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The City Council of the City of Charlotte, met in regular session on Monday, May 1, 1972, at 2:00 o'clock p.m., in the Council Chamber, City Hall, with Mayor John M. Belk presiding, and Councilmembers Fred D. Alexander, Ruth M. Easterling, Sandy R. Jordan, James D. McDuffie, Milton Short, James B. Whittington and Joe D. Withrow present.

ABSENT: None.

*** *** *** ***

INVOCATION.

The invocation was given by Councilman Sandy R. Jordan.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES.

Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Alexander, and unanimously carried, the minutes of the last meeting, on Monday, April 24, 1972 were approved as submitted.

MEMBERS OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES COMMITTEE PRESENT FOR HEARING ON PROPOSED CHANGES IN EXISTING WATER AND SEWER RATES, FEES AND CHARGES.

Present for the public hearing on proposed changes in existing water and sewer rates, fees and charges were Channing Brown, Chairman, and Committee members, James R. Sheridan, Robert D. Potter and Ed White.

Absent: Sydnor Thompson.

HEARING BEFORE THE CHARLOTTE CITY COUNCIL AND THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER PROPOSED CHANGES IN EXISTING WATER AND SEWER RATES, FEES AND CHARGES.

The required hearing was held before the Charlotte City Council and the Community Facilities Committee to consider proposed changes in existing water and sewer rates, fees and charges.

Mr. J. B. Fennell, Finance Director, stated to give some perspective to the current rate study, it would seem appropriate to point out that water and sewer rates have remained unchanged during the period from 1961 to 1970. The general effect of inflation during this period is well known. Water and sewer utilities have been subject to the same inflationary pressures and expansion demands as privately owned utilities, as well as being confronted with the same expensive demands for less pollution of water resources. Despite these pressures on our basic costs, the water and sewer rates have remained unchanged since 1961, except for one interim increase in 1970. This relatively long period in which rates were stabilized is ample evidence of the reluctance with which the water and sewer utility proposed a rate adjustment.

In a 1968 rate study, the consulting firm of Weston and Sampson, Engineers, reported that the existing rates were clearly inadequate to provide the level of services demanded by customers, and that with rising inflation, they would become increasingly insufficient. An interim rate increase was approved in 1970 and was only about 1/3 of that recommended by the consultants as needed. This slowed down our capital expansion and service improvement programs. It was also necessary to discontinue all current revenue financing of capital improvements and to resort to bond financing for these purposes.
Since the 1968 rate study we have some new developments which have some impact on our financing plans. Recognizing the public importance of adequate utility services that would be available on demand at reasonable prices, the City Council and the County Commission in 1972 approved a consolidated county-wide utility service to better meet the public necessity for these vital utilities.

Mecklenburg County authorized general obligation bonds of $20.7 million to enable the expansion of water and sewer services in developing areas outside the city. Debt service costs to finance this debt must be eventually borne by revenues from the new consolidated system. A significant portion of this capital expansion is being completed or has already been completed, and the costs of operating and maintaining these facilities must be provided for.

In recent years, water rates have been set so low that revenues barely covered operations, maintenance costs, and amortization of existing debt. These pressures toward less than adequate rates have hindered needed expansion of the water and sewer systems. Most consultants recommend that revenues from water systems must not only provide for current operating costs, but should be sufficient to permit some reasonable reserves and to carry out some expansion from current income. This is considered good business by private industries, and there is no reason why it is not also good business for publicly owned utilities. Recognizing the present need to hold water rates as low as possible, these recommendations do not provide for any current revenue financing of capital improvements.

One of the major characteristics of public utilities is the comparatively large investment in fixed assets. The highest relative investment and the lowest capital turnover rates among utilities is that of water utilities. This factor sets rather high constant costs because plants must be sized to accommodate daily maximum demand for services, including fire protection. Also plant design and construction must be undertaken well in advance of need in order to meet the public necessity of a continuous uninterrupted flow of these utilities.

The cost of borrowing money to finance needed construction has also greatly increased. Bonds sold in 1961 at an average cost of 3.11 percent, while in 1971 the lowest rate received was 4.4 percent. This means the percentage of net borrowing costs is up more than 40 percent. The Engineering-News Record construction cost index shows a rise from 811 in January, 1960 to 1682 as of March, 1972; this represents an increase of more than 100 percent the cost of construction during this 12 year period. During the year 1972, the nation-wide construction cost inflation exceeded an average of 10 percent. The cost rise topped 15 percent in Atlanta, which is representative of the Southeast region.

Mr. Fennell stated they have made some projections. The expenditures estimated for the operation of water and sewer systems in 1972-73 are projected to total about $10.8 million. Of this total, $6.0 million will be for operating costs, and debt service cost will be about $4.7 million. This projection does not make any provisions for any expansion of capital facilities from current income.

Revenues projected at the present rates are estimated to total around $8.6 million which will leave an operating deficit in 1972-73 of about $2.4 million.

Mr. Fennell then referred to a number of charts. The first reflected the actual expenditure in revenue trend for the years 1967 to 1972, and their projections to the year 1977. In the year 1968, revenues were in a position to accommodate operating costs and debt service costs on existing debts. This deficit was met by deferring needed capital improvement projects which total around $300,000. The budgeted expenditures for the current fiscal year of 1972 are about $1/2 million dollars in excess of budgeted revenue. The initial budget provided budget expenditures of $200,000 more than budgeted revenues. Start-up costs for the new county facility added about $300,000 to this figure, making a total operating deficit in the current year of about $1/2 million dollars. In 1970, the projections show with a rate increase of only...
about 1/3 of that recommended by the consultants, that we would be in a serious financial crisis in the water and sewer utilities in the year 1972. This meant we had to take some drastic cutbacks in capital improvement programs. We discontinued any current revenue financing; we paid all the developers back from bond proceeds rather than current revenues, as was the previous practice. In addition, we set ceilings on personnel, and had the identical staff in the year 1969-70, 1970-71 and 1971-72. As a matter of fact there was one less staff personnel in 1972 than we had in previous years.

He stated curtailing these operations permitted us to improve our cash position in the year 1971 by a little over a million dollars. This was absolutely necessary in order to meet this situation we are in in the current year. Although the gap between the revenues this year is somewhat large, we feel through the economy of scale of handling the new system and the growth rate in the areas that will be served, eventually this gap will be narrowed. We do feel the recommended rates may be able to be stabilized for a year.

The basic major cause of the increase in expenditures is principally the rise in borrowing cost to finance needed expansions. He referred to a chart comparing the operating expenditures and the debt service. Except for the start-up costs in the initial year of 1972 for the new system, the major increases and expenditures in the future will be in debt service. This chart reflects the relatively large investment characteristics of the public utilities.

Mr. Fennell stated the next chart shows the trend in bond financing of capital improvements. It represents the rather rapid growth that has occurred in the water and sewer system over the last few years. From the origin of our present water and sewer utility, we only issued $35.0 million in bonds up until the year 1960. In the 12 year period - 1960 to 1972 - the City and County issued over $49.0 million in bonds to meet the rapid growth in the city and perimeter area. That means there was more growth in the 12 years, than in the preceding history of the water and water utilities. The chart also shows the planned bonds that will be required to meet the present expansion program. It will require about $29.0 million over the next three years. This will include $4.7 million of county bonds. He stated this also reflects some of the pressures being brought on us by the federal and state government as far as less pollution of water resources. Up until 1960 the sewer only comprised about 44 percent of capital financing; in the last 12 years this comprised 56 percent of bond financing of capital improvements. In 1975 we will have invested around $115.0 million in physical facilities that were financed by bonds, which is in addition to the amounts financed by current revenue financing, and other arrangements. The major increase in expenditures is resulting from the increased cost to finance capital expansions. The debt service cost in 1973 on the existing debt will be about $1.6 million higher than it was in 1971. Part of this has been due to the manner in which we have created bond maturities in order to maintain the low rate structure. We have postponed bonds to sell, but now we must start repaying these amounts back.

Mr. Fennell stated they have prepared two alternative proposals for rate structures. Alternate One follows very closely the patterns set by the rate consultants in 1968. They are shown on page 5 of this report. This chart has been prepared to show the rates in terms of gallons as well as cubic feet so that it will be better understood what impact the two alternative proposals would have on the existing rates. In the first bracket it costs the water user 4.7 cents to buy 100 gallons of water. It costs the high volume user only 1.7 cents to buy 100 gallons of water. If we follow the consultants patterns, we will be increasing the low volume user being increased by 1/2 cent per one hundred gallons of water.

Mr. Fennell stated the second alternative, which they prepared and which they think is more appropriate, provides for a uniform increase in the rate based on units of 7/10 of a penny for every 100 gallons of water delivered. Under this proposal percentage-wise this would be about 40 percent less of a rate increase than that originally recommended by the consultant. Where a present water user is paying 4.7 cents, under Alternate Two he will only pay 3.10 cents.
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The second alternative proposes a change in the method of billing water to apartment complexes which is now being delivered through a master meter. A study of about 11,000 units would indicate that this 7/10 of a cent increase would be ample if these apartment units were billed on an equivalent basis as private residences.

Mr. Fennell then referred to a chart that brings into relative perspective the rate differentials between the various rate classes under the present rate schedules and those produced by each of the alternative proposals.

He stated proposal number two by increasing the unit rates keeps the differential between the large and small users rather small. If we follow the consultant report we will be going up much more per unit of water delivered on the lower volume user than we would in the high volume user.

Mr. Fennell stated at Council’s pleasure they can prepare additional alternatives; but these two alternatives would be followed generally regardless of the rates we would have to establish to meet the indicated expenditures next year.

These proposed rates are devised to supply water and sewer utility services to the public at cost. These rate adjustments are necessary if we are to continue to provide the community with adequate utility services at lowest possible costs. The failure to set realistic rates, which fairly distributes revenue requirements among the beneficiaries of these services, will inevitably obstruct these goals.

Councilman Short stated last time there was quite a discussion about whether to include along with bond financing pay as you go, and decided to put in $725,000 a year worth of pay as you go. That he understands Mr. Fennell is saying now that he is dispensing with pay as you go. Mr. Fennell replied we were forced to do this, and he was very reluctant to do this because it is good business, and it is in the interest of the water users to carry out a certain percentage of capital constructions from current revenues. On the other hand they found this situation required some very prompt action in order to create this improvement in cash positions in 1972 in order to come up with it. That he would still recommend it, but is not recommending it in these rate studies because of the obvious need to hold the water rates down at this point.

Councilman Whittington asked if this proposal is only for 1972-73, and beyond that time, he will look again? Mr. Fennell replied that is right. They feel there will be some economy of scale through the elimination of certain overlapping. Also they feel we might experience a somewhat better than the 15 percent increase they have projected. Based on current trend this is the projection they would have to make.

Councilman Whittington asked if he is recommending Alternate Two over Alternate One? Mr. Fennell replied he is. It seems to him this more fairly distributes the rate burden and it will be of relative impact. That this is talking about raising water rates only 7/10 of one cent for a 100 gallons.

Councilman Jordan asked if they plan to hold the minimum of $1.00 because of the retired people and people who are on limited income? Mr. Fennell replied he would strongly recommend continuing the minimum rate. This would mean that someone can buy 2,100 gallons of water for $1.00. This would help retired couples or low income people who really want to conserve on their water use.

Mr. Fennell stated staff took the last month's billing, and analyzed it from the standpoint of the average bill. Of the first 29,818 customers, their average bill for water and sewer is less than $3.00: it is $2.90. Over 50 percent of the customers will average about that amount. Then in the next bracket which comprises 40% of the customers, their bill is about $6.34. On the 50% group this means about 45 cents increase a month in their water and sewer bill under the Alternate Two proposal.

Mr. Fennell stated if possible they would like to have the decision by the first of June; that we are operating in a deficit.
Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, stated the agreement the City entered into with the County at the time the City-County Utility Department was created, calls for a certain procedure when the review and study of increases in the water and sewer rates are considered. The first step of the procedure is what is taking place today and that is the joint hearing between the Council and the Community Facilities Committee. The second step required is that the Community Facilities Committee, following the hearing, study the proposed changes in the rates, fees and charges, and within a reasonable time following the hearing, but no later than 30 days thereafter, make a recommendation to the City Council. The third step is when the City Council receives the recommendation and advice from CFC and takes whatever action it deems appropriate based on the recommendation and advice of the CFC.

Mr. Channing Brown, Chairman of CFC, stated this is a short time for them to give this study in light of the information developed here. He stated he would like to commend to the Council the work being done by the Finance Department; they have really given detail information that is substantial and in line with the report the City paid $60,000 for. This report today has just as much in it for the Council and CFC to make a decision on. He stated out of a total of 68,000 customers, 65,000 are in the first bracket and those 65,000 will be the ones whose bills will increase by 45 cents with this recommendation.

Mr. William H. Trotter, representing the Charlotte Apartment Association and the Committee for the Charlotte Home Builders Association, stated he speaks on the positive side because it is evident a rate increase is needed, and the question is what form this should take. The present problem is a problem today because the consultants' advice was not fully implemented two or three years ago. If it had been, there would not be a crisis or problem at this time. Consideration should be only with extreme caution that any further departure be made from this consultant's recommendation.

Mr. Trotter stated there is a tendency to want to soak the apartment dweller. Since the master meters are a common use in apartments, this seems to have upset the water department's arithmetic a little bit; he asked that not get in the way of sound rate structure. There is a tendency to be sympathetic to the single family home owner. In the years ahead we will find that most of our affluent members of society live in single family homes. He urged Council to make its decision on the basis of what is good for the city and what is good for this as a public utility. Running a public utility and getting a proper rate study is the answer. This business about keeping a constant differential is just as faulty as the idea of soaking the apartments as that is where it will help the retired people.

Councilman Short stated Mr. Trotter says the apartment dweller tends to be of the moderate and somewhat lesser income, and asked if the savings is going to them or the landlord? Can the landlord not charge him whatever he wants for the water? Mr. Trotter replied this is one element of the cost; there are taxes, water, cost of moving the grass and all these things are elements of the cost producing the price. The owner is not going to continue to produce services at a loss; if he is making too much of a profit, others will come in and compete with him. Councilman Short asked if he is saying the money the landlords make in apartment projects from their water operations and the differential between what they pay and what they charge enables them to reduce the rent? Mr. Trotter replied that is right, and Councilman Short asked if that is a valid objective for a water operation to help landlords to deal with their rent problems? Mr. Trotter replied what he is talking about is how much the total housing bill is going to cost the less affluent people.

Councilman McDuffie asked the average cost per apartment for water per unit, and Mr. Bill Allan replied $2.25.
Mr. Fennell stated he feels the rate differential that already exists is not the same; we already have about 2 1/2 variations in differential. Charlotte is by no means the first to propose this. That Durham and Greensboro are already using this basis for billing apartments. That if he is not mistaken, apartments outside the city were already being billed under this prior to being taken over by the city.

Mr. Joe Grier, Attorney, stated he agrees with some things that have been said, but there are some things that have been said that he would not agree with. He agrees that water and sewer rates in general should be related to the cost to the city of providing the services to a particular user. If the rate structure will stick to that on a fairly computed basis, then the people he represents, who today are Barnhardt Mfg. Company and Sealtest, will not have any objections to whatever rate is required. But if the effort is made to base the rate on what money the city requires for its general operations, then he will dispute with it.

Mr. Grier stated it was suggested there has not been any increase in water and sewer rates in the last 12 years. In 1965, a substantial increase was put into effect in water rates, and the sewer rates were doubled. In February 1970, there was a 17-1/2 percent increase in water and sewer rates. He stated the city's own audit report indicates this with respect to the operation of water and sewer facilities, since the rate increase was put into effect about 1969. In the audit report for each of those years, there has not been a single year in that period of time in which water-sewer operations have not returned a profit. Those figures can perhaps be explained and adjusted to a slight extent, but the people engaged by the City to prepare the audit report brought forward those figures at that time. Page 5 of the 1971 audit indicates revenue exceeded operating expenses of $3,846,000. After deducting something called depreciation which exceeded about $150,000, the amount of amortizing bonds and taking off capital expenditures which amounted to $131,000, there was an excess in the funds of $1,005,000 in that year. In 1970 the rate was adopted. The study made professionally on which the Council acted had been based not on actual facts of prior years but on a projected deficit of some $800,000 in the current year. As a matter of fact there was a profit on operations in that year on the rates that were then in effect. The recommendations made were based on assumed deficit of $800,000 when, in fact, there was a profit of several hundred thousand dollars during the year. In 1969 when Council was considering the rates in effect and raised the rates 17 percent, it was then suggested that unless the rates were raised drastically at that time, there would then be another deficit. But if you examine the audit reports published since that time, you will see in that year, in 1970, and in 1971, there has been a profit. If you stick to projections as they did in 1965 and in 1969, they will predict a deficit. If they are right then there should be some increase; but he suggests that Council look at what the records indicate because the charge for water and sewer may be an appropriate way to recover the cost of providing the services, but it is not an appropriate way to raise the money for the city generally. The rates suggested here are substantial. One would raise the rates 25 percent for domestic users and 30 percent for large users. The other 15 percent for domestic and 40 percent for the large user. He stated whether it is looked at from the point of view of domestic or large, these figures are substantially in excess of price increases that are being suggested as the maximum in these days of an effort to hold price increases down.

Mr. Grier stated this is the third time he has been before the Council on this general subject. In 1965 when he appeared there was a large industry here which in 1969 was no longer in business. It was in that year the largest of the users. The largest of the users in 1969 is today operating only a curtailed basis. He would suggest that at least for some industrial and manufacturing concern the expense of water and sewer is a very substantial cost of doing business. He would ask Council to take the facts that have been developed by past operations, rather than on projections which in the past have been totally inaccurate before making an increase.
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Mr. Bill Allan, representing the Charlotte Apartment Association, stated in defense of the bulk user it is cheaper to collect from one person than it is from 300 separate individuals; it is cheaper to read one meter than to read 300 different meters; it is cheaper to send out one bill than to send out 300 bills; it is cheaper to locate one person than to try to find 300 different customers. That it does not cost the city as much to collect from the bulk user. He stated the fact more revenue is needed is obvious; that we must have an adequate water and sewer system. But he asks if it is fair to ask the people who have already paid for their water system to go out and pay again for new lines for new users. The burden should be shifted into two directions. To the new customers who are the cause for needing new money, and for the city in general, the taxpayer, who is the beneficiary in an expanded system. He stated the money is needed for expansion and growth and not current operation. He stated the water department is a profit making organization.

It is a profit making organization and the profit is going to buy new lines and new users. He stated they feel since new users are the cause for needing new money then the new users should pay for that. They also feel we all need first class water and sewer systems, and we have to pay for it. They are not against expansion and not against adequate water and sewage; but they feel the principal of letting those who benefit pay the bill is a sound one in this or any other case.

Councilman Short asked if he does not feel the developers have profited a great deal from the arrangement whereby the city has expanded the water system? Mr. Allan replied very much so; the ultimate profit goes to the people who have bought the new houses, or the ones who live in new apartments. He stated they are not up here for a free ride; they are just asking that the cost be allocated where the benefits go.

Councilman Alexander stated on a city wide basis for a city resident, he asked if Council can set up separate rates? Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, replied that is what is in effect now; it is broken down into separate rate structures according to the amount of water used. The law permits different classifications and different rate schedules for structures.

Mr. Potter, member of the CGC, stated on Page 8 of the report, it shows administrative difference of $400,000 in the 1971-72 and 1972-73. He asked if something unusual is going on there? Mr. Fennell replied a good portion of this is going to be for engineering type costs; it will be distributed to the projects; they are setting up a general engineering organization; the administrative costs will go up somewhat because the structure will change because of the county-wide operation. A great deal of this cost will be engineering.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES COMMITTEE LEAVE MEETING.

Members of the Community Facilities Committee present for the hearing on proposed changes in the existing water and sewer rates, fees and charges left the meeting at this time.

COMMENTS BY DR. MICHAEL GOLDEN, CHAIRMAN OF THE CLEAN WATER BOND CAMPAIGN.

Mr. Michael Golden, Chairman of the Clean Water Bond Campaign, stated on May 6 the voters of North Carolina will have the opportunity to decide on whether the State will provide $150.0 million in financial aid to local communities upgrading their water supply and treatment facilities. While most people he has spoken with are supporting the water bond issue, others have expressed surprise there is even a need for such an issue. Yet State officials estimate approximately $700.0 million in construction of water supply and treatment facilities will be needed over a five year period just to bring the local communities to where they should be. Our cities are straining their water facilities to meet the demands for the ever increasing population and growing industry. Some of the smaller communities do not now
have adequate water supply and treatment facilities. Once we leave the cities and move into the counties, residential wells, residential septic tanks and industrial waste treatment plants are found. These are not adequate or safe methods for water supply and treatment. In Mecklenburg County, the City-County Utility Department has approximately two dozen water projects which will have to be done whether or not this bond issue passes. The need for upgrading and enlarging our water supply and treatment facilities is apparent. But the cost of upgrading this is often more than the local community can bear. With state aid matching federal grants, the cost to the local communities is brought down to a level where they can afford to construct the facilities. As of 1970, 31 other states had programs offering state aid to local community water projects; in this respect, North Carolina is actually behind. The North Carolina plan for the water bond issue offers benefits to all 100 counties. Half the money will be distributed on the basis of population and the larger cities will get funds to meet their pressing water needs. Half the money will be distributed on the basis of needs to match federal grants; and the county with a small population but a demonstratable need will also be eligible for funding. The members of the State Legislature were unanimous in their vote creating the clean water bond, indicating its appeal to both small and large counties. Since the formation of the Clean Water Bond Committee in mid April, there has been an active program to speak to organizations to acquaint them with the facts. Whenever possible, they have spoken on radio and television. If the public knows the facts of the water bond referendum, it is hard to be against it, especially when it will not require any tax increase. With the passage of the water bond issue there is the potential for clean water supplies, effective water treatment facilities, reclaimed waterways for recreational activities, improved fish and wildlife areas, and an upgraded landscape. Defeat of the bond issue will just postpone the time when our water facilities must be upgraded and enlarged. A postponement would then cost much more dearly to clean up what we now have polluted. Each of us can play an important part May 6 in cleaning up our water by voting yes to this clean water bond referendum.

Mayor Belk stated Council appreciates the fine job Dr. Golden is doing. That he would like to thank our Delegates for passing this; that we really could not accomplish this from just local community. There has been a lot of confusion to the public, and that is the federal government has a lot of money they are spending on this water. If we do not pass our local bonds which will probably come before the people in September, and do not pass the state bond, then we will not have the opportunity to apply for grants from the federal government.

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE TREE COMMISSION BY CHAIRMAN HERBERT HECHENBLEIKNER.

Councilman Withrow stated approximately one year ago, Council appointed a Tree Commission, and Dr. Herbert Hechenbleikner is serving as Chairman. He stated the Commission has been meeting each month, and is drawing resolutions which he hopes this Council will approve. That Dr. Hechenbleikner is present today to give Council an insight into what the Commission has been doing.

Dr. Hechenbleikner stated the Commission has been meeting once a month in the matter of the Tree Commission business, and they have had several extra meetings in order to forward the business. Committees have been appointed by the Chairman to study various aspects of the ramifications and implementation of the whole business.

He stated Charlotte has been known as the City of Trees, but if we do not start planting some trees in the new subdivisions and taking a little better care of trees in the older areas of town, we will be in trouble.

Dr. Hechenbleikner stated the Tree Commission has been studying ordinances from Atlanta, Miami, the International Shade Tree Conference, Richmond and cities in New Jersey and in New York State.
He passed around a written report and stated a proposed budget is attached to the report amounting to approximately $64,000. They all felt the most pressing need is the hiring of an arborist to work with an already employed City Landscaper. This arborist would need some help and related facilities to run an office and to tend to the business of planting the trees.

Dr. Hechenbleikner stated some of the things they feel should be considered in an ordinance and as a matter of general policy are:

1. Protection and control of existing trees.
2. Planting of new trees.
3. Establishment of a tree nursery.
4. Establishment of a site for composting sludge and leaves for economical topsoil production.
5. Determine needs and best methods for maintenance of Charlotte's existing trees.
6. Authorize site plan review for all new developments.
7. Establish the amount of assessment per lot of the developer for street trees to be planted by the city in all new developments.
8. Establish rules for enforcing said ordinance, and establish penalties for all violations.

He stated in all their discussions their emphasis has not been on penalties and violations, but in planting trees and in educating the public. That they have already contacted the public schools about this. It does not do any good to plant trees if vandals tear them down the next day or the next week. It does not do any good to plant trees if every Tom, Dick and Harry can go and cut them down. He stated we have not protected our street trees - the tree between the curb and the sidewalk - in the past.

Councilman Whittington asked if the new ordinance will propose that the new trees be planted behind the sidewalk? Dr. Hechenbleikner replied there are some places where planting between the sidewalk and curb would be indicated, and others behind the sidewalk. The further they can be planted from the street, the better it will be for the development and the protection of the trees.

Councilman Whittington stated the Commission should consider in the ordinance to plant behind the sidewalk in the future because there are many of these streets where you have these plantings and utility poles, and every time a street has to be widened, these trees or utility poles have to come down. Dr. Hechenbleikner stated they are recommending that they do get further back if there is sufficient right of way available. In some instances where there are very wide right of ways, such as Fairview Extension and other streets with 100 foot right of way or more, why stop with one row of trees, plant two rows as was done on Wendover and was done on Queens Road West. There were five rows planted there. Then in the future if you have to widen the street, you lose one row and you still have another row.

Dr. Hechenbleikner stated there are two arborists and an amateur arborist on this Commission, and they are recommending certain types of trees - the right tree in the right place. We should not have the big oaks too close to the curb because they have to be pruned to make way for the big trucks.

Councilman McDuffie asked if they will recommend that the utility company go through this department. That at one time they cut trees and left holes in the top, and now they seem to just cut them down. Dr. Hechenbleikner replied or flat topping which is worse. That they are going to recommend that smaller trees be planted under present utility lines to get away from that. In the new developments, most of the utility lines go between the back of lots, and Duke Power in many cases is putting utility lines underground. The whole situation is going to improve, and they will recommend that utility lines be coordinated with the Planning Commission and the City Landscape architect. He stated of course the members of the Tree Commission are just in a position to advise and suggest, but they do have expertise to make this possible.
Mayor Belk asked if Sharon Lane will not be a pretty street when it is finished? Dr. Hechenbleikner replied his position has been if a tree is the wrong kind, badly damaged, or diseased, or in the wrong place, he would not hesitate cutting it down. The trick is to replant and keep planting. That is what they have done in Europe. He stated you should not consider a tree as something sacred, priceless and immortal. It has to go at times. That we should protect them whenever we can. But as he wrote in a letter to the editor several months ago - "Let's cry less about what we have to cut down, and plant more and protect what we have for tomorrow".

Dr. Hechenbleikner stated present with him today are two members of the Tree Commission, Mr. Herman Porter, an arborist, and Mr. James C. Hemphill, Jr., and architect.

Mr. Porter stated he does not think we should abandon planting big trees entirely. That he talked to the Head of the National Arborist in Washington, and he said it gets pretty hot in the summertime, and we need the shade. Utility companies in some sections of the country today are putting up three phase wire, and it takes up an area 15 to 18 inches wide, and it is possible to use big trees with this three phase wire. That we should encourage Duke Power to use this type wire. If you do away entirely with big trees, the charm of beautiful streets such as Queens Road West with seven rows of trees will be lost.

PERMISSION TO USE AMPLIFIER FROM HELICOPTER AND AT SHOPPING CENTERS GRANTED POLLY HANSEN.

Ms. Polly Hansen stated she wants to stay within the law in her campaigning and it has already been publicized that she is going up in a helicopter and she would like to use an amplifier. She asked for permission to use an amplifier from the helicopter and on the ground at shopping centers and crowded areas on Friday and Saturday in asking people to vote for her.

Councilman Whittington moved that permission be given as requested. The motion was seconded by Councilman Alexander, and after discussion, the vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.


Councilman Jordan moved adoption of the subject resolution for the grant agreement for the proposed apron-terminal concept. The motion was seconded by Councilman Short, and carried unanimously.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 8, at Page 235.

After the approval of the resolution, a discussion and comparison of airports in Tampa, Orlando and Atlanta followed. Mayor Belk stated Tampa airport is built for the future and is way ahead of any airport today. There is no airport as modern as Tampa; however, the big play has been away from Tampa because it goes to Jacksonville, Miami Orlando and Atlanta. Here, we are trying to stay ahead so we will be a sub-station on this side, and we will be the most important thing between Washington and Atlanta. This means we are now receiving flights non-stop from Jacksonville, Orlando, Birmingham, Chattanooga, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Dayton because Atlanta is overcrowded. If this idea works we will be second to Atlanta in this area. We have to be sure of what we are doing, and that our facilities stay ahead of places such as High Point, Greensboro, Raleigh-Durham, Columbia, and Birmingham.

Councilman Jordan stated he spent about 30 minutes with Mr. Hoose, Traffic Engineer, before lunch today and he has some brochures and pictures of the Tampa airport, and it is really fantastic. That this gave him a whole tour of this airport with pictures.
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Mr. Birmingham, Airport Manager, stated we have some 3,000 acres with what will be acquired this year. With the way that Atlanta is boxed in they do not have any room for expansion and they are having a real problem. They now have in excess of some 500 flights a day. Some of the airlines are becoming perturbed about this because of the waiting time. In view of this, Eastern has made two changes in Charlotte; they have added a total of 12 additional flights since December, with three connecting in Atlanta. In the next several years we stand a chance of getting many more of those flights.

Mr. Birmingham stated the March figures for enplaning passengers exceeded those by 15% of the highest we have ever had. About 82,000 were enplaned, and this time last year there were 67,000. The enplaned passengers are up 10 percent and the revenue is up about 5 percent.

Councilman Short asked why the noise of the airplanes is lessening, and Mr. Birmingham replied the FAA is requiring that all jets being built now and the ones in existence where they are rebuilding the engines, that the decibel level be reduced considerably by 1975. The new engines coming out are built under different specifications, and require the same type of decibel point.

CONTRACT WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR URBAN STUDIES AND COMMUNITY SERVICE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE TO CONDUCT A HOUSING STUDY FOR CHARLOTTE HOUSING PROGRAM, APPROVED.

After explanation by Mr. Connerat, Intergovernmental Programs Director, Councilman McDuffie moved approval of the contract with the Institute for Urban Studies and Community Service of the UNCC to conduct a housing study for the Charlotte Housing Program, in the amount of $3,707.00. The motion was seconded by Councilman Short, and carried unanimously.

REQUEST BY THE CHARLOTTE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION AMENDING THE 1971-72 PARK AND RECREATION BUDGET BY ADDING ONE WATCHMAN POSITION TO THE DEPARTMENT'S AUTHORIZING PERSONNEL, APPROVED.

Councilman Jordan moved approval of subject request by the Charlotte Park and Recreation Commission amending the 1971-72 Park and Recreation Budget adding one watchman position to the Department's authorized personnel. The motion was seconded by Councilman Alexander.

Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, stated since Council is supplementing the budget of Park and Recreation by nearly a quarter of a million dollars, that anything they do in addition to what they are doing, they will have to ask the Council for additional funds, and he felt Council should be aware of what they are doing.

Councilman McDuffie stated he asked last year about the cost of fencing the course. That Carolina Golf Course, which is 18 holes, had to fence their course about two years ago. That they maintain a good fence. Mr. Diehl replied this cost was given and it ran around $47,300.00. Councilman McDuffie requested that he get additional estimates; Carolina paid $25,000 for 18 holes two years before and he does not believe the costs have gone up that much in that length of time.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

CONTRACT WITH R & W DEVELOPMENT COMPANY FOR INSTALLATION OF SEWER LINES IN THE VICINITY OF SUGAR CREEK ROAD AND I-85, DEFERRED.

Upon motion of Councilman Jordan, seconded by Councilman Short, and unanimously carried, the subject contract was deferred as requested by the City Manager.
CONTRACTS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF WATER MAINS, APPROVED.

Motion was made by Councilman Nithrow, seconded by Councilman Whittington, and unanimously carried, approving the following contracts for the construction of water mains:

(a) Contract with Mill-Power Supply Company for the construction of 925 feet of water mains and two fire hydrants in Blairhill Road, inside the city, at an estimated cost of $6,000.00. Funds will be advanced by the applicant under terms of existing city policies and will be reimbursed 100% of the cost of mains 8" in diameter and larger at the rate of 35% per quarter of the revenue derived until the entire eligible amount has been reimbursed or until the end of 15 years, whichever comes first.

(b) Contract with Charles F. Hewes for the construction of 170 feet of water main in Kingsway Drive, outside the city, at an estimated cost of $375.00. Funds will be advanced by the applicant under terms of existing city policies and will be reimbursed 50% of the cost of all water mains 6 inches in diameter and smaller at the rate of 45% per quarter of the revenue derived until the entire eligible amount has been reimbursed or until the end of 15 years, whichever comes first.

(c) Contract with Mrs. Carolyn Summers for the construction of 175 feet of water main to serve a portion of Hertford Avenue, inside the city, at an estimated cost of $290.00. Funds will be advanced by the applicant under terms of existing city policies and will be reimbursed 50% of the cost of all water mains 6 inches in diameter and smaller at the rate of 35% per quarter of the revenue derived until the entire eligible amount has been reimbursed or until the end of 15 years, whichever comes first.

(d) Contract with E. J. Smith & Sons Company for the construction of 600 feet of water main and one fire hydrant in Golf Acres Drive, inside the city, at an estimated cost of $6,400.00. Funds will be advanced by the applicant under terms of existing city policies and will be reimbursed 100% of the cost of mains 8 inches in diameter and larger at a rate of 35% per quarter of the revenue derived until the entire eligible amount has been reimbursed or until the end of 15 years, whichever comes first.

RIGHT OF WAY AGREEMENTS, APPROVED.

Councilman Jordan moved approval of the following right of way agreements with the State Highway Commission. The motion was seconded by Councilman Alexander and unanimously carried.

(a) Agreement with State Highway Commission for the installation of 24-inch water distribution main and 8 inch and 15 inch sanitary sewer mains, as follows:

1. 24" Water Main on the south side of Sunset Road, S. R. 2108, between Station 9 + 14 & 53 + 31 cross I-77 at Station 40 + 75.
2. 4-8" Sewer Mains cross I-77 at Stations 21 + 50, 63 + 50, 74 + 00, 134 + 00.
3. 2-15" Sewer Mains crossing I-77 at Stations 166 + 00 & 214 + 50.

(b) Agreement with State Highway Commission permitting the City to construct an 8-inch sanitary sewer line within the right of way of Tom Hunter Road to serve L'Atriums North Apartments.
Councilman Short stated he hopes that Item (b) will not result in the closing of Tom Hunter Road, at this time for any length of time anyway. That it seems every road in and around Hidden Valley is being worked on. He requested the City Manager to watch over this, as it is one of their few ways out. This is similar to Craighead Road, if not more so. If we close it down and build a water line across it, there will be a real problem.

PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS AUTHORIZED.

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

(a) Acquisition of 20' x 35' of easement at 1627-1634 Freedom Drive, from E. C. Griffith Company, at $35.00, for Berryhill Road Trunk Sanitary Sewer Construction.

(b) Acquisition of 20' x 689.64' of easement at 1800 Freedom Drive, from E. C. Griffith Company, at $690.00, for Berryhill Road Trunk Sanitary Sewer Construction.

(c) Acquisition of 20' x 1,679.54' of easement at 1521 Berryhill Road, from North State Investment Company, Inc., at $1,680.00, for Berryhill Road trunk sanitary sewer construction.

(d) Acquisition of 20' x 1,292.67' of easement at 2219 Freedom Drive, from John C. Caldwell and Catherine C. Ferguson, at $1,293.00, for Berryhill Road Trunk sanitary sewer construction.

(e) Acquisition of 10' x 1,396.56' of easement on Albemarle Road, at Executive Center Drive, from Koger Properties, Inc., at $1.00, for sanitary sewer to serve Koger Properties, Inc.

(f) Acquisition of 15' x 268.05' of easement at 611 Dawn Circle, from John C. McIntosh and wife, Helen, at $370.00, for sanitary sewer to serve North Tryon Mobile Homes.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE FINANCE DIRECTOR TO SELL ANY AND ALL SHARES OF STOCK, BONDS OR OTHER SECURITIES WHICH THE CITY OF CHARLOTTE MAY RECEIVE FROM THE CANNON ESTATE UNDER THE WILL OF THE LATE JOSEPH F. CANNON.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Short, and unanimously carried, adopting subject resolution authorizing the Finance Director to sell any and all shares of stock, bonds or other securities which the City of Charlotte may receive from the Cannon Estate under the will of the late Joseph F. Cannon, such sale to be at the highest market price available.

The resolution is recorded in full in Resolutions Book 8, at Page 236.

ORDINANCES AFFECTING HOUSING DECLARED UNFIT FOR HUMAN HABITATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE CITY'S HOUSING CODE.

Councilman Whittington moved adoption of the following ordinances affecting housing declared unfit for human habitation which motion was seconded by Councilman McDuffie.

(a) Ordinance No. 449-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 424 North Brevard Street.

(b) Ordinance No. 450-X ordering the demolition and removal of the dwelling at 424 1/2 North Brevard Street.

(c) Ordinance No. 451-X ordering the dwelling at 833 Louise Avenue to be vacated and closed.
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(d) Ordinance No. 452-X ordering the dwelling at 647 Pennsylvania Avenue to be vacated and closed.
(e) Ordinance No. 453-X ordering the dwelling at 930 Persimmon Street to be vacated and closed.
(f) Ordinance No. 454-X ordering the dwelling at 417 East 16th Street to be closed.

Council was advised that the property owner of 424 North Davidson and 424 1/2 North Davidson Street had indicated she would contest the orders, and the remaining property owners had indicated they would not contest the orders.

Mayor Belk asked if anyone is present to speak for or against the orders, and no one came forward. Pictures of the properties were passed around for Council members to view.

The vote was taken on the motion and carried unanimously.

The ordinances are recorded in full in Ordinance Book 19, beginning at Page 61.


Councilman Jordan moved adoption of the ordinance readopting and continuing in force Chapter 11, Licenses, of the Code of the City of Charlotte for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973. The motion was seconded by Councilman Alexander.

Councilman Alexander asked if this is the time we can consider any adjustments that are to be made in the privilege licenses? Mr. Underhill, City Attorney, advised the law requires that the license schedule be adopted every year; it can be amended at any time. The reason it is being done this far in advance is because copies of the license schedule have to be sent to the printers and they need about six (6) weeks lead time.

Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, stated the area Council is concerned in on the schedule is so limited, and would be so unfair to the other people, that it has not been recommended that Council make a change. The law needs to be changed, and Mr. Whittington can tell Council of the attitudes of the cities that attended his meeting.

Councilman Whittington stated what Council has to do is approve this as recommended, and enter into the record that Schedule B in North Carolina, is grossly unfair, and that the League of Municipalities has gone on record as saying they will do everything in the next Session of the Legislature to make this equitable, realizing the difficulty of changes in its entirety to at least make it equitable. He stated he would like to have this as part of the motion that Council does not like it, and hopes it will be changed.

The amendment was accepted by Councilman Jordan, and Councilman Alexander.

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

The ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book 19, at Page 67.

Later in the meeting, Councilman Short stated this is a very serious matter, and he hates to have to vote for this. As an example, the licensing schedule charges something like $700 to sell silk cloth, and $50 to sell cotton cloth. There are many other inequities that are just as ridiculous and absurd. This is a serious matter and he thinks we can be thankful that Councilman Alexander is evidently going to be there and can attempt to do something about it.
SPECIAL OFFICER PERMITS.

Motion was made by Councilman Withrow, seconded by Councilman Whittington, and unanimously carried, approving the following Special Officer Permits for a period of one year:

(a) Renewal of permit to Bettie D. Burnett for use on the premises of Belk Brothers Company.

(b) Renewal of permit to Nahum R. Pillsbury, Jr. for use on the premises of Charlotte Eye, Ear, Nose & Throat Hospital.

(c) Renewal of permit to Stephen J. Wilson for use on the premises of Charlotte Eye, Ear, Nose & Throat Hospital.

(d) Issuance of permit to Barry Leon Reid for use on the premises of Charlotte Branch-Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond.

ALL BIDS REJECTED FOR MOBILE BOXING ARENA FOR POLICE DEPARTMENT.

Councilman Whittington moved that all bids received for mobile boxing arena for the Police Department be rejected as recommended by the Purchasing Director. The motion was seconded by Councilman Short, and unanimously carried.

ALL BIDS REJECTED FOR SPACE HEATERS FOR GREENVILLE REDEVELOPMENT AREA.

Upon motion of Councilman Jordan, seconded by Councilman Whittington, and unanimously carried, all bids were rejected for space heaters for the Greenville Redevelopment Area as recommended by the Purchasing Director.

ALL BIDS REJECTED FOR SANITARY SEWER FACILITIES TO SERVE BARRINGTON OAKS APARTMENTS.

Motion was made by Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Short, and unanimously carried, rejecting all bids received for sanitary sewer facilities to serve Barrington Oaks Apartments, as recommended by the Purchasing Director.

CONTRACT AWARDED SANDERS BROTHERS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF WATER MAINS ALONG W. T. HARRIS BOULEVARD AND RESEARCH DRIVE.

Upon motion of Councilman Whittington, seconded by Councilman Jordan, and unanimously carried, contract was awarded the low bidder, Sanders Brothers, in the amount of $34,555.00, on a unit price basis, for construction of water mains along W. T. Harris Boulevard and Research Drive.

The following bids were received:

- Sanders Brothers: $34,555.00
- Redding-Reeves, Inc.: $41,000.00
- Thomas Structure Co.: $45,692.50
- Pierce Ditching Co.: $59,768.50

DONALD W. BREWER NOMINATED FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE CIVIL SERVICE BOARD.

Councilman Whittington placed in nomination the name of Donald W. Brewer for reappointed to the Civil Service Board for a three year term.
APPOINTMENT OF MARGARET WATKINS CLAIBORNE TO THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT.

Councilwoman Easterling stated Council has received a letter from Louis H. Asbury resigning from the Zoning Board of Adjustment as he now resides outside the city.

She placed in nomination the name of Margaret Watkins Claiborne to fill the unexpired term, ending January 30, 1973.

No other nominations were made.

Councilwoman Easterling moved the appointment of Margaret Watkins Claiborne to the Zoning Board of Adjustment to fill the unexpired term of Louis H. Asbury. The motion was seconded by Councilman McDuffie and carried unanimously.

Councilman Jordan requested the City Manager to write a letter to Mr. Asbury thanking him for his service on the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

STATUS OF REPORT ON DOWNTOWN PARKING GARAGE REQUESTED, AND SUGGESTION THAT COUNCIL SHOULD BEGIN LOOKING FOR SECOND SITE; AND CITY ATTORNEY REQUESTED TO DRAFT ORDINANCE REQUIRING PARKING SPACES FOR OFFICE AND RETAIL BUILDINGS.

Councilman Whittington asked the status of the feasibility report from the consultants for the parking garage on Site B and the survey to be made by Wilbur Smith Associates? The City Manager replied it should be in the final stage of approval; he had a meeting with them about 10 days ago in which they asked Mr. Wolfe and others to come in locally to get ideas. That this report should be coming to Council right away.

Councilman Whittington stated there was a story in one of the papers last week about the perspective intent of Wachovia at Second and Tryon Streets. If they are going to build a building there, and this is something that has been talked for a number of years, but whether they do or they don't, in 90 days they have told the tenants to vacate. Many of the telephone employees use these parking facilities, and it seems to him the city should make an effort to get this report in and perhaps think in terms of the second site, and he is not suggesting where the second site should be. Based on what is happening there, perhaps we should be talking about a site west of Tryon Street for the second site to be built and either operated by the city or leased by the city. He stated we should get on this right now, and if Council does not object, he would ask the City Manager to go ahead and give Council something to put teeth in on another site.

Councilman McDuffie asked about the Ponte-Wolfe study recommendation that Council adopt an ordinance requiring parking space for every 1700 feet of office or retail; this would mean these new buildings would have to provide some parking on their own.

Councilman McDuffie requested the City Attorney to prepare an ordinance to that effect for Council to consider to carry out the wishes of the Ponte-Wolfe recommendations.

REQUEST THAT REPRESENTATIVE OF CITY ATTEND THE TRANSPRO 72 CONFERENCE AT DALLAS INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT MAY 27 THROUGH JUNE 4.

Councilman Whittington stated Transpo 72 will be held May 27, to June 4 at the Dallas International Airport. This is the second time in the last three months they have had something either in Washington or Baltimore about new modes of transportation. He suggested that someone from local government be sent to this - either members of Council, the Mayor or the Traffic Engineer. With what we are trying to do here with the State and Federal governments, and Wilbur Smith and the Traffic Engineer, it would seem to him it would tie in together.
Mr. Burkhalter, City Manager, replied there will be someone there to represent the city. Council is going to get a fast review of the transportation study next Thursday morning. If some Councilmembers would like to go, it would be fine; that they have also suggested to the people doing the Sugar Creek study that they should attend this conference.

Mayor Belk asked if Councilman Whittington would like to go, and if so, he will propose his name.

REQUEST THAT MAYOR AND COUNCIL RECOGNIZE THE WORK OF DARRELL SIFFORD, LOCAL NEWSPAPER COLUMNIST.

Councilman Whittington suggested to the Mayor and Council that Mr. Darrell Sifford be invited to come to City Council and that he be given a presentation as is given to other people in Charlotte who make contributions in various fields.

He stated Mr. Sifford's column is syndicated and goes all over the country. Some of the articles he has written have brought out problems that perhaps local governments did not know about. He stated he sometimes looks upon him as a minister who may touch people that by and large other ministers in the community would not touch. He thinks he should be recognized. Councilman Whittington stated he is thinking in particular of the articles he has written on dope and about the organist in the home on Pegram Street, and all the burglaries he has suffered, and all the things that have meant so much to him have been taken from him. These are things that are important to all citizenry, and we should recognize him for his work.

COUNCIL URGED TO MOVE ON WATER RATE STUDY AND TO SET A DATE FOR THE BOND ELECTION, AND THEN DO EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO GENERATE INTEREST IN THE PASSAGE OF THE PACKAGE.

Councilman Whittington stated the City Attorney has pointed out what Council has to do about the water rates. That he would urge the CFC to get this back to Council as quickly as they can and that Council will take these recommendations and go on and do it. Also that Council decide as soon as possible, with the City Manager's help, when the bond election will be held. He would recommend also that Council say to the Mayor that they will do whatever he wants each one to do in connection with the bond election such as speaking engagements, house to house canvassing, and anything else to generate support for this bond issue. He stated Council should do this, and should begin doing it immediately.

Councilman Short stated in 1969, the Council members divided up the city into areas and literally walked the streets. This was effective, and he thinks we should personally take this bond issue to the people, and should feel a compulsion to do at least as much as was done in 1969.

APPOINTMENT OF DAVID GRIER MARTIN, JR TO THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES COMMITTEE TO COMPLETE UNEXPIRED TERM OF SYNDOR THOMPSON.

Councilman Short stated Syndor Thompson advised a few days ago that he cannot continue to serve on the Community Facilities because his law firm is representing a number of the large water users, and he did not feel he could have a meaningful participation in the water rate study. He stated he is informed by the City Manager and others that it is very needful to have a representative from the City on the Committee immediately who is capable of getting into this sort of thing.

Councilman Short moved the appointment of David Grier Martin, Jr. to the Community Facilities Committee to serve the unexpired term of Syndor Thompson ending September 1, 1972. The motion was seconded by Councilman Whittington, and carried unanimously.
COUNCILMAN ALEXANDER ANNOUNCES HE HAS BECOME A GRANDFATHER.

Councilman Alexander announced that he has become a Grandfather. That his daughter has presented them with a little granddaughter.

Councilman Alexander received congratulations from the Mayor and all members of Council.

CITY MANAGER REQUESTED TO INVITE CHAIRMAN OF COG TO PRESENT A PROGRAM TO COUNCIL.

Mayor Belk requested the City Manager to request the Chairman of COG, Councilman Short, to present a program to Council. That this would be very meaningful to Council. He stated sometimes we do not recognize the good work that some of the Council members are doing.

ADJOURNMENT.

Upon motion of Councilman Walkrow, seconded by Councilman Alexander, and unanimously carried, the meeting was adjourned.

Ruth Armstrong, City Clerk