

**REGULAR MEETING**

**PRESENT:** Mayor Susan W. Kluttz, Presiding; Councilmen William (Bill) Burgin; William (Pete) Kennedy; Mark N. Lewis; City Manager, David W. Treme; City Attorney, F. Rivers Lawther, Jr.; and City Clerk, Myra B. Heard.

**ABSENT:** Mayor Pro Tem Paul B. Woodson, Jr.

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Kluttz at 4:00 p.m. The invocation was given by Councilman Burgin.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Mayor Kluttz led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States flag.

**RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

Mayor Kluttz recognized all visitors present.

**RECOGNITION OF O' CHARLEY'S**

Mayor Kluttz recognized Mr. Chris James, General Manager of O'Charley's, for O'Charley's donation of bullet-proof vests to law enforcement in Rowan County. She noted that three (3) vests were donated to the Salisbury Police Department and three (3) were donated to the Rowan County Sheriff's Department. Mayor Kluttz presented Mr. James a Certificate of Recognition and thanked him for the generous donation.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

(a) Approve Minutes of the regular meeting of July 5, 2006 and Special Meeting of July 7, 2006.

(b) Approve a correction to the approved Minutes of June 6, 2006 to add the proper Ordinance titles for Ordinances 2006-33, 2006-34, and 2006-35.

(c) Adopt a budget Ordinance amendment to the FY2006-2007 budget in the amount of \$26,634 to appropriate Justice Assistance Grant funds.

A N ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2006-2007 BUDGET ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA TO APPROPRIATE JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 21, Budget, at Page No. 118, and is known as Ordinance No. 2006-37.)

(d) Adopt a budget Ordinance amendment to the FY2006-2007 budget in the amount of \$82,384 to appropriate Methamphetamine Grant funds.

A N ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2006-2007 BUDGET ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA TO APPROPRIATE METHAMPHETAMINE GRANT.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 21, Budget, at Page No. 119, and is known as Ordinance No. 2006-38.)

(e) Approve closing Rutherford Street between Mocksville Avenue and Henderson Street Sunday, August 6, 2006 from 12:00 noon until 7:00 p.m. for the Rowan Regional Medical Center's Grand Opening Celebration of the new Emergency Department and Patient Tower.

(f) Approve closing North Main Street from Innes Street to Cemetery Street, West Council Street from Main Street to Jackson Street, North Jackson Street from Council Street to Cemetery Street, West Cemetery Street from Jackson Street to Church Street, North Church Street from Cemetery Street to Kerr Street, and West Kerr Street from Main Street to Church Street Thursday, August 3, 2006 from 5:00 p.m. until 11:00 p.m. for the Second Annual Giordana Crossroads Cycling Classic Bike Race.

(g) Approve closing South Shaver Street from Fisher Street to Bank Street Saturday, July 15, 2006 from 12:00 noon until 7:30 p.m. for the Grays Chapel FBH Church neighborhood outreach.

- (h) Approve the following group development site plans:
- G-11-06 Catawba College, 2300 West Innes Street
  - G-12-06 KMD Holdings, LLC, 1305 North Richard Street

Mayor Kluttz noted the following corrections to the draft Minutes of the July 5, 2006 meeting. On page 5, first sentence last paragraph, she noted that Glenn Ketner's address should be 121 East Kerr Street instead of 121 East Innes Street. On page 17, third sentence last paragraph, replace "she indicated that she supports the expansion of Grove Street but is concerned about the impact on Henderson Street" with "She indicated she supports the expansion of Grove Street. She is concerned about Henderson Street but noted it is almost a separate issue."

Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a **motion** to adopt the Consent Agenda with the noted corrections to the draft Minutes as presented. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

**ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR A PORTION OF Z-06-06, TO ESTABLISH ZONING FOR THE NEWLY ANNEXED AREAS – AREA 1 AND AREA 3**

(a) Mr. Preston Mitchell, Senior Planner, displayed an aerial map showing the annexation areas to be changed from Rowan County zoning to City zoning. He stated that the request affects only Annexation Area 1 - Airport Road and Area 3 - South Main Street, and that Annexation Area 2 - Cedar Springs Road has been placed on hold. He pointed out that large-scale annexation occurred within and outside the extra-territorial jurisdiction (ETJ) and the City has zoning jurisdiction up to the ETJ line. He noted that the zoning must be changed if the City annexes lands outside of the ETJ. Mr. Mitchell informed Council that the State requires the City to establish zoning districts on newly annexed lands within sixty (60) days of the effective date, which in this case is June 30, 2006.

Mr. Mitchell explained annexation as the physical growth of the City by extending its boundary lines. It is a multi-departmental decision that includes the Land Management (Planning and Development) Department and the Planning Department is tasked with proposing the appropriate zoning. He reviewed photographs of the areas in question. He stated that the County zoning for the entire area was primarily Commercial Business Industrial (CBI), which is consistent with the City's M-1 Light Industrial Zone and the other County zoning in the area is Mobile Home Park (MHP). He noted that the City zoning in the area surrounding the property is M-2 Heavy Industrial and M-1, except for two (2) mobile home communities.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the City is requesting the parcel of land behind Morgan's Carpet be rezoned from CBI to M-1 or from MHP to R-6A Multi-Family Residential District. He noted that there are several mobile homes behind Morgan's Carpet. This property was split zoned by the County, and City staff recommends it be rezoned to M-1. He added that the M-1 zoning would not make the mobile homes non-conforming and pointed out that the Zoning Administrator does not believe this is a designated mobile home park.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the objective of the City's Strategic Growth Plan is to allow for continued economic development while maintaining and enhancing the area's environment and quality of life. He indicated that he felt these annexations fall within the guidelines of the primary area of the Strategic Growth Plan and within the secondary area of the Vision 2020 Plan. He concluded by stating that the Planning Board recommends approval of the zoning districts and feels the changes are consistent with the City's Strategic Growth Plan and Vision 2020 Plan.

(b) Mayor Kluttz convened a public hearing, after due notice and advertisement thereof, to consider zoning map amendment portion of Z-06-06, to establish zoning for the newly annexed Area 1, Airport Rd. and Area 3, South Main Street.

There being no one present to speak to Council, Mayor Kluttz closed the public hearing.

Councilman Lewis stated that based on the fact that the City is required by the State to establish zoning and with the opportunity to rezone the properties and not create nonconformity, City Council hereby finds and determines that adoption of an Ordinance to establish City zoning on properties within Area 1 and Area 3 of the 2006 Statutory Annexations is consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Strategic Growth Plan and the Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan, and that adoption of the Ordinance is reasonable and in the public interest.

(c) Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to adopt an Ordinance amending the official zoning map of the City of Salisbury by establishing City zoning districts on the applicable properties described in the Ordinance. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP OF THE CITY OF SALISBURY, NORTH CAROLINA, BY ZONING APPROXIMATELY 82.5 ACRES ON MULTIPLE PARCELS LOCATED ALONG THE NORTH MARGIN OF SOUTH MAIN STREET, THE EAST MARGIN OF CEDAR SPRINGS ROAD, AND THE SOUTH MARGIN OF AIRPORT ROAD, IDENTIFIED AS THE FOLLOWING TAX MAPS AND PARCELS, FROM ROWAN COUNTY ZONING DISTRICTS TO CITY OF SALISBURY ZONING DISTRICTS.

(The above Ordinance is recorded in full in Ordinance Book No. 21, Budget, at Page Nos. 120-121, and is known as Ordinance No. 2006-39.)

## GROUP DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN G-13-06, LEATHERMAN DEVELOPMENT

Councilman Burgin indicated he needed to be excused from this item due to a conflict of interest.

Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a **motion** to excuse Councilman Burgin from deliberation. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion. Messrs. Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (3-0)

(a) Mr. David Phillips, Zoning Administrator, reviewed a proposal from Mr. John Leatherman for a development in the 300 block of Jake Alexander Boulevard West. He displayed a site plan for the proposed project and noted its location adjacent to South Main Street, the Rosemont Street neighborhood and Jake Alexander Boulevard. He indicated that the property is zoned B-1 Office Institutional with a General Development A (GDA) Overlay. He noted that any site improvement within the overlay must go through the group development process.

Mr. Phillips indicated that the proposal is for a sixty-nine (69) space parking area which is permitted in the B-1 District. He stated that the developer will meet all landscaping requirements and pointed out an existing fence running behind the subdivision, facing Rosemont Street. He indicated that there is existing landscaping along the fence but if it does not meet City Code, the developer has agreed to bring the landscaping up to Code.

Mr. Phillips referred to a small triangular piece of property at the back of the site and noted that it was originally attached to property fronting Rosemont Street. In February 2004, a portion was subdivided and combined with the larger commercial tract adjacent to the site. This left a small portion of property zoned R-8 combined with the B-1 property. He stated that staff has requested a condition be placed on approval of the site plan to require the small portion of R-8 be rezoned to B-1 with the GDA overlay. He noted that the property owner has petitioned for the rezoning and it has gone through the Planning Board, who recommends approval. He stated that because of the notification requirements the request will not come before Council until its August 1, 2006 meeting. Mr. Phillips stated that in order for the property owner to have future development, he will provide an access through the business park for use by fire trucks as required by the Fire Code.

Mr. Phillips informed Council that the site plan has gone through the Technical Review Committee and was presented to the Planning Board. By a vote of 9-1, the Planning Board recommended approval with the contingency that the small portion of property be rezoned to B-1 with the GDA overlay.

Councilman Lewis questioned the process of approving the site plan before the rezoning. Mr. Phillips stated that the site plan is contingent upon the rezoning and if the rezoning should not be approved then the group development approval would be void. Mr. Lewis clarified that Council is not approving any building plans with the site plan. Mr. Phillips confirmed that this is correct and stated that any future building or improvement will have to be approved by Council.

Councilman Kennedy asked Mr. Phillips about the landscaping requirements to separate R-8 zoning from B-1 zoning. Mr. Phillips explained that when the original group development was approved it was approved with an eight (8) foot landscape buffer instead of the required fifteen (15) foot buffer because the developer was installing a fence and cypress plantings along the property line to serve as the buffer.

(b) Mayor Kluttz opened the floor to receive public comment regarding group development site plan G-13-06, Leatherman Development.

Mr. Glenn Ketner, 121 East Kerr Street, stated that he represents Mr. John Leatherman, developer for this group development plan. He noted that this plan was initiated by staff and he and his client worked to solve a potential fire access issue. He stated that they are completely comfortable with staff's recommendation and understand it is subject to the GDA overlay and understand the contingency of the rezoning.

There being no one else to speak to Council regarding the group development site plan, Mayor Kluttz closed the public comment session.

(c) Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a **motion** to approve group development site plan G-13-06 located in the 300 block of Jake Alexander Boulevard, West. Mr. Lewis seconded the motion. Messrs. Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (3-0)

## REPORT ON GROUP DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN G-10-06 SALISBURY SHOPPING CENTER, LLC

Mr. Joe Morris, Planning and Community Development Manager, indicated that group development site plan G-10-06 was presented to Council at its last meeting. There were several concerns raised by Council during the discussion and staff was directed to meet with property owners and developers to address some of the issues. He noted that a meeting was held and in attendance were: Mr. Jeff Farmer, Jr. and Mr. Richard Finch, Spectra Group; Mr. Mike Kelly and Ms. Andrea Engleman, Kelly Properties, Inc.; Mr. Don Gibbs, engineer; Mr. Preston Mitchell, Senior Planner; Mr. David Phillips, Zoning Administrator; Mr. Patrick Ritchie, Engineer; Mr. Wendy Brindle, Traffic Engineer; and Mr. Morris.

Mr. Morris noted that during the meeting the issues of connectivity and the retaining wall were discussed. He stated that Mr. Farmer indicated he is willing to offer access across the property and has changed the site plan to show the access. He added that Mr. Farmer has also proposed to change the size and appearance of the wall.

Mr. Morris pointed out that during Council's meeting concerns were also expressed regarding the wetlands permit. He noted that the City's approval of the plan requires compliance to State and Federal laws related to wetlands, which are monitored by agencies outside of the City. He stated that the issuance of a development permit would be contingent upon acquisition of the appropriate permits from these agencies. Mr. Morris informed Council that staff received information from Arlington Properties, LLC contesting the validity of the current wetlands permit, but staff today received a permit from the Spectra Group signed and dated July 17, 2006.

Mr. David Phillips, Zoning Administrator, reviewed the site plan originally submitted and noted its location on Arlington Street and Freeland Drive and adjacent to I-85. He stated that the Spectra Group is now proposing a stub connection to the adjacent property along the property line parallel to I-85. He noted it has been moved in slightly from the property line because there is a slope in the bank on the property. Mr. Phillips stated that staff recommends placing notes on the approved site plan, one of which will clarify the connectivity and note that a connection will be allowed to the adjacent property.

Regarding the retaining wall, Mr. Phillips stated that the Spectra Group has agreed to lower the elevation of the site approximately three (3) feet. This will allow for a less intrusive retaining wall to be constructed. He stated that lowering the elevation from seven hundred twenty-one (721) feet to seven hundred eighteen (718) feet will cause the plan to coincide with the pre-development grading plan approved by Council in February 2005. He added that the plan approved at that time had an elevation of seven hundred seventeen (717) feet. Mr. Phillips informed Council that a note will be placed on the site plan regarding the retaining wall noting that the adjacent property owner will be allowed to backfill against the wall. With the reduction of the elevation of the site the retaining wall will also be lowered approximately three (3) feet. Mr. Phillips commented that the developer wishes to use the same style of wall as previously submitted but is willing to work with City staff to allow staff to coordinate colors and landscaping in order to make the modular wall more attractive.

Mr. Phillips informed Council that additional traffic studies are being performed but no information has been submitted to date.

Councilman Kennedy asked Mr. Phillips to explain where the stub-out for the connection is located on the site plan. Mr. Phillips noted that it is in the same area as the previous drive used for access to Curry Auto Parts which runs parallel to I-85.

Councilman Lewis asked about the elevation at the site of the proposed connection. Mr. Phillips stated that based on the information presented to staff, the site will be approximately seven hundred eighteen (718) feet at the property line. Mr. Lewis asked how this compares with the previously approved pre-grade approval for the entire site. Mr. Phillips noted that it is within approximately one (1) foot of the pre-grade approval. Mr. Lewis asked if a retaining wall will be placed at the property line. Mr. Phillips responded that no retaining wall is proposed for the connection site.

Mayor Klutz recognized Mr. Jeff Farmer, principal for the Spectra Group.

Mr. Farmer informed Council that he believes the resubmitted plan will take the retaining wall to the height of the wall previously approved as part of the grading plan and will use the same materials approved in the previous application. He noted that he feels by working with staff the beauty of the wall can be enhanced and he is confident the structure of the wall is sound.

Mr. Farmer indicated it was his understanding that the wetlands permits went with the land, but this issue was contested so his company went back to the Corp of Engineers who reviewed the permit. The Corp of Engineers determined that the impact of the project is the same as the previously submitted application and has reissued the permit in the Spectra Group name. He noted that he provided a copy of the permit to staff today. Mr. Farmer stated that he thought the State agency automatically followed the Corp of Engineers, but the State has requested Mr. Farmer submit a statement that the impact of the project is the same as previously approved and the State will issue its permit. Mr. Farmer added that all required permits will be obtained before moving forward.

Mr. Farmer informed Council that he has no objections to notes staff has requested being placed on the site plan and added he is the one who suggested the neighbors be allowed to backfill against the retaining wall.

Mr. Farmer stated that he understands connection has been a major concern to Council, but noted that he cannot find in the City's regulations where Council has the authority to require the connectivity. He commented that he understands Council can request it but he does not feel they can require it. He stated that he feels the connection impacts his property negatively because he paid a premium price for the property with access to Wal-Mart. He commented that now he will be required to give another property owner connection with no way to address the increased traffic coming through his property and the increased maintenance it will require. He noted that he does not want the connection because his plans are set in place and asked Council not to require it. Mr. Farmer added that if Council does require the connection he has purchased an easement for \$150,000 to provide it, although he will think they are wrong to require it. He stated that he feels his neighbor's property, which was bought for much less, will greatly benefit from the connection that he has to provide. He indicated that he feels those who will benefit from the connection should help pay for it. He asked Council to consider his efforts to meet their concerns and approve the site plans with conditions so that he can move forward with the project.

Councilman Burgin indicated that he feels Council has the ability to approve the site plan with conditions if it chooses. He noted that there were three (3) issues of concern and he appreciates Mr. Farmer's response to the issues. He stated that he still wants the retaining wall to look nice and he feels that there are options during construction that will result in a nice wall and he appreciates the consideration given to staff to help ensure an appropriate appearance of the wall. Mr. Burgin noted that recognizing there will be permission for the adjacent property owner to backfill against the wall, he will yield to the proposed construction of the wall in an effort to be business friendly and in acknowledgement of Mr. Farmer's attempt to meet Council's expectations.

Mr. Burgin stated that regarding connectivity, he cannot change his position. He commented that Council must expect connectivity to be made, not only for the property owner's benefit, but because the citizens invested a considerable amount of money to initially open up the property for development when Wal-Mart was developed. He added that he is disappointed that the easement was placed on the property in the first place, but in this situation he feels the connectivity must exist because it is a necessity for that corner of the City to function as it needs to. He reiterated that as a responsible Council looking at good planning it must require the connection. Mr. Burgin stated that he also expects connection to be made from the next property owner as the adjacent property is developed. He noted that he feels the connection will add traffic as Mr. Farmer indicated, but he feels that traffic is good for retail and it will be an overall benefit for the development. Mr. Burgin stated he has some concern about the connection not going all the way over to the property line because a one (1) foot retaining wall could be built to get it to the property line. He commented that the connection has to happen so that Council will have helped develop the City to its highest and best use and the highest value to strengthen the tax base. He added that unless he sees the connection being placed along the property line he cannot support the site plan, but if the condition can be guaranteed he will relent on

the wall and approve the plan.

Councilman Kennedy stated that he supports the \$15 million investment of this project, adding that it will create jobs and expand the tax base; however, he feels it must have the connectivity. He noted that he is not sure who will pay for the cost of the connection, and will not support the City paying the cost, but he feels it must be created.

Councilman Lewis commented that Mr. Farmer has the task of developing this site but Council has the task of developing the entire City. He stated that Council cannot look at one site without looking at how it affects neighboring properties. He commented that not requiring the connection will create a site that is a "ghost town" in this area. He stated that he feels Mr. Farmer's property will be enhanced by the connection. He indicated he supports approval of the site plan and appreciates Mr. Farmer bringing the grade down to what was previously approved for the entire site. He added that he recognizes Mr. Farmer will spend a good deal of money to install a retaining wall that may be filled in. Mr. Lewis stated that he would also like to see the access extended all the way to the property line so that there will be no question when the next property is developed that it will be required to be brought to grade and connect to this spot.

Mayor Klutz stated that all five (5) Councilmembers expressed their opinions at its last meeting regarding the connectivity and the wall. She noted that Council's decision today is contingent upon proper Federal and State permitting and she is in agreement with what has been stated today by Councilmen Burgin, Kennedy, and Lewis.

Mr. Lewis stated that the basis for his decision to require the connection is stated in the policies of the City's Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan and noted that this will also be a part of the new Code to be presented in the near future.

Mr. Burgin thanked Mr. Farmer for his hard work to put this development project together and noted that the City welcomes him to the City and appreciates the efforts that have been made.

City Manager David Treme informed Council that a traffic study is currently being performed that may or may not indicate the need for a traffic signal at Arlington Drive and Freeland Avenue. He noted that staff is working on the study but at this point, the results are not known. Mr. Farmer stated that he will accept the condition for a traffic signal if warranted, based on Council's approval.

Mr. Farmer proposed to give staff the proper language and a permanent easement regarding the area for the connection because he feels it is improper construction technique to build the connection over the ledge that would be required if it is placed against the property line. He stated that the proposed connection is approximately ten (10) feet from the property line and he will give the City a permanent easement for this area.

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to approve the site plan as presented for G-10-06 with the condition that connectivity go to within ten (10) feet of the property line and that a proper easement will be recorded for unrestricted access, with no fees, from the adjoining property owner to the ten (10) feet. The second requirement will be that upon the results of the traffic study, the recommendations will be implemented and the costs borne by the developer of the site plan and contingent upon proper permitting. The last condition will be that the average height of the site be maintained at seven hundred eighteen (718) feet. Councilman Kennedy asked Mr. Lewis to clarify "no fees" as stated in his motion. Mr. Lewis stated that the property will require a ten (10) foot easement since the connection will not be on the property line and when the adjacent property owner connects in the future he does not want the easement to cost anyone. Mr. Lewis added another condition to his motion that there be staff consultation on the materials and design of the retaining wall as it appears on the site plan. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Klutz voted AYE. (4-0)

-

**STATUS REPORT FROM STAFF AND A PROPOSAL FROM HISTORIC SALISBURY FOUNDATION CONCERNING THE ELLIS STREET BRIDGE**

-

Mr. Dan Mikkelson, Director of Land Management and Development, introduced Mr. Jack Thomson, Salisbury Historic Foundation, and Mr. Dave Frechetti, an engineering consultant hired by the Salisbury Historic Foundation. Mr. Mikkelson stated that he has been working on the Ellis Street Bridge Project since 1988 and displayed a map of the area. He explained the variations of seven (7) different proposals that were evaluated over the years. He added that in 1996, after much discussion and public input, City Council decided upon the replace in-place alignment. He noted that at that time the City requested a design exception from the Federal Highway Administration to allow the City to design the bridge for twenty (20) miles per hour instead of the standard design of thirty-five (35) miles per hour. He stated that this was requested in order to keep the bridge as close to practical to the existing grades and reduce the impact on neighboring historical properties.

Mr. Mikkelson explained that the City has three (3) replacement options. He stated that the first option would be a new bridge built to cross the two (2) existing tracks. He explained that the railroad company asked the City not to choose this option because they currently have two (2) tracks and may in the future want to add a third (3<sup>rd</sup>) track. He stated that a second option is to build a longer bridge to accommodate a third (3<sup>rd</sup>) track, but that the bridge would have to be built to support the City's largest fire truck. He added that a City consultant determined that this is not a feasible option and the Federal Highway Commission, the State Department of Transportation, and the State Historic Preservation office accepted the City consultant's recommendation that it was not a feasible option. He pointed out that the Historic Salisbury Foundation did not feel the City's consultant conducted a thorough evaluation, and at their expense, hired Mr. David Frechetti, a consultant with bridge expertise, to examine the bridge. He stated that Mr. Frechetti has conducted a preliminary analysis and has developed a proposal which revitalizes interest in the rehabilitation option. He requested that City Council give staff guidance on an appropriate direction to proceed.

Mr. Jack Thomson, Director of Salisbury Historic Foundation, stated that he feels Salisbury has a habit of naming structures it has an affinity for, such as the Ellis Street Bridge which is known as Shober Bridge. He added that it is a contributing structure to the North Ellis Street Graded School National Register Historic District and is a gateway entrance into the City. He explained that the original bridge was built in 1858 by the Western North Carolina Railroad Company and the location was considered a gateway entrance as it was the road to Mocksville. He noted that the current bridge was

constructed in 1926 and he stated that he thinks it is a good idea to cross the railroad tracks at this location.

Mr. Thomson stated that Mr. Frechetti is a structural engineer from Cary, North Carolina and that he led the team to relocate the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse and has extensive experience in historic restoration.

Mr. David Frechetti stated that in many cases these types of bridges are taken out of service completely but he feels that it is important to preserve them. He explained that many of these bridges, referred to as humpback bridges, were built by the railroads because they were economical and easy to maintain. He explained that the main reason to try to rehabilitate this type of bridge is that the Federal Bridge Replacement Program usually requires a wide bridge with sidewalks, big lanes and a certain grade that impacts the neighborhood and he pointed out that by rehabilitating this bridge it will preserve the character of the neighborhood. He stated that the bridge plan indicates a 1913 bridge with 1929 additions with steel or wrought iron which is in fairly good condition. He noted that the weakest link in the bridge is the floor, but the conditions are close to a HS15 bridge. He explained that it is easy to maintain the bridge geometry and supplement the structure currently there. He indicated that the two (2) weak items that need upgrading are the caps of the timber bends and the stringers along with some deterioration of the bridge members. He stated that the preliminary cost estimate of rehabilitation is \$263,000. He concluded by stating that the bridge is a cultural resource which is valuable to the community, its rehabilitation would create the least amount of impact on the neighborhood, and rehabilitation is the most efficient use of tax dollars.

Mr. Thomson stated that the City's cost using Federal funds closely matches the estimated cost in Mr. Frechetti's preliminary report, so the City is looking at the same level of obligation. He explained that based on Mr. Frechetti's report it would take about four (4) months to rehabilitate the bridge, whereas a new bridge would take longer. He noted that in the past he has addressed Council about preservation issues and Council has done an exemplary job in supporting some challenging preservation projects and added that this is a preservation issue that Council will ultimately decide how to handle. Mr. Thomson stated that Mr. Frechetti's report presents a substantial amount of information and requested a public hearing so the citizens can address the issue. He pointed out that there are a number of people in attendance who are in support of the bridge and that they ask for the opportunity for these people to speak at a later date. He acknowledged those in support by asking them to stand.

Mr. Mikkelson explained that based on Mr. Frechetti's report, the rehabilitation process would not qualify for Federal funding, therefore the City would be responsible for one hundred (100) percent of the cost. With the Federal funding for a new bridge the City would be responsible for twenty (20) percent of the cost. He noted that the City's cost should be about the same for either option.

Mr. David Treme, City Manager, asked if the rehabilitation plan included a provision for a third (3<sup>rd</sup>) track. Mr. Thomson stated that the plan is for two (2) tracks and added that Norfolk Southern has not indicated a requirement for a third (3<sup>rd</sup>) track. Mr. Mikkelson stated that Norfolk Southern will have to authorize any work to the bridge or on their right-of-way and added that they have the right to approve or disapprove any request submitted by the City Council. He noted that up to this point the railroad has avoided stating what they would or would not approve, but he feels that due to liability concerns Norfolk Southern would approve City Council's request.

Mr. Treme stated that Norfolk Southern is a part of this process and the City needs to see if the issues can be addressed to the success of all parties.

Councilman Burgin asked if this discussion is due to the fact that Norfolk Southern did not support the City's efforts. Mr. Mikkelson stated that Norfolk Southern asked the City to make the bridge long enough to accommodate a third (3<sup>rd</sup>) track, but the City has not yet received a right of entry from the railroad for any of the three (3) alternatives. He stated that Norfolk Southern would not definitively eliminate any of the alternatives, they only indicated their strong preference.

Mr. Burgin stated that he appreciates staff's position and suggested that this may need to go to a Council Committee. He asked Mr. Frechetti if the rehabilitated bridge would accommodate the City's heaviest fire truck. Mr. Frechetti stated that the bridge was currently an HS15 and can be easily made into an HS20 which would accommodate the fire truck.

Mr. Thomson asked if there is a current right-of-way in existence for the bridge which would allow the City to maintain or work on the bridge. Mr. Rivers Lawther, City Attorney, stated that there is not a right-of-way in existence.

Councilman Kennedy stated that City Council voted for a new bridge in 1996 and he thought the Salisbury Historic Foundation agreed with Council's decision. Mr. Mikkelson stated that the neighbors felt the alignment would devastate the neighborhood and to replace the in-place bridge would have the least amount of impact. He noted that the Historic Salisbury Foundation has brought forward a third party recommendation.

Mr. Burgin asked why the other two (2) options were eliminated. He stated that he thinks to preserve the bridge has serious merit and the City should be able to accomplish this and still meet Council's objective to provide safe, reliable access across town and to the hospital. Mr. Mikkelson stated that the other two options of crossing the railroad tracks at other locations would not allow a bridge long enough to accommodate a third (3<sup>rd</sup>) track. Mr. Burgin stated that he would like to take a look at several issues and consider every possibility.

Mr. Treme stated that he recalls the Craige Street and Caldwell Street alignments being the most unpopular and the other two (2) had significant negative neighborhood impact. He noted that the decision was made to keep the same alignment and replace the bridge.

Mayor Kluttz stated that she thinks the bridge is a beautiful, historical structure that is a treasure to the City. She noted that she feels the City Council has the responsibility to the citizens for safety and the wisest use of their tax dollar and does not feel Council has received enough information to make a decision. She added that she would like to receive more specific cost figures as well as a brief synopsis of the history of the bridge project.

Mr. Treme stated that one consulting report says it is not feasible to build a new bridge in-place, which was accepted by City Council in 1996, and today we have a report that it can be done. He added that this new information needs to be evaluated.

Councilman Lewis asked what would be required to assure the bridge would support the City's fire trucks. Mr. Mikkelson stated that an additional study would be required which would be at the expense of either the City or the Salisbury Historic Foundation, or the cost could possibly be shared. He added that Mr. Frechetti can perform the analysis and present the findings to City Council. Mr. Lewis inquired about the cost for Mr. Frechetti to provide the analysis. Mr. Mikkelson stated that the cost would be between \$5,000 and \$8,000.

Mayor Kluttz requested staff to prepare more specific information and present to City Council at a later meeting.

Mr. Tremé stated that staff will return with a game plan and information needed to enable City Council to make the best decision for the community.

Mayor Kluttz thanked everyone for attending the City Council meeting to show support for the bridge. She stated that she thinks it is clear how neighbors feel and that the City Council cares very much and takes seriously the responsibility of making the right decision.

-  
**REQUEST FROM ADVANCED DRAINAGE SYSTEMS TO INSTALL HIGH DENSITY POLYETHYLENE (HDPE) PIPE AS A TEST CASE IN PHASE 2 OF THE GABLES AT KEPLEY FARM**

-  
Mr. Patrick Ritchie, Staff Engineer, explained to Council that High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) pipe is a black, double-walled, corrugated plastic pipe that is used frequently in construction projects. He noted that it is a good product but the current City Standards do not allow its use to cross streets in the public right-of-way or to be used as a primary drainage pipe in new subdivisions. Advanced Drainage Systems has requested its use and has asked staff to evaluate its effectiveness. Mr. Ritchie stated that staff would like the opportunity to evaluate the pipe before changing the Standards to allow its use in place of concrete pipe.

Mr. Ritchie indicated that staff informed representatives from Advance Drainage Systems that if they could get a developer and engineer to design it and request its use, staff would ask that it be installed so it could be evaluated. He noted that the Company had permission in 2004 with Phase 1 of The Gables, but the developer elected not to install it. Advance Drainage Systems is now requesting the same permission with Phase 2 of The Gables and the developer is willing to look at its use. He requested Council to grant permission to test the HDPE pipe and its associated fittings in Phase 2 of The Gables as a test case with the requirements established by staff. The requirements are:

1. The construction documents shall include manufacturer's specifications and details for installation, minimum/maximum cover, compaction, etc.
2. An agreed upon details shall be developed to reduce potential for trenching "dig ins" where HDPE pipe crosses the shoulder of the road. Staff recommends stone backfill to a height of six (6) inches above the pipe in combination with caution tape
3. Reinforced concrete pipe flared end sections shall be installed at all exposed pipe ends to reduce the potential for vandalism
4. Shop drawings shall be submitted for each Nyloplast structure
5. The "test" shall be authorized for Phase 2 only and shall include observations of both installation and performance before any decision is made to amend current policy

Mayor Kluttz asked if the request is the same as for the first request in 2004. Mr. Ritchie responded that it is exactly the same as the first request and the requirements are the same.

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to allow High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) pipe and Nyloplast drainage structures as an alternate to concrete pipe and structures for the construction of the storm drainage system in Phase 2 of The Gables at Kepley Farm with the conditions established by staff. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

-  
**REQUEST TO RESTRICT PARKING IN THE 700 AND 800 BLOCKS OF WEST KERR STREET**

Ms. Wendy Brindle, Traffic Engineer, referred to a map of West Kerr Street and noted it is located in the Jersey City Neighborhood. She indicated that a neighborhood representative approached staff regarding concerns for illegal activity taking place in the neighborhood and requested a parking restriction to help deter the activity. Ms. Brindle stated that she worked with the Police Department, who agrees that the parking restriction will aid in discouraging illegal activities taking place along the street. She noted that there is also a neighborhood park in the area and she spoke with Parks and Recreation who also support the restriction. She asked Council to adopt an ordinance to restrict parking along the south side of the 700 and 800 blocks and the north 700 block of West Kerr Street.

Councilman Kennedy commented that if illegal activities are taking place restricting the parking will not solve the problem. He added that he felt if there are illegal activities the Police should enforce the laws to make sure they stop. Mr. Kennedy stated that he drove through the area and there will be no place for people visiting the park to park their cars. He noted that many of the houses also use the on-street parking as well and he does not see the reason for this request. Mr. Kennedy commented that he had spoken to one of the neighborhood leaders and she indicated she did not agree with the restriction either.

Ms. Brindle stated that the request came from a neighborhood representative and not necessarily the Home Owner's Association. Mayor Kluttz commented that ordinarily these requests are received with petitions from the residents and asked if the residents along the street have been notified. Ms. Brindle responded that based on the information given to staff, notification was not done. She added that many of the properties along the street are rental properties and the homeowner's are not present. Mr. Kennedy stated that he felt something more was needed than just one person requesting the restriction of parking.

Mayor Kluttz asked if staff received a recommendation from the Police Department. Ms. Brindle responded that the Police Department did recommend restricting the parking. Mr. Kennedy questioned the basis used by the Police Department for the recommendation.

City Manager David Treme stated that he felt the homeowners and members of the neighborhood should be notified of the proposed restriction and perhaps a public hearing could be held to hear from the whole neighborhood regarding the request.

Councilman Lewis stated that this neighborhood has a Neighborhood Association and asked if it has made a recommendation for the restriction. Mr. Kennedy responded that it did not. Mr. Lewis agreed that the Association should have the opportunity to provide input.

Thereupon, Mr. Kennedy made a **motion** to table the issue. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Ms. Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

- **RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING MAYOR AND CITY CLERK TO EXECUTE THE EAST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL WATER MAIN, LIFT STATION, AND FORCE MAIN**

- Mr. Jeff Jones, Senior Engineer, indicated that at its last meeting City Council approved an agreement for the construction of a water main, lift station and force main to serve East Elementary School. He stated that the Resolution authorizing the Mayor to sign the agreement was inadvertently omitted and asked Council's consideration to adopt the Resolution.

Thereupon, Mr. Lewis made a **motion** to adopt a Resolution authorizing and directing the execution and implementation of the agreement between the City of Salisbury/Salisbury-Rowan Utilities and the Rowan-Salisbury School for the construction of a water main, lift station and force main to serve East Elementary School. Mr. Burgin seconded the motion. Messrs. Burgin, Kennedy, Lewis, and Kluttz voted AYE. (4-0)

- **RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE EXECUTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN SALISBURY-ROWAN UTILITIES AND ROWAN-SALISBURY SCHOOLS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WATER MAIN, LIFT STATION, AND FORCE MAIN TO SERVE EAST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.**

- The above resolution in full in Resolution Book No. 12, at Page No. 31, and is known as Resolution No. 2006-18.)

- **BRIEFING FROM RANDY TINSLEY CONCERNING THE ALCOA FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION (FERC) RE-LICENSING PROCESS**

- Mr. Randy Tinsley, Environmental Counsel, indicated that the Salisbury water supply pipeline to the Yadkin River is its lifeline and noted that it has been shown from the reports presented to Council that the Alcoa Yadkin Hydroelectric Project has direct adverse impacts on this lifeline. He stated that there is no doubt that the Project causes sedimentation that clogs the water pump station intakes and causes flooding that will eventually destroy the pump station. He explained that there are three (3) separate but related on-going processes that will determine if the costs of the adverse effects will be paid by Alcoa or by the City of Salisbury's taxpayers and utility rate payers. One process is the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) re-licensing process. The FERC license that presently governs Alcoa's operation of the project was issued almost fifty (50) years ago and will expire April 2008. Mr. Tinsley stated that FERC expects to issue a new license at that time. He noted that FERC re-licensing process began April 25, 2006 when Alcoa filed its application for a new license. He indicated that the City of Salisbury has filed a Motion to Intervene in the FERC re-licensing process and has requested that FERC require additional studies to allow FERC to better understand the impact of the project on Salisbury's water supply.

Mr. Tinsley stated that as the City continues to commission appropriate experts to study and report on the impacts of the project, the reports will be provided to FERC, the State of North Carolina, Alcoa and others. He commented that FERC has assured City staff that project effects will be addressed by the new FERC license.

Mr. Tinsley stated that another regulatory process is through the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR) which will issue a Water Quality Certification for the Yadkin Project. He noted that this certification will provide an important opportunity for the State to address the sedimentation and flooding impacts that jeopardize the water pump station and intakes. He commented that together, the FERC license and the certification from the State will largely determine the impact of the Yadkin Project on the City of Salisbury's water supply for the next thirty (30) to fifty (50) years.

A third process is a negotiation process being run by Alcoa. Mr. Tinsley explained that Alcoa is seeking to have stakeholders enter into an agreement that will be presented to FERC. This agreement requires stakeholders to support Alcoa's application for a new FERC license in return for a promise by Alcoa to change its project operations to favor those stakeholders that sign on. If a party wants to participate in the negotiation of the Re-licensing Settlement Agreement (RSA), Alcoa requires the party to sign an Agreement in Principal (AIP). The current AIP does not include provisions that address the adverse effects of the project on the City of Salisbury. Mr. Tinsley stated that there have been years of negotiations and years of requests by Salisbury for appropriate studies by Alcoa, as well as the City commissioning studies and reports that document the adverse effects of the project; however, Mr. Tinsley stated that Alcoa is not willing to commit, in principal, to mitigation of the sedimentation and flooding effects of the project. He commented that the AIP was delivered to Salisbury for signature, although Alcoa has indicated it does not expect Salisbury to sign. He stated that the City of Salisbury and Alcoa are continuing to explore a separate agreement that could be incorporated into the larger agreement.

Mr. Tinsley informed Council that within the next few weeks the City of Salisbury will receive another expert report that will provide state of the

art evaluation of the project's adverse effects on the water supply and state of the art predictions on how the impacts will change over the next several decades. He stated that the report will provide the basis for identifying the low cost options for mitigating the flood and sedimentation effects and once it is available Alcoa will have all necessary information, at Salisbury's expense, to decide if it will include Salisbury in its AIP and RSA. He added that the same information will be provided to FERC and NCDENR for use in their decision making process.

Mr. Tinsley stated that staff is particularly interested in one of the features of Alcoa's AIP which allows Alcoa to back out of its agreement commitments if FERC or NCDENR regulatory requirements materially increase the overall costs and burdens on Alcoa. He explained that if FERC or NCDENR requires the flooding and sedimentation mitigation as a regulatory matter, Alcoa could walk away from its agreement commitments to other stakeholders. Mr. Tinsley pointed out that if the flooding and sedimentation mitigation is included in the AIP then Alcoa cannot use the cost of mitigation as a basis for walking away from its commitments to stakeholders. He noted that this means if stakeholders sign onto the Alcoa agreements without Salisbury included, they run a substantial risk.

Mr. Tinsley indicated that staff is continuing to pursue information related to the mitigation of the adverse impacts. He added that staff always instructs the experts to provide accurate facts with no bias. Staff is also continuing to pursue voluntary mitigation by Alcoa, while pursuing regulatory implementation by NCDENR and FERC. He commented that these issues are those that are normally addressed by a Project Proponent, but staff has recognized the seriousness of the effects and the impact on the water supply and has pursued the issues. Mr. Tinsley stated that he and staff hope that Alcoa will decide to do the right thing because the effects of the project are very clear.

Councilman Burgin commented that it would seem Rowan County would be as deeply interested in this issue as the City since the system provides water to the citizens of Rowan County. City Manager David Treme noted that Rowan County representatives have attended all of the meetings and deliberations, but he has not seen a definitive statement of their final position. Mr. Tinsley stated that he imagines Rowan County is trying to decide the right thing to do and he feels a point of decision will be reached soon. Mr. Jeff Jones, Senior Engineer, pointed out that the deadline to sign the AIP is July 26, 2006.

Councilman Kennedy stated that he feels the County should take a position on this because it affects the citizens of the entire County and he feels the County should join the City in its efforts regarding Alcoa.

Mayor Kluttz commented that every citizen in the City and every water customer throughout Rowan County should be as alarmed as City Council is on this issue. She noted that ultimately City Council is responsible and if FERC re-licenses Alcoa and Salisbury has no input for the next thirty (30) to forty (40) years, the City and entire County could be in serious trouble.

Councilman Lewis asked if there is any value in seeking support of the Salisbury-Rowan Utilities' (SRU) client communities. Mr. Jones stated that the Town of Granite Quarry has offered to produce a letter of support regarding the issue and SRU staff will take this request to its other client communities as well. Mayor Kluttz commented that Rowan County should also be asked for support.

Mayor Kluttz thanked Mr. Tinsley for his work on this issue.

-  
-  
**REPORT REGARDING THE RECYCLING MARKETING PLAN**  
-

Ms. Karen Wilkinson, Public Information and Communications Manager, and Mr. Doug Paris, Summer Intern, addressed Council regarding a Recycling Marketing Plan.

Mr. Paris noted that during Council's budget session concerns were raised regarding an eighteen (18) percent participation rate in the City's recycling program. He stated that a team was formed to look into the issue and determine strategies to raise the participation rate. The team included: Mr. Tony Cinquemani, Public Services Director; Mr. Lynn Hilliard, Sanitation Division Manager; Mr. Brian Moore, Solid Waste Supervisor; Ms. Wilkinson and Mr. Paris.

Ms. Wilkinson reviewed the new promotional and educational campaign and recycling awareness program. She explained that the new marketing plan includes use of outreach avenues, forming partnerships, determining sponsors to help generate revenue, use of promotions, contests and special events, public visibility outreach, and a Hispanic education outreach. She informed Council that complimentary promotional and marketing materials are available for use from the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources that include public service announcements, posters and publication designs. She stated that working together the participation and awareness of recycling can be increased in Salisbury.

Councilman Kennedy stated he thinks this is an excellent marketing plan and asked if the items to be recycled could be expanded. City Manager David Treme noted that the City is limited by the items for which there is a market. He stated that many of the items collected by the City do not have a market willing to pay for those items. He added that a big issue in recycling is the cost of collection often exceeds the value of the items collected. He suggested expanding participation with the currently accepted items and then expanding to accept other items in the future. Mr. Kennedy suggested including a list of those things accepted in the marketing plan.

Mayor Kluttz commented that she would like to see a renewed push for distribution of new recycling bins to those who need them. She added that with the new campaign recycling should be promoted before Council has to determine what to spend as the recycling collection costs continue to increase. Mr. Treme stated that the strategy is to get the information out to citizens regarding the importance of recycling and encourage people to use the service. He added that after this has been done Council will have the best information to make a decision regarding the recycling program and its cost. Mayor Kluttz added that citizens need to be reminded why recycling is so important and expressed her appreciation for the new marketing plan.

-  
-  
**REPORT REGARDING THE ROWAN COUNTY UNITED WAY NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

Councilman Burgin, who serves as Chairman of the Rowan County United Way Advisory Board, and Mr. Bob Lippard, United Way Executive Director, presented Council with the results of its recently completed United Way Needs Assessment. Mr. Burgin pointed out that this is the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) Needs Assessment completed for the United Way and noted that the Advisory Board was comprised of representatives from a broad range of health care and human service agencies throughout the City. He explained the processes for the Assessment and Mr. Lippard reviewed the findings:

- Demographic Respondents Highlights
  - Sixty-nine (69) percent have lived in Rowan County more than fifteen (15) years
  - Fifteen (15) percent are responsible for the care of a senior adult
    - For sixty-four (64) percent of these Respondents, the senior adult resided outside of the household
  - Twenty-five (25) percent from single person households
  - Thirty-six (36) percent household had minor children
  - Race: eighty-two (82) percent White; fourteen (14) percent African-American; one (1) percent Hispanic; three (3) percent Other/refused to answer
- State/County have seen significant growth in Hispanic Population
  - The Hispanic population is much younger than the total population in North Carolina. While only fifty-two (52) percent of the total North Carolina population is under the age of thirty-five (35), seventy-seven (77) percent of Hispanics are in that age bracket
  - Of the County's five thousand one hundred seventy (5,170) Hispanic population, forty-four and six tenths (44.6) percent speak English "not well" or "not at all"
- Rowan County has experienced a rise in unemployment since 1999
  - Rowan County's peak unemployment rate came in 2003 and 2004
  - Although the County's 2005 unemployment rate is about the same as the State, five and four tenths (5.4) percent, the 2004 unemployment rate was higher than the North Carolina overall, seven and three tenths (7.3) percent versus five and three tenths (5.3) percent North Carolina
- Significant number of County residents are lacking medical insurance
  - The Rowan Regional Medical Center estimates that the following percentages of patients are "self-pay" or uninsured
    - 2000-01: eleven and eight tenths (11.8) percent
    - 2001-02: twelve and eight tenths (12.8) percent
    - 2002-03: twelve and five tenths (12.5) percent
    - 2003-04: eight and four tenths (8.4) percent
    - 2004-05: eight and four tenths (8.4) percent
  - Community Care Clinic of Rowan County has seen general clinic patients increase from eight hundred twenty four (824) in 2001 to one thousand seven hundred sixteen (1,716) in 2004
- Substance abuse and mental health programs are important part of area services
  - In 2004, nine (9) percent of individuals aged twelve (12) and over had a substance abuse problem (National Survey on Drug Use/Health)
    - Rates of illicit drug use highest for young adults (18-24)
    - Illicit drug with largest number of new-users is non-medical use of prescription drugs
  - In Rowan county, approximately two and eight tenths (2.8) percent of population aged eighteen (18) and over considered themselves heavy drinkers
  - Driving while under the influence arrests increased by eighteen and six tenths (18.6) percent between 1999 and 2004
- Rowan County's education attainment is rising, but below State average
  - In Rowan County the percent of twenty-five (25) or older with a high school diploma has increased from sixty-six (66) percent in 1990 to seventy-four and two tenths (74.2) percent in 2000 (This number for the State overall has remained near constant over same period)
  - Rowan County's High School dropout rate has declined from six and seven tenths (6.7) percent in 1999 to five and four tenths (5.4) in 2003
  - Average SAT scores rose nineteen (19) points between 1999 and 2005 in the County (versus fifteen (15) for State)
- County has increasing problem with juvenile offense and violence
  - In 2004, there were one thousand twenty-two (1,022) juvenile arrests, representing fourteen (14) percent of total arrests in Rowan County (up from twelve (12) percent in 1999)
  - Youth Risk Behavior Survey highlighted unsettling violence at schools and carrying of weapons on school premises:
    - Twenty-five (25) percent of 10<sup>th</sup> graders reported carrying a weapon one (1) or more days in the past thirty (30) days
    - Depending on grade level, between six and two tenths (6.2) percent and twelve and eight tenths (12.8) percent of students said threatened with a weapon within last twelve (12) months
- Children without health insurance is also an increasing concern
  - North Carolina Health Choice is a program for low income children not eligible for Medicaid but have no health insurance
  - In 2003, one thousand five hundred eighty-five (1,585) children, or four and eight tenths (4.8) percent were enrolled in North Carolina Health Choice in Rowan County (up from one thousand (1,000) in 2000). This is slightly less than the State overall (five and one tenth (5.1) percent of children)

- Arrests for drug sales have significantly decreased over the last five (5) years
  - Although possession arrests have remained the same, arrests related to sales/manufacturing of drugs have decreased by sixty-nine (69) percent
  - In 2004, thirty-eight (38) percent of sales/manufacturing and thirty-one (31) percent of possession arrests were for cocaine/opium
  - In 2004, twenty-six (26) percent of possession arrests were juveniles
- Survey Background
  - Randomly sampled households (estimated total households equaled forty nine thousand nine hundred forty (49,940) as estimated by 2000 Census)
  - Respondents are heads of households ages eighteen (18) and up
  - Five hundred four (504) interviews: conducted using random digit dialing
  - Conducted October 24 – November 3, 2005
  - Maximum sampling error = +/- four and four tenths (4.4) percent – represents what to expect of all households in Rowan County were interviewed
- Areas of Concern – Primary
  - Education and personal employment
  - Medical and dental care accessibility
  - Jobs: creation and retention
- Areas of Concern – Secondary
  - Barriers to the County’s Hispanic and non-English speaking populations
  - Issues affecting Rowan County Youth
  - Substance abuse
  - Needs of older adults
  - Ensuring that basic needs are met
- Education/Personal empowerment
  - Survey – nine (9) percent of respondents said they needed help managing their finances
  - Data – County unemployment rate risen every year since 1999
  - Goal – Assess personal empowerment opportunities in Rowan County, identify areas in need of development
  - Goal – Develop strategies to enhance delivery of life skills and parenting skills
- Medical and Dental Care Accessibility
  - Survey – forty-six (46) percent said affordable dental care was a serious problem
  - Data – nineteen (19) percent of Rowan County residents aged sixty-five (65) or older are uninsured
  - Goal – Establish not-for-profit dental clinic by 2008
  - Goal – Advocate to elected officials (local and national) the need to have all Rowan County residents have access to affordable health and dental service
- Jobs: Creation and Retention
  - Survey – thirteen (13) percent said a family member lost job in last five (5) years due to plant closing
  - Data – manufacturing employment decreased by three thousand (3,000) or more jobs from 1996-2004
  - Goal – Improve jobs and employment environment; provide affordable infant/toddler day care services

Mr. Burgin reviewed several charts depicting how participants in a telephone survey ranked the perception of service needs and the use of services.

- Hispanic and non-English speaking populations
  - Data – thirty-nine (39) languages spoken in Rowan County schools
  - Data – Hispanics make up four and one tenth (4.1) percent of 2000 Rowan County population – up from six tenths (0.6) percent in 1990
  - Goal – By July 2010, reduce barriers to providing services by teaching English to non-English speaking residents; provide training in understanding American culture and laws
- Rowan County’s Youth Population
  - Survey- fifty (50) percent of respondents viewed “troubled children” as a serious problem in Rowan County
  - Data – one thousand twenty-two (1,022) juvenile arrests in Rowan County in 2004; fourteen (14) percent of total
  - Goal – Create a gang-free community
  - Goal – Increase high school graduation rate
  - Goal – Decrease teen pregnancy rate
- Substance Abuse
  - Survey – sixty-eight (68) percent of respondents viewed drug abuse as a serious problem in Rowan County
  - Data – Nationally in 2004, nine (9) percent of persons aged twelve (12) or older had a substance abuse problem
  - Goal – educate the community as a whole, with a special emphasis on parents on how to prevent and identify substance abuse, and properly intervene when substance abuse is suspected



(e) Bottled Water

Councilman Kennedy commented he had recently visited Maryland and noticed bottled water with the State's name on it. He asked if the sale of bottled water might be something Salisbury-Rowan Utilities could explore. Mr. Treme responded that staff has investigated the sale of bottled water and he will share the results with Council at its next meeting.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mayor Kluttz opened the floor to receive public comment. There being no one present to address Council, Mayor Kluttz closed the public comment session.

-  
-  
**MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

-  
(a) Report on Neighborhood Canvass

-  
Lt. David Belk and Detective Jim Barber informed Council that the Project SAFE Committee met on Thursday, July 13, 2006 and performed a neighborhood canvass on Locke and Wilson Streets. He noted that there was recently a homicide in the neighborhood and the members of Project SAFE and the Police Department were there to let the neighborhood know that they were there to support them.

Detective Barber stated that the Police Department has made four (4) arrests in the homicide case that took place in the neighborhood. After the canvass the Police were able to gain enough information to indict five (5) more people in connection with the murder. He commented that he felt having the Mayor participate in the canvass helped the residents feel comfortable in opening up regarding information.

Mayor Kluttz commented that she and the Project SAFE representatives were divided into five (5) groups that went in five (5) different directions in the neighborhood. She stated that she felt it was a wonderful experience to be able to explain to the residents how much their neighborhood means to the City and City Council. She added that they wanted the residents to know that their neighborhood matters as much to City Council and the Police as any other neighborhood in the City and Council wants to make it a safer place. She expressed her pride in the members of the law enforcement who were present and added that she has already been approached by a member of another troubled neighborhood about bringing the canvass to their area.

Mayor Kluttz asked Lt. Belk to explain the process for the Crime Stoppers program. Lt. Belk stated that citizens can call 1-877-638-JAIL anonymously to provide information regarding crimes. He added that there is a system in place to reward people who provide the information leading to arrests.

Mayor Kluttz congratulated Lt. Belk for suggesting the canvass and putting it together and organizing it.

Councilman Kennedy commented that he had the opportunity to tour the Chestnut Hill Community during a similar situation and he understands the importance of speaking with the neighbors.

-  
-  
**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion** to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Burgin, seconded by Mr. Kennedy. All council members agreed unanimously to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk