MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE MAYOR AND CHAPEL HILL TOWN COULCIL MUNICIPAL BUILDING, MONDAY, APRIL 14, 1980, 7:30 P.M.

Mayor Nassif called the meeting to order. Present were:

Marilyn Boulton Joe Herzenberg Jonathan Howes Beverly Kawalec R.D. Smith Joe Straley Bill Thorpe Jim Wallace

Also present was Town Manager E. Shipman.

Resolution of Appreciation for Claudia C. Cannady

Mayor Nassif announced that the first item on the agnda, a resolution of appreciation for Ms. Claudia Cannady, would be deferred until another meeting as Ms. Cannady was not present.

Petitions and Requests

Council member Kawalec presented a letter from Mr. Hugh Huff and asked that it be read when the report on Mason Farm Road traffic was considered.

Council member Straley requested the Council consider a correction to the minutes of March 10, 1980, which had already been approved. Mayor Nassif said this would be considered when approval of the minutes of March 24 and 25, 1980, was discussed.

Minutes

Council member Straley moved, seconded by Council member Wallace, to correct the minutes of March 10, 1980, page 7, stipulation 3 to read "issuance of a special use permit, grading permit,..." and stipulation 7 to read"...issuance of a building permit..." Council member Kawalec asked if the matter could be postponed until the attorney was present. Mr. Shipman informed the Council he had discussed the matter with the attorney who agreed that as this was a technical error, it should be corrected. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ON MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER HERZENBERG, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER SMITH, THE MINUTES OF MARCH 24, 1980, WERE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

ON MOTION BY COUNCIL MEMBER SMITH, SECONDED BY COUNCILMEMBER HOWES, THE MINUTES OF MARCH 25, 1980, WERE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.

Public Hearing to Consider the Rezoning of Property at the Northwest Corner of the Intersection of Weaver Dairy Road and SR 1732 from Regional Commercial to Limited Business

Mr. Jennings stated that when the Council had zoned property recently annexed, a question had arisen as to whether this corner lot should be limited business rather than regional commercial. As the Council could not procedurally zone it limited business then, they had called a public hearing to consider rezoning.

Mr. Pipkin, representative of the owner of a portion of the property stated his client was satisfied with the currnt zoning. Mr. Deacon, the owner, presented his plans for an energy company with solar heating units and greenhouses which was being built on the site. Mayor Nassif, however, reminded the Council they were considering a rezoning, not a development.

Mr. Jennings noted that Mr. Deacon had a building permit for his building. If the zoning was changed, the building could be completed, but would be non-conforming as would the gas station being built on the other portion of the lot.

Council member Boulton asked if there would be room for another building on the lot. Mr. Deacon said there would not. He had moved his building to the back portion of the lot, leaving a screen of trees.

Council member Smith asked if the town wanted an activity center in this location. Mr. Jennings responded that the comprehensive plan called for a center in the area, although not in this exact location.

COUNCIL MEMBER WALLACE MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER SMITH TO REFER THE MATTER TO THE PLANNING BOARD FOR RECOMMENDATION. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolution Amending the Goals and Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan to Revise the Policy on Drive-In Business.

Mr. Shipman explained that the drive-in business policy had been considered by the Council before. The policy had been revised such that Easco Photo Booth would be permitted with a special use permit in Kroger Plaza. Although the special use permit had been issued, it had never been acted upon. As it had expired, the company was now applying for a modification to extend the time period. The Planning Board, since the first revision of the policy, had reviewed the policy and now recommended against all drive-in businesses with the exception of gas stations and car washes. If the Council did not adopt this policy change, Mr. Shipman indicated he would have to recommend that the modification be granted to Easco Photo Booth.

COUNCIL MEMBER HERZENBERG MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER KAWALEC, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION.

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO REVISE THE POLICY ON DRIVE-IN BUSINESSES

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that Section G, Objective 2, Policy C of the Goals and Objectives of the Comprehensive Plan is hereby amended to read as follows:

Prohibit drive-in businesses with the exception of car washes and service stations.

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

Council member Smith asked if banks would be prohibited. They would.

Mayor Nassif stated he would vote against the resolution. He believed traffic problems could be eliminated with other restrictions. If the resolution was adopted, all drive-in businesses would come non-conforming and could not be replaced in case of fire.

Council member Boulton did not believe the drive-in businesses extremely objectionable. The existing policy to discourage the businesses except in certain areas was restrictive enough in her opinion. Council member Thorpe added that the Council had shown they would not approve the drive-in businesses in the downtown area.

Mr. Reeve pointed out that the Planning Board had not considered the resolution, but had voted consistently to deny all special use permits for drive-in businesses. the Planning Board had considered this revision of policy informally in considering the proposed zoning ordinance.

Council member Wallace commented that the existing businesses would no be non-conforming if the resolution waas adopted. He noted that drive-in businesses eliminated some of the need for parking. Mr. Reeve and council member Straley discussed whether or not eliminating the drive-in businesses would conserve energy. Mr. Jennings commented that the policy was an attempt to discourage people from driving from business to business.

Council member Wallace suggested that if the Council wanted to discourage automobiles, gas stations and car washes should not be exempted.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FIVE TO FOUR WITH COULCIL MEMBERS HERZENBERG, HOWES, KAWALEC, SMITH AND STRALEY SUPPORTING AND COUNCIL MEMBERS BOULTON, NASSIF, THORPE, AND MAYOR WALLACE OPPOSING.

Resolution Denying a Modification of the Special Use Permit for Kroger Plaza Unified Business Development to Construct a Photo Facility

COUNCIL MEMBER SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER HOWES, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION.

A RESOLUTION DENYING A MODIFICATION OF THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR KROGER PLAZA UNIFIED BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT TO CONSTRUCT A PHOTO FACILITY

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council hereby fails to find that with the modification:

the location and character of the use if developed according to the plan as submitted and approved with be in harmony with the area which it is to be located and in general conformity with the plan of development of Chapel Hill and its environs; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council hereby denies the modification of special use permit requested for said development.

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolution In Support of Continued County Parks and Recreation Support Funding

COUNCIL MEMBER SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER WALLACE, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION.

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF CONTINUED COUNTY PARKS AND RECREATION SUPPORT FUNDING

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council hereby expresses its appreciation to the Orange County Board of Commissioners for the County's previous funding of the Parks and Recreation Municipal Support Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council urges the Board of Commissioners to continue the Parks and Recreation Municipal Support Program upon the same 70%/30% distribution of funds as in past years, so that the many municipal park and recreation programs and facilities servicing all residents of Orange County may continue to function at the same level; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Town Council hereby authorizes Raymond E. Shipman, Town Manager, to submit a request on behalf of the Town of Chapel Hill to Orange County for continuance of the Parks and Recreation Municipal Support funding upon the population formulae developed in past years.

. This the 14th day of April 1980.

Mayor Nassif questioned the formula for arriving at a specific figure of support mentioned in the Manager's report to the Council. He noted however, that the resolution did not mention a specific figure but a percentage. The specific funds could still be negotiated. Council member Herzenberg questioned the whole computation, and expressed concern that the Council could set a precedent by accepting this formula. Mr. Shipman explained why he had used this formula. The Council continued to discuss the formula and how it had been arrived at.

COUNCIL MEMBER KAWALEC MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER THORPE, THAT THE MATTER BE REFERRED BACK TO THE MANAGER AND RECREATION COMMISSION WITH THE REQUEST THAT THEY DRAFT A FORMULA REFLECTING THE LOGIC OF THE COUNCIL'S THINKING ON EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS BASED ON POPULATION DISTRIBUTION.

Council member Smith was concerned about putting a higher demand on County funds which would in turn put a higher demand on citizens through taxes. Council member Howes responded that the Council was only asking for a more equitable distribution.

Mr. Shipman pointed out the Recreation Commission had considered a number of alternative formulas but had recommended none of them. If the Council thought an equitable distribution 62% of the total county recreation funds, then he could request this amount from the County without the Recreation Commission again considering the matter.

Mayor Nassif thought it better to ask the County for their justification of the total \$80,000 figure before rejecting that figure.

THE SUBSTITUTE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SIX TO THREE WITH COUNCIL MEMBERS BOULTON, HERZENBER, KAWALEC, STRALEY, THORPE, AND WALLACE SUPPORTING AND COUNCIL MEMBERS HOWES, SMITH AND MAYOR NASSIF OPPOSING.

Resolution Regarding Continued County Support for the Chapel Hill Public Library

COUNCIL MEMBER HERZENBERG MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER STRALEY, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION.

A RESOLUTION REGARDING CONTINUED COUNTY SUPPORT FOR THE CHAPEL HILL PUBLIC LIBRARY

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council hereby expresses its appreciation to the Orange County Board of Commissioners for the County's previous funding of the Chapel Hill Public Library.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill urges the Board of Commissioners to support the Chapel Hill Public Library on the basis of the ratio of non-municipal users of the Library (21%) to total expenditures.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill hereby authorizes Raymond E. Shipman, Town Manager, to submit a request on behalf of the Town of Chapel Hill Public Library funding.

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Report Regarding Mason Farm Road Traffic

Mr. Shipman had distributed a report regarding the measures taken to reduce traffic hazards on Mason Farm Road and their effect. Mr. Hugh Huff submitted a letter asking that traffic counts be taken on Hibbard Drive and Purefoy Road as well. He believed that much of the traffic on Mason Farm Road had been diverted to Hibbard and Purefoy. The large numbers of children on these streets created a traffic hazard. Mr. Shipman responded that his report had dealt with Mason Farm Road and Otey's Road as these were the streets he had been directed to study in the special use permit issued to the University. The changes had had an effect. He recommended the petition be referred to himself and the Streets and Public Safety Committee. He commented that East Drive, which was still one-way, could cause a problem. COUNCIL MEMBER HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBERS WALLACE, TO REFER THE PETITION TO THE MANAGER AND STREETS AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE TO REPORT BACK TO THE COUNCIL AT THE NEXT MEETING. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Fire Station North

Mr. Hooper reported the staff had considered two locations, the site at the intersection of Weaver Dairy Road and Airport Road, and the Cedar Falls Park. After considering the advantages of both sites, the staff was recommending the fire station be located at the intersection of Weaver Dairy Road and Airport Road. He explained this would give a better area of coverage. As the land at Cedar Falls had been purchased with HUD funds, the town could not use a portion of the land for the fire station without exchanging its for land at another location, possibly Hargraves.

Mayor Nassif reviewed the recent commercial growth which could be covered by a station at Cedar Falls. He believed growth would occur northeast of town which could also be covered by this station. Mayor Nassif discussed distances of subdivisions from both locations. The fire station at Cedar Falls would reduce vandalism at the park. Council member Smith commented that although Mayor Nassif had discussed the possibility of the town providing coverage to Stoneridge and Northwood, these were outside the town's jurisdiction. Seawell School was in the town but would not be covered by a station at Cedar Falls. Also the bond referendum was passed with the station located at Weaver Dairy Road and Airport Road. Mr. Hooper added that policy of the fire department dictated that service for Brendle's and commercial buildings in this area would be served by station number 3 with back-up from station number 1. Council member Kawalec asked if more protection could be provided at the parks to prevent valdalism. Mr. Shipman said the data on vandalism was incomplete. Since Cedar Falls was isolated, it would be more of a problem than other parks. Mr. Secrist was preparing a report on the vandalism for the budget. Council member Howes thought the manager's recommendation best, but suggested the Council begin to think of a fire station near Weaver Dairy Road and Mr. Moriah Church Road as growth would occur in this area. Council member Thorpe agreed that the station should be located at the corner of Weaver Dairy Road and Airport Road as this was where the citizens had approved the location in the bond referendum.

COUNCIL MEMBER HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER STRALEY, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION.

A RESOLUTION REGARDING LOCATION OF THE FIRE STATION NORTH

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Town will locate the Town's Fire Station North at the intersection of North Carolina Route 86 and Weaver Dairy Road, upon Town-owned land at that location.

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN TO TWO WITH COUNCIL MEMBERS BOULTON, HOWES, KAWALEC, SMITH, STRALEY, THORPE AND WALLACE SUPPORTING AND COUNCIL MEMBER HERZENBERG AND MAYOR NASSIF OPPOSING.

COUNCIL MEMBER SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY COUCIL MEMBER STRALEY, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING ORDINANCE.

AN ORDINANCE TO ADOPT A CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FOR A FIRE FIGHTING STATION AND EQUIPMENT

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that, pursuant to Section 13.2 of Chapter 159 of the General Statutes of North Carolina, the following grant project ordinance is hereby adopted:

Section 1. The project authorized is the construction of a 3,800 square foot fire station at the intersection of NC 86 and Weaver Dairy Road and the purchase of a pumper truck and related equipment to be housed in the fire station. The fire station will enable the Town to provide improved fire protection to the newly annexed area and to the rapidly developing areas north of the present incorporated city limits.

Section 2. The Manager of the Town of Chapel Hill is hereby directed to proceed with the implementation of the project within the terms of the grant agreement executed with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and within the funds appropriated herein.

<u>Section 3.</u> The following revenue is anticipated to be available to the Town to fund construction of the fire station and acquisition of equipment:

Bond proceeds authorized in November 6, 1979, Referendum

\$450,000

Section 4. The following amounts are appropriated for the project:

Architect and Engineer	\$ 34,000
Construction	261,140
Equipment	106,000
Legal and Fiscal	4,000
Contingency	44,860
TOTAL	\$450,000

Section 5. All funds expended from the General Fund on behalf of this project shall be repaid to the General Fund from the capital project.

Section 6. The Manager is directed to report annually on the financial status of the project in an informational section to be included in the Annual Budget. He shall also keep the Council informed at each regular meeting of any unusual occurrences.

<u>Section 7.</u> Copies of this project ordinance shall be entered into the minutes of the Council and copies shall be filed within 5 days of adoption with the Manager, Finance Director, and Clerk.

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolution Regarding Priorities for Continuation of Federal Grant Programs

COUNCIL MEMBER WALLACE MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER KAWALEC, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION.

A RESOLUTION REGARDING PRIORITIES FOR CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill hereby expresses its support for the following priority ranking of federal grant programs other than General Revenue Sharing in order of importance to the Town of Chapel Hill.

- 1. Community Development Block Grants (HUD)
- 2. Federally Assisted Housing (HUD) (FHA)
- 3. Urban Mass Transportation Grants
- 4. Sewer Construction Grants (EPA 201)
- 5. Ridesharing (DOE)
- 6. RSVP (Action)
- 7. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) Grants
- 8. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) Grants
- 9. Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) Grants
- 10. Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) Grants
- 11. Community Action Program Grants
- 12. Airport Development Grants
- 13. Economic Development Action Grants (EDA)

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

Council member Howes objected to the low ranking of the Airport. Although this did not affect Chapel Hill directly, he believed the growth of the Raleigh-Durham airport very important to the area. He moved to amend the resolution to change the ranking of Airport Grants to sixth. The Council agreed to the amendment.

THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

A RESOLUTION REGARDING PRIORITIES FOR CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAMS

BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill hereby expresses its support for the following priority ranking of federal grant programs other than General Revenue Sharing in order of importance to the Town of Chapel Hill:

- 1. Community Development Block Grants (HUD)
- 2. Federally Assisted Housing (HUD) (FHA)
- 3. Urban Mass Transportation Grants
- 4. Sewer Construction Grants (EPA 201)
- 5. Ridesharing (DOE)
- 6. Airport Development Grants
- 7. RSVP (Action)
- 8. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR) Grants
- 9. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) Grants
- 10. Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) Grants
- 11. Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) Grants
- 12. Community Action Program Grants
- 13. Economic Development Action Grants (EDA)

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

COUNCIL MEMBER BOULTON MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER SMITH, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION

A RESOLUTION REGARDING RELOCATION OF THE FRAZER HOUSE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council hereby authorized the Town Manager to extend the time for the Frazer house to be relocated from the lot at 105 North Boundary Street until June 1, 1980, provided that Mr. Robert E. Cooper submits a written release from any claim if the house is not relocated by June 1, 1980.

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

Council member Smith asked if the Town's plans were crucial for this property, if any thing would be done to the property before June. Mr. Hooper responded that the town intended to improve the screening and landscaping. As the house was close to the property line, it would be difficult to move after the screening was constructed. The Library Board was selecting a consultant to do a feasibility study on the use of the site. Mr. Hooper expected his recommendation to include use of the site as additional parking. The deadline on the original agreement was February and the staff believed the extension to be reasonable. The Council discussed the possible changes, such as special use permit and planting in the fall.

Mr. Cooper explained that originally he had hoped to buy some property from an adjoining land owner and move the house just a few feet. These negotiations had not progressed as hoped as the adjoining land owner was considering development on his property. Mr. Cooper wanted more time to find an alternative site to move the house. Council member Straley asked how long it would take Mr. Cooper to have a crew ready to move the house once notified by the town they were ready to start work. Mr. Cooper believed it could be done in a month. Weather could cause difficulties. Council member Wallace noted that Mr. Cooper had been instrumental in the town's obtaining the property. The feasibility study could begin with the house still on the property. He moved to amend the resolution, seconded by Council member Herzenberg, to change the date to August 15, 1980. THE MOTION TO AMEND WAS CARIED BY UNANIMOUS VOTE.

A RESOLUTION REGARDING RELOCATION OF THE FRAZER HOUSE

BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the Town of Chapel Hill that the Council hereby authorized the Town Manager to extend the time for the Frazer House to be relocated from the lot at 105 North Boundary Street until august 15,1980, provided that Mr. Robert E. Cooper submits a written release from any claim if the house is not relocated by August 15, 1980.

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

Resolution Requesting Designation for the Town of Chapel Hill as part of an "Area Center" Growth Center

COUNCIL MEMBERS HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY COUNCIL MEMBER THORPE, ADOPTION OF THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION.

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING DESIGNATION FOR THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL AS PART OF AN "AREA CENTER" GROWTH CENTER

WHEREAS, the Balanced Growth Policy of North Carolina, encourages economic progress and job opportunities throughout the State in a way designed to assure a healthy and pleasant environment and to preserve the State's natural resources, and

WHEREAS, this Policy provides for the designation of growth centers throughout the State, in an attempt to carry out the policy, and

WHEREAS, the Town of Chapel Hill has adopted as a goal the attainment of gainful and stable employment for a diverse population as well as policies

encouraging the location of new employers which provide jobs for a wide range of skill levels, and reserving an adequate amount of suitable land to meet economic objectives.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town of Chapel Hill hereby requests designation as part of an "Area Center" growth center, in conjunction with the Town of Carrboro and Orange County.

This the 14th day of April, 1980.

Council member Smith asked when the citizens had had an opportunity for input. Mr. Shipman responded that there had been no public hearing on this matter. Council member Howes stated the State did not have a procedure to be followed. Although the implications of the designation were not clear, he was concerned that the town might be penalized in receiving grants because it had not sought the designation. Mayor Nassif believed the town should be cautious in requesting designation.

As they did not know the implications of designation, they should wait. There would be an opportunity in a year to again request designation. Council member Straley stated that he was not willing to have industrial plants in Chapel Hill; however, Chapel Hill was already a growth center. Council member Thorpe though the town should recognize that if Governor Hunt was re-elected, the State policy would continue in the current direction. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN TO TWO WITH COUNCIL MEMBERS BOULTON, HOWES, KAWALEC, SMITH, STRALEY, THORPE AND WALLACE SUPPORTING AND COUNCIL MEMBER HERZENBERG AND MAYOR NASSIF OPPOSING.

Historic District Commission

The Historic District Commission had recommended Mr. Lamberton, Ms. Kinnaird, Mr. Gurlitz, Mr. Tenney, Ms. Kyser and Mr. Peloquin for three positions on the Historic District Commission to expire December 21, 1982. Council member Kawalec voted for Ms. Kinnaird, Mr. Lamberton and Mr. Gurlitz; Council member Wallace for Ms. Kinnaird, Mr. Lamberton and Mr. Tenney; Council member Herzenberg for Ms. Kinnaird, Mr. Lamberton and Mr. Gurlitz; Council member Thorpe for Ms. Kinnaird, Ms. Kinnaird, and Mr. Tenney; Council member Howes for Ms. Kinnaird, Mr. Lamberton and Ms. Kyser; Council member Boulton for Ms. Kyser, Ms. Kinnaird, and Mr. Peloquin; Council member Straley for Ms. Kinnaird, Mr. Lamberton and Ms. Kyser; Mayor Nassif for Ms. Kinnaird, Ms. Kyser and Mr. Tenney. Ms. Kinnaird, Mr. Lamberton, and Ms. Kyser were appointed.

The Council was notified of a vacancy on the Historic District Commission created by the resignation of Sam Baron, effective May 15, 1980.

Future Agenda Items

Council member Howes asked when Clearwater lake would be discussed. Mr. Shipman was considering advantages and disadvantages of purchasing the lake before making his recommendation and wanted to discuss this with the Council as part of the budget.

Council member Herzenberg had heard there were former members of the Council or town committees who had not received a resolution of appreciation for their service. He asked that this be investigated.

Mayor Nassif appointed Council members Boulton, Herzenberg and Thorpe to a committee for protocol.

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned,

Joseph L. Nassif, Mayor

David B. Roberts, Clerk