funding based on 93 percent of the dollars we received for last year. That so that the Finance Department and City Council who have responsibility for all of this would not get into any difficulty, they have re-programmed funds for only three months to carry them through December 31. That an evaluation will be made and Council will receive a report prior to this period of time as to continuance.

Councilmember Carroll asked if Mr. Person still feels there are prospects for a CETA program in the area of rehabilitation? Mr. Person replied the answer to that is yes; and explained that what Mr. Carroll has reference to is that they have had some conversations regarding working with some agencies in Third Ward, Fourth Ward and perhaps some others toward housing rehabilitation. That they have explored this with Community Development and are continuing to talk about it. They are aware that some of this is taking place in cities like Memphis, in Winston-Salem and some other cities, but how far they can go in this he is not able to say at this time. They are looking at this very diligently.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

Mr. Burkhalter stated that he has heard from City Managers in neighboring cities who are having some real problems with this - some do not have even as much as thirty days of operating funds. Mayor Harris stated Charlotte is fortunate to have Mr. Person and his staff who are doing a good job, in a very tough area of work.

#### CITY MANAGER'S COMMENTS ON PLANNING AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MEETING.

Mr. Burkhalter reminded Councilmembers of the Planning and Public Works Committee meeting scheduled for Thursday, October 12. He stated Councilmembers who are not members of the committee might enjoy hearing the person who is going to speak - David Mosen of ASPO.

#### ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON LIDDELL STREET AREA.

Councilmember Carroll stated he appreciated the comments Councilmember Gantt had made in the informal session on the Liddell Street area. That he had sometime ago asked the Manager to look into some of the problems which Mr. Gantt enumerated and he had indicated that these were indeed problems. He hopes in the requests that Mr. Gantt made, that they can push beyond some of the thoughts that he had received previously and try to begin to develop some sort of program. That it falls outside of any Community Development area; that maybe it would be eligible for a Neighborhood Strategy area or another one of the newer programs; but it is a matter of real concern and he is glad it has gotten the full Council's attention.

Councilmember Short stated Liddell Street is virtually a railroad yard; it is very difficult to get through there. He does not know that we have any program that would do this, but if they are thinking about helping people that live along there, he would think the best they could do would be to help to relocate them in some way - it is just out in the middle of the railroad yard really.

Councilmember Gantt replied he was hoping they would not say that although that is the first thing that usually comes to mind. That he agrees in terms of physical environment surrounding that area. That the Charlotte Area



October 9, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 149

Fund people are working out there. That he has asked them to make a survey and get the residents' feelings with regard to relocation. That by and large most of these people are elderly and they do not want to leave; they identify it as home. That personally he has some serious problems about adding any more people to the relocation rolls until they can get some of those they are charged specifically now to relocate, relocated.

DISCUSSION OF LACK OF AIRPORT TOWER CONTROL OF GENERAL AVIATION AIRCRAFT TO BE PLACED ON FUTURE AGENDA.

Councilmember Short mentioned an editorial in The Charlotte Observer on October 2 and stated he thought it almost demanded some attention from the City Council. That they are trustees of the airport; he does not know what they have to do with the control tower and its operations, but if there is anything that they have to do with it, they should get busy and look into it a little bit. He quoted from the editorial as follows:

"Privately operated light aircraft, which pilots call 'general aviation' aren't always required to do as the control tower says. On a clear day any general aviation craft flying through the Charlotte area need not even notify the tower that they are coming except in certain situations.

For a major airport to have traffic buzzing around without mandatory controls seems a pretty casual thing . . . General aviation pilots don't want air controllers to have mandatory jurisdiction over them because this would require a transponder and some other expensive equipment."

Mr. Short stated he has not discussed this with anyone, but he thinks that is enough to be just a little bit alarming; that they should see if Council has any responsibility there. He moved that this matter be placed on the agenda for Council discussion and ask Mr. Birmingham to attend that meeting. That to leave open the possibility of something like the accident recently in San Diego happening here in Charlotte and Council not having even discussed it seems to him to be somewhat of a dereliction of duty. Councilmember Chafin seconded the motion.

Mayor Harris stated that is a matter for the FAA and it is important that if they are going to have a discussion they should have an official present. Mr. Short stated whomever Mr. Birmingham wants to bring. The Mayor stated a good point of concern has been raised.

Mr. Burkhalter offered to have some talks with Mr. Groseclose who is the head of FAA operations here to see if they are in agreement with this sort of thing so that Council would have some backing; if so, they will draft a resolution that would be appropriate; otherwise, they will put it on the agenda for discussion.

The vote was taken on Mr. Short's motion and carried unanimously.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAFIN'S REQUEST THAT STAFF RECONSIDER ITS RECOMMENDATION FOR IMPROVEMENTS AT THE SQUARE; AND OTHER COMMENTS.

Councilmember Chafin gave belated greetings to the Council from Queens College and welcomed citizens who had come.

She congratulated the City Manager and the the City Staff on our outstanding credit rating. It is good to know that we are probably the second best managed city, fiscally, in the Country. That she understands the only reason we are not first is because of our median income.

Ms. Chafin asked about the status of the improvements at Westerly Hills Park, stating that some of Mr. Leeper's constituents called her when they could not get in touch with him, and are concerned because nothing is happening out there. That they have some plans for that park in the spring and hope that the improvements will be completed by that time.

Mr. Wylie Williams, Assistant City Manager, stated he would get the information.


October 2, 1978  
Minute Book 69 - Page 150

Ms. Chafin stated we have been awaiting word for sometime on our improvements at the Square, and plans for the bus transfer point. She would really like to ask Staff to take another look at this. She has some reservations about their plans there in context of that very fine uptown pedestrian study which was just received from the Planning Commission.

She stated that in the context of the fact that we are about to embark on a major study of our central area, and here we are about to take this kind of semi-permanent step without the benefit of the recommendations of that study, and that she understands that some of what was proposed at the Square cannot be implemented because of traffic engineering problems, that unless there are objections from Council, she would like to have staff take another look at that and perhaps, once again, survey the uptown businesses and come back with some recommendations.

ADJOURNMENT.

Upon motion of Councilmember Frech, seconded by Councilmember Gantt, and carried unanimously, the meeting adjourned.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk