

Population

Greater Kings Mountain 21,914
City Limits (1966 Census) 8,256
City Limits (Estimate 1968) 9,300

Greater Kings Mountain figure is derived from the special United States Bureau of the Census report of January 1968, and includes the 14,880 population of Number 4 Township, and the remaining 6,124 from Number 5 Township, in Cleveland County and Crowley Township in Gaston County.

Kings Mountain Herald

Kings Mountain's Reliable Newspaper

VOL. 85, No. 33

Established 1889

Kings Mountain, N. C., Thursday, August 13, 1970

Eighty-Fifth Year

16 Pages Today

PRICE TEN CENTS

Will It Go Or Stay Or Go? Dam Situation Critical

Recommendations Given On McGill Plant Problem

Mull Suggests Alternatives; Use Law Must

By MARTIN HARMON

Three alternatives for alleviating the McGill Creek sewage disposal were recommended to the city board of commissioners Tuesday by William Mull, regional director of the state Water and Air Resources commission.

The recommendations are:

- 1) Switch some of the industrial waste to the Pilot Creek plant.
- 2) Enlarge the McGill plant and (perhaps) add tertiary treatment.
- 3) Construct another treatment plant in a different drainage basin.

Mr. Mull also declared sewer-use ordinance not only necessary but virtually mandatory. A federal regulation requires such an ordinance before the Department of the Interior even will accept application for federal grants in sewage system development, he added, and read the text of the regulation.

Mr. Mull asked for firm action and got it.

The commission voted unanimously to refer the Mull recommendations to its sewer system committee for study and report after consultation with state and city engineers.

Reviewing, Mr. Mull reminded the commission that the expanded McGill plant has a rated capacity of a million gallons of influent daily and was thought to be able to serve the area for 15 years. Industrial expansion has 1) brought 15 years in the future to now and 2) has created a situation where, from eight to twelve hours daily, the plant is receiving, pro-rata, influent at the rate of two million gallons per day, or twice its capacity.

Major John Henry Moss told Mr. Mull, "It is our intent to meet this as well as other problems of the city."

In other actions, the board:

1) Let contracts on purchase of chemical compounds for the two water treatment plants and for the McGill creek sewage plant on bids received several weeks ago.

All Charlotte firms, Burris Chemical company got contract for hydrogen sulphate, caustic soda and activated; Jones Chemical company got contract for a fluoride compound; and Morehead Chemical company got contract for chlorine, another fluorine compound and for liquid chlorine.

2) The commission voted to rezone Lot number 58 at Burlington Hamrick, from residential designation to neighborhood business designation.

McGinnis Clan Reunion Sunday

Annual reunion of the descendants of Nathan and Susan McGinnis will be held Sunday, August 16th, with picnic lunch to be spread at 1 p.m. at air-conditioned Club Carolina on Roy Eakee Road, Cherryville.

Mrs. Paul McGinnis, Jr., secretary of the clan, said plates, cups, napkins and iced tea will be provided.

Family members are asked to bring old photographs for a display.

Prizes will go to the oldest member present, the youngest member present, the largest family present, the newlywed couple, the couple married longest and the family traveling the longest distance.

President of the Clan is Clyde Heafner of Cherryville.

SPEAKER

Paul Lemmons, of Shelby, secretary for Gideon Bible Society, will fill the pulpit at the First Presbyterian church, August 16, at the 11 o'clock morning worship service.



FROM ARIZONA — Mrs. Wanze Y. Davis, secretary to the superintendent of Kings Mountain schools, has returned from Tucson, Arizona, where she attended the annual National Association of Educational Secretaries Institute.

Mrs. Davis To Institute

About 250 secretaries from across the United States, including Mrs. Wanze Y. Davis and her husband, Isaiah Davis, of Kings Mountain, attended the 36th annual National Association of Educational Secretaries Institute of Educational Office Personnel July 22-31 in Tucson.

Mrs. Davis is secretary to the superintendent of schools.

The institute was preceded by the annual conference of the National Association of Educational Secretaries attended by some 400 secretaries.

"The institute classes attempt to update and refresh basic office skills," explained Mrs. Rachel Maynard, UA coordinator of the 1970 conference and institute. "It really was a back-to-school week for anyone who works in any school office...high school or elementary, or administrative and college offices."

Two special double session classes for those with supervisory duties were held. Students chose four 50-minute classes to attend daily during the five-day institute. New to the agenda is a job-like workshop and discussion seminars.

Trips to Nogales, Mexico, the Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Old Tucson, San Xavier Mission, and a two-day trip to the Grand Canyon also were held.

Paschal Joins College Faculty

Fred Paschal, a former guidance counselor at Kings Mountain high school, will become Assistant Professor of Psychology and Education at Limestone college, Gaffney, S. C., August 31.

Mrs. Paschal has been director of admissions at the college since 1968, going to Gaffney from Kings Mountain.

Paschal holds an A.B. degree in history from the University of North Carolina and a M.A. degree in counseling and guidance from UNC. This summer he has studied psychology at UNC in Charlotte.

Family members are asked to bring old photographs for a display.

Prizes will go to the oldest member present, the youngest member present, the largest family present, the newlywed couple, the couple married longest and the family traveling the longest distance.

President of the Clan is Clyde Heafner of Cherryville.

SPEAKER

Paul Lemmons, of Shelby, secretary for Gideon Bible Society, will fill the pulpit at the First Presbyterian church, August 16, at the 11 o'clock morning worship service.

Toxic Metals Influent Analysis Shows Overload

Maximum influent of metals to keep a stream non-toxic for fish are being greatly exceeded on McGill creek, tests conducted during July show.

This was in the analysis of William Mull in his report to the city commission Tuesday.

The first figure is the maximum non-toxic amount expressed in milligrams per million, and the second figure is the amount going into McGill creek and the McGill creek sewage treatment plant:

Chromium	.05 vs. 2.3
Copper	.03 vs. 5.7
Lead	.03 vs. 4.24
Silver	.05 vs. .28
Zinc	.3 vs. .42

Biochemical oxygen demand, most important in the treatment process, was proved deficient in 24 tests last month. Of the 24, four showed some oxygen content, but only one test showed sufficient oxygen content.

Downstream from the plant, oxygen content showed 2.8 while minimal required for a Class D stream is 3.0.

News Singers Coming Home

The Good News Singers, 137 young people from North Carolina, wound up their European tour yesterday with a free concert in the Luxembourg gardens, a large-tree-filled park on Paris' left bank.

Many of the singers will return to the United States Thursday after a tour that has taken them to London and the Soviet Union. A spokesman said that the visit to Russia "had to be the highlight. We were treated real fine everywhere."

Four of the group are from Kings Mountain. They are Cindy Alexander, Linda Ross, Leon Ross and Jack Bell.

Barnette's Rites Conducted

Funeral rites for Clifford Barnette, 63, of 204 Benfield Drive, retired employee of Duplex Shannon, were held Sunday afternoon at 3 p.m. from Faith Baptist church, interment following in Mountain Rest cemetery.

Rev. Robert Hicklin and Rev. Flay Payne officiated at the final rites.

Mr. Barnette died Friday night at 7:05 p.m. of a heart attack.

He was a native of Cherokee County, North Carolina, son of the late Ranson and Vonia Hannah Barnette.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Emma Oates Barnette; three sons, J. D. Barnette, Buddy Barnette and Charles Barnette, all of Kings Mountain; five daughters, Mrs. Irene Nuckles of Shreveport, La., Mrs. Aileen Delling of Gaffney, S. C., Mrs. Shirley Gillespie, Mrs. Betty Lou Henson and Mrs. Elaine Guin, all of Kings Mountain; one sister, Mrs. Lela King of Kings Mountain; two brothers, Ed Barnette of Chase City, Va., and Dillard Barnette of Kings Mountain; 19 grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren.

"Barefoot In The Park" Tryouts Thursday; Mrs. McDaniel Director

Try-outs for "Barefoot In The Park", the Kings Mountain Little Theatre's forthcoming production, will be held Thursday (tonight) at 8 p.m. in the Kings Mountain Civic Center.

"Barefoot In The Park" was written by Neil Simon. Charlotte Summer Theatre featured the production among its plays for the summer season last season in Ovens Auditorium.

Mrs. Jo Ann Walker McDaniel will direct the production.

Last performance of the Little Theatre was "Cinderella".

Prospective new members are also invited to attend Thursday night's meeting, said Mrs. Bob Cox, Little Theatre president. She said volunteers are needed to portray character roles and backstage.

Mrs. Jo Ann Walker McDaniel will direct the production.

Last performance of the Little Theatre was "Cinderella".



FROM FRANCE — Anne Hunter Plonk, top, and Laura Foust Plonk have just returned from summer school abroad where they studied the French language. Anne Hunter Plonk won the award for scoring highest on finals examination among 200 students in the United States.

Plonk Sisters Study In France

Two daughters of Mr. and Mrs. John O. Plonk — sophomore student Laura Foust and senior student Anne Hunter Plonk — have just returned from Aix-En-Provence, France, where they were among 200 students from all over the U. S. enrolled in summer school studying the French language.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

Defense questioning of city commissioners was largely in the nature of review, with particular attention to recreational development of the Buffalo Creek reservoir area.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.

The defense questions the right of the city to condemn property for the reservoir and questions whether the city bargained in good faith. It questions the city's need for the amount of property on which condemnation action was taken.