

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 392

The City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, met in regular session on Monday, June 14, 1976, at 3:00 o'clock p. m., in the Council Chamber, City Hall, with Mayor John M. Belk presiding, and Councilmembers Betty Chafin, Louis M. Davis, Harvey B. Gantt, Pat Locke, James B. Whittington, Neil C. Williams and Joe D. Withrow present.

ABSENT: None.

* * * * *

INVOCATION.

The invocation was given by Reverend George Battle, Gethsemane AME Zion Church.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Gantt, and unanimously carried, the minutes of the Council Meetings on May 31 and June 7, 1976, were approved as submitted, with the following correction in the minutes of May 31, as requested by Councilman Davis:

May 31, 1976 - Minute Book 63 - Page 350

Add the following sentence at the end of Paragraph Four:
"Councilman Davis requested that Council be briefed on the General Motor Bus plan at the earliest practical time."

RESOLUTION CLOSING A PORTION OF TENSBUARY COURT.

The scheduled hearing was held on petition of Huntingtowne Farms Neighborhood Association to close a portion of Tensbury Court.

Council was advised the petition had been investigated by all City departments concerned with street rights of way and there are no objections to the closing.

Mr. Frank Bishop, 6539 Tall Oaks Lane, Vice President of the Neighborhood Association, stated they have talked with the property owners who abut the street. As evidenced by their joining in the petition to close, he thinks it is the general feeling of the property owners and the Neighborhood Association in total that this closure would be a good move in the interest of maintaining the integrity of a neighborhood concept where there is some conflict in land use of the adjoining property. He thinks this would be a good move toward the probability of the neighborhood concept.

No opposition was expressed to the proposed closing.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Withrow, and unanimously carried, adopting the resolution closing a portion of Tensbury Court.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 11, at Page 458.

RESOLUTION CLOSING COVERT LANE IN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA.

The public hearing was held on the petition of Huntingtowne Farms Neighborhood Association to close Covert Lane.

Council was advised the petition had been investigated by all City departments concerned with street rights of way and there are no objections to the closing.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 393

Mr. Frank Bishop, Vice President of the Neighborhood Association, stated the same comments he made in the preceding petition would apply to this petition also.

No opposition was expressed to the proposed closing.

Motion was made by Councilman Withrow, seconded by Councilman Whittington, and unanimously carried, to adopt the resolution closing Covert Lane.

Councilman Whittington thanked Mrs. Claudia King for the letter she wrote to Councilmembers about their concerns in that neighborhood, and the help they have received in the past. That Council does not get many of these kinds of letters.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 11, at Page 460.

RESOLUTION CLOSING CERTAIN PORTION OF OLD McCALL STREET, NORTH OF THE NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY RAMP, IN GREENVILLE URBAN RENEWAL AREA, PROJECT NO. N. C. R-78.

The scheduled hearing was held on the petition by Community Development Department to close a certain portion of Old McCall Street, north of the Northwest Expressway ramp, in Greenville Urban Renewal Area, Project No. N. C. R-78.

Council was advised the petition has been investigated by all City departments concerned with street rights of way and there are no objections to the closing.

Mr. Vernon Sawyer, Community Development Director, stated the portion of the street to be closed is the lower end of McCall Street, next to the access ramp to the Northwest Expressway, off Statesville Avenue. The reason that is such a small parcel and had to be considered separately is because the State of North Carolina Highway Department owns that parcel of land that it bought in connection with the construction of the access ramp. At first the plan calls for the project to acquire that parcel if the State wanted to sell it. Later developments concerning a better access or redesign of that access changed the State's mind and it decided not to sell it. Therefore, they had to negotiate with the State to agree to this closing and in the process the State will get half of the right of way and the City will get the other half. That is the only portion. Council has already approved the closing of McCall down to that.

No opposition was expressed to the proposed closing.

Councilman Gantt moved adoption of the resolution closing certain portion of Old McCall Street, north of the Northwest Expressway ramp, in Greenville Urban Renewal Area, Project No. N. C. R-78. The motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow, and carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 11, at Page 462.

PRESENTATION OF CORRIDOR STUDY OF U. S. HIGHWAY 74 (INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD).

Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, explained for the benefit of the large number of citizens who are present to speak to this item, this is not a public hearing and the presentation they are making is information for the Council. That it is not set up on the rules that regard public hearings; it is information requested by the Council so they will know what is being done. This is a State Highway project, the State has employed a consultant, Hensley-Schmidt, Inc., to perform a feasibility study to determine a possible location or relocation or what to do about the

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 394

situation. It is a street with the highest traffic count in the State of North Carolina, and something has to be done. Today, Mr. Hoose will present to them the engineering company that is doing this work.

Mr. Hoose, Transportation Planning Coordinator, stated The 1995 Comprehensive Plan has a proposed study for the Highway 74 Corridor. In July of 1975 the firm of Hensley-Schmidt, Inc. was selected by the North Carolina Department of Transportation to do an environmental impact study along with their planning of this corridor. This study has been going on since July and today they have a slide presentation by Mr. Bill Finger, Transportation Engineer for Hensley-Schmidt, Inc. and from the Charlotte office. Along with the slide presentation he will give a discussion which can be followed with pamphlets which he passed out to Councilmembers. The draft of the environmental impact statements is to be completed sometime in July of this year.

Mr. Bill Finger began his presentation by stating he appreciated the opportunity to present to Council the progress they have made in the study they have been doing for the State Department of Transportation. His firm was hired to do this study last July.

The U. S. 74 Corridor is centered on U. S. 74 southeast of downtown Charlotte. They have assembled a great deal of data - environmental data, economic, social, land use and planning data. They appreciate the cooperation of all City departments in helping them compile a great deal of this data. Based on this data and familiarity with the corridor itself, they developed a number of different types of alternatives, a number of transit only alternatives, a number of highway and transit alternatives, and a no-build alternative. They analyzed all of these alternatives. They looked at them from a standpoint of public acceptability, engineering feasibility, environmental feasibility, economic feasibility. On the basis of these analyses they were able to come up with four basic courses of action, four concepts, and a number of locations where some of these concepts might be applied.

In April they took these to the public in a random survey of a thousand homes in their study area in order to find out the acceptability of these transportation approaches. They are now in an implementation and evaluation period; they are also very heavily involved in community involvement neighborhood meetings. They have held ten meetings with neighborhood groups; they have had three public meetings so far; they are having a meeting of concerned businessmen tomorrow; and they have contacted a number of other neighborhood groups.

The U. S. 74 Corridor, if it continues to grow as it has been, will experience by 1995 a doubling of population, an increase of employment from 24,000 to over 34,000; an increase of population density from 2,200 within the city limits to 3,250 within the same area. Traffic almost doubling from the five major roads that serve the corridor. This is if the road continues to go as it has. The Planning Commission's plan does not intend for that road to continue as it has. There are other transportation facilities that will to some extent relieve some of this.

He indicated an area which showed a loss of population of 100 persons; and another area which showed a gain in population of 100 persons. This is over the period from 1960 to 1974. The areas showing the loss are misleading to an extent because it would be better if they could have put the one area on top of the other. A great number of these losses are due to transportation facilities and urban renewal projects in that portion of the study area. The areas are generally divided along Briar Creek. He called attention to the fact that increases in population took place throughout the corridor, not just in the newly developing areas. This is because, not only are we developing subdivisions at the outside of our city, but we are also having apartments and such residential development like that taking place closer in.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 395

Another slide showed population density. He pointed out the downtown area, Independence Boulevard, Central Avenue on the north and Providence Road on the south. It shows how population density decreases as you leave town. As you reach McAlpine Creek the population drops to a very low density - the lightest area is under 375 people per square mile, the darkest areas are more than 12,000 people per square mile.

The existing facility we have is one that in some situations is a very highly designed, capable facility; in other situations it is antiquated; it has been expanded through traffic engineering changes such that lane limits are narrower than minimum design would be for today and it has many disadvantages to the motoring public.

What are we going to do about this growth and our existing facilities? That is what they are doing - a transportation corridor study. They are looking at a number of different options. The Comprehensive Plan for 1995 includes a number of transportation improvements in the corridor. Many of them are under construction now, others such as the Outer Loop are under study at this time; they are studying a corridor which generally orients along U. S. 74, one of the corridors recommended in this plan. They have looked at the options recommended there and at others. In general they have developed four concepts which they feel are different courses of action and really different commitments as to what type of transportation facilities might be used to serve the corridor. All of these concepts have the potential to survive as transportation improvements to the year 2000. Some of them involve significant changes in lifestyles and travel patterns for the motoring public today.

Concept A would be no major capital improvement. Concept B would be improvement to existing roads. Concept C would be a two-way transit way. Concept D. would be a new expressway.

Concept A involves using existing roads such as Independence Boulevard, some of which is below design standards. It also involves committing ourselves to living with these for a long time. The existing roads are congested now but not as congested as many people realize. In general, our peak hour is less than an hour long on these roads. You can leave most of our corridor at seven in the morning and not experience congestion at this time. Past experience has shown if no improvements are made, as time goes by more and more people have to leave for work earlier in the morning and return home later in the afternoon - perhaps arrive early where they work, stay there and have breakfast, and then begin their work day. By the same token they will stay and work afterwards, if they work in a shopping center or downtown, and perhaps finish their day later. This is the transition that has taken place in other communities.

There are other solutions in addition to the peak hour stretching out to a very long drawn out period. Currently, on Independence Boulevard there are five people in every four cars. If those five people were in two cars, by the year 2000 the transportation congestion would be no greater than it is today. They have forecast a great deal of increased trip making in the corridor. These forecasts assume the completion of a number of proposed facilities including an Outer Loop facility of some type. Even with these facilities that would relieve through traffic, the local traffic which is predominately what they are dealing with in this study, would remain such that a four-lane street such as 7th Street, if converted to buses only operation, could carry the proposed increase in trip making. There are a number of things that could be done under Concept A which have significant impacts upon lifestyles and travel patterns, but they are alternatives that they can consider and they do not involve construction.

Concept B would not increase significantly capacity of existing facilities, but it would deal with safety problems in areas where lanes are too small and areas where lanes disappear, lanes are dropped. One implementation of Concept B would be towards the problem at Hawthorne Lane and Independence Boulevard where we now have a continual drop of lanes both on Northwest Freeway and Independence Boulevard and suffer from significant reduction

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 396

in capacity. This would involve spending some money. The cost would be about a half million dollars per mile. For that corridor that would be about a total of four to five million dollars.

Concept C is a new idea for Charlotte and has not been used in too many locations. This would be a new two-way transit way, exclusive right of way for buses only. Buses would be able to serve neighborhoods with express service to downtown. Hopefully, in the future, other similar corridors would provide express service back out to other corridors of the City. It offers a time advantage over the automobile particularly if streets become more and more congested over the years. It offers capacity for future growth in trip making and offers an alternative to those who are facing congestion on streets. It would cost about \$2.5 million per mile. It would be a separate facility with no signals and no stops. Once a bus completed a neighborhood run and entered this express facility it would travel to the fringe of downtown before local service would resume, as they envision it.

Concept D would be a new freeway, on a new location. Their traffic forecasts show that it would most likely need to be a four-lane freeway initially that should survive till the year 2000. The facility would be designed so that it could be expandable to six lanes as is the federal government's policy today with such facilities. If it was developed along an existing facility such as Independence Boulevard, the removal of the existing facility would require an increased capacity. He showed a "Corridor 2" which is a six-lane freeway with two-lane frontage roads on each side. This would be similar to what is at the Northwest Freeway with 11th and 12th Streets on each side.

All of the concepts that he has talked about will have significant advantages and disadvantages. He showed a chart to particularly illustrate this, indicating that No. 4 was the worst and No. 1 the best. In any of the environmental categories, different concepts score higher in different categories. By the same token, when you look at the concepts from a more subjective analysis, they find that Concepts A and B require us to make the greatest changes in our lifestyles. Concept C requires us to make a change in our travel patterns and depend more readily on transit. Concept D which more or less falls in line with the travel patterns of suburban Charlotte today would cause probably the greatest impacts upon our communities, our businesses and our travel patterns while under construction.

When you look at pollution, you see that Concept C would be the loudest facility but for the shortest amount of time because it would only carry volumes during the peak hours. When you look at pollutants you see the faster facilities give better performance with carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons which are most significantly dangerous for recreations involved, young children, heavy breathing, whereas nitric oxides which have the worst long term impacts on the environment are lowest for the slowest facilities.

Concepts C and D both have a requirement for some location and their next step was to analyze various locations and look at formulating a policy for different location development. They considered a lot of factors in determining the location - they looked at economic factors, social factors, environmental factors, mobility factors, and public opinion factors.

The economic factors included how much would it cost, where would we get the money - money sometimes depends upon the location? How does it affect businesses, growths and jobs? What are the public benefits, how do they relate to cost, would it be a self-supporting facility if located?

Social factors - how many houses and jobs might be displaced? What would be noise problems? What would be the impacts upon the neighborhoods, would they be divided? What kind of new development might come? What would be the impacts on person's homes, places where they work, their neighborhoods? Within their corridor it is impossible to develop any

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 397

alternative or alignment that does not go through some neighborhood somewhere. What community facilities might be impacted or displaced by the proposals - slides showed the schools and parks that would be so affected.

They looked at land use and the land patterns of the area. He showed a land use map that identified significant forested areas in the corridor. They did an intensive environmental analysis - they looked at parks, schools and recreation spaces; they looked at air quality and noise effects; and they looked at potential historical sites located in the area. This has a lot to do with the human environment. They also looked at sensitive environmental areas. In the significant areas - the slides indicated very severe slopes and flood plains. They looked at beautiful forested areas that are located within sometimes a short walk from Independence Boulevard.

They looked at mobility patterns. Is it safe? What would be the impacts on neighborhood traffic, what about accidents? Is it convenient and comfortable? How fast would it get you somewhere? How long might you have to wait for service if it were located in a given community? They looked at the existing roadway system. They found, for instance, that most of today's traffic on the existing roads comes from local trips. Just as Interstate 85 has over 80 percent of its travel as local trips, U. S. 74 is in a similar situation. At McAlpine Creek U. S. 74 has about 18,000 cars per day. You go up to the top of the hill to Idlewild Road and it is doubled to 36,000 cars per day - all local trips from the neighborhoods and businesses that have located in that area and all the way into town.

Travel speed and intersection congestion was analyzed. They found that although some of the roads may be uncomfortable to drive on and people feel congestion is significant, at Hawthorne Lane today, you can cross Hawthorne Lane at 10 minutes past 5 and you can generally get to Matthews by 5:30 and it really does not matter which way you go. You can get there about as fast whether you take Independence, Monroe or Randolph and Sardis. This is not to say that this situation will continue as growth continues to go on in the corridor. The study they are doing is oriented towards funding to take place sometime after 1982. This is a long range growth planning, trying to look ahead and be prepared for that growth and committed to options that might be feasible at that time.

They have looked at public opinion factors. They have done a door-to-door survey of a thousand people in the corridor. They have held a number of public meetings, a number of neighborhood meetings, have had an open door policy; have an office in their suite that is open for people to come in and inspect all sorts of the base data they have used. They have a great deal of data there for their inspection. They are asking them what they think about proposals, what they think about all of them, from Concept A to Concept D.

Locations that have been developed are numbered 1, 2, 3 and 4. They are numbered from the south as are interstate highways and most transportation facilities. Alternative Corridor 1 would generally follow the Seaboard Coastline Railroad. It has a significant problem with relocation of homes. It would displace 750 to 800 homes. At the right end there is an Alternative 1A or 1B. 1A has a problem with a very well developed Old Forest; 1B has the problem of McAlpine Greenway. That is a hard choice to make as are many of the choices involved in transportation corridors. At any rate, from McAlpine Creek on out they feel that the existing Independence corridor offers the best location for improvements either of Concept C, transit way; or Concept D, freeway approach.

Alternative 2 does not take many homes, does not do much to disrupt businesses. It follows the existing Independence Boulevard. Its impacts are primarily and particularly those during construction. The right of way required for Alternative 2 would be beyond Eastway Drive approximately an additional 70 feet. This would have its impact upon some businesses

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 398

and on a great deal of parking. Perhaps the greatest impact of Alternative 2 for freeway approach would be that Alternative 2, for either approach - freeway or transit way - would require significant detours during construction. These detours would not only be disadvantageous to people traveling and to people who live around paralleling routes, but it would also not require as much relocation of homes for a freeway as Alternative 1.

Alternative Corridor 3 has as its major problem the impact upon neighborhoods. It comes through an existing community area although it makes use of a lot of now undeveloped land - that land is often allocated for community facilities, and it also goes through an area where nothing now lives - neighborhoods or communities. This is the major disadvantage of Alternative 3.

Alternative 4 which goes up the other side of Central Avenue, behind Eastland Mall, was developed in order to see if some of these neighborhood impacts could be improved upon. To an extent, neighborhood impacts were improved, but the number of homes taken increased. Alternative 4 could offer some potential as development continues to occur in the Executive Center area, the area of Albemarle Road and Lawyers Road. It would handle traffic from that direction better.

We look at costs; we see that for Concepts C and D, Corridor 4 would be most expensive; Corridor 2 along Independence would be least expensive. However, he pointed out that Corridor 2 is the most volatile because small changes in where a final facility might be located could greatly influence this cost. Corridors 1 and 3 are in between these.

We look at the impact on public places - we see that Corridor 1 is involved with two parks, one of which might be relocated, and one cemetery. Corridor 2 would be involved with one park, one school, five churches two of which might be relocated. Corridor 3, between Independence and Central Avenue, would be involved with one park which might be relocated, three schools, five churches one of which might be relocated, one cemetery. Although this is not the main reason for his point that Corridor 3 has neighborhood impact problems, when you go into an area where there is not some facility now, you encounter many more of the public facility types of problems. Corridor 4 reduces this number somewhat - it involves one park, two schools, two churches one of which might be relocated.

We look at displacement. Concept C, a transit way, located on Alternative 1, would displace from 70 to 80 dwellings, less than 5 businesses. On Alternative 2, 30 to 40 dwellings, 10 to 20 businesses. On Alternative 3, 90 to 100 dwellings, less than 5 businesses. On Alternative 4, 100 to 110 dwellings, less than 5 businesses.

Concept D, a freeway - on Alternative 1 would displace a large number of homes, 750 to 800 and 10 to 20 businesses. Alternative 2, 10 percent as many homes as No. 1 but many more businesses, 100 to 150 representing over 1,000 jobs. Alternative 3 would displace 300 to 350 dwellings, 20 to 30 businesses. Alternative 4 would displace 400 to 450 dwellings, 20 to 30 businesses.

In looking at the four concepts and the four alternatives, the greatest decision that has to be made is the choice among problems. Each of them has significant problems. None of them is without problems. Their purpose in this study is to analyze each of these as much as they possibly can. They are currently, and have been, going to neighborhoods and to representative random cross sections of the public and asking decisions on which alternatives, which concepts, people might prefer. They realize, particularly in their door-to-door survey - they were asking them which type of transportation facility they would prefer - they were not able to be as aware of the impacts of these facilities as Council is today or as his firm is. But they were able to find out what types of travelling facilities they might think would be used the most, would be the best from a purely transportation standpoint.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 399

The questionnaire booklet which he gave Council was used as the survey instrument in their survey - they surveyed a thousand homes randomly. The questionnaire is at the back of the survey and detaches so that the person is able to keep an information brochure with him. The questionnaire included some questions so that they could compare the results with census tract information and they did find very good response that way. It showed that they had gotten a cross section of the people throughout the study area.

They realize a number of things. They realize that people were making choices based on transportation facilities, not choices based on all considerations. Looking at these choices, they see that approximately 30 percent favored the freeway, 30 percent favored a freeway and transit way, 20 percent favored a transit way alone, 19 percent favored minimum improvements to existing facilities, four percent, no major improvements. All of these percentages are of total people surveyed - some people chose not to answer given questions, so the percentages do not always add to 100. When asked which location they preferred, nearly 40 percent of the people favored the Seaboard Railroad alternative; another 30 percent favored Independence Boulevard; 10 percent favored Alternatives 3 and 4; and six percent favored none of the above.

In response to the rest of the questions, which had to do with how people travel today, they found that nine percent of the people surveyed did use transit today; they found 55 percent of the people said they would use transit or use it more if it substantially changed like Concept C. They also found out information about how often people go downtown because this has a direct bearing on the ability of transit to be successful. Other questions compared transit benefits with their disbenefits.

Councilman Withrow asked what percentage of people would come from out of the City, from Monroe, etc., and could be diverted by going out I-77. Mr. Finger replied there are a number of people who come from those areas to points in the corridor, to the Coliseum, Eastland Mall, Richway, K-Mart, to friends or relatives. As far as through trips from Highway 51 to Hawthorne Lane, which still could be going downtown, that is less than 20 percent of the total trip load. As far as trips that would go from U. S. 74 and leave on 74 that is less than 10 percent, predominately because our transportation assignments include the assumption that some Outer Loop facility will be built as a by-pass completely around the town. Those trips have already been assigned to such a facility. If an Outer Loop facility does not become a reality, then their transportation projections would be too low. They have taken into account many of the roads that are under construction today, completion of all of the things that are included in the transportation plan that the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission has proposed.

Councilwoman Chafin asked that in the responses to Question No. 2 which asked a preference on an alternate route, did the respondents know what the projected relocation figures were? Mr. Finger replied no - they did not take this survey to be based upon their assessment of what the wisest course of action considering all things. This survey was to find out what they think would be the best transportation facility if one is going to be developed. From the standpoint of which one they think will serve traffic the best or whatever reasons they have. If people asked, their surveyors were prepared with the general information they have seen today, but they were not able to keep people listening to them long enough to provide the same kind of information.

In response to a question as to whether the respondents were told the cost, Mr. Finger stated that the cost is provided in the booklet on a per mile basis so that a comparative cost can be analyzed - \$6.5 million for a freeway per mile; \$2.5 for a transit way; \$.5 million Concept B. This is so that they can compare the general costs. The people detached the booklet and kept it; the surveyor kept the questionnaire.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 400

Councilman Williams asked whose idea it was to do this study, the Department of Transportation; somebody in the City Traffic Department?

Mr. Finger replied the North Carolina Department of Transportation hired them to do the study. Various reasons of why they are interested in it he cannot speak for. He does know that the earlier a study like this is done, the less problems you have. It is too bad they could not have done the study in 1920 but then they did not think Charlotte was going to be like it is today. Even if they had done a study like this in 1956, growth beyond Eastway Drive would have been insignificant.

Councilwoman Chafin asked the timetable on this? Mr. Finger stated that they will turn their draft of a planning report and environmental impact study in to the State in July or August of this year. The State Transportation Board will be the group that will make a final decision. At the same time when they are inspecting their draft, it will be available for public review and for review by numerous federal, state and local agencies. Based on these reviews, they will then prepare a final statement sometime later. Theoretically, that could be 90 days later; more than likely it will be about six months. No matter what that schedule works out to, the current seven-year highway program of the Department of Transportation does not include any funding for any facility which means that until some point after 1982 there would not be funding to do anything. They are doing this study far in advance of any types of proposals that might be acceptable in order that right of way protection and that type of endeavor could begin as soon as possible, if Concept C or D proves to be the one that would be the most acceptable.

Councilman Gantt complimented Mr. Finger on making a very complicated study very readable. He has observed him on television a number of times giving this presentation and he has an office right down the corridor from his and he is a terribly nice guy. A lot of people see him as a villain because of the kind of study he has to do.

He stated he wants to ask him a number of questions which he would like for him to expand on because there seems to be a kind of tendency on his part to be saying something that might be of significance in terms of policy. We have four alternative routes and we have four concepts to deal with. Apparently he thinks that all of those concepts have some merit, particularly the concept of no improvement at all if some other kinds of things would happen. Then he followed that by the fact that no funds are set aside, at least at the moment, for capital improvements in seven years. Of course, he does not know what the recommendation of his study will be that might give it all of a sudden highest priority. Someone said earlier that this route has the highest traffic count of any in the State, so it should be at the top of the list.

Assuming that there are no funds in seven years, he would like him to go back and talk about Concept A which is no improvement. He heard someone on the Council once say that we never get communities coming to us talking about how bad traffic is out there and he wonders if they left that corridor alone - not totally leave it alone but talk about the kinds of expenditures we are beginning to make in public transportation and alternative kinds of things that begin to relieve congestion on Independence Boulevard, whether or not in seven years it may be that they would have to call his firm back in to do another look at the road because all of a sudden the projections did not go up to that 150,000 cars a day, or whatever it was. Can he go back and tell him a little more?

Mr. Finger replied he would not say that Concept A is a do-nothing alternative, but it is a no-construction alternative. It means that somebody still has to do something, whether it is people choosing to use transit, whether it is people choosing to carpool, whether it is programs that can encourage people to do this - all of these things have met with some degree of success in the past. They cannot be expected to solve the whole problem. What will solve the problem is the fact that congestion will get bad enough; peak hours will get longer and longer; people will

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 401

start leaving for work earlier, they will start coming home later. Some employers will change job times, they will have their people come in at different times. This has been the experience in other cities. The problem could be solved in other ways. The guy who says he is going to ride in a carpool is solving the problem for somebody else. The immediate impact of him riding in the carpool is not felt as one less car per day. The guy who decides he will leave his car at home and ride the bus still fights the same signals - the bus still fights the same signals and also stops. There can be grass roots support that could really relieve the existing facilities, but that is hard to count on. There can also be all sorts of programs to try to encourage as much as possible, high occupancy. There can also be decisions made such as one-way operation of certain streets through certain periods of time of the day - reversible lanes. For instance, you could increase the capacity of those existing facilities by operating Monroe Road one way in in the morning and one way out in the afternoon - two-way the rest of the time. This is one recommendation that came from one of the neighborhood meetings. You might find that people who have homes, businesses or jobs along Monroe Road would find that very disconcerting because it might make it very difficult for them to get where they wanted to go when they wanted to go.

They would also find that there are significant safety problems because people are not sure which way to turn when they come to the intersection of Monroe Road with another street - part of the day they can only turn right and part they can only turn left. Every one of these alternatives has problems. Some of them are operational problems, some of them are problems that depict a change in lifestyles - changing the transit is a significant change in lifestyle - and if it is going to be effective it has to be changed for a lot of people. So, we say okay we will not change our lifestyle, we will not change our traffic pattern - then that means we are in a situation where we have Freeway 1, 2, 3 or 4. And each of them have different problems, not travel problems but very important problems and the weighing of these problems is something that requires wisdom.

Councilman Gantt asked if we took Concept 4 it would mean that over the long haul we would have to make the smallest amount of change in our present travel habits, but if we took the first concept (for want of a better term, the do-nothing to Independence Boulevard) it would require the most substantial change in our travel habits? Mr. Finger stated that is correct. In between those two there would be Concept C which offers people somewhat more flexibility and less congestion, but still this concept depends upon a great deal of congestion in order for people to use the transit facility. Obviously, if the roads are free flowing, people would not choose to use the transit facility.

Councilman Gantt stated that 75 to 80 percent of the people say that they might use the transit system if it is different from the one we have; 4.4 percent said they would use it if it is safer and 55.8 percent said they would use it if there were substantial changes. Mr. Finger stated that they find that encouraging.

Mr. Finger stated they also realize that in many similar studies, people have chosen to vote for improvements they feel might relieve the roads they want to drive on. Councilman Gantt asked if his study would actually make a recommendation. Mr. Finger replied they are not making a recommendation. He personally feels that all of these alternatives have a lot of advantages and disadvantages. They could make a recommendation in their final report which will be some time off, but they will not make a recommendation with the first draft. What they are most interested in doing is providing the evaluation materials for the Department of Transportation.

Councilman Whittington asked Mr. Hoose when Independence Boulevard was built? His reply was 1948, 49 and 50. It was built in three sections. Councilman Whittington asked if it is not true that the design of this road which was to run generally east and southwest, after that was begun then the new U. S. 74 coming from Union County and Monroe was tied into

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 402

the portion of the road that was going through the center of the city? Mr. Hoose replied that is right. Councilman Whittington stated that the road at that time was designed for east-west traffic as it relates to North Carolina and it was also to move local traffic across the city. Mr. Finger has said that 18,000 cars a day use U. S. 74 east of McAlpine Creek and then when you get to Idlewild Road it picks up to about 36,000, by Pearson Drive it goes up to 48,000. Councilman Whittington stated that Independence Boulevard was the first road of any consequence in Charlotte-Mecklenburg that was built by the State of North Carolina. It was begun under Governor Cherry and finished under Governor Hodges. The thing he thinks that the firm of Hensley-Schmidt ought to concern themselves with, if the State will let them, is: (1) What are they going to do about Highway 51 which is taking traffic from U. S. 74 about McMillan Creek to I-77 beyond Pineville and south? (2) He would hope they would give some recommendation to the State on one-way streets. He said years ago to Mr. Hoose that 7th Street ought to be one-way in the morning and one-way in the evening. Now, the State is doing Albemarle Road, we have done part of it, that certainly ought to be considered. (3) He would hope that they would do what many people have talked about for a long, long time and that is a way to get Plaza Road where it dead-ends now at Chesterfield, across the railroad track, over to Laurel Avenue to get another street going across to Providence. (4) Before anyone makes a decision as far as local government is concerned, he would hope that some facts would be given to the State to consider making Independence Boulevard a limited access road as it is today. He can appreciate that people who cross this road, as he does, many, many times a week going from north to south, would be opposed to this. At the same time, if some of these streets were closed off it would certainly keep the traffic more on that road and keep it off the neighborhoods which is what he assumes the people that are present today are concerned about.

Last, he is just a layman but he thinks he has traveled this road as much per week as anybody in the room, and he thinks he knows something about it, having for many, many years championed trying to get Eastway Drive finished. When the road was opened, Independence at that time was already carrying 28,000 cars. But, also in relation to Independence Boulevard, as he goes east on Independence Boulevard and approaches 7th Street, it seems to him that the State would have a wonderful opportunity now to fan that road out over to Pecan Avenue and slice it back in when you get to Pecan as we have now between 7th Street and Hawthorne. If you were going west on Independence Boulevard, and you have the same opportunity, from Pecan back to Hawthorne and when you reach that point you are either going right to 7th Street or going under Central Avenue to get downtown.

These are some of the things he would hope this study would lend itself to so that the State could make some of those considerations before they decide on a corridor in 1982 or whenever.

Mr. Finger stated he could address a little bit of that. In their study they have considered the completion of the roads now under construction and an Outer Loop as a by-pass facility - that is a reality. Based upon that, the remaining traffic is basically local traffic to and from points within the corridor, or from outside the city to and from points in the vicinity of downtown or north of town. With respect to what he was saying about The Plaza, they have looked at opening an extension of Laurel into The Plaza as well as into Westover. It is possible these are things that they might want to include in their proposal in order to have a more extended facility in that area.

Talking about limited access, currently they look at a limited access treatment of Independence Boulevard as what they call a non-competitive alternative, predominately because of traffic circulation problems. People can actually travel many more miles and increase traffic volumes because they cannot get from one point to another easily and because of the safety problems. Such a facility will often have a higher accident rate, an arterial will definitely have higher accident severity. It is, however, an alternative they will mention in their study and the State

June 14, 1976

Minute Book 63 - Page 403

may choose to consider it further at some future date. They have very much in their Concept B looked at the interchange of Independence, Northwest Freeway near Hawthorne Lane and ways in order to reduce the problems of that bottleneck by distributing that traffic more effectively. He thinks they are trying to do some things in that direction and certainly will continue to do so.

Mayor Belk stated there were about 15 persons who requested to be heard on this item and he would like to reiterate the point that this is not a public hearing. Councilwoman Locke stated that before any of these concepts are ever adopted, the North Carolina Board of Transportation will hold many public hearings on this so everyone will have an opportunity to be heard and have their opinions known.

Mr. Richard Heath, 900 Lynbrook Drive, stated he had the experience of seeing Mr. Finger's presentation in one of the neighborhood meetings. One thing that was not brought out. While although 40 percent of the people surveyed chose Alternative 1, coming down the Seaboard Coastline Railroad, it is his understanding from Mr. Finger that those 40 percent live in the area of Alternatives 3 and 4 and basically were trying to get the freeway away from their houses. He is personally against Concept D and he would like to bring out some of the anti points to it which perhaps slipped by in Mr. Finger's presentation. These are based on a myriad of reasons, but he will stay with four: (1) His concern with Charlotte's continued survival; (2) The numerous alternatives currently available to Charlotte motorists; (3) The promotion of a wasteful resource user, the automobile; (4) And the adverse impact on all communities concerned.

Charlotte's survival is dependent upon a high property evaluation among other things. Alternative 1 would eliminate 800 homes through a fine section of Charlotte. Given an average value of just \$35,000 a house - and they range up to \$65,000 and \$70,000 - you are talking about a reduction of \$28.0 million in assessed property value, and you are going to insert a highway for the movement of wage earners who work in Charlotte to go back in the evening time to Matthews and Mint Hill and other outlying areas outside of Charlotte. Why should they live in Charlotte, closer to the hub of all these radial roads, and thereby more likely to have one of these roads in their backyard if they can escape to the outer rim of these radial roads and just utilize them and not have the inconvenience of them in their backyard. Look at Atlanta, ask Mayor Maynard Jackson what his problem is today. Part of his problem is trying to get and maintain his city's assessed value as the ease of escape from the City of Atlanta to Shady Springs, Stone Mountain and the other subdivisions. People leave the town. Now Mayor Jackson is looking for assessed valuation.

Mr. Finger brings out the purported users of Alternative 1. He says that between McAlpine Creek and Idlewild Road you only have 18,000 trips a day, but then at Idlewild it picks up another 18,000 before you get to Sharon Amity. You fail to remember that Mint Hill and Matthews come down Lawyers Road and Idlewild Road and they turn into Route 74 from that direction. Mr. Finger states that the purported users of this highway who drop down into his area, Stonehaven and Queen's Grant, would be the people from Sardis Road, Stonehaven, Queen's Grant, Sherwood Forest. They do not use that road; that is wrong. They use Randolph, Providence and an occasional trip down Monroe Road. So Alternative 1 to U. S. 74 would not affect their traffic motions at all. They would never use Alternative 1 except for the fact that it would be in their backyard and they would feel like they have to use it. Mr. Finger said that in their community Alternative 1 has very little impact. That is wrong too. Because when you come out to his community, on Rama Road you have Rama Elementary School, and then on the other side of the railroad tracks you have McClintock Junior High School. The proposed Alternative 1 would have an overpass over Rama Road. Once you have these overpasses you have entrance and exit ramps, you have people making hard lefts and hard rights through there. They have kids walking up and down the street trying to get to school. That is an impact! The adverse impact to Charlotte would also

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 404

be affected. There would be noise and smog pollution from the freeway concept. Prior to buying his house in 1974 he went to the City Planners - he knew of freeways and the problems with them so he asked them: "Anywhere in the next 10 years do you plan to have a freeway in this locale?" and he pointed out Queen's Grant. He said, "No, assuredly no; perhaps a widening of Rama Road, but that is it." Now, two years later, we have a proposal. Very few buyers of property in the City of Charlotte given this traumatic development of freeways would be tricked into such a proposal again. Miami, Florida had the same tricks. They tried freeways - I-95 downtown, across to the beach, all over. Then all of a sudden - Mr. Finger pointed this out to them in their meetings - they decided to give up on freeways. They realized that as long as you make traffic go in and out of neighborhoods easy for a car, no one will ride the buses. The next proposal is to buy a busline. You put in a freeway and your buses will be supported by the City Council, not by the people using them. The Blue Streak in Miami is their answer to the busline. Use of buses, use of express lanes, etc.; not expressways!

Mr. Ed Garner, 1924 Bay Street, stated he lives in the Elizabeth community. That the North Carolina Department of Transportation has commissioned the firm of Hensley-Schmidt to study the Highway 74 corridor and to suggest transportation options for the future. One of the suggestions which has come from this study envisions a new freeway which would run through the Elizabeth community.

An overwhelming number of Elizabeth community residents is opposed to the construction of another major road through their community. He is here to express their point of view to the Council and to request that they make their position on that issue public so that it can be included in the report to the Transportation Board. His family has lived in the same house continuously for nearly 40 years. The house now sits directly in the path of the proposed freeway and he needs hardly say that he is opposed for purely personal reasons to the construction of this road.

He stated there is a larger consideration which argues strongly against the chart of this route which has become to be known as Alternative 1. The Elizabeth community dates from before the turn of this century and is an established neighborhood some 70 years old. As such it is an asset to this city of irreplaceable historical value. It has already been damaged once by the construction of Independence Boulevard. From approximately the time Independence was built, Elizabeth began to experience a decline in quality as a place to live. A few years ago the Council approved the rezoning of a large part of the Elizabeth community for single family dwellings. They believe this action reflected Council's concern for the preservation of this unique inner-city neighborhood, and it has certainly had a rejuvenating effect on the life of their community. Older residents have taken a renewed pride in their property and new residents have moved in, convinced of Elizabeth's desirability as a place to live and with the confident expectation of staying. The result has been the restoration of one fine old house after another, some of which would number among the hundreds of homes it is estimated would be destroyed to make way for a freeway in Alternative 1.

He stated that this bicentennial year has focused our attention unprecedentedly on our past. We have an opportunity here to take a leading role among our Country's great cities in preserving what is left of it. The Elizabeth community is a part of the past, a part of the present, and they sincerely trust, a part of the future. The citizens of Elizabeth urge Council to act in this spirit by saving their neighborhood from further fragmentation and from the decline which would inevitably result from the location of another major road here.

Mr. Paul Epley, 429 Clarice Avenue, stated it is very easy for anyone to deal with numbers, facts, figures and percentages. The citizens of Elizabeth think of themselves as a neighborhood of people with sensitivities and needs, and he would visually reinstate their position through the use of sound film.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 405

He stated by the late 1800's the Elizabeth community was a dream coming true. Grover Cleveland had been defeated at the polls, cotton was up to 9.8¢ a pound and Charlotte was becoming the largest city in the Carolinas. It was in this fervor of growth and activity that their present neighborhood, Elizabeth, was born. A neighborhood designed by its inceptors for the people of the community of all economic levels; a neighborhood designed for new growth and new life; a neighborhood designed to stand forever as the giver of life to Charlotte.

Today Elizabeth is nearly a century old. The names of her people have changed but not their ideals; not their desires for neighborhood integrity and not their demand for neighborhood preservation. Elizabeth stands today as an example of what a neighborhood should be - a place where people can live, work and play in peace. A place where children may enjoy green parks and cool streets; a place where old and young alike can meet and enjoy the beauty that is Elizabeth; a place not to be covered in asphalt but to be covered in flowers and trees for their children; a place where life and the living of it are of great value; a place for youth and a place for elders.

Should this neighborhood, rich in Carolina history, be replaced by giant parking lots? Of what value will a highway be if in the end there is no place to go? Will our children be forced to forget their heritage or will they be able to look back in years ahead to be proud of the foresight of their parents. Charlotte has demanded much from Elizabeth - her statesmen, her civic leaders, her strong and solid citizens. A good portion of her lands have already been lost to the progress of highways. But Elizabeth has withstood, has always given her best. Elizabeth is alive, but her days are numbered if the leaders of our great city permit her sturdy frame to be mutilated by pavement; she will die, and the life that she so freely gives will be lost forever. Not enough of her will remain to survive. Since the first plot was made the neighborhood has been a source of city pride. Her streets were among the first to carry the trolley lines of the 1900's. Elizabeth has never shunned progress, but neither has she let her ideals be removed. Her people will not stand idly by; they will be counted and they ask Council to be counted as well. Elizabeth has given her best for us; can we do any less for her? Think of her great history; think of her solid homes; think of her strong people; of their lifestyle; think of what you can do to help us save Elizabeth. Elizabeth challenges you to stand up and be counted! Elizabeth asks for your support and demands her right to life! Elizabeth needs them; they ask Council to please help!

Mrs. Jane Kessler, 1722 E. 8th Street, stated she did not want to be redundant because she thinks some of the things that were said in the film were said a lot better than she can say in words, but she does speak as one of the younger couples who have moved into the Elizabeth community and who have taken a real interest in restoring and keeping some of the beautiful old homes that really cannot be replaced. After having worked on a house like that for a year and finding out how difficult it is to replace these old moldings, fireplaces and solid wood doors, and then finding out that just about the time they finish it, they are going to build a freeway through it, it is a very difficult thing to deal with. She wanted to bring that point out so they can consider what is happening in Elizabeth - it is coming back up, people are rebuilding it and saving what they feel is worth saving.

Mr. Fred Kessler, 1722 E. 8th Street, stated his concept of a place to live is basically that - a place to live, not a place to drive through. There seems to be a great thrust now for Charlotte to be a good place to zip right through, down a good blue line, but it is no place at all to live when you are beside that line. A lot of emphasis has been placed on preserving communities, in preserving the historical part of Charlotte, and that is just what their group is interested in doing - taking these old houses and keeping them because they will never be seen again. You cannot buy the sort of things that are in them; you can only preserve it. All of the Councilmembers have made statements in support of

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 406

communities - he has them with him, he went to the Library and looked up what they said during the election campaign. Mayor Belk is interested in the entire community; Councilwoman Chafin wants participation by neighborhood organizations, and she is in favor of new zoning ordinances to protect the environment and insure the preservation of neighborhoods; Councilman Davis relishes life in Charlotte and wants to end the love affair the public has with its automobiles; so on and so forth, taken from the newspaper. He asks that they consider the Elizabeth community.

Mrs. Chase Brenizer, 622 Clement Avenue, stated that she is 81 years old; she has lived at this address in Elizabeth for 39 years. She has improved the house by taking out an old coal-fired furnace and installing a modern gas-fired furnace. Herman Litaker, a fine builder, tells her it would cost \$100,000 to build this home new today. Her lot is 99' on Clement by 195' on Bay Street, where she owns a duplex, 1912-14 Bay Street, which she rents and receives a good income from. Her lot is full of camellias, azaleas, rhododendron, dogwood and shade trees.

Mr. Lee Willard, 611 Clement Avenue, stated he feels the survey made by the consultants of Hensley-Schmidt is invalid because those surveyed were not told anything about the adverse environmental impact of the proposed alternative routes. He quoted a Charlotte News article on April 15 by John Vaughn which stated the 988 who answered the questionnaire were not given the social or environmental impact of various alternatives they were asked to choose from. Also, the survey booklet states it is recognized that the respondents who will answer these questions do not have all the information they might like to have prior to making their choices. They feel that the only thing that the survey accurately showed is that those surveyed about a new road wanted the road as far away from them as possible or not through their neighborhood. As a community, they have studied the various proposals and feel that Alternative 2, Independence Boulevard, is the only possible location for changes in the transportation system. In discussing the proposal they have found that there are numerous reasons why Alternative 2 is the best choice. The 1995 Comprehensive Plan recommends improving old roads and not destroying homes wherever possible. Independence Boulevard, being 20 years old, is already in bad shape. It needs help regardless. Improvement of Independence Boulevard may help alleviate some of the blight. Improvement of Independence would allow limited access in the inner-residential area which needs such traffic control to take the pressure of through traffic off these areas. The parking facilities already exist along Independence Boulevard to park and ride transit options. Unlike all the other alternatives, mass transit can be experimented with on Independence Boulevard now with no real capital outlay just by going down and painting the lines for a busline. City may own the bus system July 1st and would have the duty to the taxpayer to make it attractive and competitive to the car. A bus line on Independence is a possibility now or within a year or two. Along the boulevard the State already owns the right of way of sufficient width to make the necessary improvements, improvements that will help residential areas by limiting access to them. The businesses which do have to be relocated can be helped to relocate in the metropolitan centers as per the 1995 Plan. This can help amend the mistakes of no planning in the past and further the 1995 Plan. While businesses may suffer during construction, in the long run they will profit by the increased people-carrying potential. Construction in stages will minimize adverse impacts on business. The business along Independence Boulevard can be compensated. Here he is talking about a dollars and cents proposition. Talking about destroying neighborhoods, communities, streets lined with 60 year old oak trees, you are talking about a value money cannot buy.

He stated he would also like to bring to their attention the fact that all four alternatives take part of Elizabeth. This area of Elizabeth is most tender, having suffered by Independence Boulevard being built

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 407

through it in the 1950's. Further destruction of homes in this area will have certain severe adverse impact on their neighborhood. They feel City Council should eliminate consideration of Alternatives 1, 3 and 4; develop plans for the U. S. 74 corridor that does not damage any community, plan to reduce traffic not make more traffic, preserve not destroy.

They request that the Elizabeth Community Association be allowed to participate with the City in advising the North Carolina Department of Transportation of how improvements could be made that would have the least adverse impact on their community and Charlotte as a whole.

Councilman Withrow stated that they had on the agenda today the purchase of the bus system. As they know, we had a bond referendum and voted to purchase the bus system but it did not give them any money to operate the system. How many people present today would say that if we put on the bond referendum again, that we could use their tax dollars to operate the bus system and would vote in the next election to do this? If we purchase the bus system, you say you would ride it, but we have to get money to operate it. How many people would vote to do this?

Ms. Mary Ann Hammond, 1915 Ashland Avenue, stated she represents the Plaza-Midwood Neighborhood Association and they would like Council to know that they are vitally concerned with the far reaching implications and impact existing with the proposed construction of an Independence Boulevard corridor. None of the proposed routes will bring the proverbial bulldozers to their front door, but they would be close enough to cause them concern as a prospect for increased traffic through their otherwise quiet streets and a general increase in noise and air pollution. They question the necessity of pursuing a project that would destroy neighborhoods, homes and recreation facilities. These are the very things we must strive to preserve to perpetuate a quality of life that makes Charlotte a desirable place for people to live and work. As residents of an inner-city neighborhood, members of the Plaza-Midwood Association are striving to keep their area a stable and sought-after place to live. With traffic and thoroughfares converging all around them they sometimes fear for their survival as a neighborhood. They deeply empathize with the plight of residents of Elizabeth and other threatened neighborhoods as they face the prospect of having a major thoroughfare rip through their homes.

According to the 1995 Comprehensive Plan, "decisions made now and in the future regarding the inner-city will do more than influence the appearance and character of the areas many of us see only as we travel to and from work. Such decisions and commitments will have a profound effect upon the lives of many poor families, elderly, young professionals and others who will be forced into the inner-city or drawn to its potential for convenience and variety of lifestyles. So important is the inner-city and its future as a vital part of our scene, the Planning Commission has designated the inner-city as a key element in its Comprehensive Development Plan."

The Charlotte Observer quotes Paul Muldore, an Atlanta architect and urban planning specialist, as saying "Charlotte has the opportunity to be a model for the middle-size American city in developing a comprehensive transit system for the future, to use public transit planning as a tool for saving the city." They would like to commend City Council, and Councilman Davis in particular, for efforts in seeking ways to reduce car use in Charlotte. They all agree that the most destructive element

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 408

in American cities today is the misuse of the automobile. The more roads you build, the easier you make it for people to use their cars. That private cars are a cancer to our city. Council is the one with whom the final decision lies. The decision that they make now will determine whether or not Charlotte will be a desirable place to live in 30 years from now. They challenge them to expend their thinking and their decision making beyond the obvious and the commonplace. As the City Council, only they have the power to take the first step to discourage individual use of the automobile by not building as many new roads. Some time and at some place it has to stop and they think the place is here and the time is now.

Mrs. Lillie Hendrix, 232 Orange Street, representing the Grier Heights Association, stated they are trying to build up their community. That they have Community Development out there now. They have the re-development of Randolph Road on one side and Monroe Road on the other side. In this corridor plan, they spoke of a freeway coming up the railroad. If this happens it will come right through a big percent of the community, right in their back door. This would not do their community any good. When the survey was made in their community, most of them decided on the Independence Boulevard as being the best highway that could be used for a freeway. It would be less trouble and would not bother their community or other communities and would not cause people to lose a lot of homes. She appealed to Council to please not have any highway come through the Grier Heights Community or any other community.

Ms. Jan Valder, 1418 Euclid Avenue, Vice-Chairman of the Dilworth Community Development Association, stated they had heard the Councilmembers talk about neighborhoods and concern for the people in the neighborhoods and have heard of campaign promises today. Dilworth shares the concern of their neighbors about a road attacking their neighborhoods. At the June 1st Dilworth Community Association board meeting, they voted unanimously to ask City Council to go on record in the continued preservation of neighborhoods and that they, therefore, resolve to oppose the use of Independence Boulevard corridor alternatives that would remove and destroy homes and infringe upon the neighborhood of persons living in the area of this planned roadway. That the alternatives of transportation that would least affect residential neighborhoods adjacent to the development be considered.

One of the most serious things she has heard here today, was while standing in the hallway waiting to get in. A man who was beyond 40 years of age said to another man "I can't move, I've been in that house 40 years." She stated that one of the saddest things in our city is the boarded up homes that we see. The boarded up homes are not as bad as the elderly couple that we see sitting next door on the porch, next to the boarded up home where the life they knew had left. On the porch, they wait to be moved - for progress.

Dilworth is not immediately affected by this present alternative for Independence Boulevard. They do feel that this is a critical time in the development of stability in neighborhoods and ask Council to help Charlotte neighborhoods to remain people places.

Mr. Charles Harper, 1211 Barrymore Drive, in the Rama Road neighborhood, stated that it has just occurred to him that they are putting a lot of their faith in Council's ability to help them at least do something about the proposed transportation corridor. He asked if Council disagreed with the proposed Corridor 74 alternatives, would it be stopped? He wants to know how much impact they will have in helping them to stop this, or are they wasting their time here today?

He stated his comments convey the feelings of not only himself but 1,100 people whose names he has on petitions. He represents the Rama Swim Club, Stonehaven, Rama Woods, Queen's Grant and McClintock Woods and families in Castleton Gardens. Rama Swim Club has 350 members constituting about 1400 people. If this proposed Alternatel comes through this area it will wipe out the entire club and there is no area adjacent that they feel could be purchased to rebuild a new club.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 409

He stated that the Hensley-Schmidt study lists four concepts. They favor Concept B which recommends that the existing roads be improved throughout the city. They feel the taxpayers would be willing to sacrifice some time and inconvenience while the roads are being improved and he thinks from his comments, Mr. Finger said this was a viable alternative. From their own survey in the Stonehaven area, they have found that very few people from their area use Independence Boulevard. Most of them go down Providence Road or Randolph Road or Monroe Road. From what they understand, the study was designed to alleviate the traffic problem on Independence. They feel the improvement of existing roads is more in keeping with the Planning Commission's long range plans of development of the inner-city and keeping people from leaving the city. The expressways that divide existing communities destroy 800 plus homes; displace three or four thousand people, is certainly not the way to improve the city. Where can anyone move within the city and be safe from the bulldozer that is driven by some bureaucrat coming to tear your house down. Expressways built to town go both ways and he thinks people who travel in are going to find that we move our city farther and farther out and people are going to move out away from the city and really not enhance the value of the city both economically and socially.

They made a suggestion to Hensley-Schmidt that Monroe Road be improved, along with other corridors, and this would probably alleviate much of our problem, and also cut down the exodus and wiping out of whole communities. If it is decided, over the opposition of the citizens, that an expressway be built, then they feel that it should go down Independence Boulevard for the following reasons:

From the standpoint of affecting people - homes - this will have the least effect. They understand from Hensley-Schmidt, that 150 businesses will be affected, representing approximately 1,200 people - 8 people per business. He is not sure that this 150 figure really represents 150 viable, going businesses. He is sure most of them welcome federal funds to relocate. Maybe in some cases some would go out of business which is unfortunate.

What would we do while Independence is being improved? He is sure that most people would be willing to sacrifice a little time and inconvenience to by-pass Independence or go some other way to keep a house from being torn down to keep a neighborhood from being divided and torn up. He feels that more study should be made by Hensley-Schmidt. They said that 20 percent of the traffic comes from out of town. The other 80 percent they do not know where it comes from, north or south. The neighborhoods need Council's support and they are willing to support Council. Tearing up neighborhoods and destroying homes is not a real viable means of improving the city and they really wonder if this is the type of progress that Charlotte needs. They hope Council will give them a lot of consideration.

Mrs. Joni Heckler, 5843 Charing Drive, stated she and her husband Lou live in Rama Woods along the Seaboard Coastline Railroad; it runs practically through their backyard. She knows that people who do not live near a railroad do not understand that they do not mind living near a railroad - they love it. They rush back there with their four-year-old and they all wave. As far as the noise is concerned they could not tell you the last time it went by unless they went back and waved - it is a thing that you just do not notice after a while. They love their community and she wants to impress upon them two things. First, the immediacy of the situation and secondly, the financial hardships which it will impose upon individual families, particularly hers. She did not hear of this until last Wednesday and she was very surprised to hear that a proposed freeway may come directly through their home. The study was commissioned in July of 1975 and it may or may not be their fault that they did not hear about this before but she has the feeling from talking with others that most people in her area did not know about this. The study will be completed next month and she feels that is a significant point. The North Carolina Department of Transportation has hired a consulting engineering firm to do a one-year study and we can all guess how much that cost. Consequently, if recommendations are made either directly or by showing certain statistics she believes that the recommendations will be accepted in Raleigh.

The immediacy of the situation is that by next year in July, the decision evidently will be made in Raleigh as to Alternative 1, 2, 3 or 4. They are on Alternative 1. Suppose the decision is made that it is Alternative 1,

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 410

what will this do to their property values? This is the way they see it. Their property values right now are great; they have been going up and up. They had no fear moving in and no doubt if they had to move they could easily make a profit on their investment. If this decision is made next year, it will be public knowledge and if they move out it will be at a great loss. It is true that funds are not in this seven-year plan, but consider the impact upon them from the year 1977 to 1982. If her husband is transferred, they cannot move out. If as is the case with one of her neighbors, the company is dissolved, the man will not be able to move to another city. There is a neighbor on her street who works for Eastern Airlines and are relocating to Miami. How are they supposed to sell their house? The property values will be decreasing and they may not be able to sell at all.

She has asked Hensley-Schmidt what they would receive should the road come through in 1982 and was told: The money you will receive for your house will be based on appraisal made by looking at the house, its attributes, etc., and also on the market value of homes in your area for the previous two years. If they come in 1982 and buy her house, what will the 1980 and 81 market value be they will be looking at. It will not be what it is today. It may not be what it is tomorrow because right now this is public; next year a decision will be made and the market values will go down. She thinks this is unfair. Their home is their biggest single investment. They have home insurance if their home burns to the ground; they will receive the replacement value. Very careful they are when buying home insurance not to say we paid this for it or the market value is this, but what will it cost them to replace it. This is the same thing as burning it down.

They also have life insurance; should her husband drop dead tomorrow the house is paid for. Well, they are putting them in a very bad financial situation - family by family - and 750 to 800 families are involved. They feel very strongly about this. It will destroy their homes without giving adequate replacement value. What about those who stay; what about her neighbors two blocks away whose homes will not be taken but who will have a chainlink fence in their front yard? All of their capital is tied up in their house. They have everything from young married couples who have this money in their homes to retired people on fixed incomes. As of July 1977 people will stop buying their homes and this is what will happen. No one can get out if they have to move; the financial hardship is on (1) those who need to move between the time of decision and the time of construction, (2) those who are buy-outs by the freeway, and (3) those who stay. If something must be done, they recommend Independence Boulevard since it is an existing facility that does not go through homes. Alternatives 1, 3 and 4 cut through homes and will work a big financial hardship on the people who live there.

Mr. Bill Stayduhar, 1342 Tarrington Avenue, stated he represents the Sheffield area; also Eastway Park and Winterfield Place. Even though they are three separate subdivisions, they are just divided by next door neighbors; there are no natural barriers, so he considers them all one neighborhood.

Across the street from his house is the park which Alternate 3 would go right through, Sheffield Park. This park is used by Eastway Park, Winterfield, Idlewild people, people from Coventry Woods, from Central Park, etc. There is one unique nucleus of people in his group. He will tell them about the impact and they will certainly understand. The Winterfield Booster Club in their neighborhood, comprised of approximately 400 families, has been in existence since 1967. During the baseball season just ending they had over 400 children between the ages of 4-1/2 and 18 participating in baseball, softball and T-bat. Saturday they were honored with Mayor Belk, Councilman Whittington and Mrs. Hair who attended the dedication of Brad Fraasa Memorial Field that they just completed. To illustrate the impact of Alternate 3 going through their neighborhood, it would go right through these fields that these 400 kids play sports the year around on. He has a petition with over 400 signatures saying that because of the neighborhood impact if Concept B is approved, they do not want it to go through any of the neighborhoods. But instead, if improvements are needed, use Alternate 2 down Independence Boulevard.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 411

Mr. Joe Carpenter, 1310 Tarrington Avenue, stated if this study is accepted it would not be funded for seven or eight years. In attending a meeting he was told that either one of the corridors would be obsolete in the year 2000. So, it will only be seventeen or eighteen years of use and tearing up a maximum of 800 homes or a minimum of 300. He does not think it is the right study. He thinks they need to go over it again. There must be another alternative. Maybe to our lifestyles; maybe take a few more minutes to get to work; a few more minutes to get back. Surely there is some other alternative than tearing up neighborhoods for a road that is only going to last us seventeen or eighteen years.

He realizes Council did not ask for this study, but he asks them to make the State aware that they are destroying neighborhoods and it should not be that way.

Mr. Don Carroll, 708 Clement Avenue, President of the Elizabeth Community Association, stated he would recap briefly. They have seen representatives from a number of neighborhoods come before them today to say on this particular issue, which is one not springing out of their hands, but one in which Council is vitally concerned, because they have a lot to do with the other things that surround what happens on this issue. It is time to take a stand for neighborhood preservation and put that priority ahead of transportation planning. We have all heard about how Charlotteans love their cars but he thinks they like their homes and their communities even more. What they have heard today indicates that folks are ready and the time has come to make the sacrifices that we need to keep our homes and also live in an expanding city. Let us learn by the mistakes of some of the other cities and move on forward. On behalf of the Elizabeth Community, he will add one little note that is in the Comprehensive Plan. Although the inner-city neighborhoods are only a small part of Charlotte, the degree of their viability has the greatest impact of any area on the overall enjoyment and liveability of the city. Because some of these alternatives would particularly affect Elizabeth and other inner-city neighborhoods, it is worth quoting from the 1995 Comprehensive Plan where it states "we must employ all these tools and any others that may be developed in the future toward the task of maintaining our old neighborhoods." It is noted in a previous section "it is the inner-city with thousands of units of good and low-moderate income housing that are presently available in the private market." If we do not preserve this, there is very little chance new housing units could be provided without massive subsidies. By placing a high priority on saving such existing units we may well be saving millions of dollars of public money, not to mention an important part of our community's history. They think this city's history is entirely up to the decision on the 74 Corridor. They request that the City Council act now on behalf of all of the communities that have spoken to inform the North Carolina Department of Transportation on the city's view of what alternatives are the most appropriate and as everyone has said, they are almost unanimous in opposing Alternatives 1, 3 and 4. Whatever needs to be done by way of improvement - do it on Alternative 2.

Councilwoman Chafin stated it is obvious from the presentations Council has heard today that the overwhelming sentiment of the affected neighborhoods is against Alternate Route 1, 3 and 4. Secondly, it is interesting to note that almost every neighborhood we have heard from today is a neighborhood that Council, in recent months, has taken some sort of public action to preserve and protect from Elizabeth to Grier Heights, and The Plaza-Midwood area. Finally, she has heard numerous times in recent weeks and months, members of this Council indicate a desire to have more input if possible into state road planning. We have an opportunity now at a very early stage of plans for this particular road to do just that. We can test out this desire and find out just how much the North Carolina Department of Transportation is willing to listen to the Charlotte City Council.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 412

She presented the following:

"RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
CHARLOTTE REGARDING THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION'S U. S. 74 CORRIDOR
STUDY

WHEREAS, it has been and continues to be the policy of the Charlotte City Council to preserve, protect and promote neighborhoods within the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to develop a transportation policy compatible with its policy of neighborhood preservation; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has conducted a public review on the four alternative routes contained in the North Carolina Department of Transportation's U. S. 74 Transportation Corridor Study; and

WHEREAS, it appears from the presentations of the North Carolina Department of Transportation's Consulting Firm, Hensley-Schmidt, Inc. and representatives of the Elizabeth Residential Neighborhood, the Plaza-Midwood Residential Neighborhood, the Grier Heights Residential Neighborhood, the Winterfield-Eastway-Sheffield Residential Neighborhood, the Rama Road-McClintock Woods and Castleton Gardens Neighborhood, and the Dilworth Residential Neighborhood that the use of Alternative Route 1, 3 or 4 would displace at a minimum hundreds of families, destroy between 300 and 800 houses, relocate residents from existing neighborhoods so that the neighborhoods can no longer function as viable communities, create artificial barriers in presently cohesive neighborhoods, and destroy a significant number of large shade trees and public recreational areas:

THE CITY COUNCIL HEREBY REQUESTS THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO:

- (1) Reject all concepts using Alternatives 1, 3 and 4 in its Route 74 Corridor Study; and
- (2) Limit consideration of Alternative 2 to include only those proposals having minimal impact on existing residential neighborhoods and businesses."

Councilwoman Chafin moved adoption of the resolution, which motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington.

Councilman Withrow stated he is going to ask Council that we go to the voters once again for the privilege of using tax funds to pay for a transportation system so we can run a system that can do what these people are telling us today. That he hopes all these people will work as hard to get these bonds passed so we can have the transportation system. If Council will go along with this we can move full speed ahead, and get the funds necessary to have the transportation system, and put on a pilot program in this area to see if people will ride the buses. It will take funds, and it will take tax money to do it. That he is willing to pass this resolution on this condition.

Councilman Williams stated the idea of another swath through our city causes him to recoil. That he supposes it was this presentation which was the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back for him. We have a lot of road building and improvements going on right now. That he cannot imagine anything that would be worse than another parallel Independence Boulevard. He will gladly support this resolution. With respect to what Mr. Withrow said about the bus money, if we ask for permission for this special tax levy again from the voters, he thinks the voters would approve it if we put a limit on the levy, instead of saying levy without limitation, which implies to some people that we are going to charge the moon if we say five or ten cents. Then he thinks it would have reasonable chance of success.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 413

PURCHASE OF CHARLOTTE CITY COACH LINES, AUTHORIZED.

Motion was made by Councilman Gantt, and seconded by Councilman Williams, to approve a Memorandum of Agreement between the City of Charlotte and Charlotte City Coach Lines, Inc., providing for the purchase of the physical assets of City Coach Lines, in the negotiated purchase price of \$3,300,000.

Councilman Withrow stated as he mentioned before when Council decides today to buy out the bus system, we still have to ask people for a tax levy to run the system, whether it be five cents on the tax dollar, or six cents, or the amount of money it takes to run the system. That he has heard from \$750,000 up as high as \$1.5 million in the next three years. Council should know when it buys something how it will be run. Where are we going to get the money to run the system? Are we going to run a small system until we can go to the taxpayers and ask for enough money to broaden the system to where we can really have a transportation system?

Councilman Gantt asked if he is tying that to the purchase of the system and Councilman Withrow replied no, he is just asking if we are going to have just a small system now. That he is ready to go full speed ahead. He is ready to ask the taxpayers if they are willing to fund the bus system so that we can operate it. Councilman Gantt stated he is asking if he is trying to say that he will not approve the purchase of this bus system unless this Council agrees it will have a referendum tomorrow? Councilman Withrow stated he is just asking, and he would like the Manager to tell him how we will operate the system?

Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, replied they are spending monies this year to operate it out of funds other than real estate taxes - taxes from licenses and fees. Councilman Withrow asked if it is costing us 3/4 million dollars this year and Mr. Burkhalter replied yes. Mr. Burkhalter asked the proposed deficit, and Mr. Kidd, Transit Planner, replied our share is about \$700,000. Mr. Burkhalter stated it is a million and a half roughly as a deficit. Councilman Withrow asked what he proposes as the deficit when we buy the system and get the buses from UMTA and get into full scale operation. What do they estimate the deficit to be in three years? Is there any projection at all? Mr. Kidd replied they have not made any detailed projections for the next three, four or five years as to what it will be. That about 70 percent of the cost to operate is labor. That they can project types of increases such as wage increases. The revenues have stabilized pretty much at the projected level. The cost escalation has been the thing that created the deficit.

Councilman Whittington stated he thinks this Council and the news media should tell the public starting today that this system in 75-76 has a deficit of \$700,000 plus. He stated Mr. Kidd should get the facts and tell this Council and the public what it is going to cost next year. Second, after this action is taken here today, this Council and the public should know there are two ways that this transportation system has to be paid for. One is out of current revenue and the other is that the legislature give us additional money to pay for it. Anyway you cut that, he wants the majority of citizens of Charlotte to know that they are going to have to pay for this transportation system. The last thing he is concerned about, and the City Manager has talked individually to him about this, and to other Councilmembers, is who is going to operate it? This decision has not been made. It has not even been discussed. In some instances here we are putting the cart before the horse. We have known that we were going to do this for two years, but these questions still are not answered, and the public deserves the right to know that the majority of the citizens of this City who pay taxes are going to support this system. That is where Mr. Withrow is right when he talks about a referendum. He stated he is talking about a referendum from the citizens that they are willing to support it. Right now, we are buying a pig in a poke. There is no question about that because no one is this room and no one down the road knows what we are getting into except that it will cost a lot of money. The only thing we know for sure is that the taxpayers of this city will pay for it. Most of them think they have had it right up to the neck anyway.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 414

Councilman Gantt asked Mr. Withrow if he is making a motion and Councilman Withrow replied he did not make a motion; that he said he would support the resolution on the corridor. But we have to realize we need to go to the voters again as they voted down the operational money for the buses, and we need to go to them again.

Councilman Gantt stated he thinks Mr. Whittington is right; but he guesses he is looking at it in a different way than Mr. Whittington appears to be. That is more from the positive end. That this community did vote to buy these buses. There is no question in his mind about that. He agrees the public has to know on the whole issue of operation how the buses will be operated over the long haul. Councilman Whittington stated the public turned down the support. Councilman Gantt stated but the public voted to purchase the system, and that is all we are doing with this action. He admits there is a lot of work to be done, and he has expressed this to Mr. Kidd and Mr. Burkhalter at various points in time the whole business of how this system will be operated; who will operate it has not yet come before this Council. The public should understand that subsidies will have to be acquired from the public; taxes to operate the system; they will also have to understand the national policy on this issue is such now that we do get 50 percent of the operating funds, where we did not get it before.

Let's look at this in a positive light. That he sees it as an opportunity to follow through on some of the very concerns that these citizens a moment ago had. That we, as a Council should take transportation as a positive study rather than a negative one or foreboding. Sure, it is going to cost a lot of money; but roads have cost large amounts of money in this community also over the years. Councilman Whittington stated he is correct in what he is saying; but he wants to make sure that all of us, and more importantly the public understands. He thinks the time is going to come when we will have to go to the public again and ask them to support a referendum.

Councilman Williams stated he appreciates what has been said; that he agrees we should take the positive approach to this, and take the offensive on it. Mr. Gantt mentioned the cost of automobiles; we have heard from all these people who are opposing new road construction and some of the costs of the automobile. Not so long ago we had a presentation which projected a cost of \$600 million or so in the next few years for road building. At that rate, you could operate this system at a million dollar deficit six hundred years.

Councilman Williams stated he thinks we are beginning to consider the alternative for the first time, and it is a real step forward. With respect to financing, he thinks Mr. Withrow is right about how we should go to the people again. This time it should have a limitation so that it will not scare people half to death. When it comes time to present our wish list to the legislature, maybe we can get a little more money from the automobile tax to help support the buses. Some people say there is something wrong with that; that the automobile should not subsidize the bus; but he does not see it that way. That he thinks it is a very appropriate thing. He stated in the first place, he is not convinced the automobile does pay its own way entirely from gas taxes. That he is not convinced of it when you consider the secondary damage it does. He is not sure Louis Davis is not correct when he talks about a disincentive of automobiles. In that respect it is a disincentive and aids public transportation. He just thinks it is a good step forward, and he is delighted we are here.

The vote was taken on the motion, and carried unanimously.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 415

Councilman Whittington moved approval of a contract between the City of Charlotte and Charlotte City Coach Lines, Inc. for the purchase of all real property and improvements located at 707 North Brevard Street. The motion was seconded by Councilman Gantt, and carried unanimously.

Councilwoman Locke moved adoption of Ordinance No. 113-X transferring 1975 Public Transit Bonds and Estimating Revenue estimates from the United States Department of Transportation and the North Carolina Department of Transportation to establish an appropriation for the acquisition of the physical assets and inventories of Charlotte City Coach Lines, Inc. The motion was seconded by Councilman Gantt, and carried unanimously.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 23, at Page 135.

The City Manager stated on Friday, June 25, if it does not rain, a formal transfer of this will be made at 10:00 o'clock a.m., in front of City Hall.

He stated Mr. Kidd has some very exciting plans to propose to Council about the bus system. They will have to select some colors, and approve some changes that are being worked on now.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 416

CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE AND GREATER GETHSEMANE A.M.E. ZION CHURCH FOR A SUMMER SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR FIVE POINTS, THIRD WARD AND WEST MOREHEAD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AREA YOUTH.

Motion was made by Councilman Gantt, seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and unanimously carried, approving subject contract for a summer special education program for Five Points, Third Ward and West Morehead Community Development Area Youth with Greater Gethsemane A.M.E. Zion Church, in the amount of \$77,996.50.

CONTRACT FOR TECHNICAL OR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE AND YMCA OF CHARLOTTE AND MECKLENBURG FOR A SUMMER DAY CAMP FOR WEST BOULEVARD COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AREA YOUTH.

Councilman Withrow moved approval of a contract for Technical or Professional Services between the City of Charlotte and YMCA of Charlotte and Mecklenburg for a Summer Day Camp principally and primarily for West Boulevard Community Development Area Youth, in the amount of \$31,800.00. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Chafin, and unanimously carried.

CONTRACT FOR TECHNICAL OR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE AND THE LEARNING DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION, INC. FOR A SUMMER ONE-TO-ONE TUTORING PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AREA YOUTH WITH LEARNING DEFICIENCIES.

Upon motion of Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilwoman Chafin, and unanimously carried, subject contract was approved with the Learning Development Foundation, Inc. for a Summer One-To-One Tutoring Program for Community Development Area Youth, in the amount of \$40,959.00.

RESOLUTION APPROVING 1976 SUBGRANT APPLICATION FOR LEAA FUNDS TO TRAIN THREE POLICE PERSONNEL IN MANAGEMENT RELATED COURSES.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Withrow, and unanimously carried, adopting a resolution approving the 1976 Subgrant Application for LEAA Funds to train three police personnel in management related courses, one at the Northwestern Traffic Institute and two at The Souther Police Institute.

The resolution is recorded in full in RESolutions Book 11, at Page 463.

RETIREMENT EXTENSIONS FOR CITY EMPLOYEES, APPROVED.

Councilman Whittington moved approval of the following retirement extensions for city employees in accordance with the City's policy governing retirement which was adopted on June 4, 1962, which motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow.

NAME	AGE	DEPARTMENT
Joseph N. Clark, Sr.	65	Public Works
George L. Edwards	65	Utility
Herbert H. Fisher, Sr.	65	Traffic Engineering
Hubert Cleo Harris	66	Utility
Herman J. Hoose	65	Transportation Planning
James E. Lowe	67	Utility
John M. Sutton	66	Utility
Clarence Stratford	66	Utility
Samuel P. Woodard	67	Inspection

Councilman Davis stated this is the first time that the personnel retirement policy has come before Council since he has been here. In order to have a

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 417

retirement policy, it is almost essential to be somewhat inflexible, especially in regard to senior staff positions, or leadership positions. If you do not have a firm policy the top people are usually influential in adjusting the policy to fit individual circumstances and you end up with a selective retirement policy. That Council may want to reconsider at some point the overall policy, particularly in regard to this five year option period.

In today's consideration, there is only one senior staff person or one person in leadership position that he recognizes - that is the Transportation Planning Director. He thinks in this area, Charlotte is faced with the same trauma that many other cities have been through in recent years as they have grown. In Transit Planning we need a balanced system, and we must to some degree actually create a modern public transit system capable of growing into a mass transit system. In this area we need expertise in transit; what the new technology is. That it might well be handicapped to have a sort of lame duck director here at extensions of one year intervals, subject to a doctor's certificate. He thinks this would be an opportunity to bring someone in with a background in transit planning, with new technology, a person with experience in various companies where some new innovative functions has been tried; and he would like to amend the motion to read as follows: "that we approve Item 12 with the exception of the Transportation Planning Director." Councilman Williams seconded the amendment for discussion.

Councilman Williams stated he would like to discuss the policy. It says it is a policy that dates back to 1962 and at some point he suspects there was a trauma about this whole thing, and he supposes that is the reason for adopting a mandatory retirement age in any event. To some extent he agrees with Mr. Davis that a policy does not do much good if you waive it routinely. He is curious about the reasons for the waiver. If it is because there is somebody who we cannot find a replacement for, and there is nobody available in the market place, then maybe we have no alternative. But if there are other people, he is not sure he sees the reason for deviating from the policy except maybe to accommodate the individual. But if we want to accommodate the individual, whoever set it in 1962 should have set it higher than 65. That he is talking about everyone.

Mayor Belk asked if he is talking on the motion or the amendment? Councilman Williams replied he is talking on the amendment, but he thinks the amendment spills over and effects the whole thing.

Councilman Davis stated he prefaced his amendment with the fact that this is the first time it has come before Council since he has been here; he mentioned the fact that he does not see the wisdom of this policy. If we make a decision here either way, we are setting a new policy. His amendment is predicated in his own mind on a policy of having a fixed retirement age. His amendment is to authorize the extension under this retirement policy to everyone except senior staff officers and department heads.

Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, stated the policy is to extend to 70. That is the rule and regulation. It reads that employees shall be retired, provided on the approval of City Council, such employee may be granted one year extensions to age 70. The employee can work until 70, if Council approves the extension. This is the policy and it comes up every year. When a man reaches 65, if he is performing his job, we keep him on. It is something to the city to do so. If a man is performing and performing well in a function that we need there is no point just because he reaches that magic point to kick him out if he is willing to stay. There are times when many people would not want to stay. But if a man is capable to perform the job and willing to perform and wants to do it, there is no reason why he should not. In the case of Herman Hoose, he has taken over a very difficult job in this particular area. He left one that he loved dearly which was head of the Traffic Engineering Division for some 27 or 28 years. If it had not been for him, the crowd they had today would have been here many years earlier because he stretched Independence 40 ways from Sunday to get this traffic on it. People who know traffic tell him that

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 418

Mr. Hoose has worked some marvelous things with traffic carrying people on some of these streets. That is for the past. But to talk about now.

Mr. Burkhalter stated he has on his desk right now fifteen current projects that are underway involving state and federal highways. He does not think Council has any idea of the complexities of the transportation picture today. The reason this job was created was because of the fact we were unable - and it was his responsibility to keep Council informed - to keep Council informed and up to date and to keep him informed on what is going on in this country in regard to transportation. That Council is just culminating just one thing Mr. Hoose was able to do, and that is the purchase of this system. Mr. Hoose started this many, many months ago. That Mr. Hoose's contacts with other people's involvement in this, we were able to do many of the things we have done on this bus system so far. We were able to keep Council from making mistakes that a lot of people have made in adult transportation - for example, senior citizens. That one proposed was the one Mr. Hoose worked out, and was brought to Council. For some number of years Mr. Hoose was the only man in City Hall and on staff who knew anything at all about a bus; he was the only man we had to go to rely on any information in connection with this.

He stated because we have transportation involving airports, roads and streets, and transportation involving buses, transportation involving the engineering system, transportation involving the federal government, state government, the county and the mass of committees involving transportation which are mandated by federal law and state law, and those we have created locally, someone has to keep all of these in some kind of perspective, and bring them together.

He stated we have not given Mr. Hoose the staff to do the type of thing Mr. Davis is talking about; but we have given them enough people to try to keep together some idea of what is going on in this whole vast network of transportation.

He stated he would guess that every one of the people in this room today have been in this building in Mr. Hoose's office to discuss a project. He is the only source we have to send people to. People want to know where 51 is going, and there must have been several hundred people in that office wanting to know where 51 is going.

Councilman Gantt asked if it is policy when a group of employees are 65 years old and they do not wish to give up their jobs and are performing competent, a list such as this is given to Council every year? That he does not recall last year's. Mr. Burkhalter replied they have to do it every year. Councilman Gantt asked if there are certain extenuating reasons why a person may not be on this list and Mr. Burkhalter replied it is his responsibility to recommend to Council on these people. It is done through the department head. The department head contacts Mr. Earle that a person will be 65 before June 30, and the person has indicated an interest in staying. If it is a department head, he visits with him and talks with him. An example would be Mr. Franklin. That he and Mr. Franklin had an understanding about when he wanted to retire. That we were taking over the joint utilities operation; it would have been a severe blow to this city to have Mr. Franklin leave this city the day the city and county utilities were combined. That he persuaded him and he was agreeable to stay at least two years to get it on its feet.

Councilman Gantt stated he thinks this is a good policy that you do not retire people when they are 65 simply because they have chronologically reached that age. While he might understand Mr. Davis' concern about a department head being in a sense a lame duck, they all are to some extent in terms of how they perform from year to year. They can be terminated because of inability to produce, or to produce as competently as we would want. He does not believe a department head that is 55 with ten years to go before he gets to that point necessarily has a lock on his job forever anymore so than he would Mr. Hoose or anybody else.

June 14, 1976

Minute Book 63 - Page 419

Councilman Whittington stated about Herman Hoose - he concurs with everything that the City Manager said about his ability and what he has meant to this city in the years he has been here as Traffic Engineer, having come here from South Bend. In his 17 years down here, he does not know of any man who has been more involved with the state and federal government as far as construction is concerned, roads, transportation systems, whether it be with the airport, bus systems and the highways. Many, many years ago he was offered a job as Assistant Traffic Engineer for the City of New York when Moses was Traffic Engineer. That is the kind of reputation he has in this country. He stated he wanted to say that about him because he is his friend, and because he thinks the man is an expert in his field.

Councilman Whittington stated back when this policy was adopted, it was done because people were coming to their department heads and saying physically they were all right, mentally they were all right and their doctor concurred and they thought they could still be of service to the city. The only way Council had the opportunity to extend that person's service to this city was that the names were submitted by the City Manager and Personnel. It was done one year at the time. That is the reason Dave Ray, who was the Airport Manager, Walter Franklin, who retired two years ago, Henry Yancy, City Manager, George Livingston, City Accountant for 40 years, L. L. Ledbetter, City Treasurer - all of these people one year at the time served at the permission of the Council. Then when they reached 70 years of age they had to retire. That he would hope that Mr. Davis does not mean when a person reaches 65 years of age that they should be a lame duck and be ready to get out.

Councilman Whittington stated at some point you must say what the limit is, and 65 seems to be the limit pretty much throughout the country that a person works to before retirement is considered, unless they want to take early retirement. The reason a lot of these people come down here and the Mayor hands them a retirement plaque, they are doing it on their own, and want to do it. That he thinks our system is sound, and he cannot vote for the amendment that Mr. Davis proposes.

Councilman Withrow stated he looks at this from two angles. One is that we have an economy where we have people out of work, college graduates, with PHD's and Masters, not able to get jobs. We have people 65 and above holding jobs that in one respect we need to give people jobs. On the other hand, he knows you save money by keeping them on longer because you do not hire another person to put in that job. When he hears the Supreme Court, these old guys up there, and he is going to be there too, render the decisions they make, he says they should throw everyone of them out at 65 years and not allow anyone to serve over 65.

That he feels this way about the city. He does not care who it is. There are certain cases where you have to keep a man like in the Water Department, but he does not think there are a lot of these. But you have to look at it from two angles. There are people who need jobs and need to work. Then from the other angle, the city saves money by keeping them on.

Councilman Davis stated he thinks the major intent of his proposal has not been addressed. That he said if you do not have a rather firm policy, and almost an inflexible one, you have no policy. For example, in most of this unfortunately most of the response has been directed at the individual's personal performance in the past, which he had no reference to. That he is not concerned about who the individual is, but just about the senior staff member and department head. How well he has performed his duties really is not particularly material when you run up against a retirement policy. Try to eliminate the personal factor which is not his concern at this point. For example, mention was made that when an individual came to retirement age like Mr. Franklin, a consolidation was coming up which would take place maybe within a year's time. This is something you could see the completion of.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 420

He stated right now in Transportation Planning, we are talking about the Comprehensive Plan for 1995; we talked today about a decision on the alternatives for the Independence Corridor that is not funded until sometime after 1982. We are making judgements and getting inputs that is way out in the future beyond the maximum extension we would have for an employee age 65 today. The matter about being a lame duck. Yes, we all became lame duck as we approach a fixed retirement age. But if we do not have a policy to retire at age 65, go ahead and make it 70. That he has no objections to that. Whatever we make it. Let's set the retirement policy at 70, and a man can retire early at the age 65 if he likes. But he should not be put through the indignity of having one year extensions based on a doctor's certificate.

Councilman Whittington stated it is his decision; he can ask for it or elect to retire.

Councilman Williams asked what private industry does in this area and Mayor Belk replied his store has a policy of age 65 and it is brought to the Board of Directors to vote on the extension each year; it is at the discretion of the Board. This is up until age 70. When they are 70, they automatically retire then

Councilman Whittington stated his father-in-law worked for the City of Philadelphia until he was 79 years old; every year they extended it. The Fire Department goes to age 60 or 30 years, which ever comes first. Duke Power and most of the organizations he knows of go to 65 and extends it one year at a time based on the supervisor's and doctor's recommendations. Mayor Belk stated J. C. Penny has a retirement automatically at 60 - anyone in an executive position.

The vote was taken on the amendment and failed to carry as follows:

YEAS: Councilmembers Davis and Williams.

NAYS: Councilmembers Chafin, Gantt, Locke, Whittington and Withrow.

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

YEAS: Councilmembers Whittington, Withrow, Chafin, Gantt, Locke and Williams.

NAYS: Councilmember Davis.

CONTRACT AWARDED ZIMMERMAN-EVANS, INC. FOR FIRE EQUIPMENT BREATHING UNITS.

Upon motion of Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilman Gantt, and unanimously carried, contract was awarded the low bidder meeting specifications, Zimmerman-Evans, Inc., in the amount of \$9,960.00, on a unit price basis, for Fire Equipment Breathing Units.

The following bids were received:

Zimmerman-Evans, Inc.	\$9,960.00
Mine Safety Appliance Co.	9,993.00
Action Fire & Safety, Inc.	10,262.00
Allied Safety Supply Co.	10,272.19
Jones Safety Supply, Inc.	10,664.00

Bid received not meeting specifications:

Burgess Fire Equipment, Inc.	7,916.00
------------------------------	----------

BID RECEIVED FOR TAPPING SLEEVES AND VALVES REJECTED AND PERMISSION GRANTED TO READVERTISE.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilwoman Locke, and unanimously carried, authorizing the rejection of the only bid received for tapping sleeves and valves and permission granted to readvertise in order that more competition might be obtained.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 421

CONTRACT AWARDED SOUTHERN PUMP AND TANK COMPANY FOR FIRE HOSE.

Councilman Whittington moved award of contract to the low bidder, Southern Pump and Tank Company, in the amount of \$20,265.30, on a unit price basis, for 15,500 feet of fire hose, which motion was seconded by Councilman Withrow, and unanimously carried.

The following bids were received:

Southern Pump & Tank Co.	\$20,265.30
Eureka Fire Hose	20,580.00
Action Fire & Safety, Inc.	20,930.00
Bi-Lateral Fire Hose Co.	21,779.00
Blaze Guard Mfg., Inc.	22,000.00
Dillon Supply Company	22,476.30
Piedmont Safety Appliance, Inc.	22,834.35
Tidewater Supply Company	22,983.30

CONTRACT AWARDED ACTION FIRE & SAFETY, INC. FOR FIRE HOSE.

Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Withrow, and unanimously carried, contract was awarded the only bidder meeting specifications, Action Fire & Safety, Inc., in the amount of \$8,780.80, on a unit price basis, for 4" Fire hose.

The following bids were received:

Action Fire & Safety, Inc.	8,780.80
----------------------------	----------

Bids received not meeting specifications:

Southern Pump & Tank Co.	7,543.80
Zimmerman-Evans, Inc.	7,398.00

CONTRACT AWARDED T. A. SHERRILL CONSTRUCTION CO., INC. FOR LESTER STREET IMPROVEMENTS.

Motion was made by Councilwoman Locke to award contract to the low bidder, T. A. Sherrill Construction Co., Inc., in the amount of \$13,684.75, on a unit price basis, for Lester Street Improvements. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and carried unanimously.

The following bids were received:

T. A. Sherrill Construction Co., Inc.	13,684.75
Blythe Industries, Inc.	14,732.25
Crowder Construction Company	16,228.00
F. T. Williams Co., Inc.	28,008.50

CONTRACT AWARDED PRISMO UNIVERSAL CORPORATION FOR THERMOPLASTIC PAVEMENT MARKING.

Councilman Withrow moved award of contract to the low bidder, Prismo Universal Corporation, in the amount of \$65,760.00, on a unit price basis, for thermoplastic pavement marking to repaint center lines and lane lines on city streets. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and carried unanimously.

The following bids were received:

Prismo Universal Corp	65,760.00
Cataphote Corporation	83,760.00
Perma-Line Corp. of America	94,800.00

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 422

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS FOR THE ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY BELONGING TO ALFRED L. PURRINGTON, JR., JOSEPH P. CHESHIRE, JR., HENRY HAYWOOD, JR., TRUSTEES OF THE DIOCESE OF NORTH CAROLINA OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH; RT. REV. THOMAS A. FRASER, BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF NORTH CAROLINA OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH; THOMPSON ORPHANAGE & TRAINING INSTITUTION, INC., CHARLOTTETOWN NORTH, INC., LEASEHOLD INTEREST; CHARLOTTETOWN, INC., LEASEHOLD INTEREST; CHARLOTTETOWN, INC., LEASEHOLD INTEREST; AND CHARLOTTETOWN CINEMA, INC., LEASEHOLD INTEREST, LOCATED AT 416-18 SOUTH INDEPENDENCE BOULEVARD, IN THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE, FOR THE SANITARY SEWER TO SERVE STATE EMPLOYEES CREDIT UNION PROJECT.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilwoman Chafin, and unanimously carried, adopting subject resolution as recommended by the City Attorney.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 11, at Page 464.

CONSENT AGENDA APPROVED.

Motion was made by Councilman Gantt to approve the Consent Agenda as listed. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington.

Councilwoman Locke stated she would like to discuss the item relating to the sale of the Karr property, and asked that it be deleted from the motion.

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

(a) Special Officer Permits for a period of one year to the following:

- 1.) Renewal of permit to James Leslie Bell for use on the premises of Charlotte Park & Recreation Commission.
- 2.) Renewal of permit to Paul Zollie Hill for use on the premises of Douglas Municipal Airport.
- 3.) Issuance of permit to David Jack Wallace for use on the premises of Charlotte Park & Recreation Commission.

(b) Settlement in the case of City of Charlotte v. Charles William Parker, et al, in the total amount of \$1,056.00, for acquisition of necessary rights-of-way for a sanitary sewer to serve Singleton Associates Warehouse, as recommended by the City Attorney.

(c) The following streets to be taken over for continuous maintenance by the City:

- 1.) Plumstead Road from 213' east of Standish Pl. to 323' east of Vining Court.
- 2.) Vasser Pl. from Plumstead Road to 140' north.
- 3.) Vining Court from Plumstead Road to 270' northeast.
- 4.) Dorton Street from North Tryon Street to 610' south.
- 5.) Strangford Avenue from 139' west of Cobbleridge Dr. to 79' east of Fernleaf Court.
- 6.) Fernleaf Court from Strangford Avenue to 350' north.
- 7.) Cobbleridge Dr. from Shamrock Dr. to Strangford Avenue.
- 8.) Yates Court from Cobbleridge Dr. to 225' west.
- 9.) Stedwick Pl. from Arborway Rd. to 820' east.
- 10.) Isenhour St. from Norris Avenue to 150' south of Norris Avenue.
- 11.) Falcon St. from Castleton Rd. to 210' north of Castleton Rd.
- 12.) Bellamy St. from Seymour Dr. to 230' north of Seymour Dr.
- 13.) Davis Avenue from 300' east of Midland Avenue to 730' east of Midland Avenue.
- 14.) Rosetta St. from Celia Avenue to 150' north of Celia Avenue.
- 15.) Justice Avenue from Isenhour St. to 340' east of Isenhour St.

(continued)

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 423

- 16.) Madrid St. from LaSalle Street to 150' south of LaSalle Street.
 - 17.) Nelson Avenue from 50' west of Tennessee Avenue to 190' west of Tennessee Avenue.
 - 18.) Willow St. from 1,080' west of Old Steele Creek Road to 1,400' west of Old Steele Creek Road.
 - 19.) Montreat St. from McArthur Avenue to 100' south of Holland Avenue.
 - 20.) Parker Dr. from Remount Road to 1,435' west of Remount Road.
 - 21.) St. George St. from Central Avenue to 550' south of Central Avenue.
 - 22.) Rayon St. from Tennessee Avenue. to 200' north of Isenhour St.
 - 23.) Wainwright St. from Isenhour St. to 250' west of Edgewood Rd.
 - 24.) Lockleven St. from Edgewood Rd. to 270' west of Edgewood Dr.
 - 25.) Beaux St. from Midland Avenue to 210' west of Midland Avenue - from Wilson Avenue to 285' east of Wilson Avenue.
 - 26.) McDonald Street from Botany St. to 230' south of Remington St.
 - 27.) Grove St. from Trexler Avenue to 300' north of Trexler Avenue.
 - 28.) Wells St. from McArthur St. to Justice Street.
 - 29.) Chisholm Ct. from Summit Avenue to 140' east of Summit Avenue.
 - 30.) Grove Avenue from Lake Rd. to 250' east of Lake Road.
 - 31.) Martin St. from Summit Avenue to 100' east of Summit Avenue.
 - 32.) Cedarwood Lane from 1,317' west of Reddman Rd. to 1,657' Reddman Rd.
 - 33.) Ligette St. from Ashley Road to 300' west of Ashley Road.
- (d) Change Order No. 1 in contract with RDR, Incorporated, increasing the total contract amount of \$485,829.22 by \$854.00.
- (e) Two sanitary sewer contracts:
- 1.) Contract with MAR, Inc. for construction of 950 l.f. of 8" sewer to serve Piney Grove Subdivision, Longbriar Drive and Eaglewind Dr., inside the city, at an estimated cost of \$14,250.00.
 - 2.) Contract with Ralph Squires Company for construction of 2,836 l. f. of 8" sanitary sewer to serve Timber Creek, Phase II-A, outside the city, at an estimated cost of \$42,540.00.
- (f) Ordinances affecting housing declared "unfit" for human habitation under the provisions of the City's Housing Code, as follows:
- 1.) Ordinance No. 114-X ordering the dwelling at 321 Duke Road to be vacated, demolished and removed.
 - 2.) Ordinance No. 115-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 2316 Sherrill Street.
 - 3.) Ordinance No. 116-X ordering the dwelling at 3100-02 Columbus Circle to be closed.
- The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 23, beginning on Page 137.
- (g) Ordinances ordering the removal of weeds, grass, trash, rubbish and junk appliances from properties in the City, as follows:
- 1.) Ordinance No. 117-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass at 117-121 North Cedar Street.
 - 2.) Ordinance No. 118-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass at 216 Mill Road.
 - 3.) Ordinance No. 119-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass at 2331 Booker Avenue.
 - 4.) Ordinance No. 120-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass adjacent to 2022 Garnette Place.
 - 5.) Ordinance No. 121-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass adjacent to 1909 St. Mark Street.

(continued)

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 424

(g)

- 6.) Ordinance No. 122-X ordering the removal of weeds and grass at corner of Spencer Street and East 37th Street.
- 7.) Ordinance No. 123-X ordering the removal of trash and rubbish at rear of K Mart, North Tryon Street.
- 8.) Ordinance No. 124-X ordering the removal of trash and rubbish at 1627 Newland Road.
- 9.) Ordinance No. 125-X ordering the removal of junk appliances from premises at 2436 Kingsbury Drive.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 23, beginning on Page 140.

(h) Two Encroachment Agreements, as follows:

- 1.) Encroachment Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation and Highway Safety permitting the City to construct a 6-inch water main in Green Rea Road, SR 3652.
- 2.) Encroachment Agreement with the North Carolina Department of Transportation permitting the City to construct a sanitary sewer line crossing the following streets and highways for Gum Branch Sanitary Sewer Outfall: Gum Branch Road, Coulwood Drive, Birchwood Drive, Valleydale Road and three locations crossing Belhaven Boulevard.

(i) Property transactions, as follows:

- 1.) Acquisition of 30' x 1,131.53' of easement at 1201 Valleydale Road (vacant land west side of Valleydale Road), from George Coppala, Heirs - G. H. Coppala & Paul E. Coppala, at \$1,135.00, for the Gum Branch Outfall Project.
- 2.) Acquisition of 30' x 779.68' of easement at 1500 Valleydale Road (off Highway #16), from Joel J. Ostrow and wife, Linda L., at \$1,850.00, for the Gum Branch Outfall Project.
- 3.) Option on 97.39' x 78.50' x 96.30' x 94.0' of property at 314 West 6th Street, from Beulah W. Grier (widow), at \$26,900.00, for the Fourth Ward Area Park Site Project.
- 4.) Option on 47.62' x 187.0' x 46.25' x 187.06' of property at 313 North Poplar Street, from J. B. Ivey and Company, at \$24,500.00, for the Fourth Ward Area Park Site Project.
- 5.) Option on 43.0' x 190.50' of property at 317 West 7th Street, from Joseph W. Grier, Jr. and wife, Catherine S, at \$18,830.00, for the Fourth Ward Area Park Site Project.
- 6.) Acquisition of Parcel No. 3, in Block 24, in the Third Ward Community Development Target Area, from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 813 Westbrook Drive, at \$26,500.00.

SALE OF KARR PROPERTY TO THE HIGH BIDDER, AUTHORIZED.

Councilman Gantt moved approval of the sale of the Karr property which was purchased by the City for the Police and Fire Training Facility to the high bidder, Mrs. James W. McIlwain, in the amount of \$10,000, as recommended by the Public Works Director and the City Attorney. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Chafin.

Councilwoman Locke requested the City Attorney to explain to Council the problem with the bid.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 425

Mr. Underhill replied as indicated by the attachment in the agenda, the high bidder, Mrs. James McIlwain's bid had two, what he will characterize as irregularities. One, the bid specifications called for a check which is to be submitted at the time of the bid, and in the bid proposal, and was to be a certified check or money order. In any event, Mrs. McIlwain submitted a personal check. The second irregularity is that the bid proposal that she submitted failed to contain with it the instructions to bidders. He stated they think that came about because some of the bid proposals sent out were not stapled together, and in any event, the instructions to bidders were not an essential part of the bids. The way we saw it was we were looking - back from the bidder - a bid proposal sheet which contained the amount - it has a line there for them to submit the amount they were bidding. Both of these matters, they feel are irregularities or technicalities and may be waived by the governing body. In this case by the Council if it deemed necessary, which also has the option of rejecting the bids and readvertising.

Mr. Underhill stated they do not believe the failure here put the bidders on an unequal footing since both items are the kinds of things the city can waive if it deems and cares to do so.

Councilwoman Locke asked if he thinks there is any problem if we waive it and Mr. Underhill replied no, particularly in light of the fact that we are selling something rather than purchasing something.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

NOMINATIONS TO VARIOUS BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS.

Councilman Withrow stated one of the positions on the Historic District Commission to be filled is a person serving as a member of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Historic Properties Commission. He placed in nomination the name of James A. Stenhouse whose terms on the Historic Properties Commission will expire July 16, 1976.

Councilman Gantt placed in nomination the named of Howard J. Campbell to succeed himself for a three year term on the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission.

Councilman Whittington placed in nomination the name of Nick Collias to fill the expired term of C. D. Thomas on the Civil Service Board for a three year term.

FURTHER COMMENTS ON CITY'S RETIREMENT EXTENSION POLICY.

Councilman Davis stated in view of today's discussion on the retirement policy, he would like to ask an agenda item be placed on an early agenda to consider changing our retirement policy which currently reads: "An employee shall be retired on June 30 following his 65th birthday, subject to an annual approval of the City Council, and based upon the recommendation of the City Medical Examiner."

He stated he would like it placed on the agenda to consider amending this to delete having it subject to the approval of the City Council, and make it subject only to the recommendation of the Medical Examiner.

Mayor Belk stated he does not see how he can take it away from the City Council. As the governing body, it should have the privilege of doing this.

Councilman Davis stated he does not understand the reason for not approving someone to age 70. The City Manager asked that he be allowed to look at this. There may be some reason for this. It may have to conform to the State Law. That he will look at this, and come back to him.

June 14, 1976
Minute Book 63 - Page 426

Councilman Withrow stated he thinks what Council is asking if everyone at 65 who wants to continue employment is submitted to Council? That the Council has no way of knowing about this except when it is brought to Council. Mr. Burkhalter stated each one is brought to Council at 65 if they are to continue their employment. He stated if there is a person not performing or is obviously tired of his job, he discusses it with the employee and discusses his retirement. Generally speaking, if a man is able to perform his job and wants to continue, it is routine to ask for the extension. That the Personnel Director gives him the information on all these people, with the recommendations of their Department Heads. After receiving this and if there is no reason to retire them, he sends them to Council.

Councilman Davis stated he is saying the policy ought to be 65 or 70. If a man can stay until he is 70 on his request, he would rather not have it come up and let it be subject to the medical examiner's recommendation. That it is hard to keep it off a personal basis.

ADJOURNMENT.

Upon motion of Councilwoman Locke, seconded by Councilman Whittington, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.



Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk