

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, met in regular session on Monday, September 11, 1978, at 3:00 o'clock p. m., in the Council Chamber, City Hall, with Mayor Kenneth R. Harris presiding and Councilmembers Don Carroll, Betty Chafin, Tom Cox, Jr., Charlie Dannelly, Harvey B. Gantt, Ron Leeper, Pat Locke, George K. Selden, Jr., H. Milton Short and Minette Trosch present.

ABSENT: None.

* * * * *

INVOCATION.

The invocation was given by Councilmember Milton Short.

INTERPRETER PRESENT FOR BENEFIT OF THE DEAF AT TODAY'S PUBLIC HEARING.

The Mayor announced that Ms. Doris Hill - an interpreter for the deaf - would be providing this service at today's Public Hearing. He advised that several requests would be made of participants: that only one person should speak at a time; persons reading statements should read slowly; that citizens should not move the podium as its placement is important to the interpreter and the audience. That he will try to recognize each Councilmember by name, but that if he fails to do this they should raise their hands when they speak as it will be difficult to identify them by voice.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NOMINATIONS TO BE MADE AT SEPTEMBER 25TH MEETING.

The Clerk announced that in meeting on Monday, September 25, the City Council will make nominations to fill three vacancies on the Charlotte Area Fund Board of Directors.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

On motion of Councilmember Trosch, seconded by Councilmember Chafin, and carried unanimously, minutes of the regular Council Meeting on Monday, August 21, and the recessed meeting on Monday, August 28, 1978 were approved as submitted, with the following correction:

Page 431, first line - Change Councilmember's name to "Frech."

Councilmember Selden stated his comments are not intended as a correction to the minutes, but there was a misunderstanding in respect to the item relating to the Airport Project Manager.

It was his understanding that this item was being deferred to the next business meeting which would have been - not the recessed/reconvened meeting, but - the next business meeting thereafter, and that the Clerk has confirmed that is what the tapes of the meeting indicate.

Mr. Selden stated he had a number of items for input into the discussion on this matter, but unfortunately since he was out of town, it was too late to make a change. That they should be well aware of the wording, as such, on a recessed meeting because the misunderstanding caused difficulties on his part.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 2

COUNCIL ACTIONS AUTHORIZING BOND REFERENDUM.

1. Public Hearing on Four Orders Authorizing Bonds.

The Mayor announced that this was the date and hour fixed by the City Council for the public hearing upon the orders entitled:

"ORDER AUTHORIZING \$9,700,000 PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES BONDS,"

"ORDER AUTHORIZING \$5,600,000 WATER BONDS,"

"ORDER AUTHORIZING \$3,200,000 SANITARY SEWER BONDS," and

"ORDER AUTHORIZING \$1,500,000 STORM SEWER BONDS."

Mr. Ted G. Hartsock, Jr., co-chairman of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Aquatic Recreation Committee, stated they have held meetings around Charlotte among a number of interested groups in the Parks and Recreation bond referendum that will come up in November. That this group certainly has its own views and he is appearing before Council to express these views and to state that they are one hundred percent behind the Parks and Recreation bonds that will be presented to the voters.

He stated the \$9.75 million which they sincerely hope the citizens of Charlotte will cast their votes on in an affirmative way is very important to the growth of this city. That while Charlotte has only spent about \$2.6 million in bonded indebtedness over the past 25 to 30 years - since World War II - all of the funds that have gone to recreation have come out of our operating budgets. That at the informal meeting Councilmember Trosch quoted some figures about how much Charlotte spends for recreation compared to other cities in North Carolina. We need to change this; the citizens of Charlotte need to recognize that this change needs to occur and needs to occur now.

He stated C-MARC is obviously interested in one phase of the Parks and Recreation bond issue that will be before the public - building of adequate aquatic facilities. That you might say a lot of them are interested in competitive swimming. Certainly they are! Competitiveness is a part of life, whether we compete in politics, in a swimming meet, a soccer game, golf, football, in business or whatever it happens to be. Competitiveness goes to make up part of the American way of life. Yes, they are interested in competitive swimming, but they are also interested in saving lives - the Red Cross programs, the drown-proofing. That just before he came into this meeting an incident was related to him concerning a young man, good football player, strapping young man, 18 or 19 years old, who died less than a month ago because he did not know how to swim. We need to provide facilities in this city - and he hopes the public gets this message - for adequate training for each and every youngster before they leave the high school level. Programs for the handicapped so that they can enter the water; programs for all people of this community. It is important that this bond issue passes.

They stand ready, as a small committee, of about 25 or 30 people at this point. For every person that is on this committee there are at least 100 or 200 that stand behind them, ready and willing to work; to do whatever is necessary to see that these bonds get passed. He hopes that as Council makes its plans it will coordinate them with the County and if this takes place, he will be glad to appear before them and express their views. That some of his group has been before County groups and they think they have an awful lot of sentiment there despite the fact that money for pools was deleted from their bond issue.

Dr. Winslow Hartford, 1413 Redcoat Drive, stated he is speaking not only as a resident of Charlotte but also as a member of the Environmental Science faculty at Belmont Abbey College; that he speaks in behalf of the City and County Park Bond proposals; that he would like to do this in the framework of nostalgia rather than that of planning.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 3

Dr. Hartford stated he grew up in the Boston area. When he left Boston in 1934, he took as a matter of civilized urban living the magnificent urban and suburban park facilities that Boston, its suburbs and the Metropolitan District Commission had created thirty years before. These facilities are still an asset of incalculable value to that area in 1978.

When he moved to Baltimore in 1934, he moved to a different political structure and found that while Baltimore had some traditional city parks and greenways, the agricultural counties surrounding it had nothing. Time has remedied this to a large extent. His next move was to Onondaga County, New York, a virtual twin of Mecklenburg County, population-wise. Here, he found in addition to excellent city and town systems, two state parks, nine large county parks and a county forest of several thousand acres.

Parenthetically, about this time he became familiar with little Pueblo County in Colorado. Here, when land is developed, zoning requires that the developer donate 8 percent of the gross acreage to the county for park purposes.

He stated that in 1970 he moved to Charlotte; has followed Charlotte's park plans closely through his environmental students at the college, through the "Dimensions" program, and through the Sierra Club. That we need major plans in this area, for it is one where by virtue of their agricultural recent past, Charlotte and Mecklenburg County fall far behind where Baltimore was in 1934 and Boston was in 1905.

He stated his environmental studies tell him also that we are entering an era where urban sprawl and individual mobilities must decrease as petroleum supplies in the United States lessen and become more expensive. Charlotteans must find their leisure closer to home, as Bostonians did in 1905, and all of us did during the depression.

In this framework, the wisest investment we can make for all the people in Charlotte and Mecklenburg is a strong park program, with greenways, forests and other natural areas a major part of it. These areas, in addition to providing recreation in the finest sense, curb flooding, modify and improve our climate, decrease our energy consumption, and help to combat air pollution.

He urged the Council to support the City - and County - park program, and to move as soon as possible, to a unified city-county park system. Recreation knows no artificial boundaries.

Mr. Mark Johnson, 4021 Rutherford Drive, stated there is a new attitude among handicapped people. That attitude is a realization of what he would call "basic human rights." In the process of arriving at that new attitude it has been very frustrating. A lot of these basic rights are not being met - what they are entitled to they are not getting. He is here to give Council an opportunity to relieve his personal frustrations and prevent any more frustrations. He is sure Councilmembers are aware there are many issues - there is housing, there is transportation, there is education. But, he is appearing regarding the proposed park.

He stated they are very disappointed in the City. That he is personally disappointed and he represents the National Paraplegic Foundation, the Metrolina Chapter, of which he is president. He stated that several of their members are present to express their frustration; that their presence is more of a confrontation than a sharing of knowledge. They feel the City has had time and they recommend that a site decision be made so that the brick can be laid. That they notice that there is \$2.65 million going towards swimming pools and toward the park. He is not personally worried about how much money is allocated but when it will be done.

Mayor Harris reminded the citizens that the preliminary reports they have read about in the press are just that - preliminary. That until Council approves something, there are no set figures. That the report from the Finance Committee which they will hear shortly will be in regard to that.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 4

Mr. James Black, 2732 Watson Drive, stated he is making the same proposal he made on August 7th with a little extra added to it - that is, how we can go about getting a better facility in our city for golfers. We need to upgrade our facility which we already have because we have over 300,000 people here. We need the right kind of program set up - junior programs, middle-age programs and senior citizens (male and female).

Mr. Black submitted copies of a detailed proposal to the Councilmembers.

Mr. Carl Robinson, 5701 Cherrycrest Lane, stated he represents the District III Parks Committee; that his remarks concern a report that has not been presented to Council as yet, but his committee has already reviewed it. His committee made its wishes known to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission. That after they saw the Planning Commission's published "Discussion of Citizens' Comments on the Short Range Park Plan" they felt that their input had been acceptably considered.

Mr. Robinson stated their primary concern is neighborhood park development in District III. However, the planned bond referendum broadens their concern to the entire city. They have reviewed the three plans before Council - the Park and Recreation Department plan, the Cox, Leeper, Carroll plan, and the Finance Committee's plan.

That the unacceptable feature of the Park and Recreation plan is that it does not contain construction priorities. The Finance Committee plan is totally unacceptable to them. It is not a plan at all. It clearly states one of its prime characteristics is that priorities and substitutions may become urgent later. It is quite obvious to them the direction these urgencies may take. For example - three community parks are proposed by the Finance Committee: Plaza Road, Boyce Road, and Statesville Road. The plan itself gives a reason to delay the Statesville Road Park indefinitely. The Statesville Road Park probably would be the most intensely utilized of the three, which should give it top priority.

He quoted from the Finance Committee report: "Recreation Centers are visible and considered a quick payoff," stating that when the Committee makes its presentation he hopes they will explain just what a quick payoff means.

He stated none of the plans indicated a citizen demand for additional centers. That there is a demand that existing centers be upgraded and expanded to meet the needs of the individual communities wherever they are located. He stated it is not reasonable to expect the citizenry to support a bond referendum that does not represent a specific plan for the funds involved. That if they support a \$9.7 million referendum, they want to know exactly how these funds will be spent and how the figure was established in the first place.

He stated the Cox, Leeper, Carroll Plan takes into consideration the Park and Recreation recommendations - community input - and is obviously fair to the entire city. That the Finance Committee intentionally leaves out firm commitments to specific parks. They have asked themselves why members of this Council want to provide funds to be spent as subsequent Councils may see fit. His committee's recommendation is that Council accept and pass the Cox, Leeper, Carroll Plan.

Mrs. Lilian McGrath, 2552 Lumina Avenue, stated that parallel to the importance of placing a bond package on the ballot November 7th is trying to make that package acceptable to the voters. Bond referendums do not always pass. That after reading the August 3, 1978 memorandum to the Mayor and City Council from Councilmembers Cox, Leeper and Carroll, she feels that this one must pass.

She stated that the first eleven pages of the memorandum with its summary of principles had her looking forward to the specific proposals listed on the following three pages. Written in clear-cut fashion was a fair and equitable park plan for the whole city. No area rightfully could feel neglected. People could read for themselves where the bond money would be spent. Consequently, there would be a lessened fear that the package voted on November 7th could be altered considerably if the membership of the Council changed before all funds were spent.

Mrs. McGrath stated that to her the great value of the August 3rd memorandum lies in its specific commitment to all those areas mentioned on the memorandum's last three pages. That here the people read what their money will buy for them. The personal benefit, the something-for-everyone idea, stated plainly in the memorandum, must be impressed upon the voter. For instance, residents of Randolph, Lakeview, Evergreen and Ramblewood will be more likely to approve money for development of parks in those areas than if the vote is to be cast on "district parks - \$2,160,000." How vague and impersonal that is to a taxpayer!

She stated that to expect taxpayers' approval of a \$9.7 million spending program in this time of Proposition 13, Council must be prepared to publicize how and where the money will be spent. That openness and specifics will have voter appeal, resulting in passage of the bond issue.

Mr. Gene Johnson stated he is the chairman of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Chamber of Commerce's Park and Recreation Task Force. The task force was formed several months ago prior to the public discussions in the City and County chambers about the park and recreation bond referendums, to promote the recognition of the importance of our community's recreational assets and the continued development of new and existing park areas. They have worked for several months, have reviewed the short range park plan and citizens' comments on that plan, and have also reviewed what is known to date about the City and County bond referendums.

He stated they are convinced, based on the work they have done to this point, that the need for additional park and recreation facilities in our community is very great. We are far behind the national standards in park acreage as it relates to population and in total dollars spent for park and recreational facilities. They believe that the time for catching up is now. They are very happy to see the things that the City and the County are doing to try to work this problem out together. They have some questions on the timing of the referendum - in November, less than two months from this date; there is a lot of work to be done, but they are strongly in favor of the bonds and recognize that Council's plans are to go.

He stated that during the past year the community we live in has made a lot of great strides forward; a lot of things have happened. There is somewhat of a utopia attitude about Charlotte right now. He does not think we want to rely on that inertia of this year to carry these referendums to successful passing. He believes that it is essential that the City and County mount a combined coordinated effort to assure passage of the referendum. They further think that the coordination ought not to be just limited to the campaign itself, but should also include extensive planning for the use of the money that the two referendums will raise. That the Council and the County Commission are at this time developing their various plans for the park system and for the referendums; they assisted the Planning Commission in drawing up their short range park plan. The Chamber wants to strongly encourage them to continue this sense of cooperation in executing the park bond referendums.

They also think that the time is here to take the necessary first steps toward consolidation of our City and County Park and Recreation systems. They realize there are many practical problems in doing that; it is impossible to have that done prior to the election date, but they believe that it would certainly be in the best interest of the two referendums if some positive steps are taken in the meantime to begin the first initial steps toward consolidating the two systems. That they are strongly in favor of the park referendums; they will work very hard to help City Council and the County Commission convince the citizens of our county to vote in favor of them.

Mr. W. J. Veeder, President of the Chamber of Commerce, stated he is present today, in some respects, more as an individual than in his position with the Chamber, but the two roles of necessity overlap. That what Mr. Johnson has had to say, along with other information about the other elements of the bond package, will in due course come before the Board of the Chamber and be acted on. He anticipates and hopes that it will be acted on in a very positive fashion. The Chamber has a history of supporting those things in the community that need to be done to make sure that Charlotte-Mecklenburg

continues to be a good place to live and work. That certainly as an individual, he agrees with Council most wholeheartedly that the priorities are now such that they have the top priorities up front for this upcoming bond election - they have the park needs up front. It is time. They have water and sewer needs up front. This is a continuing need that we always must face. That the importance of these elements of the issues that are to be voted on should not be overlooked. We cannot continue to move ahead in an effective fashion for Charlotte-Mecklenburg unless our water and sewer needs are met on a continuing basis. He thinks these priorities are proper and commends Council for putting them together in this fashion.

He stated the storm drainage elements of the bond package are something new. It is a new policy before them in the context of the use of this money. He is very much aware that there are many projects that have substantial merit in terms of storm drainage problems and that this new answer that they have chosen to implement with some bond money should go a long way toward answering some of these needs throughout the community.

Mr. Veeder encouraged them, particularly on the park projects, to define and refine what specifically is going to be done in the way of projects and get this out front as quickly as they can. This will help everybody move in the most positive fashion to support the Council. He would anticipate that when the Chamber Board has an opportunity to consider these things Council will again have continuing support from the business community.

Rev. John Epps, 2701 Beechnut Road, commended the Council for the great amount of work that they are putting forward in seeking to improve the Park and Recreation facilities for the City of Charlotte. He strongly urged as Council moved forward in improving Recreation and Park facilities, that the community which he represents, Clanton Park, want to have assurance that their cause and interest will be represented. They went to the polls and passed the Airport Referendum because they believed in it, even though it did not represent any great amount of benefits their community would benefit from. They felt that it benefited the larger community in general, therefore, what is good for Charlotte, they feel in some sense, is good for them.

Rev. Epps stated they have been deceived many times, and they attempt to vote for issues they think will benefit them. They certainly want to endorse the Cox, Leeper, Carroll Plan. That plan does seem to show a bit of equity that will be the best approach to benefit all of Charlotte rather than be voting for some things which they do not understand. They feel the priority should be drawn now, and they are willing and ready to go out to beat the bushes and everything within their power to see this referendum is passed only if they have further assurance it will benefit the people he represents in District Three.

Mr. John Bloom, 506 Louise Avenue, stated this is not the first time he has been here to speak about parks; this time they are all for it. He stated he is representing the Circle Avenue Area, and the Elizabeth Community. He would like to remind Council they are approximately forty-six and a half acres short on park space. He stated they hope this will be alleviated when the bond issue is passed, and they ask the Council to keep this in mind.

Mr. Lewis F. Snyder stated we are talking about more parks when we are not able to take care of the present parks and centers security wise that we now have. There are a lot of undesirables taking over our present parks such as, the gays, the ladies of the night, and other undesirables. There is a rising increase in damages and vandalism. The restrooms are being destroyed because we do not have enough park police officers to take care of what we now have. He does not oppose more parks, he just thought we are putting the cart before the horse so to speak. We do not have enough

park police officers to protect what parks that we now have. These handicapped people which are present here this afternoon would not be safe at night at most of our parks. He is just knocking the dust off the table so to speak. It seems to him that we are putting the cart before the horse because we need to look for more money to hire more police park officers to protect the property that we now have and to protect the citizens that would like to go out. They are afraid to go out, especially at night, for fear that they will be mugged, or propositioned. So let us put the cart before the horse and take some of this money and place more protection out there to take care of our property and the people who are going out. That Mr. Ott of the Parks and Recreation Commission stated that the plumbing had been torn out of one of the newest restrooms in Freedom Park four times in the past six months and they are knocking holes in between the ladies' and mens' restrooms. Why build more parks when we can not take care of the ones we have? Again he says he is not opposed to parks, we need more parks, but we need to protect the parks that we have with more police protection so that people can go out and relax and enjoy our parks.

Ms. Rosetta B. Alexander stated she is Chairman of Precinct 27, Tryon Hills Community. They have a deep need for security. They have a park at the Tryon Hills School that is being used by the elderly of the community and they do not have a nice park for the younger children. The park in Tryon Hills School needs to be upgraded. There are no lights and it has become a haven for the young people in the evening because of the darkness. They would like to see many parks in their area, if we can not have a better park at the school. They have facilities all around which are available if the City would use them. They attended several meetings with the Park Commission several months ago and she believes their quote at that time was 'there is a park at Craighead Road and Sugar Creek Road that they can use,' but our children are of such age that they would be afraid to send them that distance away from home. Again they would like to see more lights at our park in Tryon Hills School and some upgrading.

Mr. Don Dunn stated he is representing the Carolina Tarwheel Associates Basketball team, Architectural Barriers Committee and Paraplegic National Foundation, and numerous other groups and businesses who would like to see this passed. He stated this is not only for their selfish reasons, but as a facility that can be utilized as a place where all can come to coordinate efforts to do things and projects for each other. He related the difficulties they have in finding a place to practice. He stated it is important to push this mainly for their personal interest, but the parks could be a grand addition to our city, and this is something that should be provided to the citizens of a city.

Mr. Charles E. Smith of the Faed Club, Plainwood Drive, stated the Center is a meeting place for social and educational meetings for the hearing impaired people of the Charlotte area. It is supported by the Faed Club, Inc., which is made up of twenty one members, and the money to take care of the Center comes from the pockets of the deaf people which is not very much.

He stated they were before Council three years ago on the \$3.0 million Federal Gant. So far, the deaf population of Charlotte has not received one cent. He wrote one of the Councilmembers last year asking for help for the operation of the Faed Center, and so far he has heard nothing.

For years and years the deaf population of Charlotte asked the Park and Recreation Departments for a regular meeting or gathering place, but they were always either turned down or bypassed. After years of trying, a small group of the deaf got together to lay out plans for building a recreation center of their own in 1969. Finally, they barely had enough to start

remodeling a house on Plainwood Drive in 1976. It has a fraternal hall, large enough to seat 125 people, a kitchen, stage, storage room and small office. The deaf people are still working on it little by little. You all are invited to come out and inspect it for yourselves. The entire building was built by the deaf people themselves.

What he is here today for is to ask the City Council for \$10,000 to help take care of some our expenses with some of the Federal money the City gets.

He stated he hopes the City Council can help them with some of their expenses. At present the Faed Center is paying its own city and county taxes.

Mr. Lee Dukes, Director of the Utility Department, stated there are four items on this bond referendum he thinks Council needs to talk about. Number one is the \$5.6 million request for additions to our water treatment facility. One of the straightest lines he has introduced to Council, he believes, has been the average daily water use by the citizenry of Charlotte. Since 1940, he does not think we could have anything that would be any straighter- the increase. He pointed out a dotted green line on the map which indicates the three day maximum we have in summers, in which people utilize water at a much higher rate than other times. He stated the average for 1977 is about the rest of the dots, right on the line, and the peak for 1977 was above the three day maximum. The black line shows the treatment capacity we have in treatment plants. He pointed out the areas where we are beginning to approach our capacity. He stated they are requesting a 12 million gallon capacity to put us back in tune with our needs; presently we are a little behind. That when we get there, and he does not have the treatment facilities, it is too late. This is the reason they are asking for the additions to the Hoskins Filter Plant; it is the most important need we have at this time.

He stated the other items are waste water treatment requests; they are three in number. He pointed out on the map the plants where they were given a \$4.2 million 2/3 bonds to do these. There are three left which the Environmental Protection Agency has promised funding for - the upgrading of Sugar Creek plant; the upgrading of the Irwin Creek Plant, and the rehabilitation of the sanitary sewers. He stated they are asking for the \$3.2 million for matching funds to do that work.

Mr. Dukes stated that is what they need. Why do they need this so bad? They use to say they were afraid they would be put in jail; then they said they were afraid EPA would fine us. He does not think either of these is the reason we would like to do it. He stated if the EPA does not upgrade these facilities, and we do not upgrade them as they have asked us to do, they will not say one thing, but we will not be able to add anything on. This puts the home builder in a position where he cannot do anything; it puts the Utility Director in a position where he cannot tie on another customer. This is the worse thing that could happen to us.

He stated part of this is to take care of some of the odors at Sugar Creek area. Councilmember Gantt asked how many federal dollars is he talking about in the sewer program which he has outlined? Mr. Dukes replied it is pretty close to \$60.0 million. This is the whole thing for the 201 North Mecklenburg and Metro. Councilmember Gantt asked how much state money and how much matching money? Mr. Dukes replied 12½% is State; 12½% is our money, and the 75% is federal money of that \$60.0 million. Councilmember Gantt stated so we are putting in about \$8.0 million. Mr. Dukes stated the \$4.4 million is the first contribution we have had in 2/3 bonds; and this our \$3.2 million so it is really about \$8.0 million we have put into it.

Mr. Clark Readling, City Engineer, stated the \$1.5 million for Storm Sewer Bonds is to fund the city's portion of storm drainage improvements according to a policy which was recently approved by the Council Operations, and then the City Council for a 1/3-2/3 cost sharing on storm

drainage on private property. This is that property owners would only pay 1/3 of the cost of the improvements. The \$1.5 million is seed money for the original financing of the property owners' portions so that this can be paid over a ten year period.

Mayor Harris announced that Mr. Ben Tyson has agreed to be the Information Chairman for the Water-Sewer Bond part of the package.

2. Finance Committee proposed general priorities for use of Park Bond Funds tabled for two weeks:

The following report by the Finance Committee on use of Park Bonds was presented for consideration:

CITY COUNCIL FINANCE COMMITTEE

August 17, 1978

The Finance Committee of the Council agreed to make the following Park Bond recommendation to the City Council:

\$2,600,000 -	Natural Preserve and Community Parks - (26.8%)
2,160,000 -	District Parks - (22.3%)
1,390,000 -	Neighborhood Parks - (14.3%)
500,000 -	Park Improvements - (5.2%)
2,650,000 -	Recreation Facilities - (27.3%)
<u>400,000 -</u>	Special Population Center - (4.1%)
\$9,700,000 -	TOTAL PARK BOND PACKAGE

Statement of Intent

In order to minimize the impact on Debt Service and the operating budget, the programming of expenditures and necessary bond sales will be scheduled over a three and one-half (3½) year period.

The allocations by broad categories reflected above represent relative priorities and are made with the understanding that changes can be made during the course of the Park Development Program.

Land available at schools will be developed as Neighborhood and District Parks. With the approval of appropriate school officials, these schools include those listed below. Additional park land will be acquired and developed as capital and operating funds permit.

Funds will be used for land acquisition and development at Plaza Road, the City's only Natural Preserve, and appropriate Community Parks in cooperation with County programs.

Funds will be used for upgrading and construction of new recreation center facilities based on the criterial of need and population served and for the Special Population Center. Funds are provided for a swimming program in consideration of a joint City-County program.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 10

List of School Parks

August 18, 1978

District School Parks

Garinger High
Myers Park High
West Charlotte
Harding High
Albemarle Road
Cochran-Devonshire
Carmel Junior High
Olde Providence Elementary

Neighborhood School Parks

Alexander Graham Junior High	Montclair
Allenbrook	Oakhurst
BOE (Archdale Drive)	Oaklawn
Bruns Avenue	Pinewood
Chantilly	Rama Road
Collinswood	Randolph Junior High
Druid Hills	Sedgefield
Graham Learning Center	Spaugh Junior High
Highland	Thomasboro
Idlewild	Tryon Hills
Lansdowne	J. T. Williams
Mason Smith Junior High	Pawtucket
McClintock Junior High	Park Road
Merry Oaks	
Piney Grove	
Foxcroft	
Starmount	

Councilmember Cox, Chairman of the Finance Committee, stated each member of Council has received a copy of the Finance Committee's report, and minutes of the two days they spent discussing this.

He stated several years ago the Comprehensive Plan 1995 was presented to the two governing bodies by the Planning Commission. Following that by several months there was a presentation of the comprehensive park and recreation needs for the entire community - the Short Range Park Plan. It represented over \$30.0 million of needs that our joint planning agency had identified.

From that point, both governing bodies felt public hearings did receive enthusiastic support. Then, on the same day in August, and only because the two departments are not now consolidated, the two governing bodies adopted resolutions to fund their respective portions of that same plan. Since then, the City and County have adopted a single committee to disseminate information, and to promote the bond referendum. Also, we have had preliminary efforts to consolidate the park and recreation departments.

He stated it appears to him the only apparent uncoordinated part of this whole deal is the fact there will be two separate items on the November ballot; that has come into focus for considerable attention lately. It really is the only apparently uncoordinated part; whereas if you take a look at the facts, everything else is coordinated. Also in August, Council voted to ask the Finance Committee to recommend what commitments this Council wanted to make regarding identifying specific uses of the \$9.7 million. That is what they have done. They have submitted their work, and he is going to make a motion soon to ask Council to approve the work the Committee has done.

Councilmember Cox stated it was the consensus of the Committee that events beyond the control of the City may nullify at some future point in time, any promises we made. Also it did develop that additional study and coordination was needed on several potential uses of the funds.

drainage on private property. This is that property owners would only pay 1/3 of the cost of the improvements. The \$1.5 million is seed money for the original financing of the property owners' portions so that this can be paid over a ten year period.

Mayor Harris announced that Mr. Ben Tyson has agreed to be the Information Chairman for the Water-Sewer Bond part of the package.

2. Finance Committee proposed general priorities for use of Park Bond Funds tabled for two weeks:

The following report by the Finance Committee on use of Park Bonds was presented for consideration:

CITY COUNCIL FINANCE COMMITTEE

August 17, 1978

The Finance Committee of the Council agreed to make the following Park Bond recommendation to the City Council:

\$2,600,000 -	Natural Preserve and Community Parks - (26.8%)
2,160,000 -	District Parks - (22.3%)
1,390,000 -	Neighborhood Parks - (14.3%)
500,000 -	Park Improvements - (5.2%)
2,650,000 -	Recreation Facilities - (27.3%)
<u>400,000 -</u>	Special Population Center - (4.1%)
\$9,700,000 -	TOTAL PARK BOND PACKAGE

Statement of Intent

In order to minimize the impact on Debt Service and the operating budget, the programming of expenditures and necessary bond sales will be scheduled over a three and one-half (3½) year period.

The allocations by broad categories reflected above represent relative priorities and are made with the understanding that changes can be made during the course of the Park Development Program.

Land available at schools will be developed as Neighborhood and District Parks. With the approval of appropriate school officials, these schools include those listed below. Additional park land will be acquired and developed as capital and operating funds permit.

Funds will be used for land acquisition and development at Plaza Road, the City's only Natural Preserve, and appropriate Community Parks in cooperation with County programs.

Funds will be used for upgrading and construction of new recreation center facilities based on the criterial of need and population served and for the Special Population Center. Funds are provided for a swimming program in consideration of a joint City-County program.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 10

List of School Parks

August 18, 1978

District School Parks

Garinger High
Myers Park High
West Charlotte
Harding High
Albemarle Road
Cochran-Devonshire
Carmel Junior High
Olde Providence Elementary

Neighborhood School Parks

Alexander Graham Junior High	Montclair
Allenbrook	Oakhurst
BOE (Archdale Drive)	Oaklawn
Bruns Avenue	Pinewood
Chantilly	Rama Road
Collinswood	Randolph Junior High
Druid Hills	Sedgefield
Graham Learning Center	Spaugh Junior High
Highland	Thomasboro
Idlewild	Tryon Hills
Lansdowne	J. T. Williams
Mason Smith Junior High	Pawtucket
McClintock Junior High	Park Road
Merry Oaks	
Piney Grove	
Foxcroft	
Starmount	

Councilmember Cox, Chairman of the Finance Committee, stated each member of Council has received a copy of the Finance Committee's report, and minutes of the two days they spent discussing this.

He stated several years ago the Comprehensive Plan 1995 was presented to the two governing bodies by the Planning Commission. Following that by several months there was a presentation of the comprehensive park and recreation needs for the entire community - the Short Range Park Plan. It represented over \$30.0 million of needs that our joint planning agency had identified.

From that point, both governing bodies felt public hearings did receive enthusiastic support. Then, on the same day in August, and only because the two departments are not now consolidated, the two governing bodies adopted resolutions to fund their respective portions of that same plan. Since then, the City and County have adopted a single committee to disseminate information, and to promote the bond referendum. Also, we have had preliminary efforts to consolidate the park and recreation departments.

He stated it appears to him the only apparent uncoordinated part of this whole deal is the fact there will be two separate items on the November ballot; that has come into focus for considerable attention lately. It really is the only apparently uncoordinated part; whereas if you take a look at the facts, everything else is coordinated. Also in August, Council voted to ask the Finance Committee to recommend what commitments this Council wanted to make regarding identifying specific uses of the \$9.7 million. That is what they have done. They have submitted their work, and he is going to make a motion soon to ask Council to approve the work the Committee has done.

Councilmember Cox stated it was the consensus of the Committee that events beyond the control of the City may nullify at some future point in time, any promises we made. Also it did develop that additional study and coordination was needed on several potential uses of the funds.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 11

For that reason, they chose to let the consensus of the Committee be less specific, although no less committed to the very specific alternative plans we all looked at. Their intention was not to be unspecific; to the contrary they were very concerned if the Committee would make a promise they would not be able to follow up on. The result is the document they have before them.

So the Committee unanimously voted to accept George Selden's motion regarding the spending categories and a statement of intention which basically says - If everything goes like we hope it is going to go, here is how we are going to spend the money.

Although certain things are not mentioned specifically, as they were in other plans, that does not mean they are not going to try to do those things. It just means the Committee felt it was too much of a risk of non-availability of land in certain areas, for example; or some reasons beyond our control that would nullify a promise that we had made; and the citizens of Charlotte that did not get the park in their area may feel cheated. That is what they wanted to avoid, so they made the statement of intent; and basically what it says is as follows:

- a) In order to minimize the impact, the \$9.7 million will be scheduled over a three and one-half (3½) year period. That Jack Fennell from the Finance Department stated that is the proper spend rate to avoid any unnecessary peaks, and to avoid any future risk of having to increase our property tax rate for that reason.
- b) The allocations that we made were six broad categories. He would like to say to the handicap people that just left. He wish they were here, that originally the proposal was that there would be five broad categories. We brought the sixth one out for the special population's sake. To be more specific, we have control over that one. That was one that we could identify with and was certain that we could do. We brought that one out feeling that we had a special commitment to our special population.
- c) Then we went on further to say that there are other aspects of our spending that we do have control over. For example, land available at schools. We listed specifically each of the district and school parks that we wanted to put it in. It came right out of all of the plans that we looked at.

Now the one thing which is non-specific in his mind is that additional land will be acquired and developed as capital and operating funds permit. That is the area which we opted not to be specific in because of reasons which he stated before. This is really the only area that we were not as specific in as we could have been.

- d) Then we said funds will be used for land acquisition and development for the Plaza Road area, the Plaza Natural Preserve, and appropriate Community Parks in cooperation with County Park plans. He believes that means Statesville Road.
- e) We said further study needs to be done in the community in the recreation area. Take specifically in consideration the use of school property for joint use. We have not done that piece of work yet. So we felt like before we committed to new versus rehab. recreational facilities, we should do a study of it and take a look at the alternatives. Maybe there are some areas of joint use of school properties which we have not looked at yet. Then we said that part of the \$2.65 million dollars for recreational facilities would go to the swimming program, provided there was other coordination with the County and perhaps the school.

Councilmember Cox stated that is the piece of work the Finance Committee has done.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 12

Councilmember Cox moved that Council formally accept the Committee's recommendations, and that a copy of it be sent to the Joint Parks and Recreation Committee as expressing Council intention for the ultimate use of these bonds, and that a copy of the Committee's report be placed in the minutes so that there will be no mistake later on about what was said and what was not said. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Selden.

Councilmember Leeper stated he would like to respond to some of the citizens' comments and to the Finance Committee, as to whether at some point in time, some other Council might have to evaluate and make some other priorities down the road, whenever that might be; that while that may have some merit in some cases, he feel this particular Council has some responsibility to make sensitive priorities based on the needs as we see them today. It may be true that two or three years from now, some Council might say that we indicated there was a need to have certain things in certain areas, and now because of population shifts and some other kinds of things, we have to re-evaluate that decision. But, just as we have to change some decisions that previous Councils made, because of different changes and different situations which come up, certainly some Council would have to make some of the same kinds of suggestions. He is concerned that we are talking about section priorities for parks in some areas, and other areas we are saying that right now we do not want to make a commitment. There is some merit to the fact that while we might indicate some specific places we might want to place parks, there are some opportunities that persons who own particular parcels of property may assume we might want to buy it, and might tend to want to inflate that. We also have the opportunity to reject that also. That still does not negate our opportunity and responsibility to say there are some general areas where we intend to locate some parks. Statistics indicate the needs are there. That some of those citizens indicated for us to ask people to expect them to go out and fight and support a park bond, and we are not willing to make any kind of general or specific commitment, is a little unreasonable. He thinks the report was a little bit inconsistent in that we said on one hand we do not want to make specific commitments because we do not want to have to purchase property and it be inflated; and on the other hand, we indicated we are going to purchase property in the Plaza Road area somewhere in the area of \$1.0 million. To him that seems to be a little inconsistent when we indicate our intent to purchase property in one area, and then say we do not want to indicate our intent to purchase property in another area.

He stated in Tom Finnie's comments, it was indicated that the maintenance of neighborhood parks would be costly, and we might want to build them on a one to one basis from year to year as opposed to making some specific priorities right now. He is at a loss as to why the maintenance for a neighborhood park would be any more expensive than maintaining a community center or even a community park where we might have someone living. His concerns about neighborhoods parks, and maybe district parks, is that out of all the comments he heard from people who made comments to the Planning Commission, even the Planning Commission indicated there was a need for more parks in communities; that is what people were saying, rather than having much larger parks, their desire was to have smaller parks in their neighborhood areas. So it seems that we took an about-face, and decided on our own, that regardless of citizens input, we are going to try to develop much larger parks. He asked for an explanation of expenses for maintaining neighborhood parks as opposed to a community center or community park?

Mr. Finnie replied there are two points; his point about being on a year to year basis does not determine the maintenance, rather that it is possible that revenue sharing and other funds are available on a year to year basis on smaller parks, and it is easier to get enough money to buy a smaller park.

He stated as far as maintenance cost goes, it costs more to maintain the large number of parks than the relatively small number of community centers - they are talking about 2 to 4 community centers, and 30 to 50 parks. The cost of maintaining smaller parks is higher on a per acre basis because a large part of maintaining them is travel time. In a district park, the crew can spend a half day or full day taking care of it. In smaller parks they may do two, three or four a day, and they lose time in traveling.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 13

Mr. Finnie stated in the Cox-Carroll-Leeper Plan the amount designated for district parks as small parks was almost the exact same maintenance cost - a perfect relationship there. The proposal by the Finance Committee simply reduces the amount of money allocated to parks in general - district and neighborhood parks. Neighborhood parks are a little more expensive to maintain per acre, and there are a lot more neighborhood parks being proposed.

Councilmember Leeper stated he still does not see how they come to that conclusion. What is the cost of maintaining a park once it is developed - a neighborhood park, that is; he is specifically talking about neighborhood parks. He does not see that there would be that much maintenance. That what they did was to shift money from neighborhood parks to recreational facilities which meant community centers. That when he talks about showing that comparison with the maintenance cost, he just cannot see how they made that kind of comparison.

Mr. Finnie replied he is not trying to say that it is more expensive to maintain a park than a community center; all he is talking about is only three or four community centers and about fifty parks, including all the school parks. Mr. Leeper stated then that is different and they need to separate that, because what was cut out was the neighborhood parks and the district parks. They need to be more specific when they talk about the maintenance in terms of operating those in comparison with some of the other things that were included.

Mr. Finnie stated the cost in maintaining a school neighborhood park is almost the same as maintaining a "regular" neighborhood park. There is very little difference.

Councilmember Frech stated they have heard it said today that people have been deceived before by being promised things that they think they did not get. This is exactly what the Committee had in mind when they all agreed that the worst thing they could do would be to promise the specific park in a specific place that later, for various reasons, might not be able to be built. They were trying to avoid what people say has been done to them in the past. They were not trying to conceal anything or to evade any responsibility - they were simply trying to avoid future deceiving of people. That as far as she can tell, there is no way this Council can commit future Councils to build a specific park. They can state that they would like to see a certain park built, but if the present Council is not here several years from now when the money is spent, there is no way to require that to be done.

Councilmember Locke stated that in years past every Council has gone along with recommendations of the prior Council; have never in any way dissented from the previous Council's action in this kind of thing.

Councilmember Frech replied perhaps so, but she thinks what they are trying to do is avoid disappointment in the future. She stated that perhaps it is not clear, but in the statement of intent they did feel that they were operating along the guidelines of the short range park plan. If it does not say specifically what parks are to be developed, it is because they intend to develop parks as recommended in the short range park plan. That it may be that what Councilmember Leeper is concerned about is something that they should consider doing; that is, simply add a statement that it is Council's intention to build certain neighborhood and district parks as funds are available.

Councilmember Leeper stated what they are asking the citizens to do is support something on the intention that in the event funds come up . . . they are asking citizens to support a \$9 million bond package and telling them that really we do not have anything in the bond package for you, but in the future as funds come along, we will consider you. That is basically what they are saying.

Ms. Frech replied with all the district school parks and the neighborhood school parks, is there nothing for these people? She was not aware they were saying that; but perhaps they could clarify a little more by saying that in addition to the school parks and the district parks, they place priorities on certain neighborhood parks.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 14

Councilman Leeper offered an example of inconsistency. We said that we are not going to make any specific proposals about district parks, because we do not want to commit ourselves to the land that might not be available at some point in time or that it might be an inflated cost. We purchased some property down in Ramblewood some time during the first part of the year which means we already own the property, our intention was to build a park and all we have to do is improve the property and make a park out of it. We own the property and all we have to do is state our intentions of developing that park along with some of the others that we are going to develop. That is just inconsistent.

Councilmember Frech stated she is saying that perhaps that is what we need to do and she thinks the Council might be willing to add to what is here. That we do intend to develop those parks. She does not see any problem or where any conflict is in that.

Councilmember Short stated he wanted to re-phrase Ms. Frech's statement of what he took to be the intent of the Committee. That the purpose here is, indeed, not to disappoint someone in the future; but that is a smaller purpose compared to what he took to be the real purpose of the Committee - to pass the bond referendum. If they do not get this bond referendum passed, then nobody is going to get anything.

He stated he does not know where Ramblewood is even located, but if they start zeroing in on a small piece of land in Ramblewood, and have voters all over this City who are just not interested in Ramblewood, then those voters have been turned off. That they can assume from the fact that the need was listed as \$30 million and there is approximately \$10 million involved in the referendum, that they have already, in effect, led a lot of people to wonder if they are going to get anything. It is just a fact of dealing with voters in a bond referendum that you have to be somewhat generalized.

As an example - the drainage bond. We have 1,300 cases and are going to have money enough to give some assistance to perhaps less than 50. If they tried to particularize it, they are going to turn off 1,250 people right there who see that their situation is not going to be reached by the bond issue.

That as he sees it, the Committee's plan and all of the other plans were just that the Council paid attention to all of those plans where by looking at them was a procedure for determining the total amount of money that should go into this bond issue. From these plans they have concluded that \$9.7 million is a reasonable amount to spend for parks and recreation in this community. That was determined by looking at these various plans.

Mr. Short stated that he expects to support the Finance Committee's plan - he voted for it in the committee - but he has already had some conversations with Mr. Carroll and others that lead him to believe that, when the time comes, it can be improved a little bit. But, that may be three or four years from now. All they are saying here is that they have determined a certain amount of money which will be spent for this general purpose, by this Council, over the next three or four years.

He stated that an individual who seems to realize the necessity of being very general like this is Mr. Hartsock. His comments were along the line of he and his group are going to support this thing whatever it is, they are for it one hundred percent. They are going out there and work for everybody's park and hope that somehow they will later be included. That the gentleman who represented the disadvantaged seemed to realize that. That he made the comment that for them to zero in on a certain amount seemed to be almost selfish on their part - and he used that word. It is easy for the voters to conclude that somebody in a certain geographic area is being selfish, and they get a little turned off where you have a bond issue that is involving nothing but "blood" money.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 15

Councilmember Short stated he thinks the attitude of the Committee was, yes we do not want to disappoint somebody a few years from now by being specific, but the basic thing is that we have to pass this, and it is going to be a difficult bond issue to pass.

Councilmember Trosch stated the Finance Committee's report does have some differing instances; that there is more money that has been put into the development of the Plaza Road Park, therefore there was a differing of priorities from the Cox-Leeper-Carroll memorandum and, to some degree, also from the Planning Commission. She believes that some of that came from the comments from the staff about operating expense.

Also, she went to speak to citizens on Tuesday night and that district asked "What's in it for us?" She immediately answered, "Evergreen" but realizes she cannot say that; she does not know that, although she knows that Evergreen is a high priority. She could say to them that according to the proposal from the Finance Committee, certain schools will probably be developed.

That when she went home and looked at the priority listing given to them by the Planning Commission, she found that the picture made, in developing all neighborhood school parks and district school parks, some of which were third year priorities, is an inconsistent picture for the community. That, for instance, Mr. Leeper's district may not have as many schools to develop, so the Planning Commission, in making that plan, substituted the development of purchased land - Ramblewood or whatever - to make that whole.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 16

So, when they go armed with a neighborhood school park and a district school park named, and do not go armed with his district, she can understand the feeling that we are not getting anything in our district. How to overcome this perhaps is to look at the priority need even though we are developing the neighborhood school parks because of the cost effectiveness of that, and the need for joint programs in the district school parks; also perhaps to name the higher priority in the other parks, that have been defined that made that package in the first year look more divided according to need among work in the community. Then you can go and say we will go by the principle of developing neighborhood school parks, we will go by the principle of developing the district school parks, also. We will also develop according to priority and there is money left over in the Finance Committee's report for that kind of development. It is not that it is all used up in the neighborhood school parks or the district school parks.

Councilmember Selden stated that in the \$30 million and the \$9.7 million relationship, he believes the \$30 million relates to the short range in County and City combined, so that really they are talking about \$19.7 of the \$30 million, or roughly two-thirds, which is a more comprehensive position.

That secondly, when the Committee debated this matter of shares between the different types of parks, different members of the Committee brought up certain areas such as Statesville Road Park; that in their deliberations they made certain that there were adequate funds for all those specifics that there was concern about. The ultimate decision of the Committee was that to be specific was detrimental when you went down below the category of a given park.

Councilmember Carroll stated his feeling was he wanted to come in and suggest some changes in the percentages of Mr. Cox's committee, to put a greater emphasis back on where we had the district parks and neighborhood parks in some of our earlier discussions.

He stated he ran into Ted Hartsock down the hall a few minutes ago, and he said "If you want to get this thing passed, you're going to have to be specific. We're dealing with sophisticated voters out there. I talked to my next door neighbor about it, and he said 'I'm going to vote against it unless I know exactly where that \$9.7 million is going.'"

Councilmember Short replied he might have said "unless that \$9.7 million is partially spent in my neighborhood".

Councilmember Carroll replied he does not think so; that they are dealing with a sophisticated electorate now, and are dealing with them in a closer relationship with our district representatives than we ever have before. That people understand the need for something to be done in all segments of the community. That the citizens can rightly expect to have Council's intentions spelled out. Albeit, things can come up in the future, and they will not be able, perhaps, to carry out that intention. But, it is important that they state their intention and it will really enhance the possibility of this thing passing. That the County has basically done that. They have adopted what the County Park & Recreation Commission presented to them at a \$10.0 million level. And, they spelled out what they were going to do in determining the parks, where they were going to be, and where the greenways were going to be.

He thinks it is appropriate for the City to spell out that intention.

Councilmember Carroll made the following substitute motion:

"That we endorse as a park program, to be funded to the extent possible by the \$9.7 million park bonds, the following:

- (1) The development of a natural preserve at Plaza Road.
- (2) The development of a community park at Statesville landfill.
- (3) Acquisition of district parks at Randolph and Lakeview.
- (4) The development of district parks at Evergreen, Randolph, Lakeview, and Ramblewood.
- (5) The development of the district school parks and neighborhood school parks as set forth in the Finance Committee's recommendation.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 17

- (6) The development of neighborhood parks at Green Oaks Road, Griers Grove, Boulevard Homes, Derita Creek, Viewmont Drive, Tom Hunter Road, Pressley Road, Sharon Road, Briarcreek and Hanson Drive, Cedar Wood, Shannon Park; plus four of the ten additionally needed sites identified by the Planning Commission based on their priorities.
- (7) That we allocate \$500,000 for park improvements.
- (8) That we allocate \$400,000 for special population.
- (9) That we allocate \$2.55 million for recreational facilities based on the criteria of need and population served as set forth by the Finance Committee recommendations.
- (10) That in order to minimize the impact on debt service and the operating budget for the programming of these expenditures, the necessary bond sales be scheduled over a three and a half year period."

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Leeper for purposes of discussion.

Councilmember Gantt stated he believes the kind of thing that Mr. Carroll and Mr. Leeper are concerned about are real problems. Notwithstanding the interest that Mr. Short has and the points he has raised, they may in fact be speaking to the perception on the part of some voters in this community, based on past history. Council cannot ignore that - the perception that quite frankly government cannot be trusted. That this Council, and more recent ones, have done more to alleviate that fear, but he heard, in the public hearing, almost all of the citizens saying that they want to know specifically what is in this plan. That they can stop short of the kind of specificity that says they are going to acquire (a) property on (b) corner when this bond referendum is passed; that they should stop short of placing on the ballots the specific parks to be voted upon; and they can be more general in certain categories; but a priority plan requires that the Council simply "bite the bullet" on that issue.

He stated they cannot go before the community, given the fact that there is some concern already about the amount of dollars being spent by the County and the City, without saying here are the priorities. That he happens to believe that citizens in this community will not turn their backs on this particular issue simply because a park is not going to be developed in their neighborhood, particularly if they understand the Council's public reasoning of why these parks are going to be located where they are. They have a good foundation to go on - a short range park plan that all of the Councilmembers have commended. That he is going to support this package although he is not sure that he understands everything which Mr. Carroll has set out in the motion. He really would like to suggest that Mr. Carroll allow Council one week to look at this against the Finance Committee's operation. It seems to him that they could pass the other items indicating their desire to set the bond referendum. That no one has said anything about putting the City-County thing together - whether or not the County should be involved in land acquisition primarily and the City in development, and all the other kinds of things that they might work out. It may well be that what Mr. Carroll is recommending is a negotiating posture in which the City can sit down with the County to coordinate their programs. That may, in fact, change once they have had a chance to talk to the Commissioners about this.

Mr. Gantt stated he does not mind Council setting a priority list now, such as was suggested, and use that in terms of going to the County and saying that maybe we should get this thing together in terms of who will acquire the land, etc.

Mayor Harris stated that the County plan is a capital acquisition plan; that is what it really boils down to. That they are not going to change; it has already been set. That the City and County will be coordinated from the standpoint of the campaign; that there will be a press conference on Wednesday regarding chairmen - one from the County and one from the City. He believes the important thing is that the County will be a capital acquisition program of land acquisition, and that is one reason that he would have some concern about the monies being allocated for this natural preserve because we are growing and the County, with their interest like that and the scarcity of funds that we have, he believes it is important that the City be responsive to the citizens for the development of these areas, rather than the acquisition of the areas. That a joint committee on consolidation will also be announced later this week and that ought to be taken into consideration.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 18

Mr. Burkhalter stated that all Council needs to do today is approve the \$9.7 million on the bond referendum.

Councilmember Cox stated they are talking about at least two issues, perhaps more - one is specificity and the other is the neighborhood/district park land versus some other kind of .. really what he is talking about is percentages.

He stated that in the Committee meeting, it got down to the point of saying Plaza Road acquisition is important, we have to have it; Plaza Road development is important, we have to have it; Statesville Road development is important, we have to have it; swimming pools are important, we have to have them; recreational facilities are important, we have to have them. The fact of the matter was that in the committee, when they started out with the CLC Plan, they did not have a problem with specificity, because it says they are going to do it all. That he is quite willing to take that approach.

Mr. Cox stated the point is that when you take money away from district and neighborhood parks and put it somewhere else, you lose your option of being specific, then you must be general or lose the option of being specific to the point of excluding someone who is already on one of the other plans. That needs to be said!

That if he heard the motion right, they are going to spend more than \$9.7 million. If that is not what was said, then they took money away from natural preserve and community parks, they took money away from recreational facilities; and put it in district parks and neighborhood parks. He stated he does not have any problem doing that with the obvious caveat that it increases our operating costs and increases pressure on our tax dollar; that he thinks that will introduce another kind of problem. He is quite willing to have the voters vote on whether they want more district and neighborhood parks. But, if we are going to be specific about district parks and neighborhood parks, then we have to be specific about which of the three natural preserves and community parks that this \$2.6 million was intended to fund - which one is going to go where.

Councilmember Carroll stated that the motion was done in terms of what their intention would be to respond to the things that Ms. Frech was talking about; to expand the intentions which Councilmembers had expressed with the school parks and to what Mr. Gantt was saying; but without locking them in. That what he has heard is that citizens are entitled to know what they basically will be buying. That he was concerned also, from the information they got from the Budget Department, that the operating costs would be increased this way; that maybe they need to take a look at how they can reduce some of those operating costs. That he believes what they heard throughout the hearings on the parks - they are doing this in the context of the fact that they had the Planning Commission have a hearing in each district in the City in which people have been told "these are the things in your area which will serve you if the short range plan is implemented."

He stated they have those expectations built in and he believes they have to meet the need; that if the cost in terms of operating is more than they want to spend, then they need to address the operating costs. That from the information that Ms. Trosch has, we are already below everybody else's operating costs anyway. He stated the parks which he included were parks that were included in the Planning Commission's study as priorities; they were the ones taken off the memorandum of August 3rd.

Councilmember Cox stated they are being very specific about district parks and neighborhood parks (Mr. Carroll stated he was specific about each one of them - all of them.) If they are reducing the allocation from 26.8 percent in the Finance Committee's report, to 19 percent, that means to him that the money goes out of the natural preserve community area somewhere else. That what he is asking is - in that plan, are they going to be non-specific about what they are going to do there, because one you reduce roughly a quarter of that, then you cannot do either Plaza Road acquisition, Plaza Road development, or Statesville Avenue development. That was the problem that the Committee got into.

Councilmember Carroll stated he named each one of them and what they would do with them. Councilmember Cox replied we do not have enough money to do all of that; according to the projections they had. That is his problem!

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 19

Councilmember Carroll stated he did not suggest any development program; that he thought he said acquisition; that if he said development, he did not mean to.

Councilmember Dannelly stated he was a minority of one on the committee in that he felt that they should have been more specific. That is the only reason the neighborhood school parks were listed in their report. That he indicated that he was hearing that people had been disappointed in the past because of their not being specific and that they wanted to know where the money would go. He must admit that in all fairness, he does believe that the Cox -Carroll-Leeper original plan is more equitable, on the basis of the parks that we have now, and on the basis of needs as to the research they have done and for the services that citizens need at this time, that plan presently would do more to satisfy the citizens throughout Charlotte. That, in addition, he found himself in the same position with a group in Thomasboro as Ms. Trosch had related - that some of the citizens said they had been waiting and had been promised for the last 20 some odd years and they still do not have adequate park facilities in that area. He stated that being specific will certainly boost the morale of our citizens and give them more faith in government, and possibly help pass this bond issue.

Councilmember Chafin stated she wanted to agree and disagree with the Finance Committee's recommendations and with Mr. Carroll's motion. That it is clear, as they listen to this discussion and as they heard citizens speak, that they are going to have to be specific in stating to the citizenry what the City's intentions are. This is an era of full disclosure and an attempt on the part of elected officials to be open and honest with the citizenry. That it is important to look very carefully, when they get to the allocation or the percentages, at Mr. Carroll's recommendations, in light of Mr. Cox's comments and some things that Mr. Finnie said that we do have to be concerned about the fiscal impact of these recommendations in terms of operating costs. She stated they also have an opportunity to fund the neighborhood parks in particular, on a year-to-year basis. This is not the kind of expenditure that has to come out of a bond referendum.

She believes those two items need to be closely considered and for those reasons she would be inclined to support the recommendations of the Finance Committee, as far as the percentages. That, finally, it is clear that they are not going to resolve anything here today on this and that they do need time for further study.

Ms. Chafin moved that a decision on the Finance Committee's report be tabled for two weeks. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Gantt, and carried unanimously.

3. Adoption of Orders authorizing the issuance of bonds on the second reading.

Thereupon, upon motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Chafin, the order introduced and passed on first reading on August 28, 1978, entitled: "ORDER AUTHORIZING \$9,700,000 PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES BONDS", was adopted on the second reading, by unanimous vote.

Thereupon, upon motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Short, the order introduced and passed on first reading on August 28, 1978, entitled: "ORDER AUTHORIZING \$5,600,000 WATER BONDS", was adopted on the second reading by unanimous vote.

Thereupon, upon motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Trosch, the order introduced and passed on first reading on August 28, 1978, entitled: "ORDER AUTHORIZING \$3,200,000 SANITARY SEWER BONDS" was adopted on the second reading by unanimous vote.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 20

Thereupon, upon motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Short, the order introduced and passed on first reading on August 28, 1978, entitled: "ORDER AUTHORIZING \$1,500,000 STORM SEWER BONDS" was adopted on the second reading, by unanimous vote.

The Clerk was directed to publish each of the said orders in The Charlotte Observer once, and to publish at the foot of each of said orders the appended note, as required by The Local Government Bond Act, as amended.

4. Adoption of a Resolution Calling a Special Bond Election on Tuesday, November 7, 1978.

Thereupon, Councilmember Gantt introduced the resolution entitled: "RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL BOND REFERENDUM". The Clerk was directed to publish in The Charlotte Observer the Notice of the Special Bond Referendum to be held on November 7, 1978, and to deliver a certified copy of the resolution to the Mecklenburg County Board of Elections within three days after its passage.

Thereupon, upon motion of Councilmember Gantt, seconded by Councilmember Trosch, the resolution entitled: "RESOLUTION CALLING A SPECIAL BOND REFERENDUM" was passed by unanimous vote:

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, beginning at Page 413, with the Orders having been recorded in Ordinance Book 26, beginning at Page 220.

RESOLUTION APPROVING THE SALE OF EIGHT HOUSES AND LOTS TO MOTION, Inc. IN THE THIRD WARD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TARGET AREA.

The scheduled public hearing was held on the sale to MOTION, Inc. of eight properties on Greenleaf and Victoria Avenues, in the Third Ward Community Development Target Area.

Mr. Vernon Sawyer, Community Development Director, stated his department has negotiated the sale of these houses and lots to MOTION, Inc. for rehabilitation and sale. That under the City's contract with MOTION, the purpose of this is to create more homeownership in our city target areas by rehabilitating these properties that are purchased in a very rundown condition and offering them at affordable prices.

No one spoke in opposition.

Upon motion of Councilmember Cox, seconded by Councilmember Gantt, and carried unanimously, the resolution approving the sale was adopted.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 424.

MEETING RECESSED AND RECONVENED.

Mayor Harris called a recess at 5:01 p. m. and the session reconvened at 5:15 p. m.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 21

CONTRACT WITH COMMUNITY SCHOOL OF THE ARTS FOR AN INTRODUCTION TO MUSIC PROGRAM FOR PRE-SCHOOL AND SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN.

Motion was made by Councilmember Gantt, seconded by Councilmember Locke, approving a contract with Community School of the Arts for a program providing musical training and instruction for Community Development target area youths from September 11, 1978 to June 30, 1979 for a total cost of \$14,899.

Councilmember Trosch expressed her strong support of this program. She questioned the difference in the number of participants, stating that the evaluation last year was for 613 participants; that this year's contract is for about the same price range but there are only 309 participants?

Mr. Vernon Sawyer, Community Development Director, replied that the main reason for that is that the summer program has been eliminated. Ms. Trosch asked if it is the same contract, without the summer program and Mr. Sawyer replied yes. Ms. Trosch asked if they go back to the same children and progress through the 1 through 5?

Mr. Henry Bridges, Executive Director of the Community School of the Arts, stated there are two reasons for the reduction in the number of students. One is the fact that they are not doing the summer program this year - the summer students came for two weeks and the winter students came for the whole public school year. They both counted as one student, even though the term of teaching is shorter. The other reason is that they felt the need, in order to do the kind of quality program that they would like to do, of having more supervision in the program than they had last year. They have budgetted \$2,880 for a program coordinator who works 15 hours a week. Last year they did not have a program coordinator.

He stated one of the functions that they feel is very important is making some kind of follow-up on a student who misses a class. They try as much as possible to either make absentee calls, or if an absence continues, to make a visit. Last year they depended on the sponsoring agency to do this function and found that in many cases it did not get done. This year they have written in the program coordinator in order to do this function along with have visits to classes and keep a closer supervision, giving a much better quality to the program.

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

AMENDMENT TO A CONTRACT WITH MILLER, JOHNSTON, TAYLOR & ALLISON FOR LEGAL SERVICES FOR LAND ACQUISITION LITIGATION IN THE FIRST WARD URBAN RENEWAL AREA.

On motion of Councilmember Cox, seconded by Councilmember Selden, and carried unanimously, an amendment to the subject contract was approved for an amount not to exceed \$18,750.

RESOLUTION TO EMPLOY A CONSULTANT TO STUDY THE CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PLANNING PROCESS.

Councilmember Gantt, Vice Chairman of the Planning & Public Works Committee, spoke to a written report from the Committee which had been submitted to the City Council. He stated the Committee had spent a considerable amount of time looking at the planning process of the City; they received various comments from staff. That they identified some problem areas that they saw, related to policymaking, relationship of the present Planning Commission to the City Council and staff, and the administrative and implementation problems as related to what they perceived to be operational - that is the City Manager and his staff; and some further problems that related to inner-governmental relationships between the six governmental bodies of the County.

Mr. Gantt stated the committee did not seek to make a definite recommendation to Council because this is a very complex issue, but what they are really asking Council to act upon today is a resolution included in this interim

report to allow them to hire an ASPO consultant who will examine our present structure in more detail and make some recommendations to Council. They did want to prepare this report, however, to at least give the consultant some view as to what Council perceives to be the problem. It may very well be that upon examination by a more professional and disinterested person that consultant may not, in fact, agree with some of the committee's conclusions. That Councilmember Selden sat in on most of the Committee meetings and he has a differing perception as to what the problems are. Nevertheless, the consensus of the majority of the committee was that we do have some problems. That given the structure of where the Planning Commission sits in the overall structure in this County, organizationally, it has created some problems with regard to policymaking and implementation of plans. That since planning is becoming an important facet in the development of policymaking in the community, they felt that it is time to re-evaluate it.

He stated it is interesting to note that since the Charter was passed back in the early 50's, Council has not examined that particular structure in light of present day needs. That planning, certainly at that time, was not nearly as much in the forefront as it is today. So, what the Committee is really asking Council to do - and this is not intended to cut off debate - is, whether they agree with some of the points made by the Committee or not, that they approve the resolution which essentially identifies their concerns and requests the Council to allow them - the Mayor and himself - to work with getting involvement of other governmental bodies in the County to participate as they deem appropriate. Hopefully, appropriate might mean participating in the cost of funding a consultant. But, at least would not limit them in the event that the County or some other group decided they did not want to participate; they feel it is important that this person be brought in to look at this problem.

That the report is important from another standpoint in that when they started this study there was a perception that at least some of the Committee was on a witch hunt to keep the issue of the Planning Director before the Council and to involve them more substantially in that decision. Their report makes no mention of the Planning Director, nor in fact, the specific qualities of the Planning staff that exists today, and for very sensitive and good reasons. However, notwithstanding (and this is his own personal opinion) how ever good planning director we might have, the core problem is that the City itself needs to have a more direct and integrated relationship to the planning in this community. It does not now have that. That no matter how super the director would be, or any proposed director would be, he doubts if that problem would be totally resolved. He would, however, reserve his final opinion until they have had this consultant hired and hear his report.

Councilmember Selden stated he had the privilege of sitting in with the Planning and Public Works Committee and they did an excellent job in ferreting out some of the problems. They gave him an opportunity to speak and that was appreciated. Mr. Selden read the following statement:

I, too, am very concerned about the planning process as it is being conducted here in Mecklenburg County. However, my first concern is that none, absolutely none, of our plans and policy development have been, or are being, structured on a viable, realistic and comprehensive population projection that is up to date.

As you may recall, I raised this objection last February and as a result succeeded in obtaining a 20 percent reduction in the Comprehensive Plan population projection in the County. However, this adjustment was never reflected in the individual projections throughout the County, or the traffic volume data and other statistics which are based on population data.

The report of the Planning and Public Works Committee makes the very true assertion that planning as an instrument for policy making is too fragmented; and I totally agree. It is my opinion that this fragmentation is the result of the Planning staff attempting to develop policy rather than elected design with predicted consequences of a "go/no-go" decision.

The early appointment of a strong, well-qualified Planning Director would certainly be the means of correcting this dilemma. This report more or less promotes the consolidation of all planning processes, such as transportation, traffic, community development, utilities, etc., under one administration. Planning within the Traffic Department or the Utilities Department, etc. should certainly relate and conform to the master plan of population growth and development, including any administrative policies set by the governing body related to this growth. The specific planning for transportation or utilities or any other function of the other departments must be conducted within these other departments. Otherwise, their plans would not include the individual characteristics that the service offers.

For instance, bus service may be planned to a given community of the city based on an indicated need as seen by a planning staff, but if there are, or will be, no riders on such a route, it is idiotic to plan for the route. To transfer all planning to one department would require a substantial increase in personnel and expertise of that department, and would lead to considerable inefficiency in the other departments' operation.

Item (A)3 of the committee's report indicates a high degree of inconsistency between the Comprehensive Master Plan and short range planning. I share the view that this is so, but I hold that the reasons for this are: (a) the Comprehensive Plan is out of date and loaded with distortion and impracticality; (b) there is no firm leadership for the Planning staff and there is little prospect for such until a new director is hired; (c) short range planning and guidance emanates from the same planning body that designed the Comprehensive Plan, but there appears to be no coordination within that planning organization between long range and short range planning.

Item (A)4 of the report identifies the lack of communication between Planning staff and other groups. It is my opinion that a new Planning Director should and could correct that situation.

Item (A)5 states, in effect, the County appointees ". . . are not accountable to the electorate." This is totally in error since the County Commissioners who appoint them are elected by residents inside the City limits as well as those outside this boundary. As a matter of fact, the County Commission members are subject to a larger constituency than that of the at-large City Councilmembers, and that is substantially more than those representing districts. More than 75 percent of their electorate are City citizens.

I agree that there is planning fragmentation between city, county and town, but the fault does not necessarily lie in the door of the Planning Commission or of the Planning Department. Each of these governing bodies has a geographic area of responsibility and each share in the output of objective planning policies generated by the Planning staff. The decision making process and the establishment of policy for action within each of these geographic areas rests with the respective governing body. If I were a resident of Mint Hill or Matthews, or simply lived outside the city limits of Charlotte, I would not want that decision or policy related to my area to be under the control and administration of Charlotte's governing body. That philosophy is like taxation without representation.

In Item (C) of the report it is stated that the City of Charlotte represents two-thirds to three-fourths of the population of the County. The part is overlooked that the County governing body represents one hundred percent of the population in the County. Perhaps the division of appointments should be greater to the County than the City, to be equitable. This section further indicates a lack of coordination of the planning process with the Board of Education. Apparently the fact that our school system is under the administration of the County Commission has been overlooked. I do feel that the six smaller towns in

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 24

the County should be represented in this matter. I also feel that they, and the county, should share in the re-examination of the planning process including the employment of the consultant and his cost, if they so desire. I, therefore, move a substitute resolution as follows:

WHEREAS, the Planning and Public Works Committee has studied the planning process as it now exists in Charlotte-Mecklenburg;

WHEREAS, the Committee has identified numerous problems arising out of fragmented state of planning in the City;

WHEREAS, the Committee believes there is an opportunity to make substantial improvements in the planning process;

WHEREAS, it is highly desirable that the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissioners and the six towns within Mecklenburg County should be invited to participate with the City Council in this endeavor;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council, through the Mayor, invite the County Commission and the six towns' governing bodies to join with the City of Charlotte in employing a consultant endorsed by the American Institute of Planners to study the Charlotte-Mecklenburg planning process and to share in the cost of this study. The proposed allocation of cost between the entities would be 6% of the cost divided equally among the six towns and the remainder shared on a 50-50 basis between city and county governments.

He stated the last sentence could be deleted if other Councilmembers do not like the apportionment.

Councilmember Locke seconded the motion for the adoption of this resolution for the purpose of discussion, asking that the last sentence be deleted.

Councilmember Trosch stated that if this last sentence is deleted she does not understand why it is different from the resolution proposed by the Committee.

Councilmember Selden replied that in the first place, this resolution basically sets the stage of it being a coordinated activity rather than an individual activity that invites - if you want to or you do not want to. That there was no mention of cost in the original proposal. Councilmember Locke stated that it also says the Mayor and the Vice Chairman would look for a consultant.

Mr. Selden stated there is a difference in that he has no objection at all for the consultant to be from the American Society of Planning Officials, but he feels he should be endorsed by the American Institute of Planners.

Councilmember Frech called for a point of order, stating that they did not have an original motion and second. Mr. Gantt stated he made a motion to adopt the original resolution, but the Mayor ruled that it was presented as a report from the committee. Whereupon, Mr. Selden stated his was a motion rather than a substitute.

Councilmember Trosch stated she still believes that when Mr. Selden's resolution says they are inviting them it does not mean in fact that they would be required to participate or that the process would be held up; our going ahead would not be contingent upon their participation. Mr. Selden replied that is true, but it sets the stage on an equal footing basis as a joint venture rather than an individual venture on the part of the City. That if they fail to join, then we can take up a resolve of a slightly altered plan.

Councilmember Carroll made a substitute motion for the adoption of the resolution proposed by the Planning and Public Works Committee. This motion was seconded by Councilmember Trosch.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 25

Councilmember Locke stated this resolution was not a unanimous one among the committee members. That she received it Wednesday afternoon at the Spirit Square reception and spent three hours looking at plans for Spirit Square and there was no way to respond to it, or to even read it, until late Thursday afternoon. That she disagrees; that she agrees wholeheartedly with having a consultant and trying to get the County Commissioners and some of the little towns to go in with them. When we hire consultants for any reason whatsoever, we always go through the normal selection process. That is the reason she disagrees with the Vice Chairman of the Committee being on this committee to help choose the consultant. That in the normal selection process, they are all invited to sit in when a consultant finally comes down to the staff recommendation. If the Council sits in on it they can agree or disagree or whatever. That the reason she is supporting Mr. Selden's resolution is that she feels they should go through the normal selection process and with this resolution that would be done. That it does not matter to her who recommends - the American Institute of Planners or ASPO or whoever - a consultant to our professional staff, just so we pick one through the normal selection process.

Councilmember Short asked Mr. Carroll if he would want his motion to be amended slightly to provide that the Mayor and Manager would recruit this person? He stated he asks that without any intention at all to slight Mr. Gantt; that Mr. Gantt moved into his position as the Vice Chairman at Chairman Locke's request and he appreciates what he has done. He has very definite ideas on this subject, but it seems to him that the Mayor and the Manager would be somewhat more detached perhaps in the recruiting.

Councilmember Carroll stated he was glad to see Mr. Gantt be involved because they would be making use of our home talent, and the fact that he was going to be judgmental in making sure that we got someone good and that is important. That he obviously has some background that the Mayor and the City Manager do not have.

Mayor Harris stated that perhaps they should pause for a moment and refresh everyone's mind about the hiring process, and about consultants.

Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, stated that the process that the Council has used for consulting engineers, architects, etc. is that the staff does the interviewing, sets up a procedure of elimination and, for obvious reasons, narrows it down to a group that they can reasonably handle, informs Council of when interviews are to be scheduled, and then proceeds from that point to interview them and make recommendations to Council. That they have always made a recommendation, but usually have an alternate or sometimes two, for Council to choose from.

He stated that this request stems from just a little bit of a different angle in that these are organizations in this particular field and do furnish this kind of service to the public. That his concern is that he should be the one to do this; that he does not say that for any personal reason, but just thinks it is a very dangerous precedent to set up that they start assigning committees or anybody else the responsibility of hiring consultants or this sort of thing. That the Council can keep better control over it if they let him do it than if they give it to the Mayor or a committee of the Council or something of this kind. They will not get something they do not want - he is not going to hire someone they do not want because the Committee is the one they would be hiring for. The person that they hire would be a lot more comfortable - there is no procedure for working any other way except through the administrative staff in this sort of thing. That it would work better, they could pay him better - the bookkeeping, the accounting, all of it just works better when you go through the established procedure.

Councilmember Gantt stated he is not interested in getting in the way of the normal process; and he is aware of how they go about hiring consultants. That all members of the Committee would probably be interested in this. That it was included in the resolution that the Committee received prior to this final report and the consensus of the majority of the Committee was that they wanted the Chairman to be involved with the Mayor. That the sense of that still is that the process go about in its normal fashion.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 26

He stated he does not want them to miss the underlying thing that they want to accomplish here and that is why he has problems with Mr. Selden's motion. It tends to hamstring the Council from the standpoint of if the County Commission and other towns, in fact, are quite comfortable with this process that we have, then the corollary of that is that they do not do anything about it. By using the term "invite" them to participate as they deem appropriate still allows the City the flexibility to move ahead with this matter rather than having to come back through the process again.

His final point is that the cost of this consultant and the reason why they specified a planning organization is that the Committee has reviewed some very thorough studies on organization by the ASPO-AIP people. It is not a question of simply finding an organizational specialist out here who simply will come in and give them the standard approach of a consultant's report on an organization. They want someone, a group of people, sanctioned by the ASPO and AIP or the combined organization that have had experience in looking at this specific issue of structure. If they are tied down to say that they cannot do this thing - or should not do this thing - unless the County agrees to participate, either by some formula or by leaving the formula unsaid, that they may be haggling over this issue for a very long time.

Councilmember Selden stated he is not tying them down in the motion he made. That he wants to point out that the resolution included in the agenda states that the City Council through the Mayor and the Vice Chairman proceed to employ a consultant. This means that by its very wording, the City Council is going to do the employing; and any town commission or any county commission can say "Well, if they are going to do the employing, let them go ahead with it." That when an employer employs a consultant the consultant looks first to that organization or that person, and anyone else outside is peripheral or secondary to the importance of the operation. He is endeavoring to give equal share, at least to invite equal share. If they do not accept, then he is all in favor of going ahead and employing, but in the interest of consolidation, in the interest of continuity, he would propose that they use the wording not that the City is going to employ, but that the total group would be the employer.

Mayor Harris stated that in the interest of time, if you try to get six towns to agree to sharing the cost with the City of Charlotte - that just is not going to happen. Mr. Selden replied if they do not, then we will proceed on our own. The Mayor stated that what he read in the Committee's report was to the effect that we have pretty definite feelings about this already, and we think the City ought to be determining its destiny more in this area, and if they believe that then there is no reason to have any of the small towns share the cost. They ought to invite them to participate. That he would really like to have a meeting with the mayors of these other small towns; that it seems to him that this would be a good time to sit down and talk, but not with the idea of sharing the cost. Charlotte is pretty dominate in Mecklenburg County.

Councilmember Selden asked what he would do about the County Commission? The Mayor replied they can join us if they like, but the report is indicating that we do not like what we have now. If that is the consent of Council, then he does not think they should invite the County Commission to pay half of the cost to say that we would like to dissolve our relationship.

Councilmember Gantt stated that if they would, fine; but otherwise they should go ahead.

Councilmember Cox stated there are a lot of things that he has disagreed with on this committee's work, but one thing he does agree with is that we need to do a better job of planning in Charlotte; that he is committed to that; that Council should make that happen. That when he thinks of planning he thinks primarily of land use and transportation policies and things like that. It is hard for him to understand how they can proceed to implement better planning when most of the development is happening on the periphery of the city. He finds it very hard to understand how they can make much progress in creating a very effective kind of planning organization without some kind of remedy for the perimeter areas. In the absence of either perimeter zoning or joint participation by the County, he finds it hard to understand how they

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 27

can make much progress. Therefore, he cannot support the City going off by itself without the County or without some commitment to perimeter zoning.

Mayor Harris stated when they talk about perimeter zoning - that should be in their legislative package.

Mr. Cox stated all he is saying is that it does not make much sense to him for them to proceed without either one of those two things being in place.

Councilmember Gantt asked if it is reasonable not to say that we fund a study that brings back a report - does it mean that cooperation by other governmental bodies is dependent upon their initial participation in a consultant study? That suppose they decide later to participate, would it be impossible to sit down and talk? Mr. Cox replied he does not think it is impossible but that the odds for success are better.

Mr. Gantt stated that is what they are talking about - trying to invite them to participate; they are not talking about going off and ignoring them. We have been inviting the County to participate in this from the beginning.

Councilmember Trosch stated that one of our crucial problems was wrestling with the problem in the relationship with the County on planning. That is why they are inviting them if they deem it appropriate to be a part of this. That in the consultant's report, she would hope that he would look at the options of perimeter zoning; look at the options of how we can involve the County. That the committee did not come up with the answer - they are not professional planners - to all problems. She wishes it were that easy. That is why they are at this place where they hope a consultant will come in and say "You have this option, and this option, this option. If you take this option . . . for instance, if they are going to go with the joint city/county agency, these are the costs that you, as a city - not financial costs, but costs in other things, whether land use planning or what - you will be making that policy decision at that point." Or, he or she may say this is another option and these are the costs. She stated the studies by ASPO are very complete; they deal with many, many options. The ones that she read did not come back with specific "this is your answer;" they came back with "these are your options, this is what it will cost you" - the very things Mr. Cox is talking about - then the decision is left to the governmental bodies that are involved, ultimately, to decide which option they would like to take and the costs they want to bear in the process.

Councilmember Dannelly stated that everyone's concerns are very good, but the original report had only one problem; that after Mr. Burkhalter's explanation, he would certainly like to ask Mr. Carroll whether or not he would accept adding something in the sixth paragraph of the resolution after the word "proceed", to say "through normal hiring procedures."

Councilmember Locke stated if they could just take Mr. Selden's resolution and in the last paragraph put a period after "planning process", that would do it. It takes care of what they have been discussing.

Councilmember Gantt indicated that he could accept that; that what she is saying is that all of the "whereas's" are the same. Councilmember Trosch replied no they are not - Mr. Selden has left out the third "whereas" which is crucial. It was agreed to put that one in.

Mr. Gantt stated the hang-up has been on the hiring procedure, which surprises him, but he is not worried about that. Why not take the substitute motion, which is the resolution proposed by the Planning and Public Works Committee and delete the sixth paragraph; then substitute Mr. Selden's fifth paragraph, altered as follows:

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council, through the Mayor, invite the County Commission and the six towns' governing bodies to join with the City of Charlotte in employing a consultant endorsed by the American Institute of Planning and the American Society of Planning Officials, to study the Charlotte-Mecklenburg planning process.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 28

Councilmember Carroll, having made the substitute motion, agreed to the change, stating that the only question that he had is that it does not specifically say to employ a consultant. He suggested the paragraph read:

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Manager proceed to employ a consultant endorsed by the American Society of Planning Officials to study the Charlotte/Mecklenburg planning process.

Mr. Gantt asked if that is the only change he would make, and Mr. Carroll replied everything else would remain the same.

Councilmember Chafin asked if they would not eliminate the last paragraph of the Committee's resolution and the consensus was yes.

Councilmember Cox stated he would have to make a comment for the record. That when he left the last committee meeting, he was under the impression that the results were going to come out differently than they have. For example, he was under the impression that they were going to ask the County Commissioners to participate and share the cost of the hiring of this consultant. That is what he agreed to.

Mayor Harris stated that is what the amendment to the resolution says. Mr. Cox replied that if they added a period after "planning process" it deleted "to share in the cost of this study." That he wants to vote yes to sharing the cost. Mr. Gantt stated that is not in the resolution.

Mr. Burkhalter stated he will add one little thing for information. First, he has heard, and the Mayor has heard, in the presence of the Chairman of the County Commission say that they were happy with the way the Planning Department is structured and that they did not see any reason to change this. That is just the chairman speaking and he is not stating his position - he just wants everyone to understand the thinking that is put into place there. That this Council, through its committee, has expressed some concerns about the way the planning process works for the City, and he does not think it is out of line at all for the Council to employ somebody to advise them, with an objective viewpoint, whether or not their thinking is very good. As he understands it, that is what they are really trying to do - to bring someone in with an objective viewpoint to say "Hey, you are just way out of place", or "no, you are right, you ought to be going . . .". He does not think the County is going to pay for it; he does not think they should even ask them. That they should say "we are going to do this; if you would like to participate, we are happy for you to participate, to come over and sit in on our meetings, talk with our planner. . ." That certainly no planner is coming here without talking with them.

Mayor Harris stated he is going to have a meeting with the mayors of the small towns, but he does not think they should worry about sharing the cost.

Councilmember Cox stated the point he is trying to make is that he thinks the committee system has taken a beating today; that he needs to make that point because he feels that strongly. That the Parks and Recreation thing has taken a real beating; they had seven members sitting around the Finance Committee and it appeared, at least to him as Chairman, that they all agreed that was going to be the way that it made sense. Now, they have had a different kind of problem with the committee system. That they have had two very important - probably the two most important issues that they will face as a Council (Planning and Park and Recreation) and the committee system has not worked well for them.

Mayor Harris asked what he means by "has not worked well." Does he mean has not been reported out as well, or has not agreed, or what? Mr. Cox replied he is just trying to express his frustration with the fact that it has not worked well - it they would like for him to go into it at this time he will be delighted to do that. Mayor Harris replied he did not think they needed that.

Councilmember Short stated that the Finance Committee's plan was postponed for two weeks. It may very well be an excellent plan that the members of Council might like then. That also, what they are voting on here is

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 29

something arranged and proposed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee - he does not see it as a beating. Ms. Trosch stated it was directed by the committee. Mr. Cox stated all he is saying is that the resolution came out different from what he voted on. Ms. Locke stated that she and the Vice Chairman just sat here and got together - today, right here and right now.

Councilmember Dannelly stated that having worked on the Finance Committee, that one thing the committee has done for him, and he does not think it is a loss; that both of these committees have done a lot of discussing and have done a lot of research to make it more understandable for this body. He hates to see this body go through the research and understanding that particularly this group brought out and pointed out to a lot of them. He thinks it is very fruitful and saves a lot of time.

Councilmember Chafin called for the question and Councilmember Carroll read the amended resolution as follows:

WHEREAS, the Planning and Public Works Committee has studied the planning process as it now exists in Charlotte-Mecklenburg;

WHEREAS, the Committee has identified numerous problems arising out of fragmented state of planning in the City;

WHEREAS, the Committee has identified problems of fragmentation arising out of a multiplicity of governmental units within Charlotte-Mecklenburg;

WHEREAS, the Committee believes there is an opportunity to make substantial improvements in the planning process;

WHEREAS, it is highly desirable that the Mecklenburg Board of County Commissioners and the six towns within Mecklenburg County should be invited to participate with the City Council in this endeavor;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Manager proceed to employ a consultant endorsed by the American Society of Planning Officials to study the Charlotte/Mecklenburg planning process;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor invite the Board of County Commissioners and the six towns within Mecklenburg County to participate in this endeavor as they deem appropriate.

The vote was taken on the substitute motion as amended and carried as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Carroll, Chafin, Cox, Dannelly, Frech, Gantt, Leeper, Locke, Short and Trosch.

NAY: Councilmember Selden.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 425.

Councilmember Selden stated he does not want the question of population projection to be lost; that he would hope, for that purpose, the memorandum which he wrote will be handed to the consultant.

Mayor Harris reminded the chairmen of the committees to make sure that they take into consideration only those items referred to that committee - nothing else. That this may be hard to do at times, but we do not have an operating committee system where issues can come directly before a committee for consideration. He stated the same type of process is in effect as they have with the Liaison Committee - every item considered by a committee comes through a vote of Council for referral to a committee; then the appropriate committee is selected by the Mayor.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 30

ORDINANCE NO.278-X TO AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 91-X, THE 1978-79 BUDGET ORDINANCE, INCREASING THE REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES FOR THE TRANSPORTATION FUND TO FINANCE THE COMPLETION OF THREE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.

On motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Cox, and unanimously carried, the subject ordinance was adopted, reappropriating the FY78 balance of transit funds, \$61,471, to the FY79 Transportation Fund to finance the completion of projects initiated by Transit Planning in the past fiscal year.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 26, at Page 224

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING A NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION GRANT FOR THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION SECTION 9 TECHNICAL STUDIES FOR FY79.

On motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Selden, the subject resolution was adopted accepting a state grant in the amount of \$7,500 for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration Section 9 Technical Studies.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 426.

TRAFFIC MEASURES TO ELIMINATE CUT-THROUGH NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC APPROVED.

Approval was given to the implementation of traffic measures to eliminate cut-through neighborhood traffic on the following streets:

1. Spruce Street off West Boulevard, for permanent installation - on motion of Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Chafin and carried unanimously.
2. Southwold Drive off South Tryon Street, for temporary installation of Alternative 2 as proposed by the Traffic Engineering Department - with the motion being made by Councilmember Short, seconded by Councilmember Locke.

Mr. B. A. Corbett, Traffic Engineering Director, explained the two proposed alternatives, stating they have talked with the lady who owns property on both sides and she may be willing to donate right-of-way, but at the moment they feel that the solution provided by Alternate 2 would be the most economical and will probably solve the problem.

Councilmember Trosch stated the cost differential seems to be the major consideration in the report; also the fact that they would still have access, but the residents seem to favor the closing of the street. Is it not possible to very inexpensively close the street for a period, or is it the turnaround problem?

Mr. Corbett replied the turnaround problem would be the difficult part to solve. They could take barrels and put them across the street and close the median opening, but there would be no way for traffic to turn around and go back out the other way. That the recommended alternative is a much easier way of solving the problem on a temporary basis, as well as having a much lower construction cost - \$10,000 versus \$32,000.

Mrs. Woodard stated she lives on the corner of Southwold and Tryon; that they own the lot on their left and the three directly across the street. She hates to see the City waste the money on something temporary and they are willing to donate property for the hammer-head because the way the turnaround will be everyone from the river would make a righthand turn even if they had to go down, they would come back up and cut through as it is just a short street. That she has discussed this with Mr. Corbett for about a year and a half and she knows his feelings on it. But, it is about to drive them insane. She would like to see the street closed and their donating property would help - it would solve the situation so they would not have to go into it later.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 31

The solution to the problem was further discussed with several Councilmembers inquiring about various alternatives. Councilmember Leeper stated they should try the temporary measure; that the discouragement is going to be there if they cannot turn immediately into that street; that because of the expense involved in putting a permanent hammerhead there, he would like to see them try the method recommended by Mr. Corbett.

After further explanation by Mr. Corbett and response to Councilmembers' questions, the vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

Councilmember Short explained to Mrs. Woodard that these arrangements are always temporary under the cut-through program because they just have to see what is going to happen. He suggested that later she come back and make some comments.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE PERTAINING TO CITY TRANSIT SYSTEM APPROVED.

The following recommendations from the Transportation Committee were considered.

Advertising on Buses - On motion of Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Locke, and carried unanimously, the policy of advertising on buses will be continued.

Service for Elderly and Handicapped - Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Dannelly for approval of the Transportation Committee's recommendation regarding free off-peak tickets for the elderly and handicapped.

Mr. Michael Kidd, Transit Planner, stated that on April 4th the Transit Planning Office responded to a request from Mr. L. C. Coleman basically to eliminate transit fares for elderly, which in accordance with our TAPE program would include handicapped people as well. He stated their response at that time was that the TAPE program currently provides half fare (20¢) to the elderly and handicapped persons and that the additional annual subsidy required by the fare reduction could be better spent for general service improvements for the entire riding public; that the initiation of a fare-free program for elderly and handicapped persons would likely prompt similar requests from other community groups.

He stated that subsequent to their response, Mr. Coleman appeared before City Council requesting fare-free service for elderly persons and this request was referred to the Council's Transportation Committee. The committee met on August 10 and passed a motion saying that they recommend to Council that they adopt a free off-peak service for elderly and handicapped citizens, or that the entire Council could consider the suggestion of including 10 free off-peak tickets with the purchase of 10 regular tickets by the elderly or handicapped citizens. That also a photo ID system should be developed to insure that the privilege would not be abused; that senior and handicapped citizens would be expected to purchase and pay for the cost of the photo ID cards.

That Transit Planning was requested to investigate the cost of two alternatives presented in the motion, which really addressed two separate items - one a photo ID system and secondly, a fare elimination program.

In regard to the photo ID system, Transit Planning is now in the process of establishing a new registration identification system for the TAPE program. They have some small problems with administering the program right now, but the new system they are talking about which includes a photo ID system will be more efficient and will provide improved security for TAPE registration administration. Implementation for this is projected some time after the Uptown Information Center is opened which will be late October or early November, so sometime after that they should be ready to announce when they will start the new ID system.

In regard to the fare discount program, they have prepared a table outlining the likely costs of eight alternative fare reductions, including two that were recommended by the Transportation Committee. He explained the effect on their subsidy payments of each alternative.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 32

Mr. Kidd stated that after reviewing the original request with the analysis that was done at that time, as well as the cost information developed in this report, he still recommends that no change be made in the fare schedule for the elderly and handicapped provided in the existing TAPE program. However they are going to proceed with the changing of the registration process by going to a photo ID.

Councilmember Trosch stated it took some time for the committee to discuss and to understand and to come to its recommendation; that very little was provided in the agenda regarding this matter and the deliberations of the committee. That perhaps this is an item that needs to be deferred for more information. That if the full Council did receive copies of the committee minutes perhaps they are aware of this.

Councilmember Cox asked how much this would increase the ridership? Mr. Kidd replied it would be very difficult to project that.

Councilmember Gantt stated there are certain programs that we definitely get into that are designed to increase the ridership. This is more a welfare oriented type of thing, designed to additionally help senior citizens and handicapped people.

Councilmember Selden asked for clarification of a figure on the last alternative; Mr. Kidd apologized for the error, stating the figure should be \$126,000 instead of \$144,000.

Councilmember Dannelly stated he does not know how true it is but he understands that Central Piedmont Community College has an ID system already set up. That if this came about, would it be possible to have those persons be responsible for getting their own ID cards from that designated place. Would that cut down on the expense?

Mr. Kidd replied they could certainly look at that; that within the City family, he knows the Fire Department has some equipment, but he does not think that it is the type that they would need for this program. They are now in the process of looking to see. He was not aware of Central Piedmont's but it is a good suggestion. They will certainly use the cheapest way they can do it. They feel rather strongly that the person should pay the first time cost of acquiring the card, whatever that cost might be.

Councilmember Short stated Mr. Kidd does not recommend either the \$30,000 or the \$35,000 program? Mr. Kidd replied that is correct; they prefer to leave the program as it is. Mr. Short asked if in the event the Council votes for this, where would it come from? Would it come from the Council contingency?

Mr. Finnie, Budget Director, replied hopefully it would come from money that would accumulate during the year. He does not know that for a fact; they would have to go back and do a study. That it is all local money, but they would still go back and do an analysis to see where they stand in terms of the budget. If they did not have enough money to cover that, then it would require Council action.

In lieu of a motion by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Leeper, for approval of the second alternative recommendation of the Transportation Committee - a program of free off-peak tickets with the purchase of regular tickets - Councilmember Locke withdrew her previous motion.

A substitute motion was offered by Councilmember Trosch, seconded by Councilmember Locke, for a two-week deferral in order to secure more information.

Councilmember Cox asked Ms. Trosch to state, without going into details, why this should be deferred. Councilmember Trosch replied that the figures have just come before Council. Mr. Cox asked why is this complicated? Ms. Trosch replied she feels it is complicated because they are dealing with a fairly large subsidy and that it is a big enough decision. That there are some reasons that were made by Mr. Carroll and the committee as to why he felt that we ought to have the person participate in purchasing the tickets plus free tickets - that type of discussion.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 33

Mr. L. C. Coleman stated he does not think this matter should be deferred because it is something that will affect our entire city - to do something for people who are in need over the years. He understands what Ms. Trosch is saying, but he does not agree with what she said. That they would not be doing something they should do for citizens who have given long years of service and who receive less than \$200 a month in income. That there is nothing to talk about if they wait two weeks - two or three people might die before then; why not give them a chance now.

Mayor Harris stated the only thing he opposes in this type of a motion is that the welfare payments should come from the County - in other words, the City should be getting \$30,000 a year from the County to provide free bus service. It is inter-governmental. That it is a little more complicated than what Mr. Coleman is saying.

Mr. Coleman stated these people have paid taxes for 56 years both ways and now they are in need for many reasons. This is a time Council could do some humane service.

Mayor Harris asked if he feels we should have free bus service for the elderly, period? Mr. Coleman replied he thinks so, but they are not asking for that; they are asking for what Council just asked for. Yes, he thinks we could afford free service.

The vote was taken on Ms. Trosch's motion to defer and was defeated as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Trosch, Locke and Frech.

NAYS: Councilmembers Carroll, Chafin, Cox, Dannelly, Gantt, Leeper, Selden and Short.

Councilmember Carroll stated that Mr. Dannelly's suggestion that the identification procedures be tight enough so that there would be no abuse of this program was an integral part of the committee's recommendation. That this did not come from the staff as a part of this proposal.

Councilmember Cox stated this is the only reason he is voting for it.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

Mr. Burkhalter stated he wants everyone to understand that this will not be done tomorrow; that it will require a number of decisions about Sundays and other things and will be coming back to Council.

Study by ATE of the Transit Maintenance Facility - Motion was made by Councilmember Chafin, seconded by Councilmember Selden, to approve a study by ATE of the Transit Maintenance Facility.

Councilmember Gantt stated that Council will recall that for two or three times the Transit Planning Office has brought to Council proposals for a master plan study for a transit garage, which Council rejected on all occasions. Some of the reasons were that the cost of the study and the issues contained in the request for proposal in effect were items that many Councilmembers felt all along could be accomplished by the Management Company rather than by an architectural and engineering firm. That the committee had discussions with the staff and subsequently with ATE when they responded to a set of the committee's minutes, in which they indicated to staff that they felt that they could handle most of what had been defined - indeed had done most of this work before - and that there was apparently some misunderstanding in the earlier stages when these proposals were previously presented to Council.

He stated that on the basis of that, the committee felt that ATE, since it could do this work, should proceed to do it. That essentially the per diem would present no problems.

Councilmember Cox asked how much we would save by doing this? Mr. Gantt replied the figure was not given to them. That under the Management contract that is a part of the services that they provide.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 34

Mr. Cox stated the point he is trying to make is that by using the services of A/E we are in effect taking advantage of something we should have been taking advantage of all along, but he just wonders how much we save by doing that. In other words, what is the value of their relationship?

Councilmember Gantt replied a portion of this work will still be required by an A/E firm. He has always contended that is something that an A/E firm could do once we determine the basis for the study. There may be some cost associated which could probably be the front-end expense of an architectural contract at a later time. If he were putting the value on it, he would say the City would save about \$20,000.

Councilmember Short asked about the progress of our proposal and plans for the Square? Mr. Kidd replied that we have been promised by the Federal Government that they will give us some word on that application in October. That he has done everything he could do - he has called repeatedly, called on Congressman Martin's office and anyone else they can find to try to speed it along.

In response to a question from the Mayor, he stated his office is ahead of schedule, they should be in it probably the latter part of October.

Mr. Burkhalter stated he wants them to know that it is not going to be the complete plan that was proposed unless they do something about the traffic situation. That the City may not have done everything - you cannot put the whole thing in because the State will not agree to it.

Mr. Kidd stated they are getting conflicting reports out of the State. At one time they had agreed totally with the plan - both Trade and Tryon Streets are North Carolina maintained roadways. However, there are some problems with connectors.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

Participation with the Mecklenburg County Commission and UCS for Planning and Implementing a Program of Transportation for Special Populations.

Councilmember Chafin moved, seconded by Councilmember Short, that the City participate with the County Commission and United Community Services in planning and implementing a program of transportation for special populations.

Councilmember Selden stated he feels it is imperative that he bring to this Council the fact that many times there are vehicles - vans, buses and automobiles - parked at Belmont Center, at the Health Center, at different places in relatively large numbers - and still people are asking for transportation in the immediate area and are not able to get it. That in some cases, the Red Cross goes across town to provide the transportation. That this fact should be entered into the negotiations between City, County and UCS. That we are in dire need of a better coordination between the services.

The motion carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE NO. 279 AMENDING CHAPTER 4 OF THE CITY CODE TO INCREASE LANDING FEES FOR AIR CARRIER AIRCRAFT AT DOUGLAS MUNICIPAL AIRPORT.

Motion was made by Councilmember Cox, seconded by Councilmember Selden, to adopt the subject ordinance increasing landing fees for air taxis, third level carriers, supplemental and scheduled air carriers. The motion carried unanimously.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 26, at Page 225.

LEASE AGREEMENT WITH BRUTON SMITH FOR ONE-THIRD ACRE OF LAND AT DOUGLAS AIRPORT TO BE USED FOR STORAGE AND SERVICE OF CORPORATE AIRCRAFT.

Motion to approve the subject lease agreement at a monthly rate of \$216, was made by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Chafin, and carried unanimously.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 35

ORDINANCE NO. 280-X TRANSFERRING FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE OF LAND ADJOINING SUGAR CREEK PARK FOR USE IN ALLEVIATING A PEDESTRIAN ENTRANCE PROBLEM INTO THE PARK.

Motion was made by Councilmember Gantt, seconded by Councilmember Locke, and carried unanimously, adopting the subject ordinance transferring funds from the unencumbered balance of the 1969 Recreation Facilities Bond Fund for the purchase of 3.27 acres of land adjoining Sugar Creek Park, for a total of \$26,692.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 26, at Page 227.

RESOLUTION APPROVING THE SUBMISSION OF A GRANT APPLICATION TO THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION TO PAY THE SALARIES OF THREE FULL-TIME CRIME PREVENTION OFFICERS.

Motion was made by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Short, adopting a resolution to approve the submission of a grant application to LEAA, in the amount of \$49,623.20, for salaries of three fulltime Crime Prevention Officers.

Councilmember Trosch stated this concept is very good, especially in light of the Dalton Village report and the things they are beginning to learn about one-to-one contact with citizens in the community by the police to increase protection. However, her question is would this involve hiring three additional personnel? Assistant Chief C. E. Adams replied it would.

Ms. Trosch asked if the LEAA funding is a year-to-year operation, and Chief Adams replied it is.

Ms. Trosch stated that her problem with this is that she feels as a policy maker, she is given conflicting data on which to base a judgment. She is very supportive of this concept, however, she is dealing with a productivity study which says that the Police Department has 123 possible positions through reorganization that could by attrition be eliminated. She is not saying that she believes that or she does not believe that; she is just saying that even if they are 50 percent wrong, or 70 percent - in the application they send to the government agency a report that says that because of lack of personnel, yet we are dealing with a productivity study that tells us something different. She does not know whether the study is accurate or not and it will probably be a long time in coming to find out.

She stated that the last LEAA funding that they had, they used two positions in the department. The people were already there, but they got funding for them. Did they consider using this funding for current personnel? She would not want the grant to go, but she would want . . .

Mr. Burkhalter stated that under today's standards - the way we operate today - we do not have the people to do this. That there is a study which says that some changes ought to be made in the department, but that is not completed. That the governor, through the LEAA state level, has offered Charlotte these three positions. It is a little bit different - they came to us and offered us these three people. The Chief says he cannot give them three people; he cannot operate under his standards and assign three of them to that job. So, three would have to be employed for this purpose. He stated that anyway you go about reducing under the productivity study it would be over a long period of time through attrition. He does not think this is that big a problem; he does not feel it is a violation.

Ms. Trosch asked if they said the funding could not be used for existing positions? Mr. Burkhalter replied so far as he knows they did not say that.

Councilmember Frech stated the productivity study recommends setting up a Crime Prevention Bureau. That at present we do not have such a bureau? Mr. Burkhalter replied we have everything through teams now. She stated if a Crime Prevention Bureau of eleven officers as recommended by the productivity study is considered, would these three be a step toward doing that - the nucleus or beginning of such a bureau, or would they function as such.

Mr. Burkhalter replied if they were going to start one, of course it would be. But, he does not want to tell them it is the beginning of something that Council has not decided to do. He stated this is something that staff feels

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 36

will be very helpful. It is the type of thing that if they are going to get extra people, crime prevention is one of the big areas they should be working in. That they are not able to do as much in this area as they would like and this is an opportunity to do more.

He stated that in the last five years, every time they have come to Council with an LEAA project which involved a number of people, they have told Council that at the end of that project if Council does not see fit to carry the project on, those people will be terminated - they will look after, through attrition, taking care of these people. They have always done that.

Ms. Trosch stated that the goal she sees of this project is continuation; then we have acquired three additional people. Mr. Burkhalter replied that is exactly right, but the point he is trying to make is that Council will be making that decision at a later date.

Councilmember Leeper stated he saw some good and positive things that came out of the Dalton Village report and it concerns him that they seem to add to the frustration of the citizens in many cases when they study them to death. That the bottom line of what he got out of that report was that policemen on foot in high crime areas tend to develop, at least in perception, a sense of police protection; it develops a better police and community relationship and some other kinds of things that he feels was good information for Council and something that they ought to want to pursue and implement on an ongoing kind of basis. That crime prevention officers are probably good, but he just cannot see them doing the kind of job that policemen out there in the field who have communication with the community on a day-to-day basis can do. He asked if they would have one of these police officers in one community and one in another, or would they be working as a team going from one area to another?

Chief Adams replied they would focus on the high-crime, low-income, predominately black areas - areas where the housing projects are. They would put the people in there and initiate these programs - owner identification programs, the community meetings for neighborhood watches. That these are the communities that at present we do not have these neighborhood watches in. That there is low citizen participation in these areas at present. The officer would go in, build rapport with the community and hopefully gain that public support and cooperation.

Mr. Burkhalter asked Chief Adams if he could not say that these three people are going to be used in a way to take advantage of all that we learned from the Dalton Village report; that this is a way of implementing in other areas what we learned in this case? The Chief replied yes.

Councilmember Leeper stated that what we do, as far as he is concerned, is we went into Dalton Village and provided those people with a certain sense of police protection and then we pull them out and said "Well, we found out what we really need to do; let's go somewhere else and give these people a false sense of protection." We just keep moving around and experimenting with people. That if we are learning anything from this report, it means that we need to keep some people in those areas if that is the problem, and not just keep moving around experimenting with different communities, learning the same thing.

Mr. Burkhalter stated that one thing that he learned is that sure, you can go in and saturate the place with police, but can you afford to put ten policemen in every Dalton Village? You cannot do that. That they have to take the benefits that they learned from what they did with those ten and try to apply that.

Councilmember Leeper stated that what we do is building people's expectations up and then we say this is the end of it, it was just an experiment and sorry folks, we will be back next year if we get some more federal money to try something else.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 37

Mr. Burkhalter stated all of these people knew that when they went in there; they knew that this was experimental. As a matter of fact, there was some objection to this, some strong objection - they did not want this.

Councilmember Leeper stated he agrees that everyone knew that it was an experiment. What he is saying is what is the purpose of compiling information that says that the kinds of things that we are doing in the experiment is good and that is the way we ought to move, and then never put anything specific in terms of moving in that direction?

Mr. Burkhalter stated that every one of LEAA's programs is experimental; and every one is supposed to terminate or they do not do it. Mr. Leeper stated it is all federal money and it really does not cost us that much, so let's just keep getting it and using it for experiments.

Councilmember Trosch stated Mr. Leeper has expressed some of her frustration. How long is it going to take us to move toward meaningful reorganization and emphasize the broader reaching of these needs, if we keep doing this type of piecemeal. Mr. Burkhalter stated there is no one in the United States that knows how to answer these problems; if they did they would be in here tomorrow morning. The only thing we can do is to give the best opportunity that we have, the best advantage. Here is an opportunity that the state governor picked us because of our crime rate - that is all. He said maybe we could use three more people. Now, the way we use them - if we do not use them and take advantage of something we have just done with ten people, then we are pretty stupid.

Councilmember Leeper asked if we ever say "State, we understand that we can get \$100,000 to do another study, but we do not need \$100,000 to do another study, we understand our problem; we have done enough studies; this is what we need \$100,000 for; can we use the money for that?"

Mr. Burkhalter replied this happens occasionally; there are literally hundreds of thousands of dollars in this program that we do not take advantage of. We do not ever go out and ask for money just for the money's sake. We would not be doing this one except for the fact that they came to us and asked us if we would use it because they wanted to put it in a high crime area.

Councilmember Dannelly stated that Mr. Leeper's point is real good; it is an excellent point, and Mrs. Trosch's concerns certainly are. That he concurs with their feeling to the extent that the only way he can support this is that in the process, with the productivity study and all, that they look for ways, if not on the same level with as much manpower, once they have found that this experiment of research will work, of maintaining some level of security for the people they are experimenting with in those communities. Some of them will just put their foot down and say you are not coming in here because we are tired of your experimenting with us. For instance, that Dalton Village study - he is sure the City does not see where they can leave that many officers in there to carry on as that study provided the funds for, but he certainly feels strongly, after looking at the productivity study, that they can find some manpower someplace to give them some feeling of continuous security. That has not been done.

Chief Adams stated he will speak to that specifically. That has occurred. There is a much higher presence of the officers now in Dalton Village than there was before the project. The officers went back in; he wishes he could tell them they were maintaining the office they were furnished out there, but he is not sure that they are, although they were the last time he checked.

Councilmember Leeper stated he was just down in Little Rock Apartments last week talking to the manager about some other problems and he said they were giving the police officers a team office and some other people and stated they could not even get the police officer to come down there and use the telephone. There is an office down there but they just refuse to come down, walk in and go back out.

Mr. Burkhalter stated he would like to point out to them that in Dalton Village they could not get the police to go there - they considered it dangerous to go into Dalton Village before this project. There were a number of

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 38

incidents there and no policeman would go in by himself. Now, we have a much better rapport in there than we did - much better. That this is just a continuation of that very thing.

Councilmember Carroll made a substitute motion that the application be submitted and use it for existing positions until we resolve the productivity study.

Mr. Burkhalter stated if they do not want this grant, they should just say so. To do that they are saying that they are going to have to take three people off of another assignment; that they will have to certify to them that they will be doing this. That is not the way to do it.

Councilmember Gantt stated that Mr. Leeper, Ms. Trosch and Mr. Dannelly and Mr. Carroll are right in the sense that many of the things that we have done in pilot programs from Model Cities on up never seem to be carried on in the long term. That maybe what they are saying is that we ought to look at ways of continuing the work of the Dalton Village study. He is not sure at this point that we want to turn down the grant to have crime prevention officers come in and work with these neighborhoods. He is not sure how we would look, even to those neighborhoods that may need that service right now. But, it seems to him that there is a real issue here of what do we do - what concrete steps are we taking - now that we know about Dalton Village. It seems to him that they have misused the LEAA funds, just as he has often said that we misused Model Cities and other pilot programs that were designed to allow you the opportunity to experiment. He does not think they should confuse the two. One, that they did not do anything after the Dalton Village study, or they could not afford to, when maybe they should have been looking for ways to do that - maybe they will still have the opportunity to do that after they look at the productivity study. On the other hand, he would hate to see them tell the Governor to take his program and go somewhere else with it, when in fact we might learn some additional kinds of things that can be put into a long range process.

Mayor Harris stated he can see Council going to the district meetings around the city on crime prevention in the next six weeks and saying that they turned down three full-time crime prevention officers that the Governor wanted to give us. Mr. Burkhalter stated that he must have been misunderstood; that he did not suggest that they turn the grant down. Mayor Harris stated that is the way the offer is; that can not be changed.

Councilmember Carroll stated he thought someone said earlier that they could fund existing people. Mayor Harris replied no, we have funded additional people in the past was the comment he heard; not this present grant.

Mr. Burkhalter stated he cannot understand how they would come to us and say you are a high crime area and we are going to give you some money to pay for what you are already doing. He does not believe they would agree to that. He asked Mr. Finnie if he could get a clarification on that.

Chief Adams stated our record thus far is that we have not been able to fund existing positions or existing programs; they have had many difficulties with LEAA on this account. That this Police Department is so progressive that LEAA has not caught up with it. We already had the existing program.

Ms. Trosch stated in June we did; that was the question asked about the two positions that we were funding: Would we be funding additional personnel, and the answer was yes. Mr. Burkhalter stated they were thinking about the planner. The statement was made that was an existing position and was funded every year.

Councilmember Leeper stated maybe he got a little off base; he was really trying to drive a point home. His basis was that we need to do a little bit more follow-up on it, not that we ought to not necessarily receive some of these funds but after we have gotten some information about where we are trying to go and how we can resolve some of these problems that they ought to try to see if they can utilize some additional funds to continue the programs that they have developed. That was really his point; he is not so sure what we are going to find out from the productivity study. They might find out that we are short 25 people as opposed to having 125 too many.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 39

At this point, he would be inclined to go ahead and support the project. He hopes that the message can get across that they are interested in trying to follow up once we get data about the kind of problems we have in the community.

Councilmember Carroll apologized, stating he misunderstood what was said and withdrew his substitute motion.

Councilmember Dannelly emphasized what he indicated earlier that he certainly supports this, with the understanding that when the funds are depleted they will still have some visible evidence of providing that security they have built up for people in these neighborhoods.

Councilmember Trosch stated she hopes their emphasis on the productivity study has been heard, and the fact that they are anxiously awaiting some results of the productivity study regarding the Police Department and all of the other departments. She has great frustrations in voting on this because of that. She hopes they are all aware that Mr. Burkhalter did say that there are three positions being created by this that will be positions that they are taking on with the LEAA in one continuous program in our operating budget.

The vote was taken on the motion to adopt the resolution for submission of the grant application and carried as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Carroll, Chafin, Cox, Dannelly, Frech, Gantt, Leeper, Locke, Selden and Short.

NAY: Councilmember Trosch.

Mr. Burkhalter stated that on the Dalton Village report - they had to cut it off, under the terms of the agreement. There is no way you can evaluate whether you did any good or not unless you run a counterpart in time to see what happens. Now they have the information; they can make their decisions. They should not get too frustrated about that situation, because there are a lot of good things there.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 427.

MAYOR'S COMMENTS 'ON POLICE DEPARTMENT'S RECENT STING OPERATION.

Mayor Harris stated they have talked a lot about the police today; that Council has not had a meeting since the announcement of the Sting Operation occurred. He stated the Police Department is certainly due the appreciation of this Council. That operation went off so well from so many points of view. It points up a lot of what they have been talking about in crime prevention. That had some of these areas used the system of identifying property with the engraver, or by using the neighborhood watch programs, and things like that . . . only three identifiable items were found in all of the property recovered. There are also the meetings on crime prevention which will be held in the districts in the next few weeks.

MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT WITH ACCESS CORPORATION FOR POLICE RECORDS EQUIPMENT.

Motion was made by Councilmember Chafin, seconded by Councilmember Selden, and carried unanimously, approving a maintenance agreement with Access Corporation for preventive and emergency maintenance services for Police Records equipment, for the period from November 1, 1978 through October 31, 1979, for a total amount of \$10,539.58.

APPOINTMENT OF KAY TURNER TO THE MUNICIPAL INFORMATION ADVISORY BOARD.

Councilmember Selden moved that the rules of procedure for appointments by City Council to Boards, Committees, Commissions and Agencies be suspended, and Council fill by voice vote the unexpired term on the Municipal Information Advisory Board. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Cox, and carried unanimously.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 40

Council was advised that the following nominations have been made:

- (1) Belinda Stinson, nominated by Councilmember Leeper.
- (2) Kay Turner, nominated by Councilmember Chafin.
- (3) Donald Young, nominated by Councilmember Frech.

The Mayor called for the vote on Belinda Stinson, which failed for lack of a majority vote - as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Leeper, Carroll, Dannelly and Gantt.

The Mayor called for the vote on Kay Turner, with the vote recorded as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Chafin, Frech, Locke, Short, Selden and Trosch.

Mayor Harris advised that Ms. Turner had received a majority vote of six and was appointed to the unexpired term.

APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL ON AGING AND CIVIL SERVICE BOARD.

(a) Council on Aging - first position for two year term.

The following nominations to the Council on Aging for a two year term were considered:

1. James Hawkins, nominated by Councilmember Chafin.
2. Betty Watson, nominated by Councilmember Frech.
3. Mac Webb, nominated by Councilmember Carroll.
4. Richard Elmore, nominated by Councilmember Selden.

The results of the first ballot were announced as follows:

1. James Hawkins, 3 votes (Councilmembers Chafin, Short and Locke).
2. Betty Watson, 2 votes (Councilmembers Frech and Trosch).
3. Mac Webb, 4 votes (Councilmembers Leeper, Dannelly, Carroll, Gantt).
4. Richard Elmore, 2 votes (Councilmembers Selden and Cox).

None of the nominees having received a majority vote, Council then voted on the two receiving the highest vote, with the results of the second ballot as follows:

1. James Hawkins, 5 votes (Councilmembers Short, Chafin, Trosch, Selden and Locke).
2. Mac Webb, 6 votes (Councilmembers Carroll, Dannelly, Cox, Leeper, Frech and Gantt).

Mr. Webb, having received a majority vote of six, was appointed for a two year term.

(b) Council on Aging - second position for two year term.

The following nominations to the Council on Aging for a two year term were considered:

1. James Hawkins, nominated by Councilmember Chafin.
2. Betty Watson, nominated by Councilmember Frech.
3. Richard Elmore, nominated by Councilmember Selden.

The results of the first ballot were announced as follows:

1. James Hawkins, 8 votes (Councilmembers Locke, Gantt, Cox, Selden, Leeper, Chafin, Short and Carroll).
2. Betty Watson, 3 votes (Councilmembers Trosch, Frech and Dannelly).
3. Richard Elmore, 0 votes.

Mr. Hawkins, having received a majority vote of eight, was appointed for a two year term.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 41

(c) Civil Service Board - Beverly Ford's unexpired term.

Councilmember Leeper stated he would like to withdraw his nominee, Ms. Marnite Shuford, from consideration.

The following nominations were considered:

1. Rudolph Hendricks, nominated by Councilmember Selden.
2. Paul Horne, nominated by Councilmember Carroll.
3. Ron Sanders, nominated by Councilmember Frech.

The results of the first ballot were announced as follows:

1. Rudolph Hendricks, 9 votes (Councilmembers Dannelly, Cox, Selden, Trosch, Locke, Gantt, Chafin, Short and Leeper).
2. Paul Horne, 1 vote (Councilmember Carroll).
3. Ron Sanders, 1 vote (Councilmember Frech).

Mr. Hendricks having received a majority vote of nine was appointed for the unexpired term.

(d) Civil Service Board - David Martin's unexpired term.

Councilmember Leeper having withdrawn Ms. Shuford name from consideration, only one nominee was open for consideration:

1. Francis Pinckney, nominated by Councilmember Selden.

The vote was taken on the nomination, and Mr. Pinckney was appointed by unanimous vote of Council for the unexpired term.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAFIN EXCUSED FROM MEETING.

On motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Short, and carried unanimously, Councilmember Chafin was excused from the meeting at this time and was absent for the remainder of the session.

REQUEST THAT CITY ATTORNEY GIVE FURTHER CONSIDERATION TO THE NOMINATING AND VOTING PROCEDURE.

Following up on an earlier comment by Councilmember Trosch that this is a very good procedure, but needs some fine-tuning and asking if staff could take another look at it, Councilmember Short requested that the City Attorney study the procedure again and offer suggestions for revising it.

AWARD OF CONTRACTS.

(a) Upon motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Selden, and unanimously carried, contract was awarded the low bidder, Rand Construction Company, in the amount of \$685,898.80, on a unit price basis, subject to E.P.A approval for sanitary sewer construction for Mallard Creek Outfall.

The following bids were received:

Rand Construction Company	\$685,898.80
Ben B. Propst Contractor, Inc.	754,480.01
D. R. Allen	844,422.00
Dellinger, Incorporated	855,070.00
Preston Carroll Company	857,476.60
Sanders Brothers, Inc.	866,517.00
Blythe Industries, Inc.	871,208.00
Dickerson, Incorporated	897,959.40
C.F.W. Construction Co.	918,069.00
Lambeth Construction Co.	961,754.30

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 42

(b) Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Short, to award a contract to the low bidder, Blythe Construction Company, in the amount of \$152,370.00, on a unit price basis, for construction of Shamrock Drive sidewalk.

Councilmember Trosch stated when this was originally proposed to Council they had an option to spend either \$78,000 by acquiring right-of-way and laying a sidewalk, or to put piping in the ditch and cover it with a sidewalk at an estimated cost of \$111,000. That Council opted to go with the \$111,000. Her concern is that they have come in with a bid that is \$41,000 over what they had predicted would be the cost. That in the original proposal the construction cost of the sidewalk itself was constant; the difference in the costs was either in right-of-way or the piping. What she wants to know is has the difference of \$41,000 over been a difference in the \$48,000 sidewalk construction cost, or are they paying that much more for drainage that they had not anticipated. Where is the cost differential?

Mr. Clark Readling, City Engineer, replied it is in drainage. The bids are simply a lot higher than they had estimated. All of their bids are coming in high; the construction market is inflated. The sidewalks are still about the same; drainage was quite a bit higher.

Ms. Trosch stated \$48,000 was going to construct a good many miles of sidewalk. We are in real need in our community for sidewalks - there are some very high priority needs in various districts for sidewalks. They have a limited amount of resources. That basically the decision they will be making, if they make it, will be to lay the drainage pipe - the value of that over the value of laying more sidewalks somewhere else out of this funding.

The question is also involved as to whether or not the road will eventually be widened and take the sidewalks in the end. She feels they need to face this question. She has no problem concerning the laying of the sidewalk here; she does have a question as to the option they chose.

Mayor Harris asked if the funds for the drainage is coming out of the sidewalk budget? Mr. Readling replied yes it is. He wants to point out one thing about the drainage. That Ms. Trosch mentioned if the street is ever widened the sidewalk will be obliterated; if the street is ever widened, the drainage will serve the widened street.

Ms. Trosch stated but it is coming out of the sidewalk budget? Mr. Readling responded, at this point. Mayor Harris asked who makes that decision as to whether it comes out of the sidewalk budget or not? Mr. Readling replied the purpose of the drainage is to install the sidewalk.

Mr. Burkhalter stated that when they brought the project to Council they decided to do the drainage in addition to the sidewalk.

Councilmember Frech stated when she originally brought this to Council, it was on the suggestion of one of the City Engineering staff and she thought it was being suggested that this be treated as two separate projects - one a drainage project which would be covered under the city's construction program and essentially the City would be putting up the total and doing the drainage, but that it would not be coming out of sidewalk funds. Then Mr. Burkhalter said it was all coming out of the same fund anyway so it does not make any difference. However, now at this point, she does not think it is fair to vote down this sidewalk because they are doing a huge amount of what is essentially drainage construction. She does not think it is right that it should come out of the sidewalk fund either. Have they really dealt with the problem of whether the money for the drainage problem can come from somewhere else?

Mr. Burkhalter stated it can come from somewhere else if they can find somewhere else they want to take it from. His opinion is that he doubts if they would spend this kind of money on drainage on that project because it is not a primary drainage project. They would put drainage money somewhere else. That is just his feeling about it. It is a sidewalk expense because in order to get the sidewalks they have to do the drainage. But, they would not recommend going out there and spending drainage money.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 43

Councilmember Trosch stated then basically what they are saying is that probably with right-of-way acquisition and the \$48,000 for sidewalks we could construct this sidewalk; that they are paying double that to put the drainage in? Mr. Reading replied he believes that is correct, he does not have the figures with him. Ms. Trosch stated they are actually paying about \$70,000 out of sidewalk funds at this point for this approach.

Mr. Reading stated that if they will recall, the two options were to build a sidewalk back in the yards and have to buy right-of-way for that and it was going to be condemnation all the way, versus piping the ditch which would look a lot better and building the sidewalks closer to the street, which is what the residents wanted. Those were the two options.

Councilmember Frech asked if the original estimate of the cost of piping the ditch was far too low, how about the original figure of \$30,000 to buy the right-of-way? Mr. Reading replied that of course they were both estimates. Ms. Frech stated she is just wondering if that would not end up costing a lot more too; they will have to go through condemnation procedure to get that; that they paid a huge amount in condemnation on Providence Road.

Councilmember Trosch made a substitute motion that they look at the possibility of going the other route if, in fact, it is that much cheaper. The motion died for lack of a second.

The vote was taken on the original motion and carried as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Carroll, Dannelly, Frech, Gantt, Locke, Short.
NAYS: Councilmembers Leeper, Trosch, Selden, Cox.

The following bids were received:

Blythe Industries	\$152,370.00
Crowder Construction	165,026.00
Rea Construction	171,513.65

(c) Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Dannelly, and carried unanimously, awarding contract to the low bidder, Rea Construction Company, in the amount of \$580,502.92, on a unit price basis, for 1978 fall resurfacing of various streets.

The following bids were received:

Rea Construction Company	\$580,502.92
Crowder Asphalt Corporation	587,663.86
Blythe Industries, Inc.	589,849.80
Dickerson, Inc.	601,132.80

(d) Motion was made by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Short, and unanimously carried, awarding a contract, including insulation, to the low bidder, Avrett & Ledbetter Roofing & Heating Company, in the amount of \$8,987, for re-roofing City Hall Annex building.

The following bids were received:

Avrett & Ledbetter Roofing & Heating	\$ 8,987.00
Interstate Roofing Co., Inc.	9,847.00
Associated Roofing & Sheet Metal Co.	10,720.00

PAYMENT OF REPAIRS TO CITY EQUIPMENT.

(a) On motion of Councilmember Short, seconded by Councilmember Dannelly, and carried unanimously, payment for repair of WABCO Scraper by Interstate Equipment Company, in the amount of \$28,194.98, was approved.

(b) On motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Dannelly, and unanimously carried, payment for repair parts for REX Compactor, from E. F. Craven Company, in the amount of \$6,604.38, was approved.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 44

RESOLUTIONS AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS.

(a) Motion was made by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Leeper, and carried unanimously, adopting a resolution to authorize condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Lindsey Hern Snider, Jr. and wife, Marie Louise Snider, located at 6638 Kemp Street, in the City of Charlotte for the Annexation Area I Sanitary Sewer Project.

(b) Motion was made by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Leeper, and carried unanimously, adopting a resolution to authorize condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Ronald D. Smith and wife, Rachel S. Smith, located at 6400 Paw Creek Road, in the City of Charlotte, for the Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer Project.

(c) Motion was made by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Locke, and carried unanimously, adopting a resolution to authorize condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Brookridge, a limited partnership; Ray W. Bradley, Jr., Trustee; B & L Investment Company, North Carolina National Bank, and TIM, Inc., Trustee, located at 5201 Idlewild Road, in the City of Charlotte, for the Delta Road Extension Project.

(d) Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Selden, and carried unanimously, adopting a resolution to authorize condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Mardru, a general partnership; B & L Investment Company; Ray W. Bradley, Jr., Trustee; North Carolina National Bank; and TIM, Inc., Trustee, located at 7100 block Delta Road Extension, in the City of Charlotte, for the Delta Road Extension Project.

(e) Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Leeper, to adopt a resolution authorizing condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to George E. Wimbish, Jr. and wife, Brenda Gayle R. Wimbish; North Carolina National Bank and John E. McDonald, Jr., Trustee, located at 4911 Idlewild Road North in the City of Charlotte, for the Delta Road Park Project.

Mr. George E. Wimbish, Jr. stated it would be very inappropriate now for City Council to vote for condemnation proceedings on this parcel of land because (1) the bond issue for which payment would be derived has not yet even come before the public. He has heard it argued all day and nothing has been settled yet; (2) they still have pending legal battles over the other parcel of land that this was taken from. Therefore, he would be in a court case with the City two different times on one piece of land, which would be rather complicated.

He stated the court case stems from the fact that gross irregularities were found in the entire process of the City Real Estate Department in the taking of the first piece of land as well as what he has found out so far and what is asked that Council do tonight. Therefore, he is asking the Council to refrain completely from any action concerning condemnation of this piece of property until such time as the original case is completed in the courts of law, or until such time as he would reach a suitable settlement with the City otherwise.

Mayor Harris asked for Mr. Underhill's opinion on this matter. Mr. Underhill replied that Mr. Wimbish is correct in his statement that this is the second condemnation proceeding being brought against this one parcel of property. The first condemnation proceeding was authorized by Council September 12, 1977 in which the City condemned frontage of this property including the dwelling that was on it for the Delta Road widening project. The city is now seeking to acquire the remainder of the property for the Delta Road Park Project. So that in essence we are, by this act, seeking to acquire all of the remainder of the property which amounts to 2.7 acres.

He stated that Mr. Wimbish has retained an attorney who his office has talked to about the possibility of settling both of these matters. That they are somewhat apart in their negotiations. According to their last conversation

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 45

with Mr. Wimbish's attorney, he desires a total of \$61,000 for the entire tract and the right to remove pulpwood from the property. That the City's appraisals are in the neighborhood of between \$43,000 to \$44,000, so they are somewhat apart in the negotiations at this point. They are so far apart that they do not believe that negotiations are going to be fruitful; that perhaps the only way to decide this is to let the courts handle the question and have a jury decide the fair market value to be paid by the City for the acquisition of the entire tract.

That Mr. Wimbish made some statement about irregularities. He does not know what he is referring to. He sent one of his attorneys to talk with Mr. Wimbish after the Mayor received a letter from him making the same general statements and Mr. Wimbish would not discuss the matter with the lawyer from his office in specifics, so he does not know what he is referring to.

Mr. Wimbish stated that in referring to irregularities, if they will pay attention to some of the items they just voted on, and compare the prices that different pieces of land are being condemned for. If you compare the square footage of his property with the square footage of the other properties, in the past he was paid as little as 10 percent.

Councilmember Cox stated that what Mr. Wimbish is asking for is that Council delay the condemnation, and asked what kind of problem that would present.

Mr. Burkhalter replied there is no particular problem since this is park land, but the City Attorney has just told them that he does not think it is possible to do it through negotiation.

Mr. Cox stated all he is saying is that the City has a court case pending on the front part of the property and could this wait until that is settled. The Mayor stated that case could go on for some time.

Mr. Wimbish stated that the negotiations which have been spoken of have not been negotiations. He was approached by one of the attorneys - Mr. Watts - and all he asked was that he give him a figure he could live with. As soon as he found out that he had an attorney, he would not say anything else and left. He never did come back to him for any other answer.

Councilmember Trosch stated that Mr. Wimbish had said that we were dependent on the park bonds before the land could be purchased, but the money has already been appropriated. Another question which she had is one that Mr. Wimbish brought up - the fact that this is 2.7 acres of land at \$12,200, and for the same park there is another .09 acres at \$11,300? The answer was that the latter piece of property has a house on it.

Mr. Wimbish asked about the 42,637 square feet at virtually the same price but one third of the land? Mayor Harris stated that he does not think Council should be determining value.

Councilmember Carroll stated that to answer Councilmember Cox's point - if Council proceeds with this condemnation, the two would probably be consolidated and resolved together in court.

Mr. Wimbish stated that his request is simply that the condemnation be deferred until such time as the original case is settled in court.

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

(f) Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Selden, and unanimously carried, adopting a resolution to authorize condemnation proceedings for the acquisition of property belonging to Brookridge, a limited partnership; B & L Investment Company; Ray W. Bradley, Jr., Trustee; TIM, Inc., Trustee; and North Carolina National Bank, located at 7100 Block of Delta Road Extension, in the City of Charlotte, for the Delta Road Park Project.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Pages 428-433.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 46

ADDITIONAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZED TO C. M. DELLINGER AND WIFE, MARGARET C., FOR SANITARY SEWER CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT FOR TORRENCE CREEK OUTFALL.

On motion of Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Locke, and unanimously carried, approval was given for an additional payment, in the amount of \$2,000, to C. M. Dellinger and wife, Margaret C., for sanitary sewer construction easement for Torrence Creek Outfall.

RESOLUTION APPROVING A MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND PURCHASE OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR AN INTERCHANGE AT MULBERRY CREEK ROAD AND I-85.

On motion of Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Gantt, and unanimously carried, the subject resolution was adopted approving a municipal agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the construction and purchase of right-of-way for an interchange at Mulberry Creek Road and I-85.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 434.

CONSENT AGENDA APPROVED WITH DELETION OF THREE ITEMS.

Motion was made by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Gantt, and unanimously carried, to approve the Consent Agenda with the exception of Items 25(a), 36(d) and 36(f).

The following items were approved:

- (1) Approval of a proposed settlement of the lawsuit, City versus Will Sam DeBerry, et al, for Remount Road Widening.
- (2) Adoption of resolutions calling for a public hearing on Monday, October 9, 1978, to consider proposals by United House of Prayer for All People for purchase and redevelopment of land in the First Ward Urban Renewal Area.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Pages 435 and 436.

- (3) Approval of the extension of a contract with Winston Network, Inc. for a period of 90 days to allow sufficient time for acceptance of proposals, negotiations and City Council approval of a new contract for advertising privileges on Charlotte Transit System.
- (4) Approval of a lease with U. S. Department of Commerce, National Weather Service, for office space at Douglas Municipal Airport, at a quarterly rate of \$893.69.
- (5) Approval of eight separate Loan Ageements with MOTION, Inc. to finance the acquisition and planning for rehabilitation of eight properties on Greenleaf Avenue and Victoria Avenue, in the Third Ward Target Area, for a total of \$48,150.
- (6) Adoption of a Resolution approving a Municipal Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation for the installation of traffic signal at West Boulevard and I-77, with the State to reimburse the City for the total cost of installation.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 437.

- (7) Adoption of resolutions authorizing the refund of certain taxes which were collected through clerical error and illegal levy against nine tax accounts.

The resolutions are recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Pages 438-440.

(8) Approval for the following streets to be taken over for continuous maintenance by the City:

- (a) 34th Street, from Spencer Street to Garrison Street;
- (b) Fairmarket Place, from The Plaza to 790 feet northwest of The Plaza;
- (c) Studley Road, from 115 feet south of Longbriar to 180 feet south of Strider Drive;
- (d) Hunt Dale Court, from Studley Road to cul-de-sac;
- (e) Shiredale Lane, from Studley Road to cul-de-sac;
- (f) Strider Drive, from Studley Road to end.

(9) Approval of the following contracts for water and sewer extensions:

- (a) Contract with Norman D. Reynolds, for construction of 375 linear feet of 8-inch water main to serve Lawyers Road, inside the City, at an estimated cost of \$7,950, all at no cost to the City.

Located immediately south of N.C. 27, and north of Lawyers Road and east of Delta Road.

- (b) Contract with Rodgers Builders, Inc. for the construction of 480 linear feet of 8-inch water main to service Spector Drive, outside the City, at an estimated cost of \$5,000, all at no cost to the City.

Located immediately north of Sunset Road and west of U. S. 21 North.

- (c) Contract with Ralph Squires Company for construction of 1,220 linear feet of 6-inch and 2-inch water mains to serve Heathergate Subdivision, Phase 1-C, outside the City, at an estimated cost of \$8,250, all at no cost to the City.

Located immediately north of Lawyers Road, east of Wilson Grove Road and south of Wilgrove Mint Hill Road.

- (d) Contract with C. Paul Jenkins and Lee H. Wing for construction of 1,130 linear feet of 8-inch sewer line to serve 5917 and 5925 Albemarle Road, inside the City, at an estimated cost of \$22,600, with the applicants to advance 50% of the total estimated cost and the remaining to be funded with minor improvements accounts.

Located inside the City on Albemarle Road.

- (e) Contract with First Colony Corporation for the construction of 4,248 linear feet of 8-inch sewer line to serve Wildwood Subdivision, Phase I, outside the City, at an estimated cost of \$84,960, all at no cost to the City.

Located between Lawyers Road and McAlpine Creek, east of Idlewild Road North.

- (f) Contract with Providence Properties, Inc. for the construction of 3,783 linear feet of 8-inch sewer line to serve Park Ridge, Section 2-A, outside the City, at an estimated cost of \$75,600, all at no cost to the City.

(10) Adoption of a resolution approving an Encroachment Agreement with Southern Railway for installation of an 8-inch water main crossing at Orr Road, with the City to pay \$50 to the railroad as a consideration for the license.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 13, at Page 441.

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 48

- (11) Approval of the following Special Officer Permits for use on the premises of Park and Recreation:
- (a) Renewal of permit to Freeman Totten, 910 Beal Street;
 - (b) Renewal of permit to John Howard Chidester, P. O. Box 704, Huntersville;
 - (c) Renewal of permit to Robert Dale Blackwell, 512 Pecan Avenue.
- (12) Approval of the following Real Estate Brokers' Agreements:
- (a) Open Non-Exclusive Contract with Independence Associates, Inc. for Brooklyn Urban Renewal Project No. N. C. R-43;
 - (b) Open Non-Exclusive Contract with Townsend Realty Company, for Greenville Urban Renewal Project No. N. C. R-78.
- (13) Adoption of the following ordinances affecting housing declared "unfit" for human habitation:
- (a) Ordinance No. 281-X ordering unoccupied dwelling located at 1101 North Caldwell Street, known as 505 Belmont Avenue, be demolished and removed.
 - (b) Ordinance No. 282-X ordering unoccupied dwelling located at 915 North Allen Street, be demolished and removed.
 - (c) Ordinance No. 283-X ordering occupied dwelling located at 1554 Wilmore Drive, in a CDRS Area, to be vacated and closed.
 - (d) Ordinance No. 284-X ordering occupied dwelling located at 1632 Logie Avenue to be vacated and closed.
 - (e) Ordinance No. 285-X ordering unoccupied dwelling at 308 Center Street, to be demolished and removed.
 - (f) Ordinance No. 286-X ordering occupied dwelling at 115 Williamson Street, to be vacated and closed.
 - (g) Ordinance No. 287-X ordering occupied dwelling at 2819 Clyde Drive to be vacated and closed.
 - (h) Ordinance No. 288-X ordering unoccupied dwelling at 1300-01/2 Oaklawn Avenue to be closed.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 26, at Pages 228-235.

- (14) Approval of the following property transactions:
- (a) Acquisition of 15' x 291.04' of property at 11709 Painted Tree Road, from Painted Tree Swim and Racquet Association, at \$1.00, for Sanitary Sewer to serve Walnut Creek II Project.
 - (b) Acquisition of 15' x 714.26' of property, plus a temporary construction easement, at 6543 Concord Road, from Inge Realty and Management Corporation, at \$1,275.00, for Annexation Area I Sanitary Sewer.
 - (c) Acquisition of 15' x 143.75' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 6539 Old Concord Road, from Robert E. Cothran, at \$575.00, for Annexation Area I Sanitary Sewer.
 - (d) Acquisition of 15' x 2,340.07' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 1400 block of Cannon Avenue, from Eleanor F. Plummer, Trustee, at \$4,680.00, for Annexation Area I Sanitary Sewer.
 - (e) Acquisition of 15' x 204.18' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 4601 I-85 Access Road, from Gaynell H. Brown, at \$2,500.00, for Annexation Area I Sanitary Sewer.
 - (f) Acquisition of 15' x 243.76' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 1932 Marlwood Circle, from Joseph Du Montier and wife, Mary B., at \$1,098.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.

- (g) Acquisition of 15' x 7.60' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 5401 Mallard Drive, from Robert L. Stringer and wife, Patricia Gayle D., at \$10.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.
- (h) Acquisition of 15' x 199.36' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 5405 Mallard Drive, from Doyt W. Abernathy and wife, Alice M., at \$500.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.
- (i) Acquisition of 15' x 61.71' of easement, at corner of Wilora Lake Road and Stillwell Oaks Circle, from Neill Wilkinson and wife, Miriam A., at \$62.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.
- (j) Acquisition of 15' x 52.61' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, on 9.6 acres on Farm Pond Lane, from Four Seasons II Apartment Co., at \$53.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.
- (k) Acquisition of 15' x 366.62' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, on 41.272 acres at 5700-6000 block of Verndale Road, from H. E. Huguley and wife, Rozelle W., at \$367.00, for Annexation Area 2 Sanitary Sewer.
- (l) Acquisition of 15' x 323.41' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 2600 block of Little Rock Road, from William H. Guignard and wife, Vivian R., Joseph H. Sadler and wife, Gloria W., R. Parks Sadler and wife, Sue H., at \$324.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (m) Acquisition of 15' x 178.45' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 3500 Marshall Drive, from Charles B. Striet, Jr. and wife, Norma B., at \$500.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (n) Acquisition of 15' x 962.36' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 3500 block of I-85, from R. R. Keplinger and wife, Gladys P., at \$4,250.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (o) Acquisition of 15' x 1,347.42' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, on 32.14 acres at 5700 block of Freedom Drive, from Blanche Webb Holland and Nancy Louise Webb, at \$1,334.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (p) Acquisition of 15' x 87.64' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 7120 Lakeland Drive, from Horace Wells and wife, Dorothy M., at \$100.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (q) Acquisition of 15' x 141.40' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, on vacant lot behind Shoshone Court, from Allen C. Nance, Elsie H. Nance, Albert D. Nance and Nettie S. Nance, at \$150.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (r) Acquisition of 15' x 13.38' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 6640 Pawnee Drive, from Leroy O. Brown and wife, Gloria M., at \$40.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
- (s) Acquisition of 7.5' x 292.45' and 15' x 217.00' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, on 12.97 acres at the end of Pawnee Drive, from Allen C. Nance, Elsie H. Nance, Albert D. Nance and Nettie S. Nance, at \$750.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.

- (t) Acquisition of 15' x 93.45' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 2000 block of Arapaho Drive, from Albert D. Nance and wife, Nettie S., at \$235.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
 - (u) Acquisition of 7.5' x 298.57' and 15' x 110.58' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 2000 and 2100 Arapaho Drive, from Allen C. Nance, Elsie H. Nance, Albert D. Nance and Nettie S. Nance, at \$668.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
 - (v) Acquisition of 15' x 206.21' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 2710 Kendrick Circle, from Neal Henry Swift and wife, Mary J., at \$1,000.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
 - (w) Acquisition of 15' x 55.29' of easement, plus a temporary construction easement, at 2616 Kendrick Drive, from Frank B. Digh and wife, Cecelia H., at \$356.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
 - (x) Acquisition of .75' x 2.22' x 2.10' of easement, at 1827 Little Rock Road, from Ralph Sidney Underwood, Jr., and wife, Harriet C., at \$20.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
 - (y) Acquisition of .75' x 5.94' x 5.66' of easement, at 1901 Shoshone Court, from Dale B. Otto and Joyce Otto, at \$20.00, for Annexation Area 8 Sanitary Sewer.
 - (z) Acquisition of 7.0' x 26.0' of property, plus a construction easement, at 2409 Pickney Avenue, from William C. Douglas and wife, Iola P., at \$100.00, for Pickney Avenue Drainage Improvements.
 - (aa) Acquisition of 7.0' x 26.0' of easement, plus a construction easement, at southwest corner of Drummond Avenue and Pickney Avenue, from Car-Mack, at \$100.00, for Pickney Avenue Drainage Improvements.
- (15) Approval of the acquisition of property for West Morehead Community Development Target Area:
- (a) 2,440 square feet of land from James R. Walker, Jr., 1449 South Church Street, at \$3,000.
 - (b) 12,153 square feet of land from Mary Marshall Young, 1444 Winnifred Street, at \$14,900.
 - (c) 7,013 square feet of land from R. M. Wearn, 215 West Bland Street, at \$29,000.
 - (d) 7,013 square feet of land, from John K. Slear, 217 West Bland Street, at \$6,300.
- (16) Adoption of the following ordinances ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash, rubbish and junk from properties within the City:
- (a) Ordinance No. 291-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish from 1917 Terrybrook Lane;
 - (b) Ordinance No. 292-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish from 1921 and 1925 Terrybrook Lane;
 - (c) Ordinance No. 293-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish from vacant lot at 4525 North Tryon Street;
 - (d) Ordinance No. 294-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash, rubbish and junk adjacent to 1114 North Church Street;
 - (e) Ordinance No. 295-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass at 910 Dedmon Street;
 - (f) Ordinance No. 296-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass at 2914 Rush Avenue;

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 51

- (g) Ordinance No. 297-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 2433 Arty Avenue and vacant lot at 2424 Wilkinson Boulevard;
- (h) Ordinance No. 298-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 3040 Ridge Avenue;
- (i) Ordinance No. 299-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 2959 Ross Avenue;
- (j) Ordinance No. 300-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 1367 Bethel Road;
- (k) Ordinance No. 301-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 129 Short Hills Drive;
- (l) Ordinance No. 302-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish at 2650 Bay Street;
- (m) Ordinance No. 303-X ordering the removal of trash, rubbish and junk from 3519 Marvin Road;
- (n) Ordinance No. 304-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot corner Idlewild Road and Meadowlane Lane;
- (o) Ordinance No. 305-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash, rubbish and miscellaneous junk from 2649 Mayfair Avenue;
- (p) Ordinance No. 306-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 2217 Booker Avenue;
- (q) Ordinance No. 307-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass at vacant house adjacent to 509 Louise Avenue;
- (r) Ordinance No. 308-X ordering the removal of trash, rubbish and junk at 618 Fortune Street;
- (s) Ordinance No. 309-X ordering the removal of junk at 916 Beal Street;
- (t) Ordinance No. 310-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 5120 Dogwood Place;
- (u) Ordinance No. 311-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass adjacent to 2401 North Sharon Amity;
- (v) Ordinance No. 312-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot rear of 1419 and 1411 Ferncliff Road;
- (w) Ordinance No. 313-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on property adjacent to 1720 and 1716 Beverly Drive;
- (x) Ordinance No. 314-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot adjacent to 612 Welker Street;
- (y) Ordinance No. 315-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and junk at 615 Waco Street;
- (z) Ordinance No. 316-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass on vacant lot between 612 and 620 Waco Street;
- (aa) Ordinance No. 317-X ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash and rubbish at 312 Torrence Street.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 25, beginning on Page 238 and ending at Page 264.

PUBLIC HEARING SET FOR MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1978, ON NAMING OF THE INNER BELT LOOP.

On motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Gantt, and carried unanimously, a public hearing was set for Monday, October 9, 1978, for citizen input into the naming of the Inner Belt Loop.

Councilmember Trosch asked about the procedure for notifying residents of the streets making up the Inner Belt Loop; and was advised there is no established notifying procedure except through the news media.

ADDITIONAL ORDINANCES ORDERING DWELLINGS VACATED AND CLOSED.

- (a) Motion was made by Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Selden, ordering occupied dwelling located at 2526 Barringer Drive, to be vacated and closed.

Councilmember Leeper stated he wanted to make note of the fact that this house is valued at about \$8,000 and the estimated cost of repairing it is about \$500. He asked if this is some effort they are doing to try to encourage or is this just going to be some property that is boarded up?

September 11, 1978
Minute Book 69 - Page 52

Councilmember Carroll stated he has talked with Mr. Bill Jamison, Superintendent of Building Inspection, about this. That it is a reminder to Council that they need to go ahead and finish fine-tuning what they have pretty much agreed on. That Mr. Jamison pretty much assured him that if Council passed these ordinances they would not force any of the people out who were residences of these houses, but they would in turn comply with the repairs that he has indicated are necessary. But, that with our present procedures not quite as fine-tuned as they hope to get them, this was the only way to proceed.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

- (b) Motion was made by Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Locke, ordering occupied dwelling located at 1105 Pryor Street to be vacated and closed.

Councilmember Leeper asked if this is the same situation on the previous property and was answered affirmatively.

Councilmember Short stated, in responding to Councilmember Carroll's previous statement, the City Attorney reported today that they have made a lot of progress toward drafting the necessary materials. That the job they gave the Attorney's office is certainly an extensive one, but they are working diligently on it.


DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING CHANGED TO OCTOBER 9, 1978 AT 7:30 P. M.

On motion of Councilmember Selden, seconded by Councilmember Cox, the City Council Meeting scheduled in District 6 for October 2, was changed to Monday, October 9, 1978 at 7:30 p. m. at Queens College. The October 2nd meeting of City Council will be held at City Hall at 2:00 p. m.

Mayor Harris asked for a show of hands of Councilmembers who will not be present at next Monday's meeting, September 18, due to the meeting in Seattle or otherwise. Indications were that at least seven members would be present, constituting a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT.

Upon motion of Councilmember Locke, seconded by Councilmember Leeper, and carried unanimously, the meeting adjourned.



Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk