A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, was held in the Council Chamber, City Hall, on Monday, December 23, 1968, at 3:00 o'clock p.m., with Mayor Stan R. Brookshire presiding and Councilmen Fred D. Alexander, Milton Short, Gibson L. Smith, James B. Stegall, Jerry Tuttle and James B. Whittington present.

ABSENT: Councilman Sandy R. Jordan.

* * * *

INVOCATION.

The invocation was given by The Reverend Kisschnick, Ascension Lutheran Church.

MINUTES APPROVED.

Upon motion of Councilman Tuttle, seconded by Councilman Alexander, and unanimously carried, the minutes of the last meeting, on Monday, December 16, 1968, were approved as submitted.

CITY MANAGER REQUESTED TO ARRANGE FOR COUNCIL TO VIEW BARCLAY-DOWNS DRIVE PROJECT.

Mr. Bruce Wright stated in reference to the re-location and widening of Barclay Downs Drive, Councilman Whittington suggested a meeting with Mr. Veeder, City Manager, and the Engineering Department. He stated the meeting was held Friday morning at 9:00 o'clock when he met with Mr. Carstarphen, Mr. Clark Readling of the Engineering Department, Mr. Herman House, Mr. Russell Tucker and Mr. Bud Coira. They discussed the intersection and the engineers defended their plan by stating that it was good design. They did agree it was designed on the premise that there would be considerable traffic on Barclay Downs Drive. Mr. Wright stated Celanese has told them that when Morrison Boulevard is completed and their side entrance is completed that much of their traffic that now uses Barclay Downs Drive would be using Morrison Boulevard. Therefore, they believe that the amount of traffic on Barclay Downs Drive may be reduced rather than increased.

Mr. Wright stated he has filed with the City Clerk and delivered to each councilman a copy of a petition signed by residents of Barclay Downs; the petition contains signatures of almost 250 people which gives evidence that the entire community is concerned about this— not just the people who are property owners on Barclay Downs Drive.

Mr. Wright stated they propose that going south on Barclay Downs Drive, from Barclay Downs to Fairview, that there be two lanes of traffic—one for a left turn into the
shopping center and one for straight through or a right turn into Celanese property. On north bound traffic that the street as designed will have three lanes of traffic; they propose that overhead signs be erected far enough back from the intersection so that the traffic turning left into Celanese can get into the proper lane. The traffic turning to the right into the shopping center can get into the proper lane, and the traffic in the center lane would proceed into Barclay Downs Drive.

Mr. Hoose, Traffic Engineer, presented maps of the area, pointing out the subject area and stated it runs from Fairview Road and Telstar Lane to the entrances of Celanese at Morrison Boulevard.

Mr. Wright stated they are recommending that the street be two lanes going to Morrison Boulevard far enough back to be able to hold traffic for a left turn into the shopping center, and one lane of traffic going from Fairview to Barclay Downs. The area is now designed for three lanes of traffic - one for a left turn lane and two lanes that could go straight through. They are recommending one lane to go straight through and one lane to turn right into Morrison Boulevard.

Mr. Wright stated there is a crosswalk from their swimming pool that comes up at the end of the proposed new construction. This is where the children walk across the street, and they believe the design they are recommending will have less hazards to the children as it will invite less traffic; it will also invite less traffic to the overcrowded school crossings at Runnymede and Barclay Downs Drive.

Councilman Whittington asked how far the project run? Mr. Hoose replied it starts at Morrison Drive where they will turn lane for Celanese's new entrance and the project ends 800 feet from the intersection. Mr. Veeder stated it would be poor design and poor from a safety viewpoint to cut back to the two lanes; he stated the intersection is basically the end of the project and the only thing being done on this side of the intersection is transitioning back to the two lanes; the only reason it is in there is in order to make the intersections work and make the project all the way out to Fairview a better project; there is a problem of elevation on the curve and the only thing being done is to transition it back to two lanes. That all factors considered- the curve, elevation and the need to get back to the two lanes to the end of the project, if it could be done in a shorter distance and it would be good design, it would be done that way.

Mr. Wright stated they feel the design is on the premise that Barclay Downs Drive will be a four lane highway to their community and this is in preparation for it; it is also encouraging more traffic to use Barclay Downs Drive; they believe if they can discourage the use as a through artery that it may never be necessary to widen Barclay Downs Drive.

Mr. Hoose stated this is designed at 35 MPH speed and it is on a curve and in a good design you only stop the transition when it is tangent.
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Councilman Short suggested that this subject be placed on the agenda at some specific time and Council make a determination on the matter; that he does not think Council should just listen to this and then never even vote or decide on it.

Councilman Whittington requested that Mr. Veeder, Mr. Hoose and/or the Engineering Department make arrangements for Council to see this on the ground.

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS EXTENDING TO MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
BY JOHN SHAW ON BEHALF OF CITY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. John Shaw extended Christmas greetings to the Mayor and City Council on behalf of the City Employees wishing them a Merry Christmas and a successful new year.

REPORT ON WATER AND SEWER RATES CONTINUED FROM CONFERENCE SESSION.

Mr. Robert M. Pope of Weston & Sampson Consulting Engineers, was asked to continue his presentation of the report on water and sewer rates as started in the Conference Session.

Mr. Pope stated he has covered the debt service portion of the water system expenditure and stated page 24 of the Report shows the future expenditures of the rate base year of 1970-71. That the total figures are the ones they had in the summary of the total expenditures anticipated for 1970-71 of $4,766,500 as compared with $3,634,058 for the 1968-69. The trend of the figures are shown graphically on Figure 4, Page 26 of the Report. It shows the debt service on the proposed bonds; the debt service on the existing bonds declining; a composite of the two and the estimated expenditures total including the debt service on the capital improvements and operating costs.

He stated the sewage system is taken up on Page 25 and starts off with the revenues and expenditures for the sewage system for 1966-67, 1967-68 and the budget for 1968-69. That for the 1968-69 period, by subtracting the expenditures exceeded the revenues by about $254,000. Under water there was an adjusted deficiency of about $458,000 - we had re-allocated over $200,000 because it should be charged to the sewage system. This means the water system was subsidizing the sewage system during the last few years. If you transfer those re-allocated costs, the actual sewage system's estimated deficit would be $488,800 rather than the $254,000, and this puts the two of them about on the same level.

Mr. Pope stated to balance the operations you would have to add the $488,800 to the final figure given on the water breakdown on Page 28 where the adjusted figure for water is $424,600. That the $424,600 should be added to the $488,800 and that is the deficit for 1968-69 under the present rate structures.

On Page 4 the reports say that in order to maintain the water and sewer fund as a self-sustaining operation, it was necessary in the 1965-69 budget to eliminate capital improvement expenditures and to provide under revenues $813,249 from anticipated rate adjustments to balance the budget - that is the 1965-69 deficit based on the existing rates.

Councilman Whittington asked how often most cities increase their water rates? Mr. Pope replied there is a wide variation - they feel that a five year period is a logical period; the longer
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you wait the further you get behind. Their experience has been in towns and cities that have waited eight or ten or fifteen years, what they wind up doing is getting 2/3 of the way back to balancing the budget and the change is too great to enable them to do it. Mayor Brookshire asked if the report does not say if Council adopts the recommendations for increases in rates that it would carry the city five years.

Mr. Pope replied that is right.

Councilman Alexander asked if all cities use the same type sewage charge? Mr. Pope replied it is a common charge - a surcharge on the water bill; there are other methods discussed in the report regarding a flat rate, there are fixture unit charges and these are not as equitable as the water meter rate. This is recognized as being the most equitable way of getting the cost of sewage borne by the people who use the sewage.

Councilman Short stated he is saying that this rate of increase perhaps would yield the city some money - more than is actually needed in the next fiscal year; but it would tend to level off and about the fourth and fifth year, the city probably would lose what was made the first year? Mr. Pope replied this might happen; that after five years the situation should be re-examined and start on another cycle depending on the expansions and costs at that time.

Councilman Smith stated in studying the rates in 1960 it seems that the small consumer carried the big load - from $2 to $3 to $4; he asked if this is the same? Mayor Brookshire replied the table on Page 57 shows the domestic group of customers would pay slightly over half of the total water revenue.

Councilman Smith asked the average domestic rate for water? Mr. Franklin, Water Superintendent, replied it averages $5.00 or $6.00 for both water and sewer.

Mr. Pope stated the next section is the analysis of the water cost and they used the billing analysis as it exists in Charlotte and summarized this to determine the percentage of total consumption the various classes; the percentage of total revenue in various classes; the percentage of bills and used this to allocate the cost to various classes - the anticipated cost. The debt service is allocated on the basis of the capital values of the units the debt-service represents; the pumping stations, treatment plants and arriving at this for the large users, inside and outside; the immediate users and the domestic users. Following the allocation of the debt service they allocated the operating cost and they have described their reasoning behind each of these allocations, coming up with a total cost for each class of users of annual operating cost of capital improvements. Arriving at these figures they then have a section on the average water cost to determine the 1970-71 average unit cost of water per hundred cubic feet - this is shown on Table 19.

Mr. Pope stated the direct cost chargeable to outside users include only their pro rate share of the debt service and operating cost; there is no compensation for the city for undertaking to serve water outside the city limits and for this reason in calculating the cost of water to outside users an allowance of five percent for the city's return on an investment in works chargeable to outside users was made and added to the direct cost. In effect/for outside water users, Charlotte is in the utility business and
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is entitled to grantings as such. He stated the average costs are shown at the bottom of the table for inside users as 16 cents per hundred cubic feet for large users, 23.9 cents for immediate, 45.9 cents for domestic and roughly twice that for each of the categories outside the city, for a grand total of 34 cents per hundred cubic feet.

Mr. Pope stated the conclusion of this section is on Page 44 and it indicates that the average cost of water to the domestic class inside the city is approximately 2.9 times the cost of the larger class. For outside users only the average cost of water to all classes was determined and not the cost of each class. Consumption by outside users is relatively small and minor adjustments in the estimates of plant value used in the analysis would change appreciably the cost to each class. The average cost to outside users is estimated approximately 3.1 times the cost to the inside users based on this allocation.

Mr. Pope stated on Page 45 of the report they went through the same analysis for the sewerage costs on a basis to determine the capital value items on the sewerage to see if they resemble the water ones. It was determined they did and therefore this is the justification for going on the surcharge rather than a separate rate schedule, plus the fact you do not meter sewerage. The cost of the treatment, pumping and collection mains agree with the percentage that occurs in the water system.

On Page 47 they go into the existing rate schedule and the industrial wastes in which they mention the original recommendation of 110 percent surcharge of 1961; then they show the existing rate schedule; they talk about the deficiency in the existing rates again referring to the 1968-69 budget as this is the most concrete thing that is current. They show the total of $6,473,736 as expenditures and the revenues of $5,660,487. This is the deficit mentioned under general of $813,249 which would be larger if it were not for the fact that funds were not provided for capital improvements on that.

The City has agreed with the County to provide a minimum of 567 million gallons of water annually through a 24 inch main to Westinghouse; it provides that the rate for the first year should be $0.065 per 100 cubic feet and the rate shall be $0.07 per 100 cubic feet for the next five years. The agreement also states the rate can be adjusted after the first year. The agreed-to minimum flow is five percent of the total demand of the water system, if exercised. The analysis of water costs of Table 19 demonstrates that the city is, in effect, subsidizing this account since it is selling water considerably below cost.

The average cost of water to domestic users is 2.5 times the average cost to large users. As shown in Table 19, the water cost analysis indicates that this ratio should be about 2.9 to 1; 2.5 is the existing figure. This means unless the present rate schedule is changed to reflect the proper ratio, the large user will be paying more than the cost of his water service and the domestic user will be paying less than his share of the cost of water service.

Mr. Pope stated Page 50 deals with the proposed rate structure and states the number of rate blocks is considered satisfactory and is retained; the smaller communities frequently have a fair rate schedule comprised of one or two steps; however, a large city with industries requires a number of steps, and they feel
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Charlotte's number is fine. Higher rates for all users are required. That out-of-city users in contrast to inside-city users where a city should provide water at its cost to the consumers, however, out-of-city users generally pay a surcharge. Since all large capital expenditures are financed by the sale of general obligation bonds, where citizens pledge the integrity of the city, it is only just that the out-of-city consumers who make this commitment pay a surcharge. This is consistent with the present City-County relationship and extension policy. The present minimum monthly charge graduated according to meter size is equitable and its continuation is recommended.

Mr. Pope stated on Page 51 the table indicates the cost per hundred cubic foot - the unit cost within a block. If you used from 0 to 3300 cubic feet per month inside, you pay 44 cents per hundred cubic feet, instead of 30 cents. The rates and percentages on this page refer to per hundred cubic feet without regard for how much water is sold in that bracket. On Page 59, they take the entire revenue based on the new rate for inside the city users and divide that by the entire amount of water used and come up with an overall average figure of 30.4 cents. Doing the same thing with the present rate they come up with 25.3 cents and the difference between the two is a 20 percent increase. This is an overall figure insofar as all the water sold inside the city.

Mr. Pope stated on Page 52 they have recommendations on the private fire line connections which is principally a matter of equity rather than a substantial amounts of money. He stated the sewer work is justified in the same way; they show the total revenues estimated which can be compared back with the expenditure. They have an explanation of why they used 83.5 percent of bills for the sewer billings based on the history as some of the water does not run into the sewer.

He stated on Page 59, in addition to the average just discussed, it compares the rate with other municipalities. That in a recent survey of 25 municipalities in North Carolina, compiled by Concord, North Carolina, all but three charged the outside user a minimum premium of 100 percent. This agrees with a recent nationwide survey conducted by the American City Magazine. The billing analysis of Table 19 which was the average cost of water, indicated that the cost ratio for outside to inside users is about 3 to 1. To avoid such a large increase to the outside user it is recommended that the surcharge remain at 100 percent of the inside rate.

Mr. Pope stated it is very difficult to compare rate structures because of varying local factors such as cost of labor, age of the system, type of source, degree of treatment and age of the rate schedule. That a comparison of the prices charged for water through the full block use range as taken from the recent study by Concord, North Carolina, and Greenwood, South Carolina, indicated that the cost of water to the consumer in Charlotte falls within the higher and lower costs for the above mentioned communities.

He stated the table on Page 60 can only be used to compare the cost of water; this is taken the others rates and using the same quantity of water. This is based on per 1,000 gallons. Charlotte is 28 cents; Greensboro, 29 cents; Winston Salem, 23 cents; Durham, 28 cents; Atlanta, 29 cents and Macon 38 cents. These studies are conducted by towns in question who were making a rate study and they used certain quantities of water.

Mayor Brookshire requested Mr. Pope to find out what these cities are charging for sewer as it would be very helpful.
DECISION ON PETITION NO. 68-90 BY M.R. GODLEY FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING OF A TRACT OF LAND ON THE NORTHEAST SIDE OF FREEDOM DRIVE, FROM BROWNS AVENUE TO THRIFTWOOD DRIVE, DEFERRED.

Motion was made by Councilman Short, seconded by Councilman Stegall, and unanimously carried, deferring decision on the subject petition pending further study by the Planning Commission.

DECISION ON PETITION NO. 68-91 BY RAYMOND MASON FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING OF A LOT ON THE EAST SIDE OF BEATTIES FORD ROAD, SOUTH OF RUSSELL AVENUE, DEFERRED.

Councilman Tuttle moved that decision on the subject petition be deferred pending further study by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilman Stegall, and carried unanimously.

ORDINANCE NO. 119-Z AMENDING CHAPTER 23, SECTION 23-8 OF THE CITY CODE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP BY CHANGING THE ZONING OF PROPERTY BEGINNING APPROXIMATELY 1,250 FEET SOUTH OF TUCKASEEGEE ROAD, WEST OF BROWNS AVENUE.

Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Short, and unanimously carried, the subject ordinance was adopted changing the zoning from R-9 to I-1 as recommended by the Planning Commission.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 16, at Page 74.

ORDINANCE NO. 120-Z AMENDING CHAPTER 23, SECTION 23-8 OF THE CITY CODE CHANGING THE ZONING MAP BY CHANGING THE ZONING OF PROPERTY FRONTING 45 FEET ON THE WEST SIDE OF SPARON AMITY ROAD, BEGINNING ABOUT 183 FEET NORTH OF THE NORTHERLY MARGIN OF ALBEMARLE ROAD.

Councilman Short moved adoption of the subject ordinance changing the zoning from R-9MF to B-1 as recommended by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilman Tuttle, and carried unanimously.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 16, at Page 75.

DECISION ON PETITION NO. 68-94 BY RESIDENTS OF COLLEGE DOWNS FOR CHANGE IN ZONING OF AN AREA BOUNDED BY UNIVERSITY CITY BOULEVARD (N.C.49), A CREEK NEAR NOTTOWAY DRIVE, SUTHER ROAD AND A LINE ABOUT 1,200 FEET WEST OF MALLARD CREEK CHURCH ROAD, DEFERRED.

Motion was made by Councilman Tuttle, seconded by Councilman Whittington, and unanimously carried, deferring decision on the subject petition pending further study by the Planning Commission.
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ORDINANCE NO. 121-Z AMENDING CHAPTER 23, SECTION 23-8 OF THE CITY CODE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP BY CHANGING THE ZONING OF PROPERTY FRONTING 257 FEET ON THE WEST SIDE OF OAKDALE ROAD, BEGINNING 190 FEET NORTH OF PLANK ROAD.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington to adopt the subject ordinance changing the zoning from R-9 to B-1 as recommended by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilman Stegall, and carried unanimously.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 16, at Page 76.

ORDINANCE NO. 122-Z AMENDING CHAPTER 23, SECTION 23-8 OF THE CITY CODE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP BY CHANGING THE ZONING OF PROPERTY AT 1500 HAWTHORNE LANE.

Councilman Tuttle moved adoption of the subject ordinance changing the zoning from R-6MF to O-6 as recommended by the Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and carried unanimously.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 16, at Page 77.


Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Tuttle, and unanimously carried, the subject ordinance was adopted changing the zoning from R-9 to B-1 as recommended by the Planning Commission.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 16, at Page 78.

PETITION NO. 68-98 BY QUEENS GRANTS, INC. FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING FROM R-12 TO R-20MF (CONDITIONAL) OF A TRACT OF LAND FRONTING ON THE NORTHERLY SIDES OF LUMARKA DRIVE, ROCKY FALLS ROAD AND PICADILLY DRIVE, AND SOUTHEAST OF THE CENTERLINE OF SEABOARD RAILROAD, DENIED.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Tuttle, and unanimously carried, denying the subject petition for a change in zoning as recommended by the Planning Commission.

Councilman Short stated these gentlemen should be commended for having made the effort to use this R-20MF which he thinks is a good category and Council should bend a little some time to use this category; that he hopes this will not discourage others who might want to use the category.
December 23, 1968
Minute Book 51 - Page 214

DECISION ON PETITION NO. 68-88 BY LEONARD W. COPPALA AND ELMER D. MILLER FOR A CHANGE IN ZONING OF TRACT OF LAND ON THE WEST SIDE OF PARK ROAD, BEGINNING AT SUGAR CREEK AND EXTENDING SOUTHWARD, DEFERRED FOR TWO WEEKS.

Councilman Tuttle moved that decision on the subject petition be deferred for two weeks. The motion was seconded by Councilman Stegall, and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION SETTING DATE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON JANUARY 13 ON PETITION FOR LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS ON IVEY DRIVE, FROM CENTRAL AVENUE TO LYON COURT.

Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Stegall, and unanimously carried, the subject resolution setting date of public hearing on Monday, January 13 was adopted, and is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 6, at Page 239.

RESOLUTION APPROVING SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH THE STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION FOR THE NORTHWEST EXPRESSWAY AUTHORIZED.

Councilman Alexander moved adoption of the subject resolution approving the agreement for the Northwest Expressway which provides for the relocation of utilities, the modification of existing surface streets and the signalization and control of vehicular traffic within and adjacent to the project. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 6, at Page 240.

LEASE BETWEEN CITY AND WILMINGTON SHIPPING COMPANY FOR ROOM 114 AT AIRPORT APPROVED.

Councilman Short moved approval of the subject lease for 575 square feet of space at $4.00 per square foot for a term of one year. The motion was seconded by Councilman Stegall.

Mr. Veeder, City Manager, advised the Airport Advisory Committee has some thoughts on the general subject of rates. They have a project which will be coming before Council soon and is a project that calls for a review and analysis of each and every lease at the airport towards the end of identifying all the factors that might make it desirable to make changes and to make sure they are all similar in some respects where they are not now.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

SANITARY SEWER CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZED.

Upon motion of Councilman Short, seconded by Councilman Tuttle, and unanimously carried, the construction of sanitary sewer mains was approved as follows:
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(a) Construction of 250 feet of 8-inch main in East Peterson Drive, inside the city, at the request of N.E.C.R. Investments, Inc., at an estimated cost of $1,645.00. All cost of construction will be borne by the applicant whose deposit in the full amount has been received and will be refunded as per terms of the agreement.

(b) Construction of 927 feet of 8-inch main to serve a portion of Eastover Subdivision, inside the city, at the request of E. C. Griffith Company, at an estimated cost of $5,205. All cost of construction will be borne by the applicant whose deposit in the full amount has been received, and will be refunded as per terms of the agreement.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS AUTHORIZED.

Upon motion of Councilman Tuttle, seconded by Councilman Short, and unanimously carried, the following property transactions were authorized:

(a) Acquisition of approximately 1,770 square feet of property at 545 Swan Street, from Mecklenburg Realty & Development Company, at $118.80, for the Northwest Expressway sanitary sewer relocations.

(b) Temporary construction easement of 150 square feet at 627 Charles Avenue, owned by Robert A. Oldham, at $1.00, for culvert replacements in North Charlotte.

(c) Temporary construction easement of 150 square feet at 2717 Yadkin Street, owned by Highland Park Manufacturing Company, at $1.00, for culvert replacements in North Charlotte.

(d) Temporary construction easement of 300 square feet at 434 Faison Avenue, owned by Thomas Hill Nelson and wife, at $1.00, for culvert replacements in North Carolina.

(e) Temporary construction easement of 300 square feet at 2727 Davidson Street, owned by Highland Park Manufacturing Company, at $1.00, for culvert replacements in North Charlotte.

(f) Temporary construction easement of 70 square feet at 601 Charles Avenue, from Billy F. Patterson, at $1.00, for culvert replacements in North Charlotte.

(g) Temporary construction easement of 300 square feet at 2701 North Alexander Street, from Oscar Logan Pope and wife, at $1.00, for culvert replacements in North Charlotte.

(h) Temporary construction easement of 300 square feet at 2724 Davidson Street, from H. P. Norman and wife, at $1.00, for culvert replacements in North Charlotte.

(i) Temporary construction easement of 230 square feet at 605 Charles Avenue, from Herman Eldridge Jones and wife, at $1.00, for culvert replacements in North Charlotte.
COUNCILMAN WHITTINGTON LEFT THE MEETING AT THIS TIME.

Councilman Whittington left the meeting at this time and was absent for the remainder of the session.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS FOR ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY OF ANNIE B. MCCOY (WIDOW) LOCATED AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SEVENTH STREET AND MCDOWELL STREET, FOR THE MCDOWELL STREET WIDENING PROJECT.

Councilman Short moved adoption of the subject resolution, which was seconded by Councilman Stegall, and carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 6, at Page 242.

ORDINANCE NO. 124-X AMENDING THE 1968-69 BUDGET ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER OF FUNDS FROM THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO THE GENERAL FUND FOR THE PURCHASE OF TWO PUMPING ENGINES.

Upon motion of Councilman Alexander, seconded by Councilman Stegall, and unanimously carried, the subject ordinance was adopted authorizing the transfer of $4,497,71 to be used towards the purchase of two pumping engines for the fire department.

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 16, at Page 79.

ALL BIDS REJECTED ON CONTRACT FOR ONE 1,000 GALLON PER MINUTE COMBINATION PUMPING ENGINE WITH DIESEL ENGINE.

Councilman Smith moved that all bids received for the subject contract be rejected. The motion was seconded by Councilman Alexander, and carried unanimously.

CONTRACT AWARDED SEAGRAVE FIRE APPARATUS, INC. FOR TWO 1,500 GALLON PER MINUTE COMBINATION PUMPING ENGINES WITH DIESEL ENGINES.

Upon motion of Councilman Alexander, seconded by Councilman Tuttle, and unanimously carried, contract was awarded Seagrave Fire Apparatus, Inc., on their low base bid, in the amount of $78,584.22 on a unit price basis, for two 1,500 gallon per minute combination pumping engine with diesel engine.

The following bids were received:

**Base Bid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seagrave Fire Apparatus, Inc.</td>
<td>$78,584.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Fire &amp; Safety Eqpt. Co.</td>
<td>81,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American LaFrance</td>
<td>83,262.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternate Bid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Fire &amp; Safety Eqpt. Co.</td>
<td>$77,116.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American LaFrance</td>
<td>79,666.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seagrave Fire Apparatus, Inc.</td>
<td>86,543.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF CHARLOTTE MERIT AWARD PRESENTED REVEREND THOM BLAIR.

Upon motion of Councilman Short, seconded by Councilman Alexander, and unanimously carried, the following award was made to the Reverend Thom Blair:

PRESENTED TO THE REVEREND THOM BLAIR
In Acknowledgement and appreciation of Outstanding Meritorious Service for more firmly establishing freedom and justice among us as a member of the Mayor's Community Relations Committee.

WHEREAS, such meritorious conduct is deserving of public acclaim and recognition,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Charlotte, North Carolina, in regular session assembled this 23rd day of December, 1968, that the CITY OF CHARLOTTE MEDAL OF MERIT be, and the same is hereby awarded.

Mayor Brookshire stated that Reverend Blair is leaving Charlotte to take a position in St. Louis, and St. Louis' gain is Charlotte's loss.

CITY OF CHARLOTTE MERIT AWARD PRESENTED MR. DONALD DENTON.

At the request of Mayor Brookshire, and upon motion of Councilman Stegall, seconded by Councilman Short, and unanimously carried, the Merit Award was presented to Mr. Donald Denton, retiring President of the Chamber of Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT.

Upon motion of Councilman Short, seconded by Councilman Stegall, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

[Signature]
Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk