

THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

Regular Meeting of the Mayor and Council

June 10, 1985
8:00 PM

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Abbott

ROLL CALL: Councilmember Aldrighetti
Councilmember Bradley
Councilmember Dalmat
Councilmember D'Ovidio
Councilmember Haney
Councilmember Iddings
Councilmember Williams

PLEDGE

MAYOR ABBOTT'S COMMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS

ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS

GENERAL CITIZENS' REMARKS (those not directed at items for Council action)

ITEMS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION: City Administrator Wilson

1. Administrative reports and communications
2. Ordinance adopting Fiscal Year 1985-86 City Budget
Citizens' comments
Council action
3. Council approval of Proposed Use of Federal Revenue Sharing Funds, FY 1985-86
Citizens' comments
Council action
4. Ordinance (Code amendment) setting City Tax Rate for FY 1985-86
Citizens' comments
Council action
5. Ordinance approving City Employees Pay Plan for FY 1985-86
Citizens' comments
Council action
6. Second reading of an ordinance establishing a handicap parking space in front of
240 Park Avenue
Citizens' comments
Council action
7. Ordinance to accept proposal of Canada Life Insurance Company for accidental death and
dismemberment insurance, and disability insurance for employees
Citizens' comments
Council action

ADJOURNMENT

THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

Regular Meeting of the Mayor and Council

June 10, 1985

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Mayor Abbott	City Administrator Wilson
Councilmember Aldrighetti	City Clerk Pusti
Councilmember Bradley	Asst. Housing Director Austin
Councilmember Dalmat	Police Lieutenant Gowin
Councilmember D'Ovidio	Public Works Director Robbins
Councilmember Haney	Recreation Director Ziegler
Councilmember Iddings	
Councilmember Williams	

The Mayor and Council met on Monday, June 10, 1985, at 8:30 P.M., in the Council Chamber, 7500 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland.

Following the pledge, the Mayor commented on the success of the Street Festival held June 9, recognized the excellent leadership for the event provided by Daniel Neal and David Sawyer. A motion was made, duly seconded, and carried unanimously that they, as well as all City staff and departments involved, be commended for their superlative efforts in making the event a success. Councilmember D'Ovidio noted the birth on June 7 of Councilmember Iddings' third child, Thomas; congratulations were expressed to the family.

ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS:

Draft of a resolution concerning Cable TV (Wilson)

GENERAL CITIZENS' REMARKS (not directed at items for Council action)

Dr. Joseph Lerner, 7708 Takoma Avenue: had thought there might be further opportunity for meeting with county officials prior to construction on the Juniper Street pedestrian bridge, however, that did not appear likely. He voiced concerns regarding pipe railings planned for installation along the walkway approach to the bridge, thought some sort of fencing (such as wrought iron) would be better, precluding shortcuts. He hoped Council would work to ensure that the fencing be both aesthetically appropriate as well as effective. The Mayor commented that recommendations made at an earlier point in time were forwarded to the proper authorities; a public hearing will be held on the final plans. Following discussion, Mr. Wilson stated that the exact status of the bridge plans, including their timetable, would be ascertained from the county and that information would be passed on to Dr. Lerner. Dr. Lerner expressed concerns about roadway congestion during the 4th of July fireworks, said it is almost impossible for a single car to get through on nearby streets, let alone emergency vehicles such as fire trucks or an ambulance. He mentioned an earlier request, consideration of a 4-way stop at Chicago and New York Avenues; it was noted that item was on the Traffic Committee's agenda, would be discussed June 12. Councilmember D'Ovidio noted discussion would be occurring with the Police Chief concerning crowd and traffic control in relation to the upcoming Sister Fire Concert, perhaps things learned from that event could be beneficially applied to the 4th of July. Concerning a gate (intended for access use by emergency vehicles) in the railroad fence which runs along the tracks paralleling Takoma Avenue (between Buffalo and Albany), and which Dr. Lerner stated is generally blocked by parked vehicles, it was stated that Mr. Robbins would ascertain whether Metro or WMATA requires access to that gate, and whether parking should be restricted in that area. He noted the automobile repair business on Baltimore Avenue (near Cleveland), notwithstanding court orders to the contrary, is still in operation; he said there are more bizarre vehicles and wrecked cars parked there than ever. Councilmember D'Ovidio stated that continuing efforts are being made to resolve that ongoing and serious problem, the situation is not being ignored. He questioned whether the sidewalk area belongs to the Exxon station at Tulip and Carroll Avenues, remarked that they had a vehicle parked on Saturday blocking the sidewalk. The Mayor commented that the business is under new ownership; the police will be requested to visit the owner and advise him of the law.

Juanita Nunn, 7777 Maple Avenue: read, for the record, a statement on behalf of the Park Maple Tenants' Council regarding a recent abortive attempt by some Councilmembers to remove Corporation Counsel Gagliardo from his position with the City; it commented on the apparent lack of compassion toward one's fellow men, expressed a concern that if some of those seeking additional power should gain it, the voice(s) of the citizens will no longer be heard or heeded. Councilmember D'Ovidio spoke in rebuttal, commented that if an individual feels strongly on an issue, is willing to publicly take a stand (knowing that everyone will not agree with him), that should at least command respect, if not concurrence. Councilmember Aldrighetti remarked that while he had hoped that painful issue had been resolved and laid to rest, he would comment that anyone having questions as to the fairness of the issue should have talked to Mr. Gagliardo, as he had conceded the truth of a number of charges; Mr. Aldrighetti stated that out of the turmoil, Corporation Counsel had been retained and a process had been developed to avoid recurrence of the same painful situation.

Ellery Dennison, Hillwood Manor: spoke concerning the numerous failures of Cable TV since its installation in his area several months ago, cited examples. He requested the names, addresses and phone numbers of members of the City's Cable TV Committee (who recommended Tribune-United to the City) in order to inquire concerning their judgment. Mayor Abbott pointed out that the Cable TV issue was on the agenda at a later point in the meeting, following which any names desired would be supplied.

Clayton Forshee, 722 Kennebec Avenue: commented he had noticed in the proposed budget \$31,000 slated for expenditure on Cable TV, but no statement of income expected; wondered why the City would expend funds on something from which they did not expect any income. Mr. Wilson stated that under the arrangement with the county, the City had to wait until a specified number of subscribers was reached before franchise fees would be distributed to the City; based on the present formula, with which Mayor and Council are not in full agreement, the \$31,000 will probably not be quite reached in income. It was noted that a small initial quarterly payment had been received. Councilmember Bradley noted that the Cable Board had been charged with raising other funds so that the City does not bear the entire burden. The Mayor commented that the franchise fee is based upon the number of subscribers in the municipality. Mr. Forshee stated that in latter 1982 the City contributed \$2,000 toward the Centennial celebration program for 1983; he stated other funds amounting to \$7,141.00 were raised by the Centennial Committee; on May 14, 1985, \$31.00 (the last of incoming funds) was deposited. He turned a check in the amount of \$1,554 over to the City, amounting to the remaining balance in the account. The Mayor thanked Mr. Forshee, commented the check came at a welcome time on the eve of budget adoption.

Mr. Abramson, representing the Austin Committee of the Old Takoma Citizens' Association: requested that the Mayor and Council ask the Planning Board for a postponement of the Public Hearing scheduled for June 20 regarding the disposition of the Austin Property, until such time as the City has had adequate time to examine the issues. He stated that since the committee organized three months ago, they had confirmed that the issue of open spaces and the development of remaining lots in the city is a citywide issue; hoped the City would continue with its Open Space survey and, in a timely fashion, adopt an effective policy to deal with the lots. Mr. Wilson noted that the request for a postponement had been discussed in pre-Council session, a consensus of support was reached. He stated that upon receipt of a prior letter from Mr. Abramson, the City Clerk had arranged that the hearing be postponed until July 3.

Don Gilmore, 7777 Maple Avenue, representing Park Maple Tenant Council: implored that the City lend their assistance in getting the apartment building up to standards; he said the building is under new management, however, lighting is still inadequate on the parking lot, no air conditioning, no adequate play area for children, elevators are still malfunctioning. He stated the situation is very unfair, tenants need help in getting the services they are paying for, said no response is received from management to requests made by tenants. He spoke concerning management's request that people keep their children

away from the front of the building (which he staunchly supported in light of the traffic hazards there), said he was working with the children to gain their cooperation, however, flyers had been circulated in the building stating that if any child was found in front of the building that would be grounds for immediate eviction. He stated that the building is not restricted to adults and a play area should be provided at the side for the children, the one major asset through the summer is the swimming pool. He thanked the Mayor and Council for their past support on various issues, and reiterated his request for their help with the present problems. In response to query from Councilmember Williams, Asst. Housing Director Austin stated he was unaware of complaints other than the air conditioning problems at Park Maple. He pointed out that the air conditioning is not a health/safety requirement in the Code, and if the owner decided to discontinue using it, he could do so (the tenants could then file for a reduction in service). He stated that the condition of the elevator is under the jurisdiction of the state, Housing could only act if the elevator were not functioning; he pointed out that those elevators do have current state inspection stickers and to his knowledge are being properly maintained. The Mayor commented on having approached Park & Planning a couple of years ago about the parcel of property they own next to Park Maple which would be appropriate for use as a play area; he said at that time they had no objections, however, softballs or soccer balls going into the road or down into the creek could present a hazard, thus it would be best to fence the area. He suggested again approaching Park & Planning, getting them to fence the area and give permission for its use. Councilmember Bradley referred to recent meetings between herself, City staff, and the new head of the Parks Department in Montgomery County, at which time the parcel of land in question was mentioned. She commented on the need for input from area residents concerning what sort of equipment they would like to see there, i.e., benches for sitting, jungle gym(s), a ball field, etc.; she hoped that county representative could be persuaded to come to the city to drive around, personally survey areas needing attention and needs for park/play equipment. Mr. Gilmore stressed the need to recognize that while there are children of all ages in the building and the area, it is the younger children who really need a protected area in which to play, ride bicycles, etc. Councilmember Williams suggested it might also be appropriate to mention to building management installing speed humps in the parking lot as a safety measure. The Mayor asked that Councilmember Iddings arrange a repeat of last year's Bike Day in Sligo Creek Park in August, perhaps gaining enough following to have it each Sunday, closing the parkway to vehicular traffic and allowing people to enjoy their bicycles.

Janice Martin, 1319 Elson Place: commented on the very poor lighting in front of the Municipal Building; Councilmember Bradley and Richard Robbins concurred. Ms. Bradley remarked that the steps are not illuminated, which is hazardous. Mr. Robbins stated that the entire lighting system around the building needs to be addressed, and high pressure sodium lighting installed.

ITEMS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:

1. Administrative reports and communications.

Mr. Wilson commented there had been a significant upswing in cable TV problems in the city; he noted the proposed resolution which would address at least some of the problems, said the City had gone through a series of waves of complaints - first, the marketing process, second, installation problems, and third, billing practices (tied to significant periods of down-time in the system). He commented that while people realize problems may be experienced, a major frustration is not being able to reach anyone at the Tribune-United complaint number in order to voice their complaint(s), and if they ever do, they may be placed on "hold" for an interminable period - some people have cited spending hours trying to get through. He stated that serious questions have arisen concerning credibility of the system. Councilmember D'Ovidio stated that he had cable installed last Thursday, had been unable to see anything on his TV set since; he moved passage of the resolution, duly seconded by Councilmember Bradley.

Councilmember Bradley stated she was a member of the City's Cable TV

Committee, which reviewed proposals from the 8-10 companies that bid on the Montgomery County franchise; she was chair of the committee that endorsed the proposal that the City opt in with Montgomery County, assuming that a better system would be gotten by being part of a larger system. She stated the City did endorse Tribune-United's proposal as being highly reasonable, pertinent county entities likewise endorsed Tribune-United. She remarked how angry people are over the situation, including herself; some are cancelling their subscription to the service. Councilmember Dalmat concurred with statements made by Ms. Bradley, said she had experienced all the problems outlined in the resolution. Councilmember Aldrighetti commented on the shoddy marketing practices employed, the marked lack of understanding displayed by the company's public relations personnel. Councilmember Haney commented, as had Mr. Aldrighetti and others, on the number of complaints about the cable TV system voiced by constituents. In response to a request from Rev. Albaugh, Mr. D'Ovidio read the subject proposed resolution. An unidentified male member of the audience questioned whether there were any penalty provisions or remedies in the contract agreement; Ms. Bradley stated that there are some performance criteria in the county franchise, the City is considered a co-franchisor, however, the county has the complete prerogative for enforcement of the franchise. Thus, the City's complaints are addressed to the county asking that they enforce the franchise. Councilmember Iddings commented that the resolution should be addressed not only to the County Council, but also to the County Executive, since the problem involves administration of a contract.

Janice Martin: stated cable TV was a real sore point with her, said she, too, had experienced all the problems cited in the resolution, related problems she had had with billings. She suggested that Tribune-United have several complaint numbers with recorded messages, acknowledging troubles in various areas and stating a target date and time for their correction; she said customers should be charged a discount rate for the inconvenience they are experiencing until such time as all bugs are gotten out of the system.

The Mayor commented on the lack of ability for people to express complaints to Tribune-United due to the one published phone number, stated he had not only had no cable TV for five days, but could not get other channels either. He related that after the initial installation, it was found some parts were defective and they were replaced; now, with the new parts, he was again without any reception whatsoever. He stated that the City Council initially voted in favor of Tribune-United receiving the county contract because they felt that was the best company; he referred to subsequent dissension within the County Council over that company being chosen, said the resolution should be taken seriously and he would favor tabling it in order to see what Tribune-United's response would be and to avoid adding fuel at the county level for termination of the contract; he favored giving the company another chance to correct deficiencies.

Tom Beech, Tribune-United Area Manager for Takoma Park: said the company is working to improve the reliability of the system, additional service technicians have been hired to try to respond more quickly to service complaints (there are now 5 serving 2,200 subscribers), maintenance of the system is being improved, a different means of transmission which should improve reliability is being worked on between Rockville and the hub in White Oak that gives Takoma Park residents the lower channels. He conceded there is a lot of failure with the equipment due to the newness of the system, however, the service technicians, with some exceptions, respond well to subscribers' complaints; he noted that City staff and Councilmembers, unfortunately, hear all the complaints about the system, but not the favorable comments. He stated that Tribune-United has 15-20 operators, working 7 A.M.-11 P.M., handling complaints from the slightly less than 10,000 subscribers. The Mayor pointed out that if a more accessible system were used for recording complaints from subscribers, the company might realize the need for a number of additional service technicians to remedy the problems voiced. Following discussion, Councilmember Aldrighetti commented that Tribune-United lacks any credibility at the current point in time, appears to have no sense of contrition about their performance, should be considering how they can

make amends to the subscribers and regain credibility. The Mayor pointed out that early on the offer/request was made that Fern Krauss, Tribune-United's Public Affairs Manager, write a monthly informational column for the City Newsletter which would have been helpful, however, that was declined. Following lengthy additional dialogue concerning service problems and the inability of customers to register complaints with the company, Councilmember Bradley stated she would wish to see, in writing, 1) how system-wide service problems are dealt with, 2) how poor signal quality problems, particularly on the low channels can be dealt with, 3) what can be done about audio noise when there is a large amount of text (or character-generated material), such as on the evening newscasts. Mr. Beech responded briefly to those concerns, and, in response to query from the Mayor, stated that adjustments would be made to customers' billings for out-of-service time. Mr. Wilson suggested that a time frame be set for allowing Tribune-United to respond to the Mayor and Council, in writing, to both the proposed resolution and the other complaints registered. Councilmember Aldri-ghetti asked that it be relayed to company management that a letter of explanation of down-time in the system addressed to subscribers, stating what adjustment(s) would be made to their bill(s), and perhaps offering an apology for inconveniences suffered, would be an initial step in the right direction. Councilmember Williams moved that the resolution be tabled, duly seconded by Councilmember Haney. Mr. Williams stated that this would afford time for further clarification of the issues. Councilmember D'Ovidio stated that the tabling should be for a two-week period only, particularly if problems cited at the current meeting are not demonstrably being addressed. Mr. Beech requested that Council, during the stated time period, take note of the volume and type of complaints in judging whether remedial action is being pursued. It was noted that at the June 24 meeting, staff would present a cable TV status report. The Mayor pointed out that it would be to Tribune-United's political advantage to settle the problems, particularly the complaint reporting process, otherwise, the resolution presented would be forwarded to the County Council, which could have serious repercussions for the firm; he hoped Mr. Beech in reporting back to his company would emphasize the serious nature of the issues discussed.

Rev. Albaugh: suggested it might be helpful to forward a transcript of the current discussion to management at Tribune-United; he questioned whether Mr. Beech would attend the June 24 meeting. City Clerk Pusti stated a copy of the pertinent section of the recorded tape would be forwarded to Tribune-United, and also to County Executive Gilchrist (as requested).

Ellery Dennison: commented Tribune-United appeared to have its head in the sand, they avoid dealing with complaints by having only one call-in number, questioned the capability of the company's management.

The question was called on the motion to table the resolution for two weeks (with a tape copy being forwarded to those aforementioned). Prior to the vote, Councilmember Bradley stated that under the third "WHEREAS," of the proposed resolution, the last sample complaint should be amended to state that "service had been intermittent for several weeks, most recently no service for from one to three days, from Friday through Sunday, June 7th and 8th." She noted that the failure to provide service had not been recently only, but had been an intermittent problem. The vote was cast, the motion to table carried unanimously.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION
(attached)

2. Second reading of an ordinance establishing a handicap parking space in front of 240 Park Avenue.

Mr. Wilson noted that of the 31 nearby residents surveyed, 8 responded (all from Park Avenue) and expressed objection(s), citing as reasons that the individual making the request has off-street parking space which will accommodate three vehicles and had planted a flower garden in the public right-of-way, obstructing parking for others, had posted a "no parking" sign on the public right-of-way, and, additionally, the fact that available parking on that street is very limited. It was noted that, as was the case at the first reading, the requestor, Ms.

LaVaute, was not present. Councilmember D'Ovidio moved adoption of the ordinance, duly seconded by Councilmember Iddings. Councilmember Iddings spoke concerning the parking congestion on Park Avenue, the fact that Ms. LaVaute has alternative parking on her property, and that all handicap parking spaces granted over the past three years have been in instances where the individual had no off-street parking available; he opposed the ordinance. The ordinance was defeated by roll call vote as follows: AYE: None; NAY: Councilmembers Aldrighetti, D'Ovidio, Haney and Iddings; EXCUSED: Councilmembers Bradley, Dalmat and Williams.

3. Ordinance to accept proposal of Canada Life Insurance Company for accidental death and dismemberment insurance, and disability insurance for employees.

Richard Robbins, initiator of the RFP for the coverage (at the direction of Mayor and Council) spoke; he summarized the process, said 25 RFP's were mailed, 3 responses received. He referred to his June 6 memo outlining the various plans on which bids were submitted and discussed and elaborated on the material contained therein. He noted that the plan should be approved as soon as possible, in light of July 1 being the deadline date by which any coverage change would have to be effected. He commented at length on the various categories of coverage and rates. Councilmember Iddings commented that coverage for life and dismemberment would cost the City less under the new policy, what actually requires consideration is the new coverage for disability which will add about \$6,000 to the total cost. Mr. Robbins explained the several disability plans offered. Councilmember Iddings questioned the rationale for adding this coverage to the employees' benefit package. Mr. Robbins stated that when preparing the RFP, the intent was to get the best possible price, and the more coverage that could be gotten, the better the overall price would probably be. Over a period of time, interest and concern have been expressed (both by employees and prior management) about the lack of disability insurance coverage for employees. The proposed coverage would provide for those accidents/illnesses not covered by sick leave or Workmen's Compensation, or for a period in addition to those, if necessary; he expressed a preference for the 90-day/5-year plan outlined in his June 6 memorandum. Councilmember Aldrighetti requested that, if consensus was reached among Council to provide this additional benefit, input be sought from employees regarding their plan preferences (of the 3 offered). In response to query from Councilmember Iddings, Mr. Robbins stated that most municipalities do not offer this benefit, nor do most government agencies, and, in instances where it is offered, employees are required to contribute (which can generate problems because cost is affected by level of employee participation). He pointed out that the cost figures provided were based upon the coverage being provided 100% by the City. Councilmember Iddings commented that at the time amendments were made to the City Code in regard to employees' leave, the need/desire for disability insurance was expressed by some employees; he said the current proposal would appear to fulfill that wish, said he would support furnishing that coverage, and if consensus of support was reached, would also ask that the proposal be presented to the Employees' Committee and input solicited. Mr. Wilson stated a meeting would be arranged with the committee; he agreed that provision of such coverage had been brought up more than once, particularly by police department personnel; he suggested that, in future, should rates for that coverage escalate seriously, cost-sharing with the employee should be considered. He commented on the excellent track record and clientele of Canada Life. Mr. Robbins remarked that in checking with clients of the company, he received only favorable comments, particularly on the consistency of rates and claim settlements. He asked that authorization be given to commencing contract negotiations with Canada Life, based on a 99% probability of the ordinance being adopted in the very near future. Mrs. Abbott commented that an appropriation was effected recently for an insurance consultant contract and wondered how that tied into the current proposed ordinance. Mr. Wilson stated that the insurance consultant would be reviewing the overall levels of liability insurance (those which would cover the City in the event of litigation), e.g., vehicles, buildings, liability, etc.; the insurance(s) presently under consideration are employee-related. In response to query from the Mayor, Mr. Wilson stated that specific figures had not been factored into budget calculations to cover cost of the disability insurance,

funds would have to be redistributed to cover the required \$6,000. Councilmember Iddings commented he would not be comfortable taking action on the ordinance without input from the Employees' Committee and without having had Canada Life provide the required Nuclear Free Certification. Mr. Robbins commented the Certification of Non-Nuclear Involvement should be in-hand within the next couple of days, appropriately signed and notarized. The Mayor remarked that he did not think employees would disagree with having a disability policy provided, however, concurred that they should have a voice in the type of policy. Councilmember Iddings moved that Council collectively support the addition of disability benefits to the employees' benefit package and direct that necessary meetings be held with the Employees' Committee to select the type of policy, duly seconded, carried unanimously.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE
(attached)

4. Ordinance (Code amendment) setting City Tax Rate for FY 1985-86.

Mr. Wilson stated that Prince George's County had indicated that they will not wait beyond June 18, which is the date that County Council sets the county tax rate; they had, in fact, indicated requiring the City's input by June 11. He commented Takoma Park is not the only municipality that has not submitted their rate, a delay has been requested and will continue to be pursued; he suggested continuing the prior schedule which called for finalization of the City's tax rate by June 24, with one or two meetings in the interim. He noted that the proposed use of Federal Revenue Sharing Funds in FY 1985-86 remains to be addressed prior to budget adoption, as well as approval of the City Employees Pay Plan for FY 1985-86. He suggested adoption of the current pay plan for the upcoming fiscal year, which would facilitate computing bonuses for employees in the event money is found for that purpose, as well as allowing time for staff to review and amend the pay scale plan prior to readoption. It was moved, duly seconded, and carried unanimously, that the budget process, including setting of the tax rate, would be continued at a later date.

Roland Halstead: questioned whether the City tax bills go out July 1 and how that could happen if information were not timely supplied. Mr. Wilson explained that the counties print the City tax bills; once the City supplies them the tax rate, they will proceed; there is no mandate that the bills be mailed July 1. Montgomery County agreed to wait until June 25 for that information, said it would be no problem; Prince George's is saying that they won't wait and won't issue the tax bills until August 1 if the information is not supplied when they want it. He pointed out that the State mandate gives the municipality until July 1 to set the tax rate. In response to query, he stated the tax rate will be uniform across the city; adjustments will be made in accordance with reimbursements received by the City from each county, and the tax differential on the Prince George's side. Mr. Wilson reminded Council of the need to afford some consideration to the Capital Improvement Budget, as well as pending budget decisions outlined in a memorandum. Councilmember D'Ovidio requested that an agenda of necessary decisions be provided for the meeting(s) in Ocean City in order to formalize/organize the process.

Upon motion, duly seconded, the meeting adjourned at 11:25 P.M., to reconvene in regular session at 8:00 P.M., on June 24, 1985.

Introduced by:

Enacted:

RESOLUTION 1985-

WHEREAS, for some five years the citizens of Takoma Park have looked forward with great anticipation to the availability and enjoyment of Cable TV in the City; AND

WHEREAS, installation of the system is near completion; however, the Mayor and Council are deeply concerned about the quality of service being rendered by Tribune United; AND

WHEREAS, complaints from citizens are received in the City office on a daily basis, a sampling of which is enumerated below:

--Inability to register complaints with Tribune United due to interminable delays in telephone communications;

--Absence of response to complaints even if they are successfully registered;

--Improper billing practices;

--Extremely poor reception in many areas;

--Installation not done in a workmanlike manner;

--Only interim service for several weeks; most recently, no service at all from one to three days during the weekend period June 7, 8 and 9, and no response to calls made to Tribune United.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND hereby call upon the Montgomery County Council to effectuate remedies to the aforementioned problems by taking the necessary steps to ensure Tribune United's compliance with the franchise agreement.

JUNE 10, 1985.

Introduced by:

Enacted:

ORDINANCE NO. 1985-_____

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

- SECTION 1. THAT it has been decided that City employees are to be provided with improved benefits, to include accidental death and dismemberment, and disability insurance coverage; AND
- SECTION 2. THAT requests for proposals were solicited from qualified insurance carriers and advertised once in The Washington Post newspaper, as required by Ordinance No. 1985-20 (procurement); AND
- SECTION 3. THAT proposals were accepted until 3:00 PM, May 15, 1985, at which time they were publicly opened, with three proposals having been received; AND
- SECTION 4. THAT the proposals were reviewed and evaluated, and the recommendation has been forwarded, from the Assistant City Administrator for Operations, that the Canada Life Insurance Company be awarded the policy for accidental death and dismemberment, and disability insurance coverage at a cost of TWENTY THOUSAND, NINE HUNDRED FOURTEEN DOLLARS AND EIGHT CENTS (\$20,914.08); AND
- SECTION 5. THAT the current policy with Prudential Insurance Company, for the provision of accidental death and dismemberment insurance coverage only, be discontinued as soon as the coverage from Canada Life Insurance Company goes into effect on July 1, 1985, for a one year policy period.
- SECTION 5. THEREFORE THAT the City Administrator or his designee is hereby authorized to execute the appropriate policy contract documents.

THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

Regular Meeting of the Mayor and Council

June 24, 1985

8:00 PM

AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Abbott
ROLL CALL: Councilmember Aldrighetti
Councilmember Bradley
Councilmember Dalmat
Councilmember D'Ovidio
Councilmember Haney
Councilmember Iddings
Councilmember Williams

PLEDGE

MAYOR ABBOTT'S COMMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS'

READING AND APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING HELD MAY 20, 1985

ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS

GENERAL CITIZENS' REMARKS (those not directed at items for Council action)

ITEMS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION: City Administrator Wilson

1. Administrative reports and communications
Presentation by Robert Miller, Chairman, Prince George's County Board of License Commissioners re liquor licenses
2. Ordinance adopting Fiscal Year 1985-86 City Budget
Citizens' comments
Council action
3. Council approval of Proposed Use of Federal Revenue Sharing Funds, FY 1985-86
Citizens' comments
Council action
4. Ordinance (Code amendment) setting City Tax Rate for FY 1985-86
Citizens' comments
Council action
5. Ordinance approving City Employees Pay Plan for FY 1985-86
Citizens' comments
Council action
6. Ordinance to accept proposal of Canada Life Insurance Company for accidental death and dismemberment insurance, and disability insurance for employees
Citizens' comments
Council action
7. City Newsletter - July edition

ADJOURNMENT

THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

Regular Meeting of the Mayor and Council
June 24, 1985

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Mayor Abbott	City Administrator Wilson
Councilmember Aldrighetti	Asst. City Administrator Habada
Councilmember Bradley	City Clerk Pusti
Councilmember Dalmat	Asst. Housing Director Austin
Councilmember D'Ovidio	Police Chief Fisher
Councilmember Haney	
Councilmember Iddings	
Councilmember Williams	

The Mayor and Council convened at 8:30 P.M., on June 24, 1985, in the Council Chamber, 7500 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland, for the purpose of conducting their regularly scheduled meeting and continuing budget-adoption-related matters from the June 10, 1985 meeting.

Following the pledge, Mr. Wilson noted receipt of a telephone call from Robert Miller, Chairman of the Prince George's County Board of License Commissioners, advising he would be unable to attend the meeting and would call and reschedule at a later date. He was originally scheduled to give a presentation concerning liquor licenses. Mr. Wilson also noted upcoming COLTA hearings: June 26, 6:00 P.M., TP-270, TP-286 and TP-292 (combined into one general case for hearing on an emergency basis). Case TP-294, Miller vs. Murphy, will be heard on an emergency basis on July 3 at 7:00 P.M.

GENERAL CITIZENS' REMARKS: (not directed at items for Council action)
Thomas Connelly, Ownership Group at Park Ritchie Apartments: referred to the proposal to renovate the apartment building and the hope that they would be able to involve all tenants in the process; noted that assistance from the City in the form of a bond issue had been requested. He stated a meeting was held on June 5, attended by approximately 30 people, details of the proposed renovations were outlined, as well as anticipated improvements in management of the property, and a plan to phase in rent increases. He said a number of specific concerns about conditions of the property were expressed by tenants, and efforts have been made to correct those. Security and lack of a live-in resident manager were expressed as priority items and both have been addressed. He said it was also promised that an analysis would be prepared for distribution to tenants specifically setting forth what their rent increases would be over the next five years. He stated that on June 12, he and Mr. Lilienfeld arrived at the Municipal Building for a meeting with tenants which they had arranged, and were told that the tenants wished to meet among themselves, with the Mayor and City Administrator also in attendance. He said they waited until adjournment of the meeting at 10:30 P.M., at which time they were informed by Councilmember Williams (a tenant of the building) that the tenants had formed an association, and had voted down management's proposal, suggesting that they return to the drawing board. He commented he did not feel that all tenants were properly notified that a tenants' association was going to be formed, nor that a vote was going to be taken (only 25 out of 180 tenants were at the meeting). He stated that, in principle, ownership would welcome a tenants' association because it would assist in communicating with tenants at large, however, they were concerned that the newly-formed association may not be truly representative of the tenants. He noted that ownership had not been contacted by the new association; they had looked to City Council to make decisions regarding their renovation proposal and its feasibility, believed they had created a reasonable balance in the proposal between needs of the tenants and profitability and value of the property to not only the owners, but the city and the tenants.

Councilmember Williams stated that since it is the tenants who will be paying for the renovation, they should be making the decisions; he said the tenants felt a need to organize and he thought they had done so quite well, and had made a point of informing other tenants and gaining their support; he noted that ownership's proposal will involve rent increase(s), for which they would have to apply to COLTA, and mentioned that there are outstanding code violations. Councilmember

Haney commented that the owners appeared to have been open, honest and forthright in their approach; he questioned why they were excluded from the June 12 meeting which they had originally initiated. Mr. Williams stated that the meeting had been jointly agreed upon and the tenants decided they wished to meet among themselves. Councilmember Dalmat commented that they were "disinvited" without even the courtesy of a phone call, stated she was personally offended by the way the matter was handled, felt the developers deserved an apology. Throughout the discussion, Mr. Connelly reiterated several times the willingness of ownership to meet with the tenants. Following lengthy heated dialogue, it was noted that there is now a tenants' association and the next step should be for ownership to meet with them for discussion purposes; the City, at a later point in the process, will be involved in deciding whether financial assistance will be forthcoming, whether a Housing Authority will be formed. In light of prior occurrences, Councilmember Haney suggested several times during the discussion that once a meeting date is mutually agreed upon by ownership and tenants, a notice of said meeting on Housing Services City letterhead be disseminated to all tenants.

Tom Beech, Tribune-United Cable Company: as a follow-up to the June 10 meeting discussion, he presented a status report on efforts made by Tribune-United to address stated complaints. He said they had directed efforts toward improving the system, particularly the picture quality and reliability; he solicited any comments, either positive or negative. Councilmember Aldrighetti thanked Mr. Beech for following up on the situation and attending the meeting, and referred to a recent article in the Washington Post concerning the cable system, in relation to which he again raised the question of the company having one published number for subscribers registering complaints. The Mayor commented on a broadcast interview with Mr. Schmuhl of Tribune, in which he stated that the phone congestion was due in large part to people calling to inquire how to go about subscribing; Mayor Abbott suggested that the firm log complaints and have two separate numbers for the two separate purposes (subscribing and troubleshooting). Mr. Beech commented that was being considered, but he did not know whether it would be implemented. He stated that there had been a number of billing complaints related to the computer software and those had been corrected, which should substantially reduce the number of complaint calls. The Mayor noted that the proposed resolution presented at the June 10 meeting was forwarded to the County Executive as intended; he thanked Mr. Beech for his attendance and for efforts put forth.

ITEMS FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION:

1. Ordinance adopting Fiscal Year 1985-86 Budget.

Mr. Wilson summarized the ordinance; the Mayor pointed out that the language in the second paragraph of Section 1. should be changed to clarify that the \$636,707 CDBG Capital Outlay is not included in the General Contingency Account amount (plus substituted for "additionally,"). Councilmember Iddings commented that the latest information supplied by the City Administrator indicated a need to raise taxes 3.3 cents in order to fund the budget; he said he would prefer not having to raise taxes at all, proposed amending the figures to incorporate a \$57,548 budget reduction which would alleviate any need for a tax increase. He noted that the amount in General Contingency Fund was far higher than in prior years; Ms. Habada pointed out that \$82,500 of that amount was to cover employee bonuses, the remaining amount was 2% of the budget, consistent with prior practice. Councilmember Bradley commented on prior discussions of how the budget could be kept within limitations to avoid raising taxes (or even be able to lower them, in light of rising property assessments). In order to minimally reduce the tax rate, she moved several specific budget reductions which, added to the \$12,846 in unappropriated funds, would allow a 1 cent reduction in the proposed tax rate. Councilmember Iddings commented the reduction proposed would not be sufficient to allow a tax rate reduction, commented an additional \$40,000 would need to be cut. Ms. Bradley's motion was duly seconded by Councilmember Williams. Councilmember Aldrighetti questioned how it would be possible to cut the required amount from the budget to effect a reduction in the tax rate when there are added services (such as Newsletter editorship) which will increase costs; also the bonuses for employees, which he stated he felt were a minimal amount to do for staff. He commented he felt

the proposed budget was a compromise, but one he was willing to live with. Councilmember D'Ovidio stated support for Mr. Aldrighetti's comments, said the budget as it stands expresses Council's goals. Councilmember Haney echoed support, commented on the many hours invested in budget discussions. Following discussion of Parliamentary Procedure in relation to amending an ordinance, Councilmember Haney moved adoption of the ordinance, duly seconded by Councilmember D'Ovidio. Council-member Bradley then restated her prior motion, moving that the budget be reduced by \$17,161, duly seconded. She stated her support for the proposed budget despite compromises that had to be made. Councilmember Iddings commented that in the current budget process, there had been no stated target amount that current tax rates would raise (as in past years), giving Council a goal to work against; he felt that if a target had been provided, Council could have found cuts to make and a tax rate increase would not have been necessary. He suggested setting the budget at what the current tax rate would raise (\$5,309,114) and directing the City Administrator to come back at a future point with identification of what cuts could be made to remain within that figure. Councilmember Bradley supported Mr. Iddings' proposal in concept, however, pointed out that staff had put in extensive work on the budget and if a decision were made at the current point in time to effect changes, Council should be actively involved and she would be willing to participate. It was noted that in order to meet State mandates, the budget must be adopted by the last day of June. In response to query, Mr. Wilson stated that the only decision made in Ocean City with regard to informing Prince George's on the tax rate was to advise them, for purposes of the Circuit Breaker Tax Provision, to use last year's tax rate for that calculation. He stated that he was advised this date by Prince George's County that unless they were advised on June 25 of the City's tax rate, they would be unable to print Takoma Park's tax bills until early August. The City Clerk pointed out that in order to comply with the City Charter, a statement should be included under Section 1. of the ordinance concerning the setting aside of a Capital Improvements Reserve Fund in the amount of 1% of total revenue; following discussion, consensus was that that be done. The question was called on Councilmember Bradley's motion to amend the budget, in effect, cutting it by \$17,161; the amendment was defeated 5-2 with Councilmembers Bradley and Williams voting Aye, balance of Council voting Nay. Councilmember Iddings moved that the budget be reduced by \$56,632, and that the City Administrator be directed to identify where cuts could be made in specific line items; no second was offered. The question was called on the motion for adoption; the ordinance, as amended, was adopted by roll call vote as follows: AYE: Councilmembers Aldrighetti, Bradley, Dalmat, D'Ovidio, Haney, Iddings and Williams; NAY: None; EXCUSED: None.

ORDINANCE #1985-41
(attached)

2. Council approval of Proposed Use of Federal Revenue Sharing Funds, FY-1985-86.

In response to query from the Mayor, Ms. Habada stated that \$88,134 was probably not the entire amount the City would be getting, however, the calculation was based on the probability that there would be one more year of funding split between two budget years - the \$88,134 is the minimum amount anticipated for the upcoming year. She noted that the number of police patrol cars proposed had been reduced by one, which would effect a \$9,400 reduction in that figure (now making it \$22,000). Following discussion, Councilmember D'Ovidio moved approval of the proposed use of Revenue Sharing Funds, duly seconded, with the proviso that the \$9,400 amount for one police vehicle be frozen and discussed at a later date, as well as the fuel dispensing system which will be considered versus the need for renovation of the Library roof. Councilmember Bradley commented, as a reminder, on the need to meet and discuss strategies for replacing Revenue Sharing Funds and CDBG funding, both of which are coming to an end. It was noted that a budget amendment will be effected at a later date concerning the two Revenue Sharing items mentioned earlier, and a Public Hearing held, which might result in other adjustments. Councilmember Bradley stated, for the record, that her remembrance was that there was originally a consensus to fund a total of two (2) police vehicles. The question was called on the motion to approve the Proposed Revenue

Sharing Budget; carried unanimously.

REVENUE SHARING PROPOSED USE
(attached)

3. Ordinance (Code amendment) setting City Tax Rate for FY 1985-86.

Mr. Wilson noted that the ordinance, based on the budget and based on the ordinance passed last year, would require an insertion of a rate of \$2.017 per \$100 of assessed value. Councilmember D'Ovidio moved adoption of the ordinance, duly seconded by Councilmember Haney. Mr. Wilson noted that the overall rate would require adjustment in order to accommodate the difference IN the ways in which the two counties give a tax reduction to their citizens; that adjustment will result in a \$1.488 rate for the Montgomery County residents, and \$1.981 for Prince George's residents of the city. The Mayor suggested that Mr. Wilson's several-page memorandum concerning the tax rate be condensed/reduced onto one legal-size page for distribution to citizens inquiring about the subject; Mr. Wilson suggested the ordinance also be attached for information purposes. The question was called; the ordinance was adopted by roll call vote as follows: AYE: Councilmembers Aldrighetti, Bradley, Dalmat, D'Ovidio, Haney, Iddings and Williams; NAY: None; EXCUSED: None.

ORDINANCE #1985-42
(attached)

Councilmember Aldrighetti read a resolution which was prepared in pre-Council session concerning the City's tax rate situation directed to officials of the two counties; he moved its passage, duly seconded by Councilmember Bradley. The Mayor asked that, in the second sentence, the word "desire" be changed to requirement. It was noted that while no statement was made in the resolution that what was requested would require State legislation, that could be included in a cover letter from the City Administrator accompanying the document. There was brief discussion of whether or not State legislation was required, to whom the document should be disseminated; the Mayor noted that it, along with other explanatory material, could be forwarded to the Legislative Reference Service for their opinion. The resolution passed by unanimous vote.

RESOLUTION #1985-17
(attached)

4. Ordinance approving City Employees Pay Plan for FY 1985-86.

Mr. Wilson noted an adjustment in the Grade Structure page which would add under Administrative Staff an Administrative Assistant position, rescind the Assistant City Administrator for Operations position, and delete "for Administration" after Assistant City Administrator, as there would no longer be any need to differentiate. It was noted that under Police Department, the Parking Enforcement Officer position was abolished some time ago and should be deleted from the listing. Mr. Wilson noted that, over a period of time, the pay plan has been dramatically skewed due to inappropriate adjustments. He said that staff, with assistance from a small consulting firm, will be reviewing the pay plan and making appropriate adjustments so that step and grade differences are consistent. Once that is accomplished, adjustments will be made to the present pay scale; those will be no more than 3%, and, in some rare instances, no adjustment will be required. At some future point in time, these revisions will cost the City some money, however, the total amount involved was not presently known. He opined that the longevity steps should not be a part of the pay plan; they are addressed in the City Code and should be applied in compliance with the Code. He stated that once staff has come up with a formula for applying longevity, it will be discussed with the Employees' Committee and then presented to the Mayor and Council. Councilmember D'Ovidio moved adoption of the ordinance, duly seconded by Councilmember Bradley.

Pfc. Jim Tompkins, Police Department: commented that employees view a pay raise as a token of appreciation for a job well done, said police employees feel they have been doing a good job for the citizens. He pointed out the rising cost of everyday necessities and the fact that

employees have to meet those costs, said lack of any sort of raise would indicate to employees that they have not performed as desired, urged that Council come up with some sort of pay increase. The Mayor commented on the numerous recent promotions in the Police Department accompanied by appropriate pay increases. Councilmember Aldrighetti commented that there is a \$500 across-the-board bonus for employees included in the budget. Sgt. Jack Goetz commented that employees' morale is not at a high level in light of cuts made to their vehicle request, radio request, and lack of a pay raise. Councilmember D'Ovidio responded, pointing out the increases that department has received in recent years (probably more than any other department) in terms of increased personnel, vehicle replacements, new radio system; he said the positive side should be viewed rather than the fact that everything desired was not gotten. He expressed the hope that employees would not view appreciation for job performance solely in monetary terms, commented on the outstanding job the Police Department did in handling the crowds and traffic at the recent Sister Fire Concert. Councilmember Aldrighetti remarked on the fact that 1/4 of the police force received promotions/pay increases in advance of the budget process, the new radio system was installed; he questioned the price of not continuing to hear of morale problems, remarked that finding the money to fund the \$500 employee bonuses, whether they would be appreciated or not, was not an easy task and reminded that a 7.8% increase was given last year. The Mayor commented that the inflation rate had dropped, the \$500 bonus would equate to an approximate 2.5% increase on a \$20,000 salary. Mr. Wilson noted that this year's budget was forced to address the inherited problem of people not having been paid for hours worked at the time they performed the extra work, but being allowed to accumulate large amounts of leave; under new regulations, overtime and holiday hours will be paid during the pay period they are worked, and those projected amounts are included in this year's budget. Additionally included in this budget is \$50,000 set aside toward paying off a portion of the previously unfunded liability of accumulated employee leave. He reiterated and emphasized the intent to ensure that, in terms of pay for overtime and holiday hours, the policy would be to pay as it is earned. He noted that the cost to the City for employees' fringe benefits had also increased this year; the new budget has had to absorb an approximate \$200,000 in either hidden or new costs despite being essentially a zero growth budget.

Asst. Housing Director Austin emphasized the importance of an incentive for employees to perform at an above-average level, would like to see some sort of merit program implemented for next year (FY 1986-87) which would monetarily reward those people doing a good job, and, in addition would penalize those people not performing in accordance with their capabilities - at present the only option(s) for dealing with the latter is either termination or written reprimand. Councilmember Iddings concurred, said that is what Council wants and has been working toward; Councilmember D'Ovidio pointed out that the present pay plan was supposed to be based on merit, however, has not been utilized in that way. Mr. Austin expressed appreciation for the proposed bonus for employees. It was noted that in last year's budget, \$2,000 was appropriated, but not expended, for an employees' incentive awards program; both that and the training fund, which might also be viewed as an incentive, have been included in the current budget. Councilmember Dalmat pointed out that the \$500 bonus accomplishes an important goal in that it gives a higher percentage to those earning less, will be more helpful to those on the lower end of the salary scale than to those at the higher end.

In response to a query from the City Clerk, Council stated that neither in-grade increases nor COL was included in the budget.

Chief Fisher stated that the promotions within the Police Department were a professional process, not intended to award anyone for simply being on the job, had, in fact, improved professional management within the department. He pointed out that the promotions did not increase the salary line item, that item had in fact decreased; four additional employees were rendered exempt from overtime pay as a result of the promotions. In the discussion which followed, it was noted that the promotions themselves did not, in fact, reduce the salary line item, but that had been effected by retirements, resigna-

tions within that department and replacements in those positions with people at a lower salary rate. Chief Fisher spoke concerning equipment requests, said those proposed are made not based simply on "wants," but on the basis of current equipment being an actual liability to the city - for instance, police vehicles with mileage in excess of 90,000. He commented that one of the major issues still affecting employee morale is the lack of openness in the process - the fact, for instance, that the proposal to give employees a \$500 bonus in lieu of a salary increase had not been disseminated to employees; Mr. Aldrighetti commented that conclusions were reached on that proposal only during the pre-Council session. Chief Fisher remarked that 99% of items Council acts on are public information and should not be handled in a secretive manner; he commented on the difficulty in dealing with employees on issues when he is not kept properly informed of what is transpiring, said the problem is not so much the decisions that are made as the process through which they are made, precluding the opportunity for department heads to properly inform employees and engender their support. Discussion ensued concerning the need to add a Section 4. to the Pay Plan Ordinance covering the one-time \$500 bonus and its provisions, as well as whether the amount should be pro-rated for part-time employees based upon their hours worked. The suggested wording for the new Section 4. was "That each current employee of record as of July 1, 1985 shall receive a one-time \$500 bonus." Councilmember Aldrighetti commented that it would tend to minimize the bonus for full-time staff if it were not pro-rated on a percentage basis for part-time people; Council concurred. In response to query from the Mayor, Mr. Wilson stated that the bonus could be made in a lump sum payment if that were most acceptable to the majority of employees, perhaps during late fall preceding the holidays; the matter would be discussed with Employees' Committee representatives for their input.

Sgt. Jack Goetz asked that not only the part-time hours be considered in relation to the bonus for the Crossing Guards, but the responsibilities their job carries, their dedication, as well as the discomforts and other negative factors they contend with; he asked that they be given the full bonus amount.

In response to query, Mr. Wilson stated that the cost to the City to give the bonus had been calculated based on all employees receiving the flat \$500; in light of that and Sgt. Goetz's comments, as well as the hazards of their job, Councilmember Williams supported the Crossing Guards receiving the \$500 amount. Councilmember Bradley pointed out it should be considered that it would be primarily women being possibly discriminated against, as they comprise the majority of part-time employees, if the bonus were pro-rated on a percentage basis.

Councilmember Iddings moved amending the Pay Plan Ordinance to add a Section 4. which would read "That, in addition, each current full-time employee of record be paid a \$500 one-time bonus, with part-time employees to be paid a bonus according to their full-time equivalency rate." The motion was duly seconded by Councilmember Dalmat. Councilmember Haney requested that the City Administrator present at a future date proposals for some sort of employee recognition to utilize any surplus in the amount appropriated for bonuses, perhaps crediting to the employee award account; Council concurred. Following additional discussion, Councilmember Iddings withdrew his motion with approval of the seconder; Councilmember Bradley asked that the original motion to adopt the pay plan be acted upon, with the bonus considered as a separate action. The question was called; the ordinance was adopted by roll call vote as follows: AYE: Councilmembers Aldrighetti, Bradley, Dalmat, D'Ovidio, Haney and Williams; NAY: Councilmember Iddings; EXCUSED: None. For the record, Councilmember Iddings stated he voted in the negative because the ordinance contains no provision for bonuses or any sort of pay increase for employees.

ORDINANCE #1985-43
(attached)

Councilmember Bradley moved that the money included in the FY 1985-86 budget for employee bonuses be dispersed to all current full-time equivalent employees in the form of a \$500 bonus with part-time employees pro-rated according to the number of hours they work, duly secon-

ded by Councilmember D'Ovidio. Councilmember Iddings suggested that the City Administrator be directed to come up with a dispersement plan. Following dialogue, the Mayor moved that the motion include a statement that the City Administrator be directed to come up with a plan for dispersement of the unexpended amount appropriated for bonuses, duly seconded by Councilmember Bradley; amendment accepted. Police Officer Tompkins reiterated support for giving part-time employees the full bonus amount. Following additional discussion, Mr. Wilson requested that a period of time, up to two weeks, be afforded for listing and defining permanent part-time, temporary part-time, seasonal and contract employees in the context of the bonus situation. Councilmember Bradley asked that this be given priority so that employees can be advised where they stand as soon as possible. The question was called on the original motion, as amended; the motion carried with Councilmember Williams voting Nay, Councilmember Iddings Abstaining, balance of Council voting Aye.

5. Ordinance to accept proposal of Canada Life Insurance Company for accidental death and dismemberment insurance, and disability insurance for employees.

Mr. Wilson stated that employees surveyed favored plan 3 for disability insurance, which stipulates a 180 day delay for payment and provides coverage to age 65. Councilmember Dalmat moved adoption of the ordinance, duly seconded by Councilmember Aldrighetti. Ms. Habada noted that in the budget additional money will need to be appropriated from General Contingency and put into individual departmental fringe benefits line items to cover cost of disability insurance (\$6,000) which is a new benefit. It was noted that under the policy, all leave must be exhausted prior to payments commencing, at which time payment is 60% of salary (when application is made, a minimum payment of \$50/mo. will be made until such time as leave is exhausted), and continues (if the employee is unable to return to work) until age 65. In response to query, Mr. Wilson assured employees would be notified of the addition of this benefit and of their coverage. The ordinance was adopted by roll call vote as follows: AYE: Councilmembers Aldrighetti, Bradley, Dalmat, D'Ovidio, Haney and Iddings; NAY: None; EXCUSED: Councilmember Williams.

ORDINANCE #1985-44
(attached)

6. City Newsletter - July edition.

Mr. Wilson stated he had received a very substantial number of contributions for the subject issue of the Newsletter, asked Council's direction as to what the next step should be. Councilmember D'Ovidio stated that what was needed was someone to edit the July issue, get it to the typesetter and printer and use the same distribution system as previously utilized. Mr. Wilson noted that 4 names had been given to him during worksession of individuals interested in the presently vacant position, he would follow up on those if that was Council's wish. Councilmember Aldrighetti commented that an article setting forth the circumstances and what had occurred should be in the forthcoming issue, as well as an ad for a temporary part-time editor. Councilmember Haney requested that the explanatory article be placed on page 1 and conspicuously blocked off. Consensus was that Mr. Wilson, in light of the short time frame, designate someone to do the July issue as soon as possible in order to be able to get it out, with the aforementioned ad for an editor to be included in that issue. Councilmember Aldrighetti moved that the maximum payment for layout and editing services for the July issue be \$500, duly seconded; carried with Councilmembers Bradley and Williams voting Nay, balance of Council voting Aye. In response to query concerning responsibility for maintaining quality of the Newsletter, it was stated that was Council's jurisdiction.

Upon motion, duly seconded, the meeting adjourned at 11:43 P.M., to reconvene in regular session at 8:00 P.M. on July 8, 1985.

ORDINANCE NO. 1985-41

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

SECTION 1. THAT in accordance with Sec. 1.14 of the Charter of Takoma Park, Maryland, the budget for Fiscal Year 1985-86 is hereby approved and adopted for the year beginning July 1, 1985, said budget providing estimated revenues of FIVE MILLION, THREE HUNDRED SIXTY-SIX THOUSAND, SIX HUNDRED SIXTY-TWO DOLLARS (\$5,366,662), an expenditure appropriation as follows:

Public Works	\$1,489,587
Police Department	\$1,400,916
Government Administration	\$ 647,126
Library	\$ 241,824
Recreation	\$ 186,837
Housing	\$ 166,186
Miscellaneous	\$ 293,552
Debt Service	\$ 133,937
Capital Outlay	<u>\$ 157,144</u>
	\$4,717,109

including a General Contingency Account in the amount of ONE HUNDRED EIGHTY NINE THOUSAND, EIGHT HUNDRED AND THIRTY THREE DOLLARS (\$189,833); plus Community Development Capital Outlay in the amount of SIX HUNDRED THIRTY SIX THOUSAND, SEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVEN DOLLARS (\$636,707); and plus Capital Improvement Reserve Fund in the amount of FIFTY THREE THOUSAND, SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY SIX DOLLARS (\$53,666); AND

SECTION 2. THAT the City Administrator is hereby authorized to compute salaries for all City employees as related to various departments and disburse accordingly; to pay all rentals on the first of each month and bills monthly, discounting such bills as possible; AND

SECTION 3. THAT all capital outlay items be expressly authorized by the Council with the exception of professional services costing less than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) and items costing less than two thousand five hundred dollars (\$2,500), funds for which shall be properly authorized.

ADOPTED THIS 24TH DAY OF JUNE, 1985.

August 21, 1986

Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 1985/86;
Attachment to Ordinance no. 1985-41.

(Part of Council Minutes for meeting of
June 24, 1985)

Adopted Budget is bound separately in
Council Minutes, Vol. 56A

FY 1985-86 REVENUE SHARING BUDGET

Fuel Dispensing System	\$40,700**
Police Patrol Cars (2)	23,000**
City-wide Office Automation	12,000
Postage Meter	2,000
Metal Gate - Finance Office Safe	1,034*
TOTAL:	\$88,134 (includes \$9,400 deleted from police patrol car proposal)

* partial funding

** subject to amendment at a later date

Approved 6/24/85

Introduced by: Councilmember D'Ovidio

ORDINANCE NO. 1985-42

WHEREAS. the City Council is charged by Sec. 1.9 of the City Charter to establish a tax rate on or before the last day of June in each year.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

SECTION 1. THAT Sec . 11A-2 and 11A-3, Chapter 11A, "Taxation, of the Code of Takoma Park, Md., 1972 as amended, be further amended to read as follows:

SEC. 11A-2. Annual tax levy on real and personal property.

(a) Effective July 1, 1985, all real and personal property which is subject to taxation by the City of Takoma Park shall be subject to a tax on the assessed value of such real and personal property, as such value is determined by the State Department of Assessments and Taxation, at the rate of \$ 2.017 per \$100.00 assessed valuation.

SEC. 11A-3. Property tax credit.

(a) Double taxation credit: Effective July 1, 1985, each taxpayer shall be entitled to a credit against the tax which would otherwise be due and payable to the City of Takoma Park equal to an amount determined by:

(1) Dividing the situs county payment actually made in the fiscal year in which a tax credit is to be determined by the assessable and taxable base of the situs county; and

(2) Multiplying the result by each taxable property's adjusted assessed value.

(b) Uniform application of formula. This formula shall be applied uniformly to all classes of taxable real and personal property throughout the city.

(c) Credit for bicounty property. In the event that any real or personal property is located in both Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, any double taxation credit shall be allowed in the same proportion as county property taxes are imposed.

ENACTED 6/24/85

Note: Underscoring denotes changes.

Introduced by: Councilmember Aldrighetti

RESOLUTION #1985-17

WHEREAS, the Takoma Park Property Tax Rate Ordinance and its application have become confusing and unclear to our citizens, AND

WHEREAS, the confusion derives from the city's requirement to achieve equity for all our citizens within the framework of two very different methods of reducing double taxation by the counties in which we live.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Takoma Park Property Tax Ordinance and the City Administrator's Memorandum of June 24, 1985 explaining the method of property tax calculation be sent to the County Executives and County Councils of Prince George's and Montgomery Counties.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City of Takoma Park asks that officials of the two counties direct appropriate staff to meet with City staff with the goal of forging a single system of tax rebates or reductions to assure tax equity and clarity for our citizens.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the elected officials and citizens of Takoma Park thank the elected officials of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties for their assistance and help in this matter.

JUNE 24, 1985

Introduced by: Councilmember D'Ovidio

Adopted: 6/24/85

ORDINANCE NO. 1985- 43

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

SECTION 1. WHEREAS, Section 2-67 of Article 5, entitled Personnel, of the City of Takoma Park Code, 1972, as amended, provides that pay scales may be altered by the Mayor and Council to reflect employee cost-of-living needs, AND

SECTION 2. THAT Section 8 of Ordinance No. 1400, and subsequent amendments thereto, known as the Pay Scale Plan for the City of Takoma Park, has been reviewed, AND

SECTION 3. THAT the Pay Scale Plan effective July 1, 1985 shall be the same as the Fiscal Year 1984-85 Plan, as set forth below.

STEP	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	L-1	L-2
1	9,427	9,765	10,115	10,479	10,856	11,249	11,655	12,078	12,515	12,971	13,593	14,245
5	3,077	3,345	3,614									
6	11,740	12,165	12,606	13,064	13,541	14,035	14,548	15,080	15,632	16,204	16,988	17,811
7	12,273	12,718	13,181	13,661	14,161	14,678	15,215	15,772	16,351	16,952	17,773	18,634
8	12,833	13,300	13,784	14,288	14,811	15,352	15,915	16,499	17,105	17,735	18,595	19,497
9	13,419	13,909	14,418	14,945	15,492	16,060	16,650	17,262	17,897	18,557	19,458	20,404
10	14,037	14,550	15,083	15,635	16,208	16,803	17,422	18,064	18,729	19,420	20,364	21,356
11	14,688	15,226	15,784	16,363	16,963	17,587	18,235	18,908	19,606	20,331	21,320	22,360
12	15,368	15,932	16,517	17,124	17,755	18,409	19,088	19,792	20,524	21,284	22,319	23,409
13	16,101	16,693	17,307	17,944	18,605	19,291	20,004	20,744	21,512	22,308	23,397	24,540
14	16,825	17,456	18,097	18,766	19,458	20,177	20,924	21,698	22,501	23,337	24,476	25,672
15	17,645	18,295	18,970	19,671	20,396	21,152	21,935	22,747	23,591	24,467	25,664	26,919
16	18,452	19,133	19,839	20,572	21,334	22,124	22,942	23,795	24,679	25,596	26,849	28,164
17	19,324	20,037	20,777	21,547	22,344	23,173	24,034	24,927	25,853	26,816	28,130	29,509
18	20,237	20,986	21,764	22,570	23,407	24,276	25,177	26,114	27,086	28,095	29,473	30,919
20	22,261	23,087	23,943	24,832	25,757	26,714	27,709	28,741	29,813	30,925	32,444	34,039
21	23,347	24,216	25,114	26,048	27,017	28,024	29,068	30,152	31,277	32,445	34,040	35,715
23	25,689	26,645	27,637	28,667	29,736	30,844	31,996	33,191	34,431	35,720	37,478	39,326
25	28,263	29,317	30,411	31,546	32,724	33,947	35,215	36,533	37,902	39,321	41,260	43,296
29	34,241	35,522	36,851	38,231	39,664	41,150	42,693	44,295	45,958	47,683	50,041	52,515

GRADE STRUCTURE

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Crossing Guard	5
Clerk/Dispatcher	9
Private	16
Police Affairs Specialist	16
Private First Class	17
Corporal	18
Sergeant	20
Lieutenant	21
Captain	23
Police Chief	25

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Mechanic's Helper	7
Laborer	7
Assistant Driver	8
Driver Foreman	9
Equipment Operator I	9
Equipment Operator II	10
Equipment Operator III	11
Parks Foreman	11
Mechanic	14
Tree Maintenance Foreman	14
Administrative Supervisor	15
Public Works Coordinator	18
Building Maintenance Supervisor	18
Vehicle Repair Shop Supervisor	18
Sanitation Supervisor	18
Streets Supervisor	20
Public Works Director	23

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING SERVICES

Administrative Aide II	11
Code Enforcement Officer I	13
Code Enforcement Officer II	16
Assistant Director of Housing Services	18
Director of Housing Services	21

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Recreation Attendant	1
Recreation Aide	6
Recreation Counselor	9
Recreation Supervisor	12
Youth Outreach Worker	12
Recreation Director	21

LIBRARY DEPARTMENT

Library Assistant	8
Librarian	14
Assistant Library Director	18
Library Director	21

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Clerk/Typist	7
Secretary	9
Administrative Aide I	10
Administrative Aide II	11
Administrative Supervisor	15
Cable TV Coordinator	18
Administrative Assistant	20
City Clerk	20
Assistant City Administrator	25
City Administrator	29

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

Tool Librarian	6
Rehabilitation Coordinator	12
Economic & Community Development Coordinator	21

ACCOUNTING DIVISION

Accounting Clerk I	10
Accounting Clerk II	11
Accounting Supervisor	18

ORDINANCE NO. 1985- 44

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

- SECTION 1. THAT it has been decided that City employees are to be provided with improved benefits, to include accidental death and dismemberment, and disability insurance coverage; AND
- SECTION 2. THAT requests for proposals were solicited from qualified insurance carriers and advertised once in The Washington Post newspaper, as required by Ordinance No. 1985-20 (procurement); AND
- SECTION 3. THAT proposals were accepted until 3:00 PM, May 15, 1985, at which time they were publicly opened, with three proposals having been received; AND
- SECTION 4. THAT the proposals were reviewed and evaluated, and the recommendation has been forwarded, from the Assistant City Administrator for Operations, that the Canada Life Insurance Company be awarded the policy for accidental death and dismemberment, and disability insurance coverage at a cost of TWENTY THOUSAND, NINE HUNDRED FOURTEEN DOLLARS AND EIGHT CENTS (\$20,914.08); AND
- SECTION 5. THAT the current policy with Prudential Insurance Company, for the provision of accidental death and dismemberment insurance coverage only, be discontinued as soon as the coverage from Canada Life Insurance Company goes into effect on July 1, 1985, for a one year policy period.
- SECTION 5. THEREFORE THAT the City Administrator or his designee is hereby authorized to execute the appropriate policy contract documents.