

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE AGENDA ITEM TIMES INDICATED BELOW ARE SUGGESTED TIMEFRAMES.
ITEMS MAY BE TAKEN UP SOONER OR LATER THAN THE TIMES INDICATED,
BASED ON COUNCIL DELIBERATIONS.

CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

Public Hearing and Special Session to Consider Waiving a Section
of Nuclear Free Zone Act for Proposed Purchase of Police Vehicles
and
Consideration of "The Leading Nuclear Weapons Contractors and Their Products" Listing

THURSDAY, March 5, 1987
8:00 PM

AGENDA

8:00 CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Del Giudice
ROLL CALL: Councilmember Bradley
Councilmember d'Eustachio
Councilmember Haney
Councilmember Iddings
Councilmember Levy
Councilmember Sharp
Councilmember Williams

- (1) Consideration of waiving of City Code Sec. 8A-6(b) of the Nuclear Free Zone Act for the proposed purchase of police cruisers
Citizens comments
Council discussion and action

- (2) Consideration of The Nuclear-Free Takoma Park Committee's Listing--"The Leading Nuclear Weapons Contractors and Their Products" for acceptance and adoption by the City
Citizens comments
Council discussion and action

ADJOURN

REMINDERS: Monday, March 9, 1987 -- Regular Council Meeting
Monday, March 16, 1987 -- Council Worksession
Monday, March 23, 1987 -- Regular Council Meeting

THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND

Public Hearing and Special Session of the Mayor and Council
to Consider Waiving a Section of the Nuclear Free Zone Act
for Proposed Purchase of Police Vehicles
and Consideration of
"The Leading Nuclear Weapons Contractors and Their Products" Listing
March 5, 1987

CITY OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Mayor Del Giudice	City Administrator Wilson
Councilmember Bradley	Asst. City Administrator Habada
Councilmember d'Eustachio	Cable Coordinator Smith
Councilmember Haney	Code Inspection Supervisor Clayton
Councilmember Iddings	Police Chief Fisher
Councilmember Levy	Police Captain Wortman
Councilmember Sharp	Police Lieutenant Gowin
Councilmember Williams (tardy)	Public Works Director Robbins
	Asst. Public Works Director Torres

The Mayor and City Council convened at 8:05 P.M. on Thursday, March 5, 1987 for the purpose of conducting a Public Hearing and Special Session on the above-stated issues. In the course of his introductory remarks, Mayor Del Giudice commented that if there were numerous citizens wishing to address the purchase of the police cars, consideration of adoption of the "Leading Nuclear Weapons Contractors and Their Products" listing, presented by the Nuclear-Free Takoma Park Committee, might require tabling until a future meeting. He outlined the proposed structure of the meeting, noting that speakers would be allowed 5 minutes and citizens would not be permitted to speak a second time until all others wishing to do so had been afforded an opportunity. The Mayor remarked that Channel 24, the City's cable channel, would be video taping the meeting, and asked that speakers identify themselves, including any organizational affiliation, prior to commencing speaking at the microphone.

(1) Consideration of waiving of City Code Sec. 8A-8(b) of the Nuclear Free Zone Act for the proposed purchase of police cruisers.
Reuben Snipper, Co-Chair of the Takoma Park Nuclear Free Zone Committee: stated that, after careful review of available information and in conjunction with City Administrator Wilson, the committee was in agreement that the conditions of the current situation did not warrant the granting of a waiver to the ordinance. He referred to the committee's detailed report concerning the proposed police vehicle purchase, and presented an overview of that report. He related provisions of the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance concerning purchases and requirements for granting of a waiver; spoke concerning history of the police department's vehicles and the purchase proposal. He said the police department had recommended the purchase of Chevrolets, Volvos having been eliminated because that company was no longer making police package vehicles. He said that was the point at which the committee became involved, inasmuch as the proposed purchase would require a waiver. He said that in the opinion of the committee, Chrysler vehicles, which would not require a waiver to purchase, meet the requirements of the police department; he cited supporting evidence. Additionally, he said Chryslers cost less to purchase, and may cost less to maintain. Responding to Councilmember Sharp, Mr. Snipper explained that Volvo would not be making factory-installed police package vehicles and if the City bought Volvos and had them converted to police packages by the dealership, insurance rates for the vehicles would be greatly increased due to the specialized equipment not being factory-installed; additionally, he said that if it were desirable to purchase additional police packages from Volvo in future, it would be problematic. In response to the Mayor, he said the decision of the committee was unanimous.

City Administrator Wilson: said that during the information-gathering process, it became clear to him he would need to add to his previous recommendation submitted on February 19, 1987, concerning the police cruisers. He said it had become evident that the issue was not merely which police car to purchase, but the overall status of the police vehicle fleet. Regardless of which car was purchased, it would be necessary that enough were bought so that the situation could be altered to allow proper assignment, rotation and service of vehicles. He said the fleet was currently comprised of old cars at or near the end of their service lives as police cruisers because of their mileage, with the exception of the one 1986

vehicle, and simply adding two or three vehicles at a time would not provide a remedy. He explained that extended use of new vehicles, which would be a natural tendency, would put a significant amount of mileage on them early in their life and, within a year, they would have double the mileage that would exist if there were a viable rotation plan. Additionally, he said the assignment of vehicles to specific officers would require consideration so that problems or concerns with vehicles could be identified early and passed on to the service area. He commented that in the service area, there was a need for improvement of the records maintenance system, and there might be need for review of the required maintenance schedule to ascertain whether the current staff would be able to handle it or whether alternatives, such as contracting out a portion of the workload, would have to be considered. Therefore, he said he would suggest that any decision concerning the make of vehicles to purchase be considered in conjunction with the following recommendations and conditions: 1) that a system of records maintenance be developed requiring an assignment schedule, with check-in and check-out procedures developed by the police department; 2) that rotation schedules be developed by the police department, with collaboration from the public works department so that vehicles would be routinely rotated out of service to spread use of the vehicles and extend the life of the fleet; 3) that a more detailed system of service scheduling with appropriate records be developed by the public works department, with assistance from other shops currently in the business of servicing police cars, if needed. He recommended that consideration be given to the purchase of 5 police cruisers immediately, with 5 more to be purchased as soon as possible. He said the first five vehicles would provide the basis of a stable fleet that could accommodate the recommendations made, and the second five could be purchased through a two-year lease/purchase plan that would spread the cost over time and yet make them quickly available. He said his original recommendation as to the make of vehicle to purchase remained unchanged, i.e., Chevrolets, and stated his reasons therefor which related primarily to front end problems with the Chryslers. Should significant engineering changes in their front ends be effected in Chryslers in the future, which would remove the present concerns, then those would be the obvious choice, he said.

Police Chief Fisher: referred to a memorandum from the police department dated 1/29/87 which presented 3 options, i.e., 1) to purchase 5 Chryslers (non-nuclear); 2) to purchase Volvos (non-nuclear); or 3) to purchase Chevrolets (nuclear affiliated). He pointed out that difficulties encountered with 2 Chryslers purchased in 1986 were addressed in the aforementioned memorandum, and elaborated on those problems, noting that a significant number of other police agencies across the country had documented front end problems with Chryslers similar to those experienced by Takoma Park Police. He referred to an accident with one of the department's Chryslers last November, with the State Police investigator's findings indicating that in addition to speed being a causative factor, the vehicle had mechanical front end defects which were also a factor. He said that, based on the voluminous research shared with the City by the Oxford, Michigan Police Department and Takoma Park Police Department's own experience, he could not, in good conscience, recommend the purchase of new Chryslers. Chief Fisher stated that Michigan State Police, who annually conduct tests on all police package cars, had indicated that their most recent tests showed the Chevrolet Caprice to be the best car for 1987. He said that, despite police personnel being sensitive to and supportive of the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance, they also had to consider their responsibility and role as public safety officers and would be obliged to recommend the purchase of Chevrolets. He spoke concerning the department's use of their vehicles, which did not allow for much time out of service for preventive maintenance; thus, he said, he would have to recommend buying the best and safest new cars that could be found. In conclusion, he commented that whatever the Mayor and Council's decision, the police department would be 100% supportive of that decision. Councilmember Levy questioned Chief Fisher's statement regarding Oxford Police Department's research which was apparently based on information gathered from 140 police departments -- out of 22,300 existing police agencies countrywide. She expressed skepticism concerning the significance of the 140 responses and remarked on the use of Chryslers by police jurisdictions in both Prince George's and Montgomery Counties, as well as the District of Columbia, and their apparent satisfaction with those cars. Chief Fisher commented he did not think that Prince George's and/or Montgomery Counties had indicated that the front end problems he had cited did not exist in their Chrysler vehicles; what they had

said was that they were able to catch many of the problems very early due to their maintenance programs. He said he felt that any time 140 agencies identified front end problems in a vehicle similar to those his department had identified, that was significant -- a safety factor was involved. He said after weighing the evidence, he had to question the viability of buying Chryslers and also their dependability. Councilmember Levy related that she was a Council representative on the Nuclear Free Committee, and said they were advised that the Chevrolet Caprice was a very large car; she questioned whether, considering their size, they would be suitable for use in Takoma Park; additionally, she said the committee had found that other agencies were not fully satisfied with Chevrolets they had purchased. Chief Fisher concurred that there were other problems with other vehicles, however, he knew of no others having the significant amount of trouble with the front end and steering that the Chrysler did -- said he was unaware of studies done that indicated that Chevrolets were so large that there would be any difficulty getting around in them in Takoma Park -- said they seemed to be similar in size to the Dodge Diplomat or Plymouth Grand Fury. Responding to Ms. Levy, he said the Chryslers the City had were not significantly smaller than the Chevrolet Caprice. Councilmember Haney requested that Chief Fisher give an approximation of the hours he and his staff had spent gathering and compiling the information they had furnished; Chief Fisher responded that the cumulative total would be at least 200 hours.

Public Works Director Robbins: explained that the Public Works Repair Shop has four mechanics, one of whom is an administrative working supervisor. He said the maintenance program consisted of conducting inspections based on time, with police vehicles inspected every 30 days, other vehicles every 60 days, and utility equipment every 90 days. He explained the visual depiction in the repair shop of the inspection schedule, which also reflected remarks concerning inspections, and said that board was updated as vehicles received their scheduled maintenance. As each inspection is done, Mr. Robbins said a State of Maryland inspection form is used in processing the work. He remarked that the mechanics have enough tools to complete 95% of the state inspection -- the other 5% relates to brakes, and when that inspection is needed, the vehicles are sent out for it to be done. He said police vehicles receive complete state inspections twice a year by independent authorized state inspection stations -- other City vehicles receive one independent annual state inspection. All vehicle repairs are conducted in accordance with manufacturer's specifications, Mr. Robbins said. He remarked that there was a block flow diagram depicting the equipment repair process in the public works repair shop for anyone wishing to request a copy. He elaborated on the information contained in that document. Mr. Robbins stated that many of the problems police were experiencing with their vehicles could be traced directly to the age of the cars; he said the older a vehicle becomes, the less reliable it is, resulting in increased down time and increased consumption of mechanics' work time. He said the police department currently had 17 vehicles, with 5 of those out of service. Of the 5 out of service, he said 4 were too expensive to repair and the 5th had been wrecked. The remaining 12 vehicles, he said, had an average of 100,000 miles; the average age of the cars in the police fleet was 6.25 years. Mr. Robbins commented that the average age of the public works truck fleet was 14.2 years, with some heavy construction equipment dating back to the early 1960's -- that fleet currently had 4 trucks out of service -- 2 sanitation trucks awaiting availability of parts and 2 pickups which would be too costly to repair. He addressed other City vehicles, their age and problems, concluding with the fact that in order to keep such a fleet operational, there had to be an effective maintenance program. However, he said the aging fleet was taking its toll -- problems were surfacing faster than they could be corrected, vehicles were being placed out of service regularly for either being too expensive or impossible to repair; he said all departments are in need of new vehicles and equipment. The Mayor inquired whether repairs such as the steering box on the 1986 Chrysler police vehicles were effected under warranty by the dealership; Mr. Robbins responded in the affirmative.

Glen Joachims, National Fleet Service Specialist for Chrysler Corporation: stated he had no formal presentation, however, was in attendance to respond to any questions people might have regarding operation of Chrysler vehicles. He said Chrysler Corporation had a vested interest in all vehicles they produce, that they meet all federal FMVSS requirements. He said they have had no safety problems with their vehicles, however, are most interested in any such issues. Councilmember d'Eustachio inquired

whether there was any substantial engineering design/structural difference between 1986 and 1987 Chrysler models. Mr. Joachims responded in the negative, stating that they were not contemplating any design changes in the front end suspension system; however, minor changes had been effected, such as addition of a bushing in the steering gear; increase of the metal gauge and stem diameter on stabilizer links would occur in the 1987 production -- within two months. He said stringent quality control inspections were being performed on the front cross member. In response to query, Mr. Joachims said Mr. Levy, a member of the Nuclear Free Committee, had asked that he attend the meeting. Councilmember Sharp inquired whether Mr. Joachims would be asking the factory to consider the problems experienced by Takoma Park Police with their 1986 Chryslers; Mr. Joachims responded that Chrysler was always open to examining problems users experience with their vehicles, and that they always try to cooperate in tracking down problems experienced by law enforcement agencies. Mr. Joachims pointed out that the City's Chryslers had mileage amounting to 90,000 on them, at which time parts become worn and problems are likely to occur; he said if the City sent a letter on the subject, Chrysler would be willing to look into the situation and respond. Responding to Councilmember Bradley, he said he personally had never received any written communications from the City regarding the police vehicles; said the complaints cited in Oxford Police Department's report were solicited, however, he said there were many people driving Chryslers and apparently satisfied with them -- he stated the Chrysler car was a safe vehicle, however, like any vehicle, it requires proper maintenance. He said he could not answer how many law enforcement agencies had contacted Chrysler regarding problems with their cars. The Mayor remarked he understood Chrysler was putting a new plant into operation to produce police package vehicles; Mr. Joachims explained that the Dodge Diplomat and Plymouth Grand Fury were produced at a plant in St. Louis, however, it became necessary for that plant to be used for another purpose, so an agreement was signed with AMC in Kenosha, Wisconsin, to utilize an unused portion of their plant for building rear wheel drive Chrysler-manufactured vehicles. Councilmember Levy related that, after receiving the packet of information from the police department, the Nuclear Free Committee had two contacts with Chrysler Corporation -- one with a mechanic, and the second a conference call, during which comments were offered about the maintenance of the torsion bar. Mr. Joachims concurred that that item was discussed during the subject conference call, and said he had indicated that one of the things that was very important was maintenance of the vehicle ride height -- a simple adjustment of the torsion bar, which would eliminate a lot of front end problems. Ms. Levy inquired whether Mr. Joachims' recollection agreed with hers that Mr. Diffenderfer of the Public Works Department had stated during that conversation that he was not making that adjustment according to the given specifications; Mr. Joachims responded he did not recall that statement, however, said he did recall the subject being discussed. He confirmed that Chrysler had a zone office in Landover, Maryland, with trained instructors, primarily for the purpose of training dealers' technicians to service and repair Chrysler vehicles. He said it was possible that City personnel could attend those classes. Responding to Councilmember Iddings, he said the courses probably would not have been offered to City employees unless contact had been made with the zone office. If that were done, he said that office would provide a training schedule of courses to be conducted. Mr. Wilson inquired about anticipated K-frame modifications to Chrysler vehicles; Mr. Joachims explained that retooling was going to occur and, at that time, the gauge of the crossmembers would be increased by sixteen-thousandths of an inch.

Police Captain Wortman inquired whether dealership mechanics were factory-trained to perform warranty work on vehicles; Mr. Joachims responded in the affirmative. Captain Wortman referred to steel bushings placed on the front of one of the department's 1986 Chryslers to try to correct some of the steering problems; he said only the driver's side of the vehicle had two bushings on it, which was somewhat unusual inasmuch as the kit ordinarily comes with four bushings and, if a Chrysler dealership put only two bushings on the front end, perhaps the other two should have been put on the other side in order to stabilize the whole front end. Mr. Joachims responded he recalled Captain Wortman mentioning that during the conference call; he affirmed that the kit contains four bushings, however, said he had no knowledge of why the mechanic did not install the entire kit. Captain Wortman remarked that the Chrysler dealership that did the work had the car for 30-60 days in order to complete that job. Mr. Joachims, responding to Captain Wortman, stated it would not take as much as a year to complete the

several production changes that had been referred to earlier in the discussion. He clarified that, concerning adjustment of the ride height as mentioned earlier, in his experience with six vehicles, they required one adjustment after the initial adjustment (total of two adjustments) and then they remained as adjusted. Despite that, he said that was an item that should be routinely checked when vehicles are in for normal maintenance. Captain Wortman remarked he recalled some confusion during the conference call when Charlie Diffenderfer was trying to ascertain the point at which the height measurement between the ground and the frame should be made; Mr. Joachims said his recall was that he told Mr. Diffenderfer that the measurement of 12-13" was from level ground up to the cap screw that the cross member attaches to the frame rail -- he said that was the specification and instruction given in the service manual.

Mairi MacRae, Nuclear Free America, Baltimore: spoke against buying cars (or anything else) from General Motors, based on the fact they were the seventeenth largest Department of Defense contractor in 1985 (the latest year for which data was available), with its Hughes Aircraft subsidiary acquired in 1986 ranking eighth among the DOD top one hundred contractors in 1985. She said when the contract amounts are combined for the two companies, they rank sixth among the top DOD contractors. She enumerated the nuclear weapon-related systems manufactured by General Motors, and pointed out they are also involved with the manufacture of numerous nuclear-capable aircraft. Ms. MacRae summarized the history of the City's adoption of its Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance and subsequent waiver amendment, effected when the purchase of police radios were at issue. She noted the waiver had never been invoked, however, its use was again being proposed for the purpose of purchasing police vehicles. She voiced strong opposition to granting of the waiver, stating it would seriously weaken the political message of the ordinance and was totally unnecessary. In response to Councilmember Sharp, Ms. MacRae stated her organization did encourage private individuals to avoid purchasing consumer items manufactured by nuclear-related manufacturers, because it was felt individuals had a responsibility as well as organizations; she said their primary approach was that of publishing a list of consumer products to avoid buying and making that available to communities considering becoming a nuclear free zone. Responding to Councilmember Haney, she said there were presently 134 nuclear free zones in the U.S., 8 of which had adopted legislation very similar to that adopted by Takoma Park. She commented Marin County, California, was beginning to face problems very similar to those faced by Takoma Park.

James Bruns, 7215 13th Avenue: expressed support for the waiver; said the elected officials are town, not federal, officials and their principal concern should be for local problems such as traffic, community services, housing, etc., rather than crusading for international causes. He asked that the Mayor and Council return their focus to pressing community problems and spare citizens the waste of countless hours of precious City staff time spent in trying to circumvent the waiver -- he referred to the 200 hours of time spent by police personnel on the vehicle subject, in addition to the hundreds of hours of volunteer time spent by committee members. He said that volunteer time could be better spent in schools and other community services. He asked that the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance be either eliminated entirely, or rendered a symbolic gesture, or, failing those, that the citizenry be allowed to make a choice in the matter. He said if a poll were taken, he thought it would be found that many of the residents did not share the Council's view.

Dave Cruze, 7912 Lockney Avenue: stated he was in 100% agreement with Mr. Bruns, as well as with letters in the Newsletter authored by Hank Cox and Lisa and Charles Itte.

Kurt Stern, 103 Grant Avenue: expressed support for the Nuclear Free Committee's report; said he did not feel a case had been made for purchasing automobiles other than Chrysler. He said any police department using a particular make of vehicle, putting a lot of mileage on them, would notice the defects of that particular car; however, said he felt the solution would be replacement of vehicles as needed and proper maintenance. He said the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance was adopted following many hours of meetings and discussions involving both citizens and the Council; he remarked that those who opposed the legislation certainly have the right to express their views and to work toward change, however, those who wished to make it symbolic were about equivalent to those who are symbolic vegetarians.

Mary Pennifield, 7305 Takoma Avenue: spoke against purchasing Volvos for use as police vehicles; said they have ignition problems, when you put them in "drive," they go backward rather than forward. She said that had been written up in the newspapers. She said Plymouth was the best car, that she had one that was 12 years old and had been completely trouble-free. She said a good mechanic and regular maintenance was the secret of her success with her car. She suggested a motorcycle squad in the police department, which would eliminate the purchase of 5 cars. She said the current administration was very extravagant, and suggested the implementation of more austerity measures in the budget be considered. Mrs. Pennifield said whatever vehicles are purchased should be non-nuclear, because she did not want Takoma Park to become another Three Mile Island.

Brint Dillingham, 7018 Carroll Avenue: concurred with statements made by prior speakers which supported the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance and the purchase of Chryslers, which would not require the invoking of a waiver. He said he believed that the waiver amendment should never have been enacted and should be rescinded, but would not argue that case at the present meeting. He said there was no valid case for invoking the waiver in the present situation, and urged that it not be done. He spoke concerning the importance of municipalities taking a stance against nuclear weaponry development and production, citing amounts of money spent in the federal budget for that purpose and which could have been diverted to channels more beneficial to people. He quoted former President Eisenhower concerning the results of money spent for military and defense purposes, and rebutted recent statements by Councilmember Haney concerning the powerlessness of the individual to affect national issues. He urged that the Council as a whole support the original language and intent of the ordinance.

Brian Becker, 408 Elm Avenue, member of People's Anti-War Mobilization: said the current debate was not over which car was better than another, but over whether the mandate of the people who supported adoption of the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance would be upheld. He said promoters of the nuclear war establishment should not be allowed to come through the back door and take away what people voted for through the front door. He said when the City's legislation was adopted, a stance was taken by the community against the further buildup of the U.S. nuclear arms arsenal. He spoke concerning the U.S.'s initial use of nuclear weaponry, and numerous threats of its use in the intervening period since, stating that the debate was not abstract and academic, and there was a need for the voice of the people to be heard denouncing the spending of tax money on nuclear weaponry rather than human needs. Mr. Becker related that it had recently been revealed by the release of documents that former President Richard Nixon had a secret plan to threaten North Vietnam with nuclear attack in 1969 in order to end the war there unless they agreed to capitulate; however, Mr. Nixon stated in his memoirs that the reason that threat was not carried out was that 2 weeks prior to the deadline that had been set forth in his ultimatum, a half a million people poured into Washington demanding that the U.S. get out of Vietnam. Mr. Becker said that was evidence that what the people do and say does make a difference. He urged that the City's ordinance be upheld.

Sam Abbott, 7416 Holly Avenue: commented that he was the former Mayor and a possible future candidate. He rebutted recent attacks on Takoma Park's Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance and unfavorable characterizations of its citizenry by the Journal Newspapers, which he said are published by The Army Times. Mr. Abbott said the reason for the ordinance was simple -- that the City is located in the number one prime target area of the U.S., and its residents are, therefore, supportive of international agreements to reduce, and eventually eliminate, the nuclear stockpiles through mutually verifiable inspections. He referred to the process undergone in 1982 which resulted in passage of the Nuclear Freeze Resolution, and subsequent adoption of the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance in 1983. He thanked Councilmember Iddings, former Councilmember D'Ovidio, and Jay Levy for working out boycott provisions of the ordinance, and remarked on the control those provisions exerted over waste of police and staff time during the police radio situation -- commenting in some detail on events surrounding its resolution. He remarked that major purchases should not become crises; they should not be left for months after the money is appropriated before groundwork is done concerning purchase options; said the same mistakes were being repeated over and over again. He related events concerning the

vehicle maintenance program and efforts toward its improvement at Public Works during his tenure; said he was convinced that incomplete and faulty maintenance played a big role in the current situation; he referred to the Journal's report concerning the theft/destruction of records at the Public Works Department, reportedly perpetrated in order to cover up faulty/incomplete record-keeping. He related having had a long discussion with Jack Gillis, formerly employed by the National Transportation Safety Board and author of the 1987 automobile manual published by the Center for Auto Safety, and said Mr. Gillis had stated to him that all the "big three" cars had strong and weak points, and that none should be rejected outright as being inferior. He recommended that the waiver not be invoked, that the City purchase Chryslers without delay. Mr. Abbott referred to a report from the police department in which Captain Wortman had stated that information would be turned over to Corporation Counsel on the City's Chryslers so that restitution could be sought under the "Lemon Law;" he pointed out that, having checked with Ms. Silber, he found that had never been done by the police department, that the matter had not been pursued as it should have been. Concerning the 1986 Chrysler which had been totalled on Sligo Creek Parkway, he said it was not improper maintenance that caused the accident, but improper driving; said the complaints against the Chryslers could be duplicated with Fords -- all vehicles have strong and weak points.

James Jeffas, 7600 Hammond Avenue: said that many hours had been lost and expense incurred because of the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance; he said because of that legislation, police officers and citizens have been deprived of protection. He said police officers had been jeopardized by the lack of roadworthy vehicles, burglaries had occurred in his neighborhood, and he did not appreciate those events. He inquired of each individual Councilmember the type of vehicle they personally own or lease, and when it was purchased/leased. Councilmember Levy responded: Pontiac/1978; Councilmember d'Eustachio: 1972 Dodge Dart; Councilmember Iddings: 1984 Dodge station wagon; Mayor Del Giudice: 1983 Ford Escort; Councilmember Bradley: 1980 VW; Councilmember Haney: 1970 BMW; Councilmember Sharp: VW. Mr. Jeffas commented that apparently what was sauce for the goose was not for the gander.

Marc Elrich, 8110 Roanoke Avenue: read a letter from the Grey Panthers of Montgomery County stating their support for the ordinance, and relating that their organization was circulating a petition calling for major steps by the U.S. in the direction of nuclear disarmament. They asked that Takoma Park not take a backward step at the current point in time when real breakthroughs on the issue of nuclear disarmament appear possible. Mr. Elrich said he had not personally heard anything at the current meeting that would support the granting of a waiver; he concurred with points made by Mr. Abbott concerning the good and bad in all makes of cars. Based on 6 years of experience in automotive service, he said it seemed apparent to him that the City had some in-house maintenance problems, and said Prince George's County's way of contending with Chrysler front end problems should be examined. He said it appeared there were some real general problems with administrative processes in the City, particularly things like a decision made during adoption of the current year's budget turning into a major crisis in January/February and exposing the City to unfavorable newspaper coverage. He said people begin to perceive the ordinance as an obstacle to efficient running of the City, when actually it is not the ordinance itself but fundamental administrative things that are lacking. He commented in favor of not granting the waiver and purchasing Chrysler vehicles.

Michael Hasty, Nuclear Free Takoma Park Committee member: spoke in defense of the ordinance and explained how it related to the proposed purchase of police cars. He noted that, under the ordinance, the committee was charged with making recommendations to the Mayor and Council concerning reasonable alternatives to purchasing from nuclear-related companies. He said he felt the committee had been as diligent as was possible within the given time frame in researching all available information and making its recommendation. He read from the committee's report, pointing out that one of the unforeseen positive benefits of the Nuclear Free Zone Act was that, in the process of its implementation and because of its added focus on government, it exposes deficiencies in City administration that might otherwise go undetected. Mr. Hasty said that in the current process, the committee's first exercise in overseeing implementation of the ordinance, administra-

tive shortcomings in the committee's procedures had also been exposed and, had the committee been informed about the purchase difficulties at an earlier point in time, the process might have been greatly improved and facilitated, and a more thorough and fully documented body of information provided to the elected body as a basis for their decision. He recommended that the Mayor and Council continue to work with the committee in developing a process that would advance the common goals of social responsibility and administrative efficiency, and that they continue a policy of moral courage and national leadership in a movement that advances the cause of world peace by striking at the heart of the nuclear weapons industry -- its pocketbook. In conclusion, Mr. Hasty briefly addressed the subject of democracy, remarking that the process mandated by the ordinance and presently being undergone was representative of democracy in action.

Albert Donnay, Director, Nuclear Free America, Baltimore: commented that Takoma Park was the most exciting nuclear free zone in the U.S. He said he doubted the events the City would experience after adoption of its legislation were foreseen, however, pointed out that a viable alternative was found when purchase of police radios generated a crisis, as had been the case in every instance thereafter -- including the present situation with the police cars. He said there was a clear alternative in the current situation and no threat to health or safety existed, thus, there was no basis for invoking the waiver. He said the maintenance was the issue, not the cars, and that had been confirmed by recent events in the City's vehicle maintenance department, upon which he commented. Mr. Donnay concluded that the decision to be made was a local issue, not national, in that it would decide how City taxpayers' money would be spent and what sort of corporations would be supported by the expenditure.

Larry Rood, 5 Montgomery Avenue: said that, in his opinion, the issue of nuclear weaponry was one of vital importance to local jurisdictions and appropriate for local officials to address. He said what was happening relative to nuclear weapons was madness, and when madness was occurring, it was the responsibility of human beings to register protest and demand a halt. He said virtually all the issues of government were symbolic issues and dealt with the manipulation of symbols; he referred to the pledge of allegiance to the flag at the beginning of the meeting, and remarked that the Council had no higher business than taking very seriously the dealing with the symbols of freedom and democracy in the City government and its community.

Alice Trembour, 7304 Birch Avenue: remarked that part of the original intent of the ordinance was to put companies involved in nuclear-related activities on notice that continuing to do so would hit them where they would feel it most -- in their pocketbooks. Thus, she said the ordinance would be robbed of any value whatsoever if it were waived every time abiding by it presented a conflict. She pointed out that an ordinance that was merely symbolic would have no impact on the sale of products. She noted that since adoption of the ordinance in 1983, debate had arisen only one other time over purchasing, and that had been resolved without invoking the waiver. As a taxpayer, she said she did not want her tax dollars going to nuclear interests; however, said she did not feel the need to throw out all her appliances and start over in order to support her values. She spoke in favor of the City buying Chrysler police cars, and urged that Council neither waive the ordinance nor in any way render it merely symbolic.

Kay Dellinger, 7333 New Hampshire Avenue: said the Nuclear Free Zone Act was the single greatest thing the City had ever done, and probably was the single greatest thing it ever would do; she said the ordinance never was, and was not intended to be, symbolic -- when nuclear weapons were only symbolic, then the law could be only symbolic. She said the voters had elected the Mayor and Council in good faith, trusting that they would abide by and enforce the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance, which was what the people wanted. She said every City department, including the police, would have to live within the constraints of the law, and suggested that perhaps employees of that department, including the Chief, should be required to be residents of Takoma Park. She said there was absolutely no case for a waiver, that Chryslers were as safe as any other large car on the road -- if Prince George's County Police could patrol 489 square miles of that county in Dodge Diplomats, then Takoma Park Police could patrol 2.2 square miles of the City in Dodge Diplomats. She said it was patently absurd to think that a city could be nuclear free when it was convenient. She

characterized the Journal's articles on Takoma Park as ludicrous, saying that publication had failed to concern itself with the gigantic mountain of money spent and wasted by the Department of Defense and defense contractors year after year. She spoke strongly against the granting of a waiver.

Tom Gagliardo, 704 Maplewood Avenue: opposed the granting of a waiver, and said he felt Chryslers should be purchased; said anyone who cast the current situation as a debate between political commitment and fiscal responsibility was just plain wrong. He enumerated a number of reasons supporting the purchase of Chryslers, rebutting Journal statements and citing vehicle information gleaned from 1984-1986 Takoma Park Police Department records. He summarized that there were 8 vehicles in the police fleet -- 4 in working order and 4 that could be put back in service quickly if sincere efforts were made to do so. He presented a proposal that would call for the purchase of three vehicles, plus an additional one as a replacement for the totalled 1986 Chrysler in the current fiscal year, and purchase of three vehicles each succeeding fiscal year, so that by July 1, 1988, there would be ten cars, none of which would be older than a 1987 model; and available for reserve or other functions, would be the eight cars currently in good service. Councilmember Iddings commented that the plan proposed by Mr. Gagliardo had been adopted in the current year's budget. Mr. Gagliardo addressed the alleged problems the police department had experienced with their Chryslers, concluding by stating that it was not true that the Chrysler was structurally unsafe, not true that the inherent defects in Chrysler manufacture caused or contributed to the accident with the department's 1986 Chrysler; he said the simple truth of the matter, which the citizenry was entitled to know, was that incorrect maintenance was done on the vehicle, resulting in the failure of the power steering and a loss of control in the course of a high speed chase on Sligo Creek Parkway. Councilmember Iddings remarked that Mr. Gagliardo's comments were factually incorrect.

Jay Levy, 7431 Baltimore Avenue: said the other side of the story as presented thus far was maintenance; he related having spoken with the D.C. Police Department's Chief Maintenance Officer who advised him that D.C.'s cars run 24 hours a day and the secret was maintenance. They have bought Chryslers for the last 7 years because that was the lowest bid, and that they are as good as any other car on the market. Mr. Levy said he had talked to the Ventura County Chief of Maintenance who said their cars, too, are run 24 hours a day, and the City of Thousand Oaks has speed humps. Those cars are maintained every 2 months or 4,000 miles, whichever comes first, and they are retired at 80,000 miles and resold at a decent profit because they are still in good shape. Mr. Levy reiterated that the bottom line was maintenance -- not the brand of car.

Joan Jacobs, 7428 Carroll Avenue: said it seemed that adopted policy was being rehashed, and that diversionary tactics were being interjected. She said it was obvious there were alternative sources for the vehicles needed, and it had been established that neither health nor safety were at stake. She inquired why the debate was continuing unless, perhaps, there was another agenda. She encouraged the Council to abide by the original intent of the ordinance.

Rudy Arredondo, 7105 Woodland Avenue: concurred with Ms. Jacobs' comments; said he thought the issue had been settled in 1983. He related having been a quality control inspector for General Motors from 1967-1974 and said tags indicating the need for corrections he had put on vehicles were pulled off by the supervisor and those vehicles wound up with the owners having tremendous trouble with them. He said the reason a lot of residents moved to Takoma Park was because they thought they had finally found a place where they could work toward peace and harmony; he referred to people close to him who had lost their lives in the Vietnam War, and said he hoped never to see any more body bags being shipped back. He urged that the elected body not vote contrary to the ordinance adopted in 1983.

Richard Osborn, 803 Jackson Avenue: inquired concerning the reason for Chrysler's non-involvement with the nuclear weapons industry, specifically, whether they were opposed to nuclear war. Mr. Joachims responded he had no knowledge of that issue. Councilmember Sharp remarked that Chrysler did make tanks for a long time, but sold that division off during their restructuring. He commented on having been raised as a vegetarian and said while it was distasteful to him to have to deviate from that, there were occasions when it was necessary. He said it should likewise be distasteful

to deviate from the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance, and that should be done with great reluctance. He said, however, that the police should have vehicles in which they have complete confidence. He said he would support a waiver for the upcoming purchase, with a strong message sent to Chrysler stating that their product would be the City's preference and asking that they improve their design so that police in all jurisdictions could feel comfortable driving them.

Larry Robinson, 7504 Holly Avenue: summarized statements that had been made and said it did not appear adequate information was provided to make a rational decision; he said it was not clear whether the problems encountered could be attributed to design of the vehicles or the maintenance; said there was a need for cost analyses to be done. He said the necessity for invoking a waiver of the ordinance had not been demonstrated.

Mary Ann Hylander, 704 Maplewood Avenue: as a new resident of the City, said she was proud to be living in a nuclear free zone and would not wish to see that altered. She urged that the Council not compromise unnecessarily by invoking a waiver of the ordinance. She said it concerned her to hear all the comments concerning maintenance and that there should be no compromise with having a proper preventive maintenance program. She urged that no waiver be granted, that the City buy Chryslers and properly maintain them.

Morris Rodenstein, 6808 Westmoreland Avenue, member of Nuclear Free Committee: said if the committee had felt they were in any way jeopardizing the health or safety of police officers, or the citizenry of the City, they would have voted unanimously in favor of the waiver, despite knowing a lot of dissension would have been created. He said the ordinance itself is about a concern for life, and the committee members would not jeopardize anyone's life if they felt there were a convincing argument in favor of invoking the waiver. He related having talked with Prince George's County's head of maintenance who remarked to him that the way the City's police cars are driven, they would have problems regardless of the make of the vehicle. Mr. Rodenstein said it disturbed him greatly when he learned that the maintenance mechanics in public works did not have the appropriate training, and said the police should be upset about that too. He conceded that the committee was biased in favor of the ordinance, but said they based their recommendation on what they felt was the best for Takoma Park -- said had a good case been made in favor of invoking the waiver, they would have recommended that be done. Concerning boycotting products, he said one of the reasons the people in power want the citizenry to think they were personally without power, that boycotting was meaningless, was because if the citizenry continues to feel powerless then they will do nothing and will acquiesce to what the leaders want to do. He commented from personal experience concerning the effectiveness of boycotting and referred to the boycott of Nestle products, which he said had saved the lives of millions of infants. He pointed out that should the decision be to invoke the waiver and buy Chevrolets, then the City would be supporting a company that currently does over \$5,000,000,000 a year worth of business with the nuclear industry. In conclusion, he urged that the Council vote against granting of the waiver.

Thomas Morris, City employee, Housing Rehab: said he had talked to a substantial number of police officers during the past month, all of whom expressed concerns about personal safety in Chrysler vehicles. However, he said he did not feel any real evidence had been presented that would prove Chrysler to be an inherently unsafe vehicle. He said it would be his speculation that if the City purchased two police cars, those two would likely be overused and might not be properly maintained due to being in constant use. He said it was his hope that the Council would not waive the ordinance, but would purchase Chryslers. He said it had always been his perception that those persons interested in regulation/control of nuclear arms were also interested in peace, and pointed out that it was not in the interest of peace to point accusatory fingers without being in possession of all the facts.

Adele Abrams, 311 Elm Avenue: spoke in opposition to granting of the waiver; she said when the Council passed the ordinance, it was a very positive step -- something all residents could be very proud of. She said for the Mayor and Council to reverse that action by approving the waiver would make hypocrites of all involved, and pointed out that most of the

officials had expressed support for the nuclear freeze and nuclear free zone concepts in their campaigns. She said the issue had been depicted as a conflict between idealism and pragmatism, and suggested that the City be creatively pragmatic, pointing out that, as a question of the bottom line, the Chryslers were less expensive. She urged that the waiver not be granted.

Rev. George Taylor, 310 Tulip Avenue: said he felt the ordinance should be supported and the waiver not invoked, if at all possible. He said he realized the issue was complicated, not black and white, and that many factors had been considered. He pointed out that one value of the ordinance was that it mandated raising issues and struggling through all the pros and cons -- were the ordinance not in place, the current meeting would not be occurring. He said that, as late as the hour was and as tired as everyone was, the meeting was of tremendous value because it was democracy in action.

Lisa Itte, 7000 Poplar Avenue: urged that the Council vote in favor of the waiver, and additionally, help the citizens of Takoma Park reconsider the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance in its entirety. She said while she appreciated the intention of the ordinance, the critical issue was whether or not it represented the majority view of the residents and taxpayers in the city; she said she and many others did not believe that it did, and a serious look should be taken at that question. She said all the other debates hinged on that one unanswered question. She said while most people appreciate the elected officials and all the work they do, they do tend to overstep their official capacities in making national and international policy on behalf of the citizens, which they were neither elected nor authorized to do. She said many residents resent that presumptuousness, as well as the stands taken by the elected City officials and, in general, object to the waste of time and City money. She said many residents want the City officials to concentrate on the serious local problems in the city, including apparent administrative problems. Ms. Itte remarked she was far more concerned about being shot in the streets at night than about being blown up in a nuclear holocaust, which she said did not make her a proponent of nuclear war, but a realist. She said the citizens had tended to indulge their elected officials, however, the current situation regarding the nuclear free legislation exemplified the problem and it was time to end the silent majority stance and deal directly with the issue. She said there were numerous serious ramifications of the ordinance and enumerated those, stating that it was imperative to ensure that the citizens of the City were in support of the ordinance. She urged that the Council vote in favor of the waiver, that they weigh the facts and follow the recommendations of the police department and the administrator. She also urged that the current process be continued for all future purchases, remarking that one of the benefits of living in Takoma Park was that it was small enough to conduct referendums and practice true democracy. She suggested that a referendum be held in the fall to ascertain whether the majority of citizens wish to retain the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance.

Larry Dzieza (speaking in place of Ken Shields): commented his City taxes were about 2/3 the amount he pays the county. He inquired approximately how many man hours had been invested in the current process above and beyond what would be spent in the normal procurement process; Mr. Wilson responded that the only estimates he had were those voiced earlier, i.e., 200 hours by the police department and about that same amount by volunteer committee members. Mr. Shields expressed concern, as a city taxpayer, that money not be spent unnecessarily in the City government. He said he was glad that the Council would apparently not be voting in favor of purchasing Volvos. Mr. Dzieza said a workable nuclear policy was not a bad thing for the City, but one that wasted \$2,000 minimum and would waste money in the future was not good; he urged that if the policy were going to continue, Council find a means of making it function in a smooth and orderly way. He said forums, such as the present one, were fine but wasted resources which could be expended in a more constructive way.

Patrick Dwyer, 7518 Jackson Avenue: said a small ripple had started when the ordinance was adopted 4 years ago, which he hoped would be allowed to grow; he urged that Council uphold the ordinance.

Rino Aldrighetti, 7213 Central Avenue: remarked that, in listening to the testimonies given, he had found three most impressive, i.e., Chief Fisher's, which related the issues of police safety and had to be taken into

consideration; Marc Elrich's because he called for facts rather than heat; and Tom Gagliardo's because he related facts that everyone needed to hear. Mr. Aldrighetti said that, in hearing the discussion, safety did not appear to really be an issue -- that other cars under similar circumstances could present similar problems. He said when the ordinance was adopted, it was because Councilmembers wanted to do their little bit toward taking the country into a different situation; he urged that the Council consider seriously whether a waiver was justified in the present situation prior to taking any action, and commented that he did not feel it was. As an aside, he remarked it was a shame that while the intent was to put pressure on nuclear-related manufacturers, it was Chrysler who had ended up being on trial. He said he tended to doubt that the Chryslers had the flaws as presented, and wished the Council good luck with their decision.

Saul Schniderman, 306 Lincoln Avenue: supported Mr. Aldrighetti's comments; said he was opposed to the waiver, and suggested that the Council, in making their decision, try to decide what, not who, was right in the situation.

Ruth Abbott, Holly Avenue: said the problem was an emotional one for her; that if even half of the cities, towns and communities adopted and lived by the law adopted in Takoma Park, there would be no nuclear threat -- the federal government would have to heed the voice of the people and solve the problem another way. She spoke of the right of the children and young people to live and flourish the way their parents and grandparents had, and said the Council's vote denying a waiver would be a strong voice that would light their children's eyes and warm their own hearts with the knowledge they had helped children to live their future without fear of the bomb.

Diane Maceachern, 102 Tulip Avenue: said before attending the meeting, she had felt a vote in favor of the waiver would be an act of moral irresponsibility and, having heard the testimony given, she now felt it would also be an act of fiscal irresponsibility. She said, should her Council representative vote in favor of the waiver, she could not in good faith cast her vote for that individual at the next election, nor could she vote to reelect a Mayor who voted in favor of the waiver.

Unidentified female: addressing her comments to members of the Takoma Park Literary Society and others who say the Nuclear Free Zone Act does not represent the views of the majority of residents, said that a majority of citizens favored the ordinance in 1983 and still supported that legislation. She said they favored a strong ordinance and opposed the waiver provision. She said, of the speakers, she had counted 25 in opposition to the waiver and 6 in favor of it. She said that, having come of age during the beginning of the Civil Rights movement in the south, and having been a participant in some of the early symbolic gestures of that movement, she believed symbolic actions, as well as boycotts, were imminently practical and effective. She commented that in order to have a strong, healthy and just society, people had to work for it and stand firm behind their beliefs.

Mike Davidson, Edinburgh House: referred to having served on COLTA and time and again having to weigh evidence and base a conclusion on that evidence; he said he did not feel any supporting evidence had been presented to vote in favor of invoking a waiver of the ordinance. He questioned statements made by City officials concerning the disappearance of maintenance records at public works, and remarked that the Edinburgh Tenants' Association members were astonished to learn that police personnel had expended 200 hours of time doing research that should have been done by the City Administrator, who had apparently spent no time researching the issue. He quoted from a 7/1/86 memorandum in which Mr. Wilson had stated that an analysis had indicated that both the City's buildings and vehicles were in need of significant maintenance and upgrading due to lack of preventive maintenance and timely replacement, and that bringing those items up to minimum standards might require short term borrowing or leasing. Mr. Davidson commented that there had been other occasions where City records had been removed -- some permanently and some not. He referred to an instance where he said records were removed from the Housing Services Department and placed in the basement at the direction of the City Administrator. He said he wondered in whose interest it was for Mr. Diffenderfer to remove the records from Public Works, and commented briefly on that occurrence. He said regardless of the vote taken on the issue before the Council, it would not be valid, in that the Council could not

appropriately vote on a waiver unless the waiver had been recommended by the Nuclear Free Committee.

Ken Shields, 7114 Poplar Avenue: inquired of the Council whether the citizens of Takoma Park had elected a nuclear free ordinance. Councilmember Levy related the City's process for electing members of the Council, and said when she was campaigning, people asked her about her stance on the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance -- in that sense, she said she felt people cast their votes based on the candidates' views on issues important to them. Mr. Shields inquired whether the citizens of Takoma Park had elected a City Council whose purchasing activities would be governed by a Nuclear Freeze Committee; if so, he said, in the next election, he would suggest that members be elected to that committee, and possibly, a volunteer Council be asked for. He said if Takoma Park could not successfully implement a Nuclear Free Ordinance, how could it be expected that it would be effective on a national level; said it was quite obvious there were problems interpreting and enforcing the ordinance, and strongly recommended that the Council limit the interference and the influence of the Nuclear Free Ordinance until the Council studied and appropriately amended the ordinance so that problems and delays would not arise.

David Prosten, 6625 Eastern Avenue: said the requirements for invoking a waiver of the ordinance were clearly defined; did not think the scanty evidence presented would substantiate granting of a waiver. He said the weight of evidence appeared to indicate that Chrysler was as good as any other car, and he thought that was what the City should buy.

Enid Romanek, Sligo Creek Parkway: said she was very proud to live in the Nuclear Free Zone of Takoma Park, thanked all those who had spoken, and asked that the Council not vote in favor of the waiver.

Paula Roark, 7001 Westmoreland Avenue: stated she was opposed to the waiver; however, said she hoped and would want the police department not to interpret a vote against the waiver as a reason for lowering of morale within that department. She said she felt the City has an extremely good police department and citizens would wish to support them in every way possible. She asked that when Councilmembers vote on the issue, they also vote for the police force and ensure that money is allocated to provide a very strong preventive maintenance program.

Daryl Stevens, 6800 Westmoreland Avenue: said he strongly supported the police department, and felt it had been definitely proven they were in great need of cars as well as a preventive maintenance program. He said he felt it important for cities and towns to follow the example of the federal government in helping put Chrysler back on its feet, saving the jobs of thousands of American workers. He said purchases made by cities and towns helped maintain American industry and keep jobs for its workers. He said the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance compelled the City to make this sort of purchase, and enhanced its ability to make wise and competent decisions.

Gregory Hamilton, Pres. of Park Ritchie Tenants' Assn.: expressed support for the ordinance and opposition to the waiver; said he supported the police department, and believed there was definitely a maintenance problem in the City.

Jennie Hughes, 906 Heather Avenue: commented a lot of issues had been addressed -- all having equal importance. She said she felt there was one simple thing needing to be addressed, and she would say it in a way less traditional than had been heard -- she sang "We Are Gentle Loving People, Singing For Our Lives," and concluded by expressing support for the ordinance.

Police Captain Wortman: related he had been employed by the City of Takoma Park for approximately 17 years, was hired to protect the citizens. He said he worked long hours, had sometimes worked 30-40 hours straight to catch felons, was trained to deal with facts. He said the fact was that 140 police agencies in 36 states had stated they had experienced problems with the front ends of Chrysler vehicles; Prince George's County stated to the committee that all brands of vehicles have their own particular problems -- their experience with Chryslers over the past six years indicated to them that there were incipient problems involving the front end sway bar, shock absorbers, torsion bar bushings, lower control arm bolts

loosening, and idler arms at 30,000-40,000 miles, steering boxes and upper and lower ball joint failures. He said it was true that Prince George's has a stringent preventive maintenance program, however, everything he had seen indicated to him that there was a front end problem with those cars. He said when officers are responding on a call at 50-60 mph, if control is lost of the front end of the car because of some of the cited problems, they would have no control over the vehicle and would not be able to stop it quickly. He said that was his prime concern and he did not know what the answer was, but that some problem had been experienced with the steering of the Chryslers. He said the police were there to serve the citizens, hopefully with the best equipment they could get.

State Delegate Peter Franchot, District 20, 7111 Sycamore Avenue: said he would not refute what Captain Wortman had said about front end problems; he said he felt there was a consensus that citizens want the police to have safe cars, but that it also appeared there were plenty of police departments that use Chryslers with proper maintenance programs. He recommended the City stay with Chryslers, but get a good maintenance program in effect to ensure that they are safe for the police to drive, and not jump into buying cars that will have some other sort of maintenance problems a year or two hence. He related that he had been working on the appropriations bill that would put lots of restrictions on state money being invested in South Africa -- he said some people claimed that was dabbling in international affairs, but he felt it was making the right and appropriate statement. Similarly, he said, when the City assumed the responsibility of becoming a Nuclear Free Zone, it assumed the responsibility to make strong, clear statements in that area.

Reuben Snipper: in response to those who had expressed concerns that the ordinance was not workable, he pointed out it had been in effect for some years and, according to the City Administrator, only two instances had been encountered over that 3-year period wherein a City purchase had been contentious -- the police radios and the police vehicles. The purchases made since adoption of the ordinance included everything from heavy equipment to very small items. He said the committee worked very closely with the City Administrator, and Mr. Wilson had stated to them earlier in the week that he favored increasing the fleet size because he felt that was a significant part of the problem and, if that were done, it would not matter greatly what make of car was purchased; however, he did indicate a preference for buying Chryslers. Mr. Snipper said the committee felt that a serious underlying problem facing the City was a serious shortage of reliable police vehicles, a situation that had the potential of jeopardizing public health and safety, and which could seriously hamper the ability of the police to administer their duties with maximum effectiveness. He related the committee having heard testimony from many people, including Police Chief Fisher and Captain Wortman on two different occasions. Chief Fisher, despite the front end problems encountered, had stated his willingness to accept Chryslers if he had enough cars in his fleet to rotate vehicles on a regular basis -- he had initially recommended 7, subsequently 8, new vehicles in order to allow for rotation on a regular basis and regularly-scheduled preventive maintenance. Mr. Snipper said the Oxford Police Department's report had stated that the only feasible solution to problems with Chrysler defects was knowledge of them, preventive maintenance, and repeated periodic inspections of the areas involved. In summary, he said Chief Fisher's and Captain Wortman's testimony had indicated that while they preferred the purchase of Chevrolet Caprices, the Chryslers would be acceptable if the police department vehicle fleet were sufficiently expanded so that regular preventive maintenance could be performed. Mr. Snipper summarized statements made by Public Works Director Robbins concerning difficulties associated with maintaining the police vehicles and stated that the committee had found in their investigation that the Public Works Department had done an admirable job in keeping police vehicles in service, given the current status of the fleet and the pattern of vehicle use. He said the committee had found no fault with either the Public Works Department or the Police Department. He said that having examined information from other jurisdictions, the committee could find no strong or conclusive evidence either pro or con Chevrolets or Chryslers, thus, they concluded there was not sufficient evidence to recommend the granting of a waiver.

Chief Fisher: stated that the reality was that the police department has a depleted fleet and needs a substantial number of cars. He said he recognized

ongoing budgetary problems, but emphasized the need to have a sufficient number of police cars to allow them to be rotated, properly serviced, and still have an adequate number on the street for patrol purposes.

Mayor Del Giudice commented that the process appeared to have confirmed that the ordinance, despite whatever weaknesses it might have or whatever problems people might perceive, had been a positive thing. He said when the waiver provision was adopted a few years ago, it institutionalized the process to be undergone, which had helped guide the current process and decision-making. He said he felt the decision to be made was a close question, as demonstrated by the committee's recommendations. He said there was evidence on both sides of the question which could not be ignored, and that all of the evidence required weighing. He pointed out, however, that ultimately everyone is bound by the law, and that the Nuclear Free Act required that it be determined whether a reasonable alternative existed. He enumerated the 5 criteria to be used in making that determination, noting that the economic factor was not an issue in the current situation -- that the Chevrolets and Chryslers were comparable price-wise. He said what had to be demonstrated in order to invoke a waiver to the ordinance was that there was no reasonable alternative, and that would be what would have to guide the Council's deliberations.

Mr. Wilson remarked he had had an opportunity to speak with Mr. Joachims about some of his personal concerns regarding the Chryslers, based on comments made by Mr. Joachims and included in the Nuclear Free Committee's report, and said that while his uneasiness remained, he felt that if the 1987 models had dealt with and corrected the 3 major concerns addressed in earlier testimony, then he could support the purchase of Chryslers.

Councilmember Bradley moved that a waiver not be granted at the present time, and that appropriate staff be instructed to proceed with preparing purchase orders for Chrysler vehicles. For purposes of discussion, Ms. Bradley accepted an amendment from the Mayor that would indicate a quantity of five (5) vehicles to be purchased. The motion was duly seconded by Councilmember Levy. Councilmember Haney remarked he had thought the procedure would be to vote on whether or not to accept the recommendation of the committee; the Mayor pointed out that there was something of an oddity in that recommendations were made by the committee and also by the City Administrator which could potentially be at odds, depending upon how one weighed the evidence on new vehicles, as Mr. Wilson had just previously pointed out. He said, in effect, a vote in favor of the motion on the floor would be a vote to accept the recommendation of the committee not to waive the ordinance and to buy the Chrysler vehicles. Councilmember Haney commented on his dependence, trust and faith in City staff's information and judgment on a variety of matters, both prior to and since sitting on the Council; he said he trusted staff's information provided on the current issue and would have to seriously consider police personnel's expressed safety concerns in relation to Chryslers. He said he would not be voting in support of the motion not to waive the ordinance. Mr. Haney remarked he was pleased to receive friendly and understanding comments from members of the committee prior to the meeting; he said he felt badly that some people would wish to put a difference of opinion in an antagonistic or unfavorable context, and asked that anyone feeling that way try to rid themselves of those feelings in the best interest of the community as well as themselves. He said he also hoped the sporting event of making attacks on City staff would end with the current meeting; when something went wrong in City government, it should be analyzed and corrected, and if people were going to be held accountable, it should be the elected officials and not the City staff -- from the top on down. He said problems should be brought to the attention of the Council either during the "Citizens' Comments" portion of meetings or at worksessions.

Councilmember d'Eustachio commented he was in agreement with the Mayor's statements regarding the weighing of evidence. He said he made no pretense of being a mechanical expert, however, pointed out he was on his 4th Chrysler product -- a Dodge Dart with 170,000 miles on it. He said he had owned nothing but Chrysler products for the past 12 years and had maintained them himself. He said he did not believe the Chryslers would be adequate for meeting the City's needs and felt there was evidence to substantiate that. He said the question kept recurring to him why, if the police cars could not be adequately maintained, other City vehicles having hundreds of thousands of miles on them, some known for having serious

problems, could be maintained. He said he had to question whether the common thread was the maintenance or the 1986 Chryslers; said he was not satisfied that the changes made to the 1987 Chryslers would be adequate. He said that since the 1986 Chryslers had spent such substantial amounts of time in the dealer's shop, that would point away from the City's culpability or inability to maintain them -- it was the dealer's inability to properly maintain them that had kept them off the street. He stated he felt the issue was one of safety and that the Chryslers did not, in fact, present a viable alternative; said buying more cars than would otherwise be required in order to allow for time in the repair shop addressing defects was not a viable alternative -- said he could not, in good conscience, vote in favor of purchasing Chryslers.

Councilmember Bradley commented concerning history of the ordinance and the fact the present situation was only the second instance in which invoking a waiver had been considered; she said she felt these two occurrences had mandated that the Council scrutinize not only the ordinance, but management and administrative systems as well, which was not a bad thing. She said that in the present situation, she felt the Chryslers to be a reasonable alternative -- did not believe a case had been fully made for invoking a waiver of the ordinance. Ms. Bradley commented that it was difficult for her to make the decision not to support the police department's recommendation, however, felt she was elected by the citizens and had a responsibility to them as well. She said she felt the questions raised during the process had to be addressed, i.e., the adequacy of the City's maintenance program; said she would support the purchase of eight cars, would not wish to jeopardize either the police or residents by use of unsafe vehicles. In conclusion, she urged that her colleagues not support the granting of a waiver.

Councilmember Levy expressed support for the purchase of Chryslers; commented on the process used by the committee in formulating their recommendation, including conferring with the City Administrator, who she said had just two days prior indicated he felt Chryslers would be the car to buy -- she said that had influenced the committee's decision and she had not known the dynamics of his change of opinion. Additionally, she said the committee had talked with the police on two occasions, as well as Public Works Director Robbins. She thanked other members of the committee, who she said had put in long and diligent hours. Ms. Levy said, contrary to Mr. d'Eustachio's opinion, that she did not feel the two 1986 Chryslers to be indicative that all Chrysler products had problems -- the City may have gotten two "lemons." Additionally, she said some maintenance had been done on those cars in the City's facility aside from dealer warranty work, and she was not convinced that in-house work had been adequately done. Ms. Levy said she did not feel the case had been made for buying Chevrolets; while a lot of hours may have been expended on doing the necessary research, she said she concurred with Mrs. Abbott's statement that "our children will be thankful," and would be voting in favor of buying Chryslers.

Councilmember Sharp remarked that, in terms of making the ordinance more workable, current procedures might be examined to see whether it is desirable to, in effect, weed out nuclear-related suppliers early in the process by requiring the signing and submission of the Nuclear-Free Certification along with bids. He pointed out that whether nuclear-free suppliers were, indeed, saving the City money was an unknown as long as the process continues status quo. He said while the decision was a difficult one to make, he felt it had been demonstrated the police felt it important they have Chevrolets and he would be voting in support of the granting of a waiver.

Councilmember Iddings remarked that some of the comments he had heard from citizens made the decision more difficult. He directed comments to Mr. Donnay concerning his unfavorable remarks about a City employee, which he said was inexcusable; he said for outsiders to come in and mock dedicated employees riled him deeply. Councilmember Williams attempted to interject remarks, and a brief exchange ensued between him and Mr. Iddings, with the Mayor ruling that Mr. Williams was out of order. Mr. Williams continued; Mayor Del Giudice remarked that if Mr. Williams did not respect the right of the speaker who had the floor, he would be forced to hold him in contempt; Mr. Williams yielded. Councilmember Iddings continued, stating that he felt Mr. Donnay's comments were extremely inappropriate. He said a

number of comments had been made in the course of the meeting that distorted the record, i.e., that the process of purchasing indicated a failure of administration and that the committee was not involved until late in the process -- he said there had been an ongoing effort by the police department to identify and obtain alternate sources of police cars since they determined early on that Chryslers were inadequate for their needs; he said the committee came into the picture in January at the time the question of the waiver was raised. He said there was no failure in administration and that the process had functioned as intended. Concerning preventive maintenance, he said a problem exists because Council had never approved the purchase of a sufficient number of cars during the budget process -- compromises had always been effected. He said corrective measures had been adopted in the last budget process. Regarding the skill measure of maintenance people in public works, he said they had been able to keep vehicle stock operable and on the road that any other city would have junked years ago, and for anyone to mock those employees was an outrage. He pointed out the City had even purchased junked trash trucks, as an economy measure, which public works had renovated and kept running. Mr. Iddings referred to his role in bringing the Nuclear Free Zone Ordinance into being, and said it was very pertinent for cities and towns in that it clearly addressed the issue of purchasing products and the criteria for doing so, as well as how those criteria could be waived if and when necessary. He said he did not feel the process had been a waste of either time or money -- that the knowledge gained had been substantial and cheaply come by. Mr. Iddings, responding to Mr. Davidson's remarks, said the ordinance as drafted was incorrect in that it delegated a power to the committee, i.e., the recommendation that a waiver be invoked, which should appropriately lie with the elected officials; he said that should be examined and amended. He stated he would not be voting in support of the waiver, however, that decision had not been an easy one for him to make; said he felt the evidence presented had not proven health or safety to be endangered, however, had made it a close call. He said he felt the Chryslers, despite having problems, appeared to be a reasonable alternative. Concurring with comments made by Mr. Sharp about the need to examine the process relative to its weeding out of bidders, he said claims that buying from non-nuclear manufacturers had saved the City money were not fully accurate.

Councilmember Williams extended apologies for arriving late at the meeting, explaining that he had been detained at work. He pointed out that it would not be Chief Fisher who would benefit by the Council's decision, but the citizens; he hoped the decision made would be the right one. Mr. Williams commented it did not take a lot of education to come up with the right answer to the problem, that the answer could be discerned by listening to the views of the citizens.

Mayor Del Giudice related that the adopted budget had made provision for the purchase of four vehicles, an additional one could be purchased from the insurance money recouped from the 1986 Chrysler that was totalled. If more than the five were bought immediately, the additional ones would have to be lease/purchased, or ordered through some other arrangement. Councilmember Sharp again asked that Mr. Joachims take the information presented and pass it along to those in the Chrysler organization who could examine it and respond to the City concerning the problems encountered.

The question was called on the motion on the floor to not waive the ordinance and to direct staff to purchase five Chrysler vehicles immediately. It was noted that in so voting, the Council was, in effect, voting to accept the report of the Nuclear-Free Takoma Park Committee. Ms. Bradley remarked that she would hope the Council would without delay address the question of adding three additional vehicles and the mechanism for so doing. The motion carried with Councilmembers Bradley, Iddings, Levy and Williams voting Aye; Councilmembers d'Eustachio, Haney and Sharp voting Nay.

Councilmember Sharp moved that the second item on the agenda, consideration of the Nuclear-Free Takoma Park Committee's listing, "The Leading Nuclear Weapons Contractors and Their Products," be deferred until the March 9 Council Meeting; the motion was duly seconded and carried unanimously.

Upon motion, duly seconded, the Public Hearing/Special Session adjourned at 12:45 A.M., to reconvene in regular session at 8:00 P.M. on March 9, 1987.