

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE MAYOR AND BOARD OF ALDERMEN
 THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL, MUNICIPAL BUILDING
 MONDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1976, 7:30 P.M.

Mayor Wallace called said meeting to order; present and seated were:

James C. Wallace, Mayor
 Gerald Cohen
 Robert Epting
 Thomas Gardner
 Jonathan Howes
 Shirley Marshall
 Marvin Silver
 R. D. Smith
 Edward Vickery

Also present were Town Manager K. Jenne, Town Clerk D. Roberts and Town Attorney E. Denny.

The minutes of the special meeting of January 7, 1976 were duly considered and corrections were made. ON MOTION BY ALDERMAN MARSHALL, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN EPTING, SAID MINUTES WERE UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED FOR OFFICIAL RECORDING AS CORRECTED. The minutes of the meeting of January 26, 1976 were duly considered and corrections were made. ON MOTION BY ALDERMAN SILVER, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GARDNER, SAID MINUTES WERE UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED FOR OFFICIAL RECORDING AS CORRECTED.

Petitions and Requests

Alderman Gardner requested that Board members on the Orange Water and Sewer Authority report on its status and progress to this point. In response to a question by Aldermen Cohen, Alderman Howes stated that the Legal Committee of the Authority has been directed to meet with the Board on Thursday, February 12, 1976 at 4:00 p.m. Mayor Wallace officially announced said meeting stating that it would be held in the Conference Room of the Municipal Building. He also stated that the meeting between the Committee and Carrboro would be a separate meeting. Alderman Marshall announced that the Orange Water and Sewer Authority is invited to the meeting on next Monday, February 16, 1976, about the 201.

Alderman Gardner requested that the administration pursue with the County, the discussions held in the pass relative to animal shelters. He stated that the citizens are aware that there have been negotiations with the County and additional steps may be required to reach agreement with the County.

South Orange Rescue Squad - Use of Fire Station #3.

ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN VICKERY THAT SOUTH ORANGE RESCUE SQUAD BE ALLOWED TO USE A PORTION OF FIRE STATION #3 AS AN ADDITIONAL HEADQUARTERS DURING THE HOURS FROM 6:00 P.M. TO 7:00 A.M. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Transfer of Monies by Budget Officer - Ordinance

After brief description by Mayor Wallace, ALDERMAN SILVER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN MARSHALL THAT AN ORDINANCE TO AUTHORIZE THE BUDGET OFFICER TO TRANSFER MONIES FROM ONE APPROPRIATION TO ANOTHER BE ADOPTED. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SEVEN TO ONE WITH ALDERMAN GARDNER OPPOSING.

AN ORDINANCE TO AUTHORIZE THE BUDGET OFFICER TO TRANSFER MONIES FROM ONE APPROPRIATION TO ANOTHER

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that:

SECTION I

Pursuant to the provisions contained in G. S. Section 159-15, the Budget Officer is hereby authorized to transfer monies from one division to another within the department appropriation, such transfers to be reported to the Board in accordance with G. S. Section 159-15. The Budget Officer shall transmit to the Board, on a quarterly basis, a revised account of appropriations which reflect the cumulative effect of all administrative and legislative transfers made during the fiscal year to date.

226

SECTION II

This Ordinance shall become effective upon its adoption, and unless sooner repealed shall exist and continue in effect only until the 30th day of June, 1976.

SECTION III

All Ordinances and portions of Ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

This the 9th day of February, 1976.

Speed Regulations - Umstead Drive

Town Manager Jenne stated that the staff, for some time, has observed increasingly heavy traffic conditions on Umstead Drive. There have been a number of inquiries concerning the lowering of speed limit due to growing volume of traffic as well as the narrow, winding nature of the road. The State Department of Transportation has been contacted and concurred that a reduced speed limit is in order. They sent the first ordinance which reduces that speed limit from 35 to 25 on Umstead Drive from Airport Road to Weiner Street which is in their jurisdiction. Beyond Weiner Street, the road is entirely under the jurisdiction of the Town so the second ordinance is also offered to provide for local ordinance amendment in order that the entire road from Airport Road to Estes Drive will be 25 miles per hour. In response to a question by Alderman Smith, Mr. Jenne stated that Weiner Street does not intersect Umstead Drive except on the official map. This is approximately where the bus turn-around is and the basketball court for Bolinwood Apartments. Alderman Cohen stated that there is a right-of-way there. Mr. Jenne stated that this is where state jurisdiction ends. ALDERMAN COHEN MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GARDNER TO ADOPT AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 21-11 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL. Alderman Howes stated that this situation reminds him of the Thoroughfare Plan with one of its specific concerns being the ultimate realignment of the intersection of Umstead Drive with Airport Road. He stated that the State should be forced to address this problem, in light of the potential dangers, as much as they may dislike it. He stated that there is some simple, although expensive, solution to this problem. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 21-11 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that Section 21-11, "Speed Regulations," of the Code of Ordinances, Town of Chapel Hill, be amended as follows:

DELETE from subsection (3) the line

(k) Umstead Drive (SR 1761) from Airport Road (NC 86) to Weiner Street.

ADD to subsection (2) the line

(c) Umstead Drive from Airport Road (NC 86) to Estes Drive Extension.

Section II

This ordinance shall become effective upon adoption by the Board of Transportation of a concurring ordinance for the portion of Umstead Drive between NC 86 and Weiner Street, and the erection of signs giving notice of the authorized speed.

Section III

All ordinances and portions of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

This the 9th day of February, 1976.

No Parking Zone - Westwood Drive

Town Manager Jenne stated that these ordinances are in response to a

number of inquiries from the citizens in the area. The Planning Department, Public Works and the Police Department undertook a thorough study of the area. Some administrative actions have been taken to alleviate the situation. Before the Board now are two amendments to the Code of Ordinances to temporarily rectify the situation until the ultimate long range capital improvements are completed. ALDERMAN GARDNER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN COHEN, THAT AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 21-27 CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL (NO PARKING ZONE: WESTWOOD DRIVE), BE ADOPTED. In response to Alderman Gardner, Mr. Jenne stated that the residents have been contacted by way of response to direct inquiries. Also in response to Alderman Gardner, Alderman Cohen stated that when the study was made on Westwood last year, the only area without parking was on the opposite end of the circle. Alderman Silver stated that this area represents free parking for the University campus so the residents are not the ones that are inconvenienced. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 21-27, CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL (NO PARKING ZONE: WESTWOOD DRIVE)

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Aldermen, Town of Chapel Hill, that Section 21-27, "No Parking as to particular streets," of the Code of Ordinances, Town of Chapel Hill, be amended as follows:

Add the lines

Street	Side	From	To
Westwood Drive	Outside of Loop	Columbia Street south entrance	100 feet from Columbia Street (south side)

Section II

All ordinances and portions of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

This the 9th day of February, 1976.

One-Way Street - Portion of Coolidge Avenue

ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN VICKERY, THAT AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 21-10, CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL ("ONE-WAY STREETS"), BE ADOPTED. Alderman Silver stated that he had spoken to several residents on Coolidge Street who were concerned about the solution of making the traffic, on Collidge Street, one way. There is a certain amount of right turning from Coolidge Street onto Pittsboro Road. Everyone recognizes this as a dangerous turn in either direction, however this solution, which is to make the street one-way means that anyone who is coming from Coolidge Street and wants to go to the bypass, would have to go approximately an extra quarter of a mile or more in order to get back down and around. He stated that the few residents he talked to stated that they had not heard of this proposal before. He questioned Town Manager Jenne as to whether the residents of the street had been contacted. Mr. Jenne responded that they had not been contacted as such, however the direct inquiries were responded to and recommendations were made known. He had not received any comments on the solution. He stated that he did not like the use of one-way streets as a solution to traffic problems in general, however, this problem has been the subject of many long range complaints as well as recent inquiries. This intersection, which is on a decending hill and around a curve provides no traction as this part of the road is unpaved. The pros and cons were weighed and it is believed that this solution is best in terms of a short term solution to prevent the possibility of mishaps until such time as long term capital improvements are implemented. This solution arose from a concern for safety rather than convenience. Alderman Silver stated that the residents he spoke with suggested the alternative of a No Left Turn sign on an interim basis. Mr. Jenne stated that it is true that left turn is more dangerous because it is an awkward movement, however, there are other problems to be concerned with here. Alderman Vickery stated that it is Town policy to contact residents when a street is being changed from two-way to one-way. Alderman Cohen stated that this had been general policy on Ghimghoal Road and McDade. Mr. Jenne stated that this is a different situation as no one lives on the street in question. Alderman Cohen stated that quite a few residents

live behind the street. Alderman Silver stated that he only talked with a few residents and they may or may not represent everyone involved. If the alternative of a No Left Turn sign is not accepted then he suggested that this matter be postponed so that the residents can be contacted by the Streets and Public Safety Committee. It was the consensus of the Board that this be done.

Unloading and Loading of Delivery Vehicles, NCNB Plaza - Ordinance

Mayor Wallace read the proposed ordinance. Discussion of this matter centered around enforcement of illegal parking all over town as well as on Rosemary Street. Alderman Marshall stated that the biggest problem seems to be with the Post Office and the United Parcel Service who seem to feel they are immune to illegal parking violations. She also suggested walking policemen on Rosemary Street to help alleviate the traffic problem before ticketing and towing become necessary. ON MOTION BY ALDERMAN HOWES, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GARDNER, AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 21-35 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL, WAS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED.

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 21-35 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL.

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Aldermen, Town of Chapel Hill, that Section 21-35 of the Code of Ordinances, "Loading & unloading of Delivery Vehicles," be amended to add a new sub-section (1) to read as follows:

- (1) The space along the curb on the south side of E. Rosemary Street described as: Beginning at a point 370 feet east of the east curb line of N. Columbia Street at its intersection with Rosemary Street, continuing to a point 410 feet east of said intersection; with no parking allowed at any time except for loading and unloading.

Section II

All ordinances and portions of ordinances in **conflict** herewith are hereby repealed.

This the 9th day of February 1976.

No Parking Zones, West Rosemary Street and Pittsboro Street - Ordinance

ALDERMAN COHEN MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SMITH, THAT AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 21-27 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL (NO PARKING AS TO PARTICULAR STREETS), BE ADOPTED. Alderman Silver stated that the No Parking signs along Pittsboro Street are ambiguous and he suggested that someone involved in public safety look into this. Alderman Smith suggested yellow curb painting as a solution to this problem. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED. Alderman Cohen asked that an ordinance be prepared including the affected areas as tow zones. Mayor Wallace instructed the Manager to look into this.

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 21-27 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE TOWN OF CHAPEL HILL (NO PARKING AS TO PARTICULAR STREETS)

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that Section 21-27, "No parking as to particular streets" of the Code of Ordinances, Town of Chapel Hill be amended as follows:

DELETE

<u>Street</u>	<u>Side</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Rosemary Street	N	Roberson Street	70 Feet East of Roberson Street

ADD

Rosemary Street	N	Roberson Street	170 Feet East of Roberson Street
Pittsboro Street	W	30 Feet South of the S Driveway to the State Employees Credit Union	30 Feet North of the N Driveway to the State Employees Credit Union

Section II

All ordinances and portions of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

This the 9th day of February, 1976.

Street Paving Projects in the Morgan Creek and Elkin Hills Areas

Town Manager Jenne gave background information and details of the street paving projects in the Morgan Creek and Elkin Hills areas. He stated that over the last several years, residents of the Morgan Creek area have sent in petitions to have their streets paved. The petitions vary in the time they came in, the assessment at the time they came in and whether curb and gutter was wanted or not. Additionally, Mr. Jenne stated, last spring when the Board reviewed the budget, it decided to allocate certain funds to paving of unpaved streets that are now on bus routes in order that this be put on the question of the November 4th referendum. The question was put on an ultimately passed. The Town now has bond authorization to pave several of these streets both in the Morgan Creek area and the Elkin Hill area. Both in Elkin Hills and Morgan Creek, in regard to the streets on bus routes that need paving, the staff felt that it needed to consider existing street systems in order to determine what the best method of paving would be to keep the system consistent with regard to curb and gutter, alignment and the like. In the Morgan Creek area, knowing there were a number of petitions, the staff felt that in addition to physical uniformity, it needed to look at what the Town did have in terms of authority to pave the streets and under what terms and conditions they might be paved. After looking at this situation, it became apparent that two policy decisions were needed from the Board in regard to engineering, gathering the necessary materials, announcement of acceptance of petitions, and preliminary assessment. In Morgan Creek, a number of valid petitions have been received citing assessment of \$6.00 a front foot, from Kings Mill, and an invalid petition on Woodbine from Coker to Manning also at \$6.00 a front foot. This petition is invalid because part of the residents petitioned without curb and gutter. All of these residents are required on one petition, with or without curb and gutter, in order to have a valid petition.

It is Board policy, at the present, that anything over 4% grade be curb and gutter. There are spots in this street network that are over 4% grade. Upon investigation, the staff came to the conclusion that it could be handled in its entirety without curb and gutter from an engineering standpoint. This would maintain uniformity in the streets in question and would allow the petitions that are already in, to be treated with as much equity as possible. Therefore, Mr. Jenne stated, the staff recommends that the Board, in this case, waive the policy requirement and that the staff be authorized to go ahead with the engineering on the basis of all street networks being done without curb and gutter.

The second policy consideration is the matter of assessment. There are a number of petitions in at the previous rate of \$6.00 a front foot. The one invalid petition that the staff feels was submitted in good faith, also at \$6.00 a front foot, was never responded to by the Town and will have to be resubmitted. There are also several streets that the Board has already essentially decided should be paved for the purpose of public safety. The staff recommends that the petitions that are already in including the invalid one, be accepted in the future at the rate prevailing at the time they were submitted in good faith. With regard to the streets to be paved for public safety purposes, the staff recommends that these streets be assessed at the current rate of 50%. The staff also feels that instead of waiting to receive petitions on these streets, that the Board exercise its statutory method of determination that the street should be paved because of public safety and proceed with the engineering and assessment. The staff recommends this action because it feels that to pave the street without assessment would not, in the long run, be equitable in that a bus route may change.

In response to questions by Alderman Howes concerning assessments, it was pointed out that the 50% assessment is 50% of the project cost and is allocated to property owners on a front foot basis costed out at about \$30 a foot (\$7.50 to each property owner). At the time the assessment rate was set at \$6.00 a front foot, this equalled approxi-

mately one half the project cost. Inflation, however, made this figure less than adequate so the Board changed the rate. In response to a question by Alderman Silver, Mr. Jenne stated that the use of cash or bonds does not make any difference to the actual assessment. The money is needed on time to do the work. Whether it comes from cash or from bonds is where the difference lies. Alderman Vickery stated that if a street is paved in the interest of public safety or in response to citizens, if it happens to be on a bus route, the citizens should have to pay only the normal cost of paving as if the street were not on a bus route and the Town should bear the incremental cost of restructuring or making the streets heavier as a result of being on a bus route. Mr. Jenne responded that current streets standards are the same for both streets that are on bus routes and streets that are not. Some existing streets, paved years ago, were paved on a substandard basis. Alderman Vickery stated that it puzzles him that the Board is bound to honor the petitions at the \$6.00 rate if the lengthy procedure is the reason for the delay even though the Code Book now shows a rate of several times higher. Mr. Jenne responded that the Board is not bound to accept them. The delay was not due to the length of processing, but a lack of funds from budget year to budget year. This is one of the issues being addressed in the Capital Improvements Program as one of the advantages of having available bond money to respond in time and fashion to petitions that come in at a certain expected rate, so that the Town can go ahead and take action before the rate triples due to inflation. Alderman Vickery stated that in the interest of logical consistency, citizens be approached on the basis of proceeding with the paving provided they are willing to pay the actual cost of paving at the time the public hearing and all the procedures are approved. This is logical in the sense that if projects are detained, other citizens can complain that they have been wronged. He suggested that instead of approving the petitions at \$6.00, the Board follow the recommended procedure of half the actual paving cost. Alderman Cohen stated that when the Board discussed this six months ago, the rate was \$6.00. The Board decided to carry on with street paving projects and the cost had gone up to such a level that the Board started the process to amend the ordinance to reflect the original goal of the \$6.00 which was approximately 50% of the cost. This was done on the basis that the general community gains some benefit as well as the local residents in the division of cost. The petitions in question, came in, in correct format, prior to the time the ordinance was amended. The Board decided that since the residents had, in effect, complied with the ordinance at the time the petitions were submitted, that the Board would honor the petitions at \$6.00 a front foot throughout the entire project. Any future petitions will be at 50% of the cost. He stated that obviously the Board can change its mind but he feels that these petitions should be accepted as they are. Alderman Marshall stated that she also feels that the petitions should be honored at the \$6.00 rate. She stated that she questions the 4% grade and the curb and gutter. The Board is continually finding that the 4% grade criteria is not the useful criteria in requiring curb and gutter. Perhaps the Planning Board could look into this and make suggestions. Mayor Wallace concurred that this should not go on. In response to a question by Alderman Cohen, Mr. Jenne stated that the staff recommends that the Woodbine petition be accepted at \$6.00 a front foot because it was submitted in good faith through some break in communication. He stated that he felt sure that the petition would be re-submitted to be a valid one. Alderman Gardner stated that the Town encourages the people to come forth with petitions for paving partly because of the low mileage of unpaved streets in the community. There are only four property owners on Ward and Weiner Streets. The corner property owners have already been assessed for Severin Street for property frontage so they will incur a heavy total assessment. The bus service, as it now runs comes down Barclay Road to Ward Street, makes a left turn, makes another left turn on Severin and another left turn on Weiner, goes back over to Barclay Road on back down Barclay. The residents from the Weiner Street intersection on Severin Street, out to Bradley Road, are not served by the bus system. The bus, rather than looping back over Weiner Street, could go on down Severin Street, on a paved street and be made available to more people. He stated that he had contacted residents on both streets in relation to the recommendation made by the Manager, implementing the Session Laws of 1971, Chapter 227. In view of the fact that the previous Board made the decision to commit itself, ALDERMAN VICKERY MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN GARDNER TO AUTHORIZE THE MANAGER TO PROCEED WITH THIS LEVEL OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE SUB-

MITTED PETITIONS. For clarification, Alderman Gardner stated this pertains only to those streets that have already submitted valid petitions plus Woodbine. Mr. Jenne stated that the action needed here only deals with the physical nature of improvements. He stated that he needs policy guidance in terms of waiving the 4% grade requirements and allowing all approved projects listed in Morgan Creek and Elkin Hill areas to be engineered without curb and gutter, making no reference to rate. Alderman Vickery withdrew his motion with the consent of Alderman Gardner. ALDERMAN VICKERY MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SILVER, TO APPROVE THE EXISTING TWO VALID PETITIONS FOR COKER DRIVE FROM MANNING DRIVE TO KINGS MILL AND FOR KINGS MILL ROAD FROM ITS EXISTING PAVEMENT TO LAUREL HILL, AND WOODBINE DRIVE FROM COKER TO MANNING, PROVIDED A VALID PETITION BE RECEIVED, AT A RATE OF \$6.00 A FRONT FOOT AND THAT THE BOARD ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE MANAGER TO PERFORM ALL OF THE SCHEDULED STREET CONSTRUCTION WITH EXISTING PAVED PORTIONS OF THE TWO STREET NETWORKS. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

After ascertaining that no Board member had any objections, Mayor Wallace recognized Mr. Vernon Sykes who resides on the northeast corner of Severin Street and Weiner Street. He stated that he felt like he is being assessed a double duty to have to pay taxes to support the Chapel Hill Transit System and then to have to pay to have the street paved for the bus to run on. He stated that the buses heretofore have torn the street up and the Town is constantly having to send someone over there to fill the holes with Chapel Hill gravel. He stated that approximately 2 1/2 feet had been taken off of the front of his yard to widen the street and put a proper drainage ditch which has not solved the problem. Buses making the left turn off of Severin onto Weiner put the wheels on the right side of the bus into the drainage ditch until they have to swerve to miss a power pole and then go back into the ditch. He stated that he had called to complain about this. He stated that the road is not holding up under the buses like it is. If the road is paved without curb and gutter, the shoulders of the road are not going to hold up and it is going to cost the Town a lot of money to keep coming out there to build the shoulders back up. He stated that he feels that this is a waste of money. He suggested as a cheaper, easier alternative, diverting the bus down Severin Street and giving the people on that end of Severin Street and Bradley Road service instead of providing double service on Barclay. In response to Alderman Smith, Mr. Sykes stated that he would not be opposed to paving the road without curb and gutter if the buses are rerouted. In response to Alderman Howes, Mr. Sykes stated that if the bus is rerouted, there is really no need for paving at all. Only one house is served off of Weiner Street, that of Dr. Cobb. He can come in off Severin. The other three property owners have access off of Barclay Road or Severin Drive. He stated that once before he and his neighbors had tried to get Weiner Street paved. They were told that there was no need for paving the street. Now that the buses are running down the street, the Town wants to pave it. Alderman Vickery stated that this is a very useful discussion as it will come back in great force when the CIP is considered as there are a number of miles of paving and gravel streets being proposed there. He suggested that the Manager, Public Works and the head of Transportation Department, investigate the gains and losses to the Town from having difference in quality standards for bus and non-bus routes, especially in areas that have high grades. He stated that he would like to have some evaluation of this before the Board takes action on this matter or the CIP. He stated that he would also like the Manager to indicate what would seem to be a more fair sharing of the cost between the cost that would normally be born by property owners as part of normal street paving operations and those that should be contributable to operation of buses. In response to Alderman Silver, Mr. Jenne stated that the suggestion of the bus going down Severin Street had not come up before in his department. Alderman Silver suggested that Weiner Street be temporarily deleted to give the Transportation Department time to look into this and make recommendations. Alderman Marshall stated it never made sense to her that the bus didn't go down Severin Street. She stated that she is very much concerned about paving for bus routes. Before the Town had buses, the Board tried to go back and start a program of reconstruction of streets not up to Town standards as an investment for the future. The increasing traffic in Town was going to break them down sooner or later. The only thing the buses have done is to break them down sooner. This had been Town policy for some time and the buses really have very little to do with it. Alderman Cohen stated that Weiner Street dead

ends a short distance beyond Severin Street. The amount of traffic in the section is small. Most of that traffic goes out Barclay rather than Severin. He stated that he also would like to defer this until it can be looked into further. If the buses are rerouted, then Weiner Street would be low on the list of paving. ALDERMAN SILVER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES TO ACCEPT THE MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION TO PAVE THE SCHEDULED PORTIONS OF WARD, COKER AND LAUREL HILL, DELETING WEINER, IN ACCORD WITH SESSION LAWS 1971 - CHAPTER 227, AT THE 50% RATE WITHOUT PETITION. Mr. Jenne stated that all that is needed is policy guidance on this matter. Actual determination will be made formally in a later session. Alderman Smith stated that he feels that one of the reasons that buses don't come down Severin is the intersection of Bradley and Severin. The bus would have to come back up the hill to Barclay or down Bradley and out Umstead which is dangerous. He stated that he is not opposed to the motion as far as it goes. Mr. Jenne reiterated the fact that all he needs at this time is a notion of the Board's willingness to proceed under Session Laws 1971 - Chapter 227 in dealing with whatever streets that are paved. This will give the staff a chance to examine the bus situation and come back at a later date with specifics. Alderman Vickery stated that he is aware of studies that indicate that road damage is incrementally higher as a result of heavier vehicles. ALDERMAN SILVER AMENDED HIS MOTION TO INCLUDE PROCEEDING WITH SESSION LAWS 1971 - CHAPTER 227, WITH THE CONSENT OF ALDERMAN HOWES. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Paving of Pritchard Avenue Extension and W. Longview Street - Public Hearing

Mayor Wallace read the proposed Resolution Setting A Public Hearing On Assessment Roll for Paving Pritchard Avenue Extension And West Long View Street. ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN VICKERY THAT THE RESOLUTION SETTING PUBLIC HEARING ON ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR PAVING PRITCHARD AVENUE EXTENSION AND WEST LONG VIEW STREET, BE ADOPTED. Alderman Cohen stated that the area is entirely rental property and he suggested that notice of the hearing be sent to the tenants in addition to the absentee property owners, because their rent will reflect the assessment. Alderman Smith stated that there are a lot of children in this area and there are no sidewalks for them to come out on. He asked if there is any anticipation of sidewalks in this project. Town Manager Jenne responded that this project has already been completed but he stated that he believes that in the proposed Capital Improvements Program, there is consideration of a sidewalk on Pritchard, but it is separate. In response to a question by Alderman Gardner, Mr. Jenne stated that there is no sidewalk there now however grading provisions be made for sidewalks during street construction, but it was not paved during construction of the street. Alderman Cohen suggested that since there are only seven or eight resident tenants in the area that notice of the public hearing be put on their doorsteps. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A RESOLUTION SETTING PUBLIC HEARING ON ASSESSMENT ROLL FOR PAVING PRITCHARD AVENUE EXTENSION AND WEST LONG VIEW STREET

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill that a public hearing is hereby called on the proposed assessment roll for the paving of Pritchard Avenue Extension and West Long View Street for 7:30 o'clock p.m. on March 8, 1976 in the Municipal Building of the Town of Chapel Hill. A copy of said assessment roll shall be filed in the Offices of the Town Clerk where it shall be available for public inspection, and a copy of the Notice of the public hearing shall be published at least ten (10) days before the date set for said hearing, and a copy thereof together with Notice of the public hearing shall be mailed to all property owners.

This the 9th day of February, 1976.

Tax Lien Sale

ALDERMAN SMITH MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN VICKERY TO SET THE DATE FOR A TAX LIEN SALE ON JUNE 14, 1976. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Tax Releases - Resolution

Alderman Cohen stated that the first larger item on the list of tax releases is Shephard Lane Apartments. In response to a question by Alderman Smith, Tax Collector Roberts stated that Mr. Ben Armfield originally sent his tax list in before the deadline date of January 31, 1976. There was a mistake in his listing and it was sent back to

him. He made the necessary corrections and sent it back in, however this time it was late resulting in a late listing charge. In light of the fact that the original listing was sent in prior to the deadline date, the County released the late penalty and accordingly the Town wishes to do so also. ALDERMAN HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN SMITH THAT THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING TAX RELEASES, BE ADOPTED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

RESOLUTION - TAX RELEASES

WHEREAS taxes listed were erroneously levied through clerical error on properties belonging to the following:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REC. #</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>REASON</u>
Louis L. Vine	7260	\$1,551.72	Settlement before hearing of appeal to Property Tax Commission by County Commission. Reduced valuation from 1,187,700 to 1,026,900.
William Sutherland	6876	29.40	Personal property was located at Estes Park on Jan. 1, 75.
Paula Camp	1053	25.74	Personal property was listed at 2580 should be 155. Car was listed in Roberson Co.
Karen Creasman	9194	15.12	Personal property was listed at 2510 should be 1085. Car was listed in Connecticut.
Madeline T. Patterson	5487	45.60	Sewer was charged on wrong property.
Ben Wade Armfield	162	24.34	Release late list. Listed on time by mail, abstract returned for correction.
Elizabeth A. Lackey	4042	36.62	Personal property listed as 3715, should have been 265. Did not own a car as of Jan. 1, 1975.
Estelle E. Atwater	206	2.41	Double listed also listed in the name of Stella Atwater.
Clarice Griffith	2764	45.60	Was charged in error for three units, only had two.
W. D. Perry	5626	318.45	State Board of Assessment reduced valuation from 195,800 to 162,800.

WHEREAS, the above list of persons have made application for release of said taxes:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill, that it finds the taxes on the above listed persons were levied through clerical error, and in the discretion of the Board should be released to the taxpayer. IT BEING FURTHER RESOLVED that the Tax Collector is authorized and empowered to make such release.

This the 9th day of February.

Tax Refunds - Resolution

ALDERMAN GARDNER MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES THAT THE RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING TAX REFUNDS, BE ADOPTED. Alderman Cohen stated that he had attended the Commissioners meeting at which the assessments were set. The Ghinghoal and Coker properties were two of the properties where there was the largest discrepancy in the Town between assessment and value. The Commissioners increased the value and assessment by about 300 or 400%. The State Board of Adjustments did grant the County Commissioners most of the increase they requested. This refund is resultant of a reassessment of properties between evaluation times. THE MOTION WAS CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RESOLUTION - TAX REFUNDS

WHEREAS, taxes listed below were erroneously levied and collected through clerical error on properties belonging to the following:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REC. #</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>REASON</u>
Claude M. Weil	7447	\$ 15.20	Personal property listed at 4275, should be 2700. 1972 car listed and priced incorrectly.
Paul G. Carr	992 (73) 992 (74) 1120 (75)	36.00 45.60 45.60	We have charged Mr. Carr for 2 units. House has only 1 unit.
W. C. Coker	1364	395.65	The State Board of Assessment reduced value from 236,600 to 195,600 (Pd. 12-23-75).
Order of Gimghouls	8786	563.56	The State Board of Assessment reduced value from 327,600 to 269,200 (Pd. 12-29-75).

WHEREAS, the above listed persons have made application for refund of said taxes;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the Town of Chapel Hill, that it finds that taxes on the above listed persons were levied and collected through clerical error, and in the discretion of the Board should be refunded to the taxpayer, IT BEING FURTHER RESOLVED that the Tax Collector if authorized and empowered to make such refund.

This the 9th day of February, 1976.

Bus Radio Equipment

ALDERMAN HOWES MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN VICKERY THAT THE LOW BID FROM GENERAL ELECTRIC CO., IN RALEIGH, N.C. OF \$27,584.00 FOR SEVENTEEN BUS RADIOS, ONE BASE STATION, TWO SUPERVISOR'S RADIOS AND RELATED EQUIPMENT, WITH DELIVERY IN 105 DAYS, BE ACCEPTED AND THAT GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY BE AWARDED THE CONTRACT. Town Manager Jenne assured Alderman Silver that the equipment does meet the required specifications. He also stated, in response to Alderman Smith, that he did not know why there is such a long delivery time. Alderman Smith requested that the Manager look into getting the equipment sooner. In response to a question by Alderman Vickery, Mr. Jenne stated that there will be no abnormal costs imposed as a result of this late delivery date. It will mean a delay in bus service to the handicapped and the elderly. Since the service will not be in effect, no money is being spent for it. On the other hand, the citizens are not receiving the benefits of the service. In response to Alderman Gardner, John Pappas, Transportation Director, stated that there will be direct radio communication from the dispatcher to bus vehicles and provisions for a channel from the supervisor's cars to the vehicles. There will be no interbus communication. Alderman Gardner was concerned with the \$10,000 increase in the cost provisions in the original capital grant application and the amended one. It was pointed out that the difference to the Town will be 20% of the actual price. UMTA has encouraged the Town to incur the cost of a good quality radio. Other line items in the grant are being gradually zeroed out. UMTA has approved and encouraged the Town to order the equipment according to the required specifications, even though the cost is more than was estimated in the grant budget two and one half years ago. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Diesel Engine, 1962 American La France Fire Truck - Bids

Town Manager Jenne stated that this was placed on the agenda because of the urgency of the situation. The down fire truck is a primary truck and not a back up. In looking at the pros and cons of repairing the gasoline engine, both in long term benefits and immediate operation efficiency and life expectancy, the staff believes it will

be best to repower the vehicle with a diesel engine. Mr. Jenne stated bids were opened earlier that day and had been received from Cummins Carolinas, Inc. for \$6,300.00 and Miller Truck sales and service for 87,875.00. The Manager recommends the low bid of \$6,300.00 from Cummins Carolinas. He stated that he feels it should be mentioned that currently, in terms of line items in the Fire Department budget, the engine was not budgeted for. The Department made the decision, when discussing this year's budget, that the present engine could last one more year, however, it has not. There are not funds in the Department to cover it. ALDERMAN VICKERY MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES TO ACCEPT THE LOW BID FROM CUMMING CAROLINAS, INC., IN GREENSBORO, N.C., OF \$6,300.00 FOR ONE DIESEL ENGINE WITH INSTALLATION IN THE AMERICAN LA FRANCE FIRE TRUCK, WITH DELIVERY IN FOUR WEEKS, BE ACCEPTED AND THAT CUMMINS CAROLINAS, INC. BE AWARDED THE CONTRACT. In response to a question by Alderman Smith concerning installation, Mr. Jenne stated that the truck will be sent to Cummins Carolinas, Inc., for installation. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Report on Principles of Bus Service Extension Into Carrboro

Terry Lathrop, Chairman of the Transportation Board stated that several weeks ago, the Board authorized a small negotiating committee to meet with representative from Carrboro to discuss the conditions under which service could be extended into Carrboro. These meetings have been the subject of considerable publicity and comment and for this reason it was felt that as a matter of clarification and communication with the Board of Aldermen, the principles being pursued be discussed. Mr. Lathrop stated that the apparent need for this communication of principles became apparent last week, therefore the following memo was drawn up entirely by him. The Transportation Board did meet but failed to form a quorum. The members that were present reviewed the memo and came up with a change. Mr. Lathrop read and explained as he went along the following memo:

Your concurrence is needed in the general principles of the approach we are taking in our negotiations with the Town of Carrboro.

We are observing several objectives in our efforts:

1. That citizens of both communities be treated equitably.
2. That the relationship of the Transportation Board to the Board of Aldermen in Chapel Hill be honored without requirement for change based on extension of direct service to Carrboro residents.
3. That administrative "overhead" be held to an absolute minimum.

We envision the relationship with Carrboro as founded on six basic ideas:

1. Carrboro will make a monetary contribution to the cost of the total system. Annual requirements for Non-operating Revenue will be shared on the basis of the ratio of the Town's respective tax scrolls, presented in a proposed budget to the two Boards and subject to (a) income from the farebox, (b) income from pass sales (to individuals or to bulk purchasers, such as the University), and (c) state or dereral assistance (operating or capital). This basis for sharing of non-operating revenue requirements appears to represent an equitable distribution of system costs based on incremental costs of adding service to Carrboro and on the costs of providing a level of service consistent with anticipated demand in Carrboro. Obviously it is in the interest of all parties concerned to keep the requirement for non-operating revenues at a minimum.

Capital costs might be shared with a lump sum buy-in, followed by equitable participation in all future capital pruchases, or by an annual payment to Chapel Hill, by Carrboro, representing a reasonable and equitable share of the annualized cost of capital during the particular year.

2. As is the case with the system in Chapel Hill now, the majority of day-to-day operating decisions will be left to the Transportation Department staff and to the Transportation Board in accord with its charges by ordinance.

206

3. Carrboro will have representatives on the Transportation Board, generally in proportion to their financial participation in the system. Based on the current ratio of property values (approximately 84-16) the current nine members representing Chapel Hill would be supplemented with two Carrboro appointees.
4. Each of the two Boards of Aldermen would be required to approve their participation in the system annually through the budget mechanism. In effect, this would provide annual review. If either Town wished to terminate the agreement it could do so.
5. Operating and management personnel would continue to be employees of the Town of Chapel Hill under the direction of the Chapel Hill Town Manager. The Transportation Board would provide advice and counsel to the staff and manager in accord with its charge.
6. As the owner and operator of the system, the Town of Chapel Hill would have the responsibility for negotiating contracts with other agencies or entities. The Transportation Board would be represented in these negotiations by the Chairman, although the Chapel Hill Town Manager would be the primary negotiator as the legal representative of the final contractor.

Alderman Cohen brought forth two points about which the Carrboro people are concerned. They, he stated, object to the tense of the conception of Chapel Hill being owner of the bus system. It is felt that this is only present tense and should be communicated as such. Carrboro had discussed with their attorneys several methods to obtain proportional partnership such as acquiring additional buses and then transferring them to Chapel Hill. They raised the question of making an annual payment on the capital this year, having a bond issue next year and buying into the system. If they acquire buses through UMTA, grants or local bond issue, at some time they must have titles to the buses. Then those buses can be transferred to Chapel Hill and in return receive a proportional ownership of the entire system based on the value of the equipment transferred in. They felt that this proportional partnership will give them a feeling of participation. In addition to this, Carrboro wishes to have someone present at the negotiations with the University, strictly as an observer. Alderman Silver expressed the opinion that these requests were the end product rather than the beginning. The final agreement will spell these things out. Alderman Marshall stated that Mr. Lathrop saw this as a good conception of the principles being pursued for a few years, not perpetually. One of the problems is that Carrboro is projecting too far into the future before they participate in the system and learn the problems and the true issues. ALDERMAN MARSHALL MOVED TO ADOPT THE PRINCIPLES AS SET FORTH IN THE COMMUNICATION FROM TERRY LATHROP, TRANSPORTATION BOARD CHAIRMAN, WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THEY BE FOR THE NEXT FEW YEARS. ALDERMAN SILVER SECONDED THE MOTION. Alderman Cohen stated that in item no. 6 of the communication, rather than getting bogged down in negative connotations over irrelevant points, it is the intent of the Board that this be just for the next few years, then why not say this.

Alderman Vickery stated that Carrboro will have two members on the Transportation Board. There is nothing in the memo to prevent approval of the presence of an observer from Carrboro at the negotiations. There is a need for a feeling of good faith on the part of Carrboro. He stated that he is not proposing that Carrboro be included in the group negotiations, because they don't own assets. He stated that he wished to convey to the citizens that all is fair. Alderman Silver stated that this is getting ahead of the game. The Town of Chapel Hill is the present owner and operator and has the responsibility for negotiations. He stated that no one is inferring the negative by the adoption of these principles. This is a statement by which we endorse the negotiation team attitudes and principles. This is not a final contract. These points will come out later and will be argued out when the Town has something specific. This is far too general. Alderman Cohen stated that Carrboro did not approve these principles because they are too general. Alderman Silver stated that if the members of the Carrboro team have the concerns, then they should come before the Board of Aldermen or the Transportation Board with these complaints. Alderman Cohen suggested the word "present" be included in item no. 6. Alderman Smith stated that when Carrboro decided the method by which they will come into the system then these matters should be discussed.

Upon discussion of inclusion of the word "present" in item No. 6, grammar was discussed with several Board members expressing no objection to the word

"present" being included.

Alderman Marshall requested the Manager to respond to the possibility of observers being present at the negotiations, stating that he must be comfortable with whatever decision the Board makes. Town Manager Jenne responded that in all honesty he would not be very comfortable with observers in negotiations. He stated that he is not sure that it is not a contradiction to have someone observe and not comment. The system is a community system and negotiations will be for the good of the system, not for the good of the respective Towns or the University. He stated that it appears to him that through the Transportation Board, there will be representation by Carrboro. Alderman Cohen asked if the two Carrboro representatives will be added to the Transportation Board at the beginning of the process of negotiations or at the end. Mayor Wallace stated that negotiations will be carried on by the Manager and the Transportation Board Chairman. Alderman Silver stated that as soon as Carrboro makes a definite agreement, they may have representatives on the Transportation Board. He stated that he is for the betterment of a community-wide transportation system and any previous statement was not construed to place Carrboro in second place with regard to transportation in the community. Alderman Cohen stated that Carrboro will not sign a contract until they know what everything is. Mayor Wallace stated that this communication by Mr. Lathrop, in effect, is what everything will be. In response to Alderman Smith, Mr. Jenne stated that negotiations with the University will start so as to conclude not later than the middle of March. The University needs to know what its market will be and the Towns of Chapel Hill and Carrboro need to know the outcome in preparing actual operating budget. Alderman Smith stated that Carrboro should not have observers at negotiations until they commit themselves to come into the system. Carrboro can get the information from the Manager as well as the observer can get it. He stated that the Town also has a responsibility to tell Carrboro how it wants them to come in. Carrboro may not be able to meet the requirements that the Town sets down. Alderman Epting stated that he wished to take some exception with the tone of Alderman Smith's remark. There is no distrust expected or existing and he stated that Chapel Hill is doing the best it can to gather principles. Alderman Howes called for the question. Alderman Cohen asked Alderman Marshall if she would accept the inclusion of the word "present" in her motion. Alderman Marshall stated that she would call for the question as is. ALDERMAN COHEN MOVED, SECONDED BY ALDERMAN HOWES TO AMEND THE MOTION TO INCLUDE THE WORD "PRESENT" IN ITEM SIX OF THE SET OF PRINCIPLES IN QUESTION IN THE ORIGINAL MOTION. THE AMENDMENT FAILED BY A VOTE OF FIVE TO FOUR WITH ALDERMEN EPTING, HOWES, VICKERY AND COHEN SUPPORTING AND ALDERMEN SMITH, SILVER, GARDNER, MARSHALL AND MAYOR WALLACE OPPOSING. Alderman Silver stated that the reason that he voted against the amendment is that he feels that no inference should be read into this set of principles and he feels the word "present" does this. The future has to be open to negotiation. He stated that he gathers just such a connotation from the statements as they are. Alderman Cohen asked if the Board is saying that Carrboro cannot have representatives on the Transportation Board during negotiation procedures that lead up to a contract which will include them. Mayor Wallace stated that Chapel Hill obviously will have to have negotiations with Carrboro. Mr. Lathrop stated that by authority of the Board of Aldermen, three or four weeks ago, a negotiation team consisting of the Town Manager, Alderman Vickery, Alderman Cohen, himself and Mr. Pappas, Transportation Director as appropriate, was constituted. The Transportation Board itself meets publicly. He stated that he sees no way to provide any representation for Carrboro on the Transportation Board prior to some sort of agreement between the Town of Chapel Hill and Carrboro. Alderman Cohen stated that the Transportation Board would be represented in negotiations by its chairman and that would include Carrboro. Mr. Lathrop responded that this is true if they do in fact have representatives on the Transportation Board preceded by an agreement to join the system. Alderman Cohen stated when negotiations are taking place with the University, the Town is preparing a package for Carrboro to accept with the entire system. Mr. Lathrop stated that Carrboro has to make a decision as to whether they are going to participate or not. Specific budget questions can not be answered until sometime after negotiations with the University are complete. Carrboro should, in effect, not be allowed to wait until then to decide whether they like the looks of the system or not. Alderman Marshall stated that this open-ended type of negotiations, and Carrboro being a part of the negotiations or knowing what is going on is going to leave the Manager and the University in an untenable situation. Carrboro should decide whether it is going to be in or out. They should not be allowed to wait

until the decisions are made to decide whether the system is acceptable.
THE ORIGINAL MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

Report of Boards and Commissions Study

Alderman Vickery began by giving some clarifying points and passing out the final page which was left out of the packet when it was distributed. He stated that he consulted with several people, primarily Florry Glasser, Joe Nassif, Peg Parker, George Rogister, Marvin Silver, Chick White and Jake Wicker. It is indeed a very sensitive process to undo committees that exist right now. At the same time it is terribly important process to make Town operation much more efficient. This is why, he stated, he concluded the study with the recommendation to form yet another committee. A task force to do the things recommended in the report. He suggested that instead of taking action now, that the Board delay this matter until a later time and include it on an agenda at a work session or a meeting so that the Board can come forward with recommendations for the task force. Alderman Marshall requested the Manager to speak on the report. Town Manager Jenne made the following statement:

The recommendation, especially as it is stated, implies a call for a Charter Review Committee to determine whether the Town should adopt a Council/Committee form of government rather than the existing Council/Manager form.

I inter from the recommendations and report that the Manager would not have operating authority within legislative confines, but that the committee would; that the Manager would not be supplied the talent need for managing operations and otherwise serving the Board of Aldermen but that it would be provided outside of his authority; that the functional requirements which Boards, Commissions, and Committees, would serve are uniform and that the structure of the bodies should be uniform.

To the contrary, there appears to be several different functional needs for which several different forms of bodies have been created. Some of these I would see as the following:

Appeals Boards such as Zoning, Housing and Personnel to provide impartial review of administrative actions short of appeal to the courts. In these there is legislative involvement intended.

Special Boards such as Library, Recreation and Transportation with limited authority to set broad operating policy to relieve the Board of Aldermen of some detail but certainly not intended to become immersed in day-to-day operations.

Seperate Legal Bodies such as the Housing Authority, the Orange Water and Sewer Authority and Firemen's Relief with expressed statutory authorities in which the Board of Aldermen is not directly involved because it chooses to delegate that function.

Joint Boards such as the Council of Governments, Joint Use Council and the Intergovernmental Task Force on which the Board of Aldermen is represented to foster interjurisdictional coordination.

Advisory Boards such as the Appearance Commission and the Planning Board which as a matter of statute, ordinance or local legislative policy advised the Board of Aldermen on specified matters.

Aldermanic Committees such as the Streets and Public Safety Committee which primarily provides advance review of matters requiring legislative action by the Board of Aldermen, not on normal operating activities and decisions.

In sum, unless I misconstrue the recommendation or take it too literally, the course of action suggested seems to skip the important first step of defining the different substantive needs of the Board of Aldermen which can be fulfilled by a variety of kinds of bodies and does not address what I believe to be critical distinctions between the respective responsibilities and authorities of the Board of Aldermen and the Manager.

Mr. Jenne stated that he felt Alderman Vickery did a beautiful job of putting together the information but he felt concern about the inferences he received from the reading of it. He expressed the possibility that it could just be a matter of wording. Alderman Howes also commended Alderman Vickery on the study. He stated that as a former member of the Charter Commission and one who therefore ducked substantially the question of Boards and Commissions, he felt Alderman Vickery did, in far less time, what it took the Charter Commission a long time to decide it couldn't do. He stated that he also wants to associate himself, to a large extent, to some of the concerns expressed by the Manager particularly in reference to overall implications of creating the kind of commission suggested. He suggested that this report and the concerns expressed by the Manager deserve the kind of conversation that the Board intended to give it when Alderman Vickery was asked to prepare the report. He suggested that the Board take this up at a work session devoted to this matter on Monday night, March 1. Alderman Vickery stated in way of rebuttal that the talent bank is not intended as anything more than just a list of people with skills that the Board might draw from. He stated that item 1E of the report was intended as a "for instance" and he meant much more emphasis on things like item 1C where the Board requests input from Town employees, committee members and other knowledgeable citizens. He stated that there are a number of committees in each major program or department area of the Town that overlap. The Town must therefore seek the opinion of existing committee chairmen, committee members, previous people in the area, people at the Institute of Government who had experience in observing other cities. The Town also needs to seek the opinion of the Manager, Department heads and other Town employees of how the ideal relationship should be with respect to committees. He stated that there are just too many committees. Alderman Silver stated that he too feels that some time should be given to the discussion of this matter. He stated that a number of things need to be decided on, in particular the Manager's concerns. The Boards that warrant concern are the ones that help the Board of Aldermen do its business so that it can budget its time for the policy making decisions. Before the Board of Aldermen can get to the details, it needs to set down, very specifically, what kinds of functions the Board needs help in, in conducting its business as it has no legislative staff of its own. The details of how the Board gets along with the Manager and his operations so that everything is done in the best possible way, is the first thing that needs attention. In response to Alderman Marshall, Mr. Jenne stated that the Planning Board has on its agenda for its next meeting, discussion for recommendation on the Historic District and Historic Properties Ordinances. He stated that he had reviewed the staff comments and recommendations with the Planning Director. Alderman Marshall stated that the Planning Board and its operations should be addressed as the rest of this matter is addressed. She stated that she hates to get something up and change it right away. Mr. Jenne stated that he believed that Mr. Jennings and Alderman Vickery did have some discussion about this and that this contact is reflected in some of the thoughts of the Planning Board. Mayor Wallace stated that it is the consensus of the Board that this matter be considered at a later date.

There being no further business to come before the Board of Aldermen, said meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

James C. Wallace

 Mayor James C. Wallace

David B. Roberts

 Town Clerk, David B. Roberts