

CITY OF EDEN, N. C.

A special meeting of the City Council, City of Eden, was held on Thursday, December 28, 2000 at 5:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 338 West Stadium Drive. Those present for the meeting were as follows:

Mayor:	Philip K. Price
Mayor Pro Tem:	John E. Grogan
Council Members:	Ronald H. Reynolds
	Ronald L. Janney
	Christine H. Myott
	Garry Tudor
	William W. Rorrer
	C. H. Gover
Interim City Manager:	Jerry Cox
City Attorney:	Charles J. Nooe
Deputy City Clerk:	Sheralene Thompson

Representatives from staff:

Others:	Mrs. Marianne Aiken, Historic Preservation Commission, Mr. Don Moss, Director of Economic Development
---------	---

News Media:	Reid Baer, <u>Eden Daily News</u> , Leslie Brown, <u>Greensboro News and Record</u>
-------------	---

MEETING CONVENED:

Mayor Price called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

Consideration of use of funds of a Local Law Enforcement Grant for the purchase of in-car video recorders and a dual antenna radar:

The memorandum presented to Council that the Police Department has applied for and has received approval for a federal block grant in the amount of \$20,863. The money may be spent to purchase a "basic" police equipment for which we do not have budgeted funds.

In order to receive the funds, the city must provide a match in the amount of \$2,318.

Mayor Price called the public hearing and asked Police Chief, Gary Benthin, for comments.

Chief Benthin explained that the city had been issued a Federal Grant in the amount of \$20,863 and the city had agreed to put a \$2,318 matching amount. He explained that they were required to have a public hearing to receive comments concerning what the money should be spent for. He noted that there were seven (7) purpose areas that it could be spent within.

Mayor Price asked if there were any comments for or against this proposal. As there were no comments, he declared the public hearing closed.

A motion was made by Council Member Grogan seconded by Council Member Janney to approve this request.

Council Member Janney stated that they never did decide where that money was coming from. He asked if it was coming out of the Police Contingency or another budget.

Mayor Price replied that it would have to come out of the General Fund Contingency.

Action on the motion was as follows: All Council Members voted in favor of this motion. This motion carried.

Consideration of Appointments to Boards and Commissions:

It was determined by the Council to table the appointments until the January meeting.

A motion was made by Council Member Grogan seconded by Council Member Gover to table the Appointments to Boards and Commissions until the January Regular Meeting. All Council Members voted in favor of this motion. This motion carried.

Consideration of proposed replacement of Bridge No. 45 on SR 2282 over the Dan River (TIP Project B-3368):

Mayor Price noted that they have the information regarding what has been proposed and it had to do with modifying the bridge with historic types of lights.

Council Member Rorrer commented that it would be a shame to put “yellow” lights on that bridge.

Mrs. Aiken presented the Council with photographs of the old bridge, to give them an idea of what the original looked like. She pointed out the great historic significance of that area as it had the boat landing, the sluices, the fish traps, etc., and the old bridge itself had a very unusual arch design. Even in its day those arches were unusual and there are very few that have survived. She stated that they were magnificent from the river. Also she noted that it had solid paneled side walls, but the crowning feature were those ornamental lampposts and lights that went along the sides.

She stated that the bridge itself was narrow and unsafe and they all agreed that it needed replacing. She stated that the Preservation Commission had been working with the DOT and the State Historic Preservation office to be sure that the historical heritage associated with the bridge was recognized in the new bridge design. She stated that Mr. Jay McInnis was the project coordinator and he had been very cooperative. She stated that he had come up with a new side panel design with two rails above which would enable people to be able see off of the bridge. She stated that the lights were the main sticking point.

She explained that the DOT had first said the city would have to buy them, maintain them, pay for the power, and all they (DOT) would do would be to put in conduits where the wiring could go. She stated that the bill would be \$42,000 for 28 lights. She added that they had said that was the minimum to meet their standards. She stated that they disagreed and after much discussion the State Historic office intervened and miraculously, between them and the DOT, suddenly they have the offer of \$42,000 of free ornamental lampposts. She stated that all the city would have to do would be to provide electric power and maintenance.

Mrs. Aiken stated that Eden would then have a magnificent bridge, fully compatible and fully appropriate. She noted that the original proposal had the same old rails along the side, just a way to get from here to there and nothing more, (and now) the city would have a tremendous upgrade to the neighborhood, the Washington Street business center, and the city as a whole.

She stated that what this amounted to was the addition of a maximum of 28 new streetlights at a probable cost of less than the other streetlights in the city, because they would not be under a maintenance contract, just the electricity and an occasional light bulb. She stated that she had been trying to get more concrete information, which was very difficult during the holidays, but in talking with Mr. McInnis’s supervisor, she was beginning to think that those specifications of having 28 lights was more flexible than they were led to believe. She agreed that those yellow lights would not look well in ornamental lampposts, so if they were allowed to go ahead, they would see what they could do to reduce the cost as much as possible.

Mayor Price asked Council Member Rorrer if that answered his question about the lights to which he replied that he was really just making a statement. He stated that he thought that if it was the majority of the Council, they should go on record in opposition of the “yellow” lights.

Council Member Tudor and Mrs. Aiken both agreed with Council Member Rorrer. Council Member Myott pointed out that the white lights were less expensive.

A motion was made by Council Member Grogan seconded by Council Member Janney to accept the proposal, along with the recommendation that they have white lights rather than yellow.

The following agreement was presented:

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
AMONG
THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
AND
NORTH CAROLINA HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
FOR
THE REPLACEMENT OF BRIDGE NO. 45
ON SR 2282 OVER DAN RIVER,
ROCKINGHAM COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has determined that the replacement of Bridge No. 45 on SR 2282 over the Dan River in Rockingham County, North Carolina (the undertaking) will have an effect upon Bridge No. 45, a structure determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and has consulted with the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f); and

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) participated in the consultation and have been invited to concur in this Memorandum of Agreement;

WHEREAS, representatives of the City of Eden and the Eden Preservation Commission have participated in the consultation and have been invited to concur in this Memorandum of Agreement;

NOW, THEREFORE, FHWA and the North Carolina SHPO agree that the undertaking shall be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take in to account the effect of the undertaking on the historic property.

STIPULATIONS

FHWA will ensure that the following measures are carried out:

I. Recordation: Prior to the demolition of Bridge No. 45, NCDOT shall record the existing conditions of the bridge and its surroundings in accordance with a Historic Structures and Landscape Recordation Plan {Appendix A}. The written and photographic documentation will be deposited with the North Carolina Division of Archives and History/SHPO to be made part of the permanent statewide survey and iconographic collection.

II. Replacement Bridge Design: NCDOT will provide light posts and light fixtures on the new structure along the length of the bridge rails. The City of Eden will assume responsibility for maintaining the light fixtures and posts and for utility bills associated with the lights. Once NCDOT completes the preliminary general drawings for the structure that use a one-sided paneled bridge rail, then NCDOT shall consult with the North Carolina SHPO and the Eden Preservation Commission and allow each an opportunity to comment on the preliminary general structure plans

III. Dispute Resolution: Should the North Carolina SHPO object within thirty (30) days to any plans or documentation provided for review pursuant to this agreement, FHWA shall consult with the North Carolina SHPO to resolve the objection. If FHWA or the North Carolina SHPO determines that the objection cannot be resolved, FHWA shall forward all documentation relevant to the dispute to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council). Within thirty (30) days after receipt of all pertinent documentation, the Council will either:

- A. Provide FHWA with recommendations which FHWA will take into account in reaching a final decision regarding the dispute, or
- B. Notify FHWA that it will comment pursuant to 36 CFR Section 800.7(c) and proceed to comment. Any Council comment provided in response to such a request will be taken into account by FHWA in accordance with 36 CFR Section 800.7(c)(4) with reference to the subject of the dispute.

Any recommendation or comment provided by the Council will be understood to pertain only to the subject of the dispute; FHWA's responsibility to carry out all the actions under this agreement that are not the subject of the dispute will remain unchanged.

Execution of this Memorandum of Agreement by FHWA and the North Carolina SHPO, its subsequent filing with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and implementation of its terms evidence that FHWA has afforded the Council an opportunity to comment on the replacement of Bridge No. 45 on SR 2282 over the Dan River and its

effects on Bridge No.45, and that FHWA has taken into account the effects of the undertaking on the historic property.

APPENDIX A
Historic Structures and Landscape Recordation Plan
For the Replacement of Bridge No. 45 on SR 2282
Over the Dan River
Rockingham County, North Carolina
TIP No. B-3368, State Project No. 8.1511601
Federal Aid No. BRSTP-87(10)

Landscape

Site plan sketch of the existing conditions of Bridge No. 45.

Photographic Requirements

Selected photographic views of Bridge No. 45 as a whole, and views of the structure and its setting, including:

- ◆ Overall views of the structure (elevations and oblique views)
- ◆ Overall views of the project area, showing the relationship of the structure to its setting

Photographic Format

- ◆ Color slides (all views)
- ◆ 35 mm or larger black and white negatives (all views)
- ◆ Two (2) sets of the black and white contact sheets (all views)
- ◆ All processing to be done to archival standards
- ◆ All photographs and negatives to be labeled according to Division of Archives and History standards

Copies and Curation

One (1) set of all photographic documentation will be deposited with the North Carolina Division of Archives and History/State Historic Preservation Office to be made a permanent part of the statewide survey and iconographic collection. One (1) copy of the black and white contact sheets will be placed in NCDOT's files for the project in the Historic Architecture Section of the Project Development & Environmental Analysis Branch.

Council Member Gover pointed out that the most lights that he could count on the original bridge was eleven (11). He questioned that 28 lights were a lot of lights at 250 watts.

Mrs. Aiken agreed and that was bringing it up to regular highway standards. She stated that she really did not think that was appropriate in that situation.

Council Member Grogan suggested that they add that clause to the contract before they signed it, to be done with white lights. He asked the City Attorney if that could be done.

Mr. Nooe replied that they could do it, but he certainly would not recommend it if they wanted the lights and would just prefer white if they could get them. He noted that Federal Highway Standards would not be easy to change.

Mrs. Aiken stated that she would try her best to see that they would get white. She added that she did not think the State Historical office would go along with yellow lights.

Action on the motion was as follows: All Council Members voted in favor of this motion. This motion carried.

Consideration of approval of Performance Agreement – Gildan/USTex:

Council Member Grogan asked the City Attorney if he was satisfied with the agreement to which Mr. Nooe replied that he was.

A motion was made by Council Member Grogan seconded by Council Member Reynolds to approve this Performance Agreement (Draft 12182000). All Council Members voted in favor of this motion. This motion carried.

Discussion and action of the Receptionist Position:

Council Member Rorrer explained that he had asked for the item to be on the agenda. He stated that they have spent several thousands of dollars for nothing in the last few years. He stated that it was time to do away with the position and get the telephones like they should be.

Interim City Manager, Mr. Jerry Cox, stated that he had talked with Council Member Rorrer and there was technology available now for phone systems to have direct entry dial operation where numbers were listed separately and independently, and whether the Council felt that a Receptionist was needed out there to deal with the public and so forth. He stated that in the past as far as turnover, that position had been difficult. He stated that he thought that it was a legitimate issue to look at in terms that there was technology available. He noted that some organizations prefer to have someone in front of their business to greet people but he did not think it was an absolute requirement.

Council Member Rorrer stated that if he understood correctly, Mr. Cox would not be with the City of Eden long enough to undertake it to which Mr. Cox agreed. Council Member Rorrer asked if he wanted to tackle it, if the Council agreed to which Mr. Cox replied that he could get it started.

A motion was made by Council Member Rorrer seconded by Council Member Janney to instruct the City Manager to do away with the Receptionist Position and make whatever provisions necessary to take care of it. The position was vacant and now was the time to do it.

Council Member Myott asked that they explain again, what would happen when she dialed in.

Mr. Cox explained that due to improvement in telephone switches and the digital capacity, the term used was DID, Direct Inward Dial, where there would be a specific number for Finance Department, City Manager's Office, it gets published and people dial that listed number. They could also have what was called an Automated Attendant. There would be a central number that people could call into that would give information or a directory.

Council Member Myott commented that she did not like that.

Mr. Cox stated that it would be the decision of the Council, the technology was there and a lot of organizations did away with someone to sit and answer their telephone.

Council Member Janney stated that some cities and counties post all the numbers in groups and they just dial that number in. Council Member Grogan noted that the county (Rockingham) was like that.

Council Member Janney also noted that there was a system out there, if he called in and wanted to speak to the City Manager and did not know the number, he could say "City Manager" and it would automatically put him through.

Mr. Cox commented that it would be beneficial, if they wanted to explore the possibility, he would make a contact and see what options were available and come back to the January meeting with information.

Council Member Grogan noted that there was a system out there with an individual involved in answering the telephones, but that individual was trained to take information from the citizen, as to what their need was and it would be passed on to Department Heads and tracked. It would show how many phone calls they had, how quick it was answered and done. He noted that it was being used in Lynchburg and Roanoke, Virginia, and he had a CD on it that he could give Mr. Cox. He stated that this could be something to look at along that line, because they have all talked about calling in with things and getting responses back to the citizen. He stated that it was also a good measuring tool for the City Manager, as well as the City Council, in seeing how long it took to do such and such.

Council Member Tudor asked that they try to move ahead with the employment of a City Manager instead of piling this on Mr. Cox. He stated that they could attach that to the list of initial tasks that they assign the new City Manager coming on board. He noted that it did not sound like something that would be resolved in one meeting.

Council Member Grogan agreed but they could go ahead and ask Mr. Cox to contact the vendor about cost.

Council Member Gover commented that they currently had a bad system. He stated that the former employee told him that the job was monotonous and there was not enough to keep her busy. He stated that he also observed that the door opens every five minutes and there was cold air blowing in on her, (so) they would need to build a cubicle for whoever they put out there, and make that provision to spend that extra money, then when that person was out, they were putting someone who was supposed to be productive, to answering that phone, when that was absolutely not necessary.

Council Member Janney commented that the last two receptionists, before they left, told him the city was wasting its money, the job was not needed.

Mayor Price repeated that the motion was on the floor to eliminate this job and direct the City Manager gather information in regard to getting the machinery that would replace the direct dial and also to gather information on the system that Council Member Grogan mentioned.

Council Member Rorrer added that there was one thing they had not discussed. He stated that if anyone was concerned about citizens not knowing where to go when they come in, he suggested that they could cut a slide window into the Finance Department and someone could help them. Council Member Gover added that they could put all kinds of directions out there for them.

Mr. Cox commented that they could design a system that could ring back to someone to pick up. He stated that he knew that a lot of people get aggravated when they get caught in those loops...Council Member Myott stated that she could not stand that.

Council Member Grogan stated that he would rather have that than somebody just screening phone calls to which Council Member Gover and Janney agreed.

Action on the motion was as follows: Council Members Rorrer, Grogan, Gover, and Janney voted in favor of this motion. Council Members Myott, Tudor and Reynolds voted in opposition. This motion carried.

It was the consensus of Council to use a temporary receptionist until a system was in place.

Consideration of discussion of Personnel:

Council Member Rorrer stated that he would like to withdraw this item (which he requested) as Mr. Cox had already taken care of it.

Council Member Grogan thanked Mr. Cox for his action and Mayor Price acknowledged that he had made some very good decisions since he had been the city's Interim Manager.

Closed Session for discussion of personnel according to GS 143-318.11(a)(6):

A motion was made by Council Member Rorrer seconded by Council Member Janney to go into Closed Session for discussion of personnel according to GS 143-318.11(a)(6). All Council Members voted in favor of this motion. This motion carried.

Open Session:

A motion was made by Council Member Grogan seconded by Council Member Gover to return to Open Session. All Council Members voted in favor of this motion. This motion carried.

December 28, 2000 Special Meeting of the Eden City Council:

301

ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was made by Council Member Grogan seconded by Council Member Janney to adjourn. All Council Members voted in favor of this motion. This motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheralene S. Thompson
Deputy City Clerk

ATTEST:

Philip K. Price
Mayor