

**PUBLIC HEARING, REGULAR MEETING, WORKSESSION
AND EXECUTIVE SESSION OF THE CITY COUNCIL**

Monday, February 12, 1996

Executive Session 1/22/96 - Moved by Rubin; seconded by Chavez. Council convened in Executive Session by unanimous vote at 10:05 p.m., in the Conference Room. OFFICIALS PRESENT: Sharp, Chavez, Elrich, Porter, Rubin, Williams. OFFICIAL ABSENT: Davenport. STAFF PRESENT: Habada, Grimmer, Hobbs, Silber, Phillips, Espinosa. Council received a briefing on pending litigation and personnel issue. Staff was given direction on two legal matters; no action was taken regarding the personnel issue. (Authority: Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, Section 10-508(a)(7) and (1)(I)).

Executive Session 1/29/96 - Moved by Rubin; seconded by Williams. Council convened in Executive Session by unanimous vote at 8:30 p.m., in the Conference Room. OFFICIALS PRESENT: Sharp, Chavez, Davenport, Elrich, Porter, Rubin, Williams. STAFF PRESENT: Habada, Grimmer, Perlman, Bailey, Espinosa. Council received a briefing on possible purchases of property and information regarding foreclosure action. Staff was given direction on further action. (Authority: Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, Section 10-508(a)(3)).

Executive Session 1/29/96 - Moved by Rubin; seconded by Davenport. Council convened in Executive Session by unanimous vote at 10:30 p.m., in the Conference Room. OFFICIALS PRESENT: Sharp, Chavez, Davenport, Elrich, Porter, Rubin, Williams. STAFF PRESENT: Habada, Grimmer, Hobbs, Perlman, Espinosa. Council discussed potential litigation matters and received a briefing on personnel matters. Staff was given direction regarding taxing matters; no action was taken regarding personnel matters. (Authority: Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, Section 10-508(a)(7) and (1)(I)).

OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Mayor Sharp

Councilmember Chavez

Councilmember Davenport

Councilmember Elrich

Councilmember Porter

Councilmember Rubin

Councilmember Williams

City Administrator Habada

Deputy City Clerk Espinosa

Senior Planner Schwartz

The City Council convened at 7:40 p.m. on Monday, February 12, 1996, in the Council chambers

of the Municipal Building, 7500 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland.

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, these remarks were made:

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Gary Weinstein, Babe Ruth Baseball League, described the League's scholarship program (children from low-income households qualify if eligible for public schools' free lunch program).

Benjamin Onyeneke, Maple Avenue, acknowledged Black History Month. He also noted the proposal before the Montgomery County Board of Education to establish a \$50 fee for pupil bus transportation. He urged Council to oppose implementation of the fee.

Mr. Elrich suggested that residents direct their comments on the matter to the Montgomery County Council.

PUBLIC HEARING

#1 "American Dream". Mr. Sharp acknowledged the presence of Carol Rubin from the Silver Spring Redevelopment Office, as well as some of the members of the Silver Spring Development Advisory Board, including William Leary, Randy Boehm and Councilmember Elrich.

The public hearing was opened for citizens' testimonies.

Jay Keller, expressed concern about traffic patterns and anticipated congestion. He said that the original input on the mall's size was that people wanted it smaller, but that he does not think the size has been reduced. There needs to be follow-up on promises made now when the construction begins (i.e. smaller mall).

Mark Robinowitz, noted that while a number of environmental groups have endorsed the proposal, the endorsements are not necessarily representative of the membership of the various organizations. He urged city support of a pedestrian mall.

Bob Stewart, 7333 Carroll Avenue, expressed concern about the likelihood of a significant increase in motor vehicle traffic if the proposal is effected.

Benjamin Onyeneke, Maple Avenue, supported the aspects of the mall project that will provide activities for children. He urged the Council to endorse the project.

Danny Medina, stated that he is a professional civil engineer, whose business is development. He said that the project has been referred to as a radical solution to Silver Spring, and it will not give us the return we have been led to expect. He remarked that the mall trivializes the ethnic diversity of Silver Spring, and urged the Council to oppose the development.

Enid Hodes, Hancock Avenue, commented that she opposes the mall primarily because of traffic concerns. There are only local roads around the mall, and people will try and find alternative routes through communities to get to the mall. She said that many people have argued that there are no recreational facilities in the area and that the mall will offer such facilities, but pointed out that persons who pay taxes to Montgomery County should be aware of recreation facilities that do exist (e.g. public pools).

Peter Banwell, Cedar Avenue, remarked that a lot of people are looking at this proposal as the last chance for Silver Spring. He said that the proposed size of the mall is too big--way out of scale for the area. He stated that the project would be more appropriate for a suburban area with access to major highways, and that the related traffic studies do not take into account construction traffic over the six year development period. He cautioned that businesses in Takoma Park will suffer, adding that some are currently "on the edge." Mr. Banwell expressed his belief that the mall will attract patrons from out-of-town, and said that he does not want his tax dollars to support a project for people who live outside of his community.

Chris Mann, 501 Ethan Allen Avenue, stated that people who currently live on state roads do not believe that the local roads can accommodate the anticipated 20,000,000 visitors to the mall. The traffic will be a big problem, as has been experienced in the area around the "Mall of America". He said that the County needs to come up with a plan that "embraces the community."

Bruce Sidwell, 7209 Spruce Avenue, opposed the mall project. He said that the project will take away from Takoma Junction development opportunities, that the construction will be very disruptive, and that even the most optimistic projections will indicate an impact on traffic on Philadelphia Avenue and Piney Branch Road. Economic failure of the project could push the area over the edge. He concluded that he does not feel there is a desperate need (i.e. unemployment) for a desperate project.

Kit Gage, 14 Philadelphia Avenue (PHANTOM), expressed guarded optimism about the project. She urged the city to assert its interests by influencing public financing related to the project.

Jack Mitton, 501 Philadelphia Avenue, spoke in favor of the mall, noting the employment opportunities it is expected to create.

Gregory Hamilton, 7611 Maple Avenue, endorsed the project, which is expected to promote minority participation. He noted the employment opportunities accessible by public transportation which the project is expected to provide.

Robert Lanza, 7600 Maple Avenue, recommended that everyone read the business plan for the project, adding that it does not promote a sense of community. He said that in his view, the project is "designed by outsiders for outsiders." He remarked that the area needs a community center, not a wave pool. He asserted that all competing development plans have been held confidential by the County.

Jay Levy, Baltimore Avenue, expressed skepticism about whether the projected jobs for young people will have an attractive salary. He also stated that we cannot depend on the State and County to resolve our traffic problems.

C.P. Hymer, said that he does not have strong feelings about the development. He remarked about the street level and public transportation access, and commented that with the \$100 million in funding to be provided by the State and County, he wonders whether he will be able to afford to patronize the mall.

Randy Boehm (member of Citizen Advisory Board), stated that there is not a single issue that has been raised this evening that has not been discussed by the CAB. He urged the Council not to succumb to scare tactics, stating that the complexity of the project requires a careful analysis. He commented on job loss statistics over the last four years, and suggested that the project might

provide some remedy.

Stacey Gurian-Sherman, Co-Chair North Takoma Citizens Association, commented that the association has not yet taken a position on the proposal. She indicated that more than one development proposal needs to be debated, and that she would like to see professionals in the community included in the process.

Alice Trembour, stated that she is not in favor of a “mega mall” for a number of reasons cited here this evening, and that if there are other proposals that exist, they should be shared with the community. If the “mega mall” is best for the area, then it should be able to stand up to a comparison test.

Larry Robinson, Hodges Lane, said that this project is not going to be a cure to poverty--most jobs at the low end and no guarantee who gets hired. He questioned whether the project is targeting a viable market for this area (i.e. middle income market), citing the failure of the Rockville Mall. He remarked that in the Silver Spring metro area there are mostly large office and apartment buildings.

Bernie Aronson, remarked that the bottom line of this debate should be about bettering the community. He commented that the original Silver Spring development was proposed for 14 acres and this project is twice as large. To be successful, the mall will have to attract more visitors than go to the Washington Monument, Holocaust museum, etc., combined (20,000,000 visitors per year). This project will change the life of the community.

Betsy Taylor, 7322 Willow Avenue, spoke in opposition. She said that there is a high level of distrust right now based on a concern that the development discussions are moving too fast. The name and concept of the project is appalling--celebrating commercialism as the “dream”. She urged the Council to ask about the existence of other development options.

Kay Dellinger, Hampshire Towers, stated that Charles Wolfe, past President of Silver Spring Traffic Coalition, has been quoted as saying that he wants this project dead. The proposal should have been rejected immediately; it is too large. She urged the Council to read the document presented by the coalition, and demand that the County make other proposals available to the public.

Tom Anastasio, 32 Columbia Avenue, remarked that he is opposed to the project because of the scale and anticipated traffic. He said that the project proposal should match the scale previously agreed to. If the other proposals were made public, we could better decide whether we want a mall or nothing at all. He noted that the promotional brochure on the project never mentioned the community.

Bruce Moyer, Philadelphia Avenue, stated that if this is the last chance for Silver Spring, then Takoma Park will be in need of last rites. People moved here for the quality of life we have come to know in this community, and this project poses an imbalance. Traffic is already pushed to the limit in this community, and the added volume that is being proposed will choke the community. He suggested that alternative proposals be studied with an eye toward a smaller development.

Carl Smith, Kennebec Avenue, commented that he has several reservations about the current proposal, but that he also has concerns about Silver Spring. Something has to be done to bring in money from outside the community. We need to focus our energy on ensuring that we get what

we want and truly need.

Peter Weiss, 7407 Baltimore Avenue, remarked that any comprehensive development of Silver Spring will bring significant traffic. The question is not the mall, but instead, any development

Tom Gagliardo, said that he has kept an open, as requested by the County leadership. He remarked about the business "arena" in Silver Spring, and the comings and goings of several agencies.

Bill Leary, Takoma Avenue, commented that it is a chance hope to believe that we can make the developers do what we want. The developers have heard consistently that people want the project size reduced, but it has not been reduced. He said that traffic issues have not been effectively addressed, noting that the traffic consultants are paid by the developers and have arrived at optimistic assumptions. If the assumptions are adjusted, the picture changes. He noted that opposition to the project is wide spread in the community.

Buddy Cox, stated opposition to the project.

Tom Kaufmann, commented in opposition, and said that he is at a loss to identify any merits of this project. He remarked that there is no basis of comparison when other proposals have not been shared with the community.

Hank Prensky, 8018 Maple Avenue, spoke in opposition to the project, saying that we need less signature retail. He said he would like to hear what the Council can and will do to affect this development, to help prevent this abomination to our community.

Laura Steinberg, Baltimore Avenue, reminded those in attendance of where the County is in its review process, i.e., the Advisory Board recommendation will be available on February 22, 1996, and then County Executive Duncan will decide whether to proceed with a lengthy review process.

Steve Shapiro, Willow Avenue, expressed opposition to the project.

Albert Nunez, 8 Sherman Avenue, spoke in support of the mall. He said that he has attended several meetings that have been put on by the developers, and that he has seen them make changes. He remarked that he believes the developer is receptive to change and could be led to creating something spectacular. Mr. Nunez stated that the developer seems to be keen on trying to do whatever possible to make the project energy efficient. He said that finding a developer of this caliber to plant the seed is very difficult.

Mr. Rubin thanked all of the speakers for their remarks.

Mr. Sharp invited the Council to spend a few minutes discussing the matter.

Mr. Elrich noted that he is the Council's representative on the Advisory Board, and commented on what he views as "scare tactics" by some of those promoting the project. He urged the Council to pass a resolution in opposition to the project.

Messrs. Chavez and Davenport expressed their desires to obtain and consider more information before making a commitment to a position.

Mr. Williams suggested that the County be informed that the preponderance of Takoma Park residents oppose the project, and that the project would have a substantial impact upon the city.

Ms. Porter proposed that the city approach the matter by identifying the city's vision of desirable development, i.e., that the city go on record in favor of three things: (1) traffic measures, (2) environmental standards, and (3) social concerns regarding creation of jobs.

Mr. Rubin suggested that the Council further discuss the matter in a future worksession, giving councilmembers time to propose resolutions from which a composite resolution could be drafted.

Mr. Sharp emphasized the city's need to be parochial in talking with Montgomery County. He underscored the concern about the impact upon the city of a substantial increase in vehicular traffic as a consequence of effecting the proposal, notably, the possibility of proposed widening of Philadelphia Avenue and Piney Branch Road. He added his concern about the potential economic impact upon Takoma Junction, and queried the amount of economic risk that would be borne by the developers of the "American Dream" project.

The Council reached a consensus to consider the matter in Worksession on February 20, with consideration of a resolution on February 26, 1996.

REGULAR SESSION

#2 Resolution re: House Bills Nos. 67 and 413. (Moved by Williams; seconded by Davenport) Mr. Williams described the proposed legislation introduced in the Maryland General Assembly. The resolution is in support of prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation and for provision of remedies for victims of discrimination.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION #1996-5 (Attached)

#3 1st Reading Ordinance re: Architectural Services. Discussion of and action on this item was postponed. Copy of ordinance was not distributed to Council.

WORKSESSION -- The Council adjourned to Worksession, followed by an Executive Session, and eventual adjournment for the evening.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Executive Session 2/12/96 - Moved by Williams; seconded by Porter. Council convened in Executive Session by unanimous vote at 10:35 p.m., in the Conference Room. OFFICIALS PRESENT: Sharp, Elrich, Porter, Rubin, Williams. OFFICIALS ABSENT: Chavez, Davenport. STAFF PRESENT: Habada, Silber. Council discussed possible land acquisition; and consulted with legal counsel. Staff was directed to move forward on one purchase and to explore options on the other. (Authority: Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, Section 10-508(a)(3) and (7)).

Introduced By: Councilmember Williams

RESOLUTION NO. 1996 - 5

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE BILLS NOS. 67 AND 413

WHEREAS, on June 8, 1992, the City Council of Takoma Park adopted Resolution No. 1992-38, establishing a Task Force on Family Diversity; AND

WHEREAS, the Task Force on Family Diversity review of human rights statutes determined that the existing provisions of the Annotated Code of Maryland, contrary to the values and beliefs of the members of our Community, are inadequate not only to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation with regard to public accommodations, housing, and employment, but also are inadequate in providing remedies for victims of discrimination based on sexual orientation; AND

WHEREAS, House Bills Nos. 67 and 413 have been introduced in the Maryland General Assembly to revise and amend Article 49B of the Annotated Code of Maryland for prohibition of discrimination based on sexual orientation and for provision of remedies for victims of discrimination in public accommodations, housing, and employment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Takoma Park, Maryland, on behalf of its citizens and staff, that support is hereby expressed for House Bills Nos. 67 and 413, and that their prompt passage by the Maryland General Assembly is urged.

Adopted this 12th day of February, 1996.

**INTERVIEW, SPECIAL SESSION AND WORKSESSION
OF THE CITY COUNCIL**

Tuesday, February 20, 1996

Executive Session 2/12/96 - Moved by Williams; seconded by Porter. Council convened in Executive Session by unanimous vote at 10:35 p.m., in the Conference Room. OFFICIALS PRESENT: Sharp, Elrich, Porter, Rubin, Williams. OFFICIALS ABSENT: Chavez, Davenport. STAFF PRESENT: Habada, Silber. Council discussed possible land acquisition; and consulted with legal counsel. Staff was directed to move forward on one purchase and to explore options on the other. (Authority: Annotated Code of Maryland, State Government Article, Section 10-508(a)(3) and (7)).

OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Mayor Sharp	City Administrator Habada
Councilmember Chavez	Deputy City Administrator Grimmer
Councilmember Davenport	Assistant City Administrator Hobbs
Councilmember Elrich	Deputy City Clerk Espinosa
Councilmember Porter	Senior Planner Schwartz
Councilmember Rubin	Community Planner George
Councilmember Williams	Police Chief Phillips
	Lt. Creamer

The City Council convened at 7:35 p.m. on Tuesday, February 20, 1996, in the upstairs meeting room of the Municipal Building, 7500 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mr. Davenport noted that on February 17th at approximately 1:00 p.m. a fire was reported at 7600 Maple Avenue. This marks the sixth incident in the last 2-3 months of a person(s) setting plastic light fixtures on fire. Residents are encouraged to notify the Police Department with any information regarding these acts of vandalism.

Mr. Williams introduced Gary Weinstein who briefly described the Baseball Scholarship program. Mr. Weinstein explained the qualifying criteria. He noted that the Police Department will give away 20 scholarships, and encouraged anyone knowing of youth candidates in the African-American, Hispanic and/or Asian communities to contact him directly. He invited parents to call him.

INTERVIEW

#1 Nuclear-Free Takoma Park Committee. The Council interviewed Angelia Smith who expressed interest in appointment to the Nuclear-Free Takoma Park Committee.

SPECIAL SESSION

The Council convened in Special Session at 7:57 p.m.

#2 1st Reading Ordinance re: Architectural Services. Mr. Sharp explained that the ordinance would authorize the City Administrator to negotiate for an “On-call and Rotating” contract for architectural services.

(Moved by Rubin/seconded by Porter)

Mr. Williams stated that he is familiar with Travis Price Architects, and asked where the other firms (i.e. Integrated Design & Construction, and Malesari, Steiner, Keyes & McCommons) are located.

City Administrator Habada responded that one is in Silver Spring and that the other is out of the District of Columbia.

The ordinance was accepted unanimously by roll call vote.

ORDINANCE #1996-3 (Attached)

#3 Resolution re: Expression of Condolence to Family of Barbara Susan Dorman. Mr. Sharp commented on the resolution. (Moved by Porter/seconded by Rubin)

The resolution was amended to include a reference to the family, as well as Senator Dorman.

The resolution was adopted unanimously, as amended.

RESOLUTION #1996-5A (Attached)

WORKSESSION

The Council moved into Worksession at 7:59 p.m. Following the Worksession, the Council adjourned for the evening at 11:34 p.m.

Introduced By: Councilmember Porter

RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE

#1996 - 5A

WHEREAS, it was with shock and sorrow that the City Council learned of the death of Barbara Susan Dorman, daughter of the Honorable Arthur Dorman, a true friend of the City of Takoma Park; AND

WHEREAS, words are inadequate to express our feelings of outrage at the taking of Barbara's life; AND

WHEREAS, Barbara's death is a tragic reminder of the fragility of life that, once lost, is beyond human power to restore; AND

WHEREAS, in commemoration of Barbara's life, and as a reminder of rededicating ourselves to preserving, protecting and defending the lives of our loved ones, the Takoma Park Community wishes to plant a tree in her memory.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND, on behalf of the Citizens, Council and Staff of the City of Takoma Park, that we hereby extend heartfelt sympathy to the family and friends of Barbara Susan Dorman; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT the City Administrator take the appropriate steps to arrange for the planting of a tree, within the corporate limits of the City of Takoma Park, in honor of Barbara Susan Dorman; AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT the City Administrator notify the City Council of the time and location scheduled for the planting of the tree, so as to allow sufficient prior notice of the event to Barbara's family and friends.

ADOPTED this 20th day of February, 1996.

ORDINANCE NO. 1996-3

Authority to Negotiate for "On-Call and rotating" Contract for
Architectural Services

WHEREAS, the City of Takoma Park requires Professional Architectural capabilities for general architectural services; AND

WHEREAS, appropriate solicitation of interest through advertisement in the Washington Post on October 1, 1995 for Request for Proposal was followed; 30 proposals being received; AND

WHEREAS, The City Administrator appointed a Selection Committee to review submitted proposals in accordance with the Takoma Park Procurement Regulations; AND

WHEREAS, the Selection Committee properly convened for screening evaluation and subsequent interviews with a recommended short list of interested architectural firms; AND

WHEREAS, the Selection Committee has recommended that the architectural firms of Integrated Design & Construction, Travis Price, Architects, and Malesari, Steiner, Keyes & McCommons be selected on an "On-call and rotating" basis as architectural service providers; AND

WHEREAS, contractual arrangements with the above 3 architectural firms for "On-call and rotating" basis through open ended contracts is considered to be in the best interest of the City of Takoma Park.

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

SECTION 1: The City Administrator or her designee is authorized to negotiate with and enter into a contract with the architectural firms of Integrated Design & Construction, Travis Price, Architects, and Malesari, Steiner, Keyes & McCommons to provide general architectural services.

SECTION 2: THAT City Administrator be authorized to cover on-going City architectural projects from Public Works budget, not to exceed a cap of \$5,000 per project, without council approval.

ADOPTED THIS _____ DAY OF _____ 1996.

AYE:

NAY:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND REGULAR MEETING
OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Monday, February 26, 1996

OFFICIALS PRESENT:

Mayor Sharp	City Administrator Habada
Councilmember Chavez	Deputy City Clerk Espinosa
Councilmember Davenport	Code Enforcement Supervisor Castillo
Councilmember Elrich	Equipment Maint. Supervisor Allen
Councilmember Porter	Senior Planner Schwartz
Councilmember Rubin	Community Planner George
Councilmember Williams	

The City Council convened at 7:35 p.m. on Monday, February 26, 1996, in the Council chambers of the Municipal Building, 7500 Maple Avenue, Takoma Park, Maryland.

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, these remarks were made:

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

Moved by Porter; seconded by Williams.

The Council Meeting Minutes from 9/11/95, 9/18/95, 9/26/95, 10/9/95, 10/16/95, 10/23/95, 11/08/95, 11/13/95 and 11/20/95 were adopted (ABSENT: Elrich).

MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mr. Sharp noted that he will be leaving at approximately 9:45 p.m.

DHCD and Recreation Vehicles (Agenda Item #6). Mr. Sharp asked why the city cannot purchase Fords (i.e. Escort and Tracer) for both DHCD and Recreation.

Ms. Habada responded that the Escort is not adequate for Recreation uses, and that the DHCD specifications do not match those of an Escort. The Escort and Tracer are essentially the same size. The requested full-size sedans will be used for more than local trips.

Ms. Porter questioned the need for full-sized vehicles for Code Enforcement Officers. She wondered why the Code Enforcement Officer cannot use the other Festiva.

Mr. Davenport asked whether the cited prices include a trade-in.

Mr. Castillo responded that they are cash prices with no trade-in.

Ms. Habada noted that vehicles #119 (Plymouth K) and #145 (Diplomat) will be sold. She commented that staff has a track record of maintenance for the Festivas, that includes a parts inventory.

Mr. Allen explained the parts inventory.

Mr. Davenport clarified that \$18,699 is the amount for total repairs for vehicle #151.

Mr. Allen confirmed.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Clarence Boatman, Ritchie Avenue, expressed concerns about excessive vehicular speed on Ritchie Avenue, an increase in traffic volume over the last 3-4 years, and the inability of the city to provide sidewalks on the street. He suggested that speed humps be considered. Mr. Boatman asked for investigation into apparent abandoned vehicles on Ritchie, and for repair of potholes and drainage problems on the street.

Ms. George noted meetings scheduled regarding speed hump requests for the area.

Ms. Habada is to investigate and follow-up on the matters of abandoned vehicles and road surface conditions.

Benjamin Onyeneke, Maple Avenue, noted February as Black History Month, remarked on some prominent persons of African ancestry, and expressed pride in African culture.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

#1 Proposed Revisions to Speed Hump Regulations. Ms. Schwartz summarized the proposed changes and noted the comments received from citizens regarding the matter.

Benjamin Onyeneke, 7667 Maple Avenue, stated that he supports the change in the petition signature requirement (i.e. from 60% to 2/3 affected residents).

Paul Roat, 6505 Kansas Lane (Pine Crest Community Association), noted the potential impact of the revisions upon streets in his community, and expressed the association's opposition to the revisions.

Ralph Cray, 7129 Carroll Avenue, said that most traffic has been dumped onto Carroll Avenue. He commented that the uncoordinated placement of stop lights and signage contributes to air pollution. He spoke in favor of installing speed humps on Carroll Avenue and East-West Highway.

Bruce Moyer, 37 Philadelphia Avenue (Chair, Philadelphia Avenue Traffic Coalition), opposed the requirement that a street must be identified as having a speeding problem. He noted that each time the Council has been approached with a speed hump request, it has been fair and has tried to preserve the residential character of the area.

Anna Wynn, 6407 4th Avenue, commented on the traffic study for 4th Avenue, and noted the history of trying to get assistance with traffic problems from Prince George's County. Traffic will not slow down for pedestrians on 4th Avenue. She acknowledged some arguments against speed humps, and said that she would be presenting the traffic study to Councilmember Williams.

Patty Murphy, 6807 Woodland Avenue, opposed the changes. She noted that there are many speed humps in the city, but that there is a greater need for sidewalks. She suggested that sidewalks provide better safety, stating her disagreement with many parents who she feels believe the streets are for children to play in. Children need to be taught to stay out of the streets and respect motorists. She remarked that perhaps lower speed limits are needed.

Mary Naden, 7417 Piney Branch Road, expressed concern about a “hidden agenda” to shift even more traffic onto arterials. She opposed the installation of speed humps.

Diana Vidutis, 7416 Piney Branch Road, suggested that an impact study requirement might be considered, and that no more speed humps be installed until all residential streets become subject to speed humps (410, 320, etc.)

Kit Gage, 14 Philadelphia Avenue (Vice Chair, PHANTOM), expressed concern that traffic is being dealt with globally, not locally. She suggested that some neighborhoods have no rationales for speed humps, and cautioned the Council to avoid channeling traffic through residential streets.

Jerome Franklin, 6426 4th Avenue, stated that he basically agrees with the proposed guidelines, but that he also feels that sidewalks would greatly increase safety. He said that he hopes the city is looking at the costs associated with speed humps versus sidewalks.

Clarence Boatman, Ritchie Avenue, noted that what has not been stated is that people’s behavior cannot be controlled. Speed humps do slow some traffic, and it is not necessarily true that speed humps encourage children to play in the street. He commented on the need to take some measure to slow traffic on Ritchie Avenue.

(Unintelligible) Gordon, 7310 Piney Branch Road, commented on the design of city speed humps, and noted that twice in the last week, northbound drivers from the District have hit his retaining wall. He remarked about the current gridlock from “Local Traffic Only” and speed humps.

(Unintelligible), 718 Auburn, asked what the Police officers think about the speed humps.

The public hearing was closed at 8:47 p.m.

Mr. Sharp instructed staff to address the points raised.

Ms. Porter clarified that there are two methods by which a speed hump can be installed--(1) inclusion in a traffic plan, and (2) residential petition process. She expressed concern about eliminating the requirement that the street be identified as having a speeding problem, but recognized that this criteria has not been followed for years. She noted that the new guidelines require the petitioners to notify the entire neighborhood of their request for a speed hump.

Mr. Rubin asked if there are any statistics about the effect of speed humps, i.e. number of motorists who avoid the streets with speed humps.

#2 South of Sligo Citizens Association (SOSCA) Traffic Study.

Sally Taber, 703 Auburn Avenue (President, SOSCA), noted that the study has been divided into two parts, the Kentland/Larch Area and the Elm/Sligo Creek Parkway area. She reiterated

SOSCA's support for a number of traffic management improvements, including installation of two speed humps on Devonshire Avenue, and additional stop sign on Glaisewood Avenue, Channelizing of intersections of Lincoln and Elm Avenues and Auburn and Elm Avenues, and installation of a right-turn lane from Sligo Creek Parkway onto New Hampshire Avenue.

Kate Bennison, 811 Elm Avenue (Co-Chair, SOSCA Study), commented on concerns about speeding traffic, lack of sidewalks, and few driveways. She stated that she has observed many "near-misses" of motorists traveling 30-40 mph. Speed humps are self-enforcing. She noted that there are no speed limit signs posted except in the vicinity of the day care center. Ms. Bennison suggested that additional signage be erected, and that speed humps be installed on Devonshire Avenue.

Catherine Tunis, 900 block Larch Avenue, stated that the traffic has increased 4-5 fold on Larch Avenue. She suggested that the street striping be repainted at Larch and Elm, and that road mounted reflectors be installed to enhance visibility. Ms. Tunis remarked that motorists tend to ignore the stop signs. She proposed that staff consider speed humps or gridding for the length of Elm Avenue that descends toward East-West Highway. She said she would like to see cross-walks along Sligo Creek Parkway in at least three locations, especially in light of hiker-biker trail.

Nancy Weil, 914 Glaisewood Avenue, supported installation of a pedestrian switch for the traffic signal at the intersection of Larch and New Hampshire Avenues.

Karl Schneider, 703 Devonshire Avenue, supported speed humps on Devonshire. He noted that motorists passing through the area toss garbage from their vehicles.

Dennis Fruitt, 706 Devonshire Avenue, attested to all of the stories that have been told about near-miss accidents, stating that it is nothing short of a miracle that there has not been a serious accident. He remarked that the recommendations are reasonable, and added his support.

Benjamin Onyeneke, Maple Avenue, supported the conclusions of the study. He said that it seems that motorists consider Sligo Creek Parkway as an "express lane". He suggested that Lincoln, Lee and Ritchie Avenues need to be studied.

Mr. Williams noted that S.S. Carroll Citizens Association supports the SOSCA traffic study.

The public hearing was closed at 9:19 p.m.

#3 Old Philadelphia Avenue Traffic Study. Ms. George described the "After Study", and commented on the installation of traffic control signage in the area.

Maurice Belanger, 7421 Cedar Avenue, spoke in support of the proposed installation of a traffic island in the area.

Benjamin Onyeneke, Maple Avenue, supported the plan.

The public hearing was closed at 9:25 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING

#4 Resolution re: “American Dream” Development. Mr. Sharp explained the resolution, noting that Montgomery County Executive Duncan is expected to announce his recommendation tomorrow regarding whether to proceed to the next step in the development process.

Mr. Rubin noted several changes to the resolution:

- “1. The risk to public funds is minimized. [Private developers must show their faith in the economic viability of their proposals through agreeing that the majority of funds for their projects should come from private sources. Any calculation of the public funds spent on the current efforts to design a Silber Spring Redevelopment Project should include public funds that have already been spent in the various study and exploration phases.] At a time when public funds are being reduced for vital social services such as education, health care and housing, the use of tax monies to pay for private development in Silver Spring should be kept to a minimum. In no case should the public be asked to invest more money in a project than the developers are willing to invest and risk of their own money.”

- “5. Environmental protections are strictly maintained. The City of Takoma Park requests that the County and all private developers [study the] employ suggestions of the City of Takoma Park Environmental Committee [and issue a report as to their viability].”

- “6. The planning process is open. The City Council of Takoma Park urges the County, and the State, to publicly state the source and amount of what funds it might be willing to provide to any project and the conditions under which such funds would be available so that all competing projects can structure their proposals in a way that reflects any such commitment of public financing.”

Moved, as amended, by Rubin; seconded by Porter.

Mr. Davenport suggested amendments to paragraph #4:

- “4. The residential, ethnically and racially diverse character of the area is protected. The goal of job creation should not be met at the expense of the lowering of residential property values. Acceptable redevelopment projects must offer local residents both job opportunities and opportunities to open or expand their own businesses. In addition, businesses should fit the mold and reflect the community as a whole, and provide economic stability to local owners.” (Seconded by Porter)

Mr. Elrich commented that the original language tried to balance the concerns.

Mr. Davenport stated that the types of businesses in the development could adversely impact property values, and that it is important that some businesses reflect the values of the community.

The amendment carried unanimously.

Mr. Elrich proposed the addition of paragraph #7:

- “7. Size of the proposed project. The size of any project should not create conflicts with the Sector Plan, particularly regarding height limitations, setbacks, and other quality-of-life issues affecting the surrounding neighborhoods.” (Seconded by Porter)

The amendment carried unanimously.

Mr. Williams proposed an amendment to paragraph #3:

- "3. The revitalization of Takoma Junction is not hindered. Evidence must be presented that any given redevelopment proposal for the Silver Spring area will [neither diminish the potential market for goods and services to be supplied at a revitalized Takoma Junction nor will it] not create traffic conditions that would deter people from coming to Takoma Junction once it is revitalized."

He stated that he thinks the market potential of Takoma Junction will be unimpacted by the development project.

There was no second to the proposed amendment.

Clarence Boatman, Ritchie Avenue, noted the opposition of 20 people who spoke at the public hearing, but stated that he thinks the employment opportunities will make the development worthwhile.

Haynes Fraiser, Takoma Towers, spoke in opposition to a "megamall", stating that the traffic is bad enough in Takoma Park. She urged the Council to support the resolution.

Benjamin Onyeneke, Maple Avenue, stated his support for the project.

Bill Leary, Takoma Avenue, remarked that the resolution is a useful contribution to the continuing discussions about the project. He said that if the aim of paragraph #2 is to be fulfilled, traffic will have to be modified substantially. He referred to paragraph #1 on financing, adding that in no case should the public contribution exceed that of the private investments. Mr. Leary noted a difference in the developers own funds and the amount of funding the developer can raise. He said that the resolution assents, as is written, to a possible public commitment of up to \$300 million.

Mr. Sharp commented that he does not want to see a lot of public money involved in the project, and that he does not want more than the \$60 million already committed to be devoted from the public sector. He concurred with Mr. Leary's analysis.

Lou D'Ovidio asked for clarification of Mr. Sharp's remarks about the public commitment.

Mr. Sharp said that the developers need to share in the risk--they can get private funding from various sources. The public should not be in a "matching funds" situation, but this is not saying that the county should not look for money.

Mr. D'Ovidio said that he is concerned about the Takoma Voice editorial that he interpreted as an attack on the Citizens Advisory Committee. He presented a letter to the Council and read it for the record. He emphasized that the developer has made great efforts to include the community in the development process.

Mr. Davenport said that overall, he believes that the "American Dream" is a good idea that could be even better with some fine tuning.

Ms. Porter remarked that she is pleased with the Council's strategic approach (referred to resolution), indicating what it would take for the city to fully support the project.

Mr. Chavez endorsed the project, noting that there is a need for jobs in the Takoma Park/Silver Spring area. Job opportunities will contribute to the preservation of a diverse ethnicity.

Mr. Sharp agreed with Ms. Porter's remarks in regards to the tone of the resolution.

The resolution, as amended, was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION #1996-6
(Attached)

#5 Resolution of Appreciation--Public Safety Citizens Advisory Committee. Moved by Davenport; seconded by Porter.

Benjamin Onyeneke, Maple Avenue, pointed out that his name is omitted from the resolution.

Ms. Porter noted that there were residents who participated on the PSCAC, but who were not active all the way through the process.

Mr. Davenport clarified for Mr. Onyeneke that the omission of his name was a matter of procedure and nothing personal.

The resolution was adopted unanimously (ABSENT: Sharp).

RESOLUTION #1996-7
(Attached)

#6 Single Reading Ordinance re: Purchase of Vehicles for HCD and Recreation. Ms. Porter restated her question regarding the necessity of purchasing a "Taurus" automobile compared with other models.

Ms. Habada noted that we have until June 1st to make a decision with a guarantee of the same purchase prices.

Ms. Porter made a motion to table the ordinance until March 11th, providing staff the opportunity to respond to her question (seconded by Rubin).

#7 2nd Reading Ordinance re: Contract for Architectural Services. Mr. Elrich explained the ordinance. Moved by Williams; seconded by Rubin.

The ordinance was unanimously adopted at second reading by roll call vote (ABSENT: Sharp).

ORDINANCE #1996-3
(Attached)

#8 Single Reading Ordinance re: Contract Extension for Traffic Engineer. Mr. Elrich explained the ordinance. Moved by Rubin; seconded by Porter.

Mr. Rubin noted the work of the engineer in Ward 1. Mr. Williams noted the same for Ward 3.

Ms. Porter commented that the additional \$1,000 is for work already approved.

The single reading ordinance was unanimously adopted by roll call vote (ABSENT: Sharp).

ORDINANCE #1996-4
(Attached)

#9 Resolution re: 1996 Farmers Market. Moved by Rubin; seconded by Williams.

Ms. Porter commented on the items that can and cannot be sold at the market, noting that “crafts” are not allowed. She clarified that dried herbs, dried corn, etc. are acceptable goods for sale and that they do not fall under the “crafts” category.

Mr. Williams noted that the closing date of the market is stated differently in the title and body of the resolution (i.e. December 22 and December 21).

(NOTE: Staff is to make the appropriate correction.)

John Urciolo, Takoma-Old Town Business Association (TOTBA), asked for clarification of the “ten or more” provision for the number of vendors eligible to participate in the “extended” Farmers Market, i.e., post-Thanksgiving to Christmas. He also expressed concern about vendors’ booths extending into the intersection of Laurel Avenue and Carroll Avenue. Mr. Urciolo emphasized that TOTBA wants the Farmers’ Market and wants a working relationship with the Market.

Mr. Elrich recognized Mr. Urciolo’s concerns, but suggested that they might best be addressed by staff.

Mr. Rubin asked for Ms. Sickles’ response.

Ms. Sickles stated that the issue of the market swelling in size is largely due to its success. She commented that with the number of people who circulate through the market, not all of the vendors can fit on the median. She suggested that the number of vendors might need to be limited.

Mr. Williams asked whether limiting the number of vendors would require Council action, or whether the Market Manager could affect the change.

Ms. Porter expressed concern about eliminating any of the current vendors.

The Council reached a consensus that the “off-season” market be restricted to one side, i.e., the west side, of Laurel Avenue.

Mr. Urciolo remarked that the barriers should be placed in-line with the parking lot driveway.

Ms. Sickle clarified the Council's suggestions regarding the barrier placement.

Mr. Williams responded, noting that the discussion is about the one end of the market at the intersection of Carroll and Laurel Avenues.

The resolution was adopted unanimously (ABSENT: Sharp).

**RESOLUTION #1996-8
(Attached)**

ADJOURNMENT

The Council adjourned for the evening at 10:40 p.m.

Introduced By: Councilmember Rubin

RESOLUTION #1996-6
TAKOMA PARK'S CONCERNS REGARDING
SILVER SPRING REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

WHEREAS, as an integral part of the Silver Spring, Maryland, community, the City of Takoma Park recognizes the necessity of stemming the area's decay through the wise and prudent use of our limited public funds and through redevelopment projects that create jobs and improve the quality of life for area residents; AND

WHEREAS, development projects that fail become unacceptable drains on public funds; AND

WHEREAS, the City of Takoma Park is currently contributing to the redevelopment of the greater Silver Spring area through financial and planning activities aimed at revitalizing Takoma Junction; AND

WHEREAS, the City of Takoma Park believes that any redevelopment project in our area should be aimed first and foremost at serving the needs of area residents through:

- being economically viable;
- creating both small business opportunities and jobs for local area residents;
- protecting the residential nature of the area;
- maintaining the diverse ethnic and racial residential character of the area;
- maintaining the safety and convenience of our streets for pedestrians;
- maintaining levels of traffic flow that minimize air and noise pollution and maximize safety and convenience for local residents travelling locally;
- maintaining strict controls and proactive programs that protect the environment; and
- through affording residents meaningful input at all stages of the planning process.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT the City of Takoma Park will support only those Silver Spring redevelopment proposals that meet the following criteria:

1. The risk to public funds is minimized. At a time when public funds are being reduced for vital social services such as education, health care and housing, the use of tax monies to pay for private development in Silver Spring should be kept to a minimum. In no case should the public be asked to invest more money in an project than the developers are willing to invest and risk of their own money.

2. Traffic volume does not overburden Takoma Park streets. Evidence must be presented that the volume of traffic generated by any given proposal will not be greater than the current capacity of Takoma Park streets to handle traffic flow in ways that do not impinge on quality of life of residential neighborhoods. Widening of Takoma Park streets or intersections are not viable solutions to problems created by increased traffic flow.

In order to assure that traffic levels generated by development projects

are acceptable, the County Council must:

- reduce the cap on long-term parking in Silver Spring so that the peak-hour car trips are reduced by 2,000; and
- reduce the development ceiling in Silver Spring as currently-approved projects expire.

3. **The revitalization of Takoma Junction is not hindered.** Evidence must be presented that any given redevelopment proposal for the Silver Spring area will neither diminish the potential market for goods and services to be supplied at a revitalized Takoma Junction nor will it create traffic conditions that would deter people from coming to Takoma Junction once it is revitalized.

4. **The residential, ethnically and racially diverse character of the area is protected.** The goal of job creation should not be met at the expense of lowering of residential property values. Acceptable redevelopment projects must offer local residents both job opportunities and opportunities to open or expand their own businesses. In addition, businesses should fit the mold and reflect the community as a whole, and provide economic stability to local owners.

5. **Environmental protections are strictly maintained.** The City of Takoma Park requests that the County and all private developers employ suggestions of the City of Takoma Park Committee on the Environment.

6. **The planning process is open.** The City of Takoma Park urges the County and the State to publicly state the source and amount of funds they might be willing to provide to any project and the conditions under which such funds would be available so that all competing projects can structure their proposals in a way that reflects any such commitment of public financing.

7. **Size of the proposed project.** The size of any project should not create conflicts with the Sector Plan, particularly regarding height limitations, setbacks, and other quality-of-life issues affecting the surrounding neighborhoods.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT the City of Takoma Park will transmit this resolution to the Montgomery County Council and the Montgomery County Executive, and will make every effort to assure that this resolution is considered at all stages of the Silver Spring redevelopment process.

ADOPTED this 26th day of February, 1996.

ATTEST:

Thomas H. Espinosa
Acting City Clerk

Introduced By: Councilmember Davenport

RESOLUTION #1996 -7

IN APPRECIATION OF THE PUBLIC SAFETY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- WHEREAS,** *City of Takoma Park Council Resolution #1994-53 established the Public Safety Citizens Advisory Committee (PSCAC) and made appointments thereto; AND*
- WHEREAS,** *the PSCAC solicited input by all members of the Takoma Park Community, including the sponsorship of four public fora, on public safety matters; AND*
- WHEREAS,** *the PSCAC, painstakingly, gathered information on community expectations, community perceptions, and suggested improvements in providing for public safety; AND*
- WHEREAS,** *the PSCAC Members devoted a great deal of time and effort in gathering information as well as in preparation of the PSCAC's Report to Council; AND*
- WHEREAS,** *the great efforts of the PSCAC are a tribute to Takoma Park's community spirit and are in the best traditions of volunteerism.*

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND, *on behalf of the Citizens, Council, and Staff of the City of Takoma Park, that appreciation and thanks are hereby extended to the following Members of the Public Safety Citizens Advisory Committee:*

<i>Karin Anderson</i>	<i>Lamar Burnside</i>	<i>Lloyd Johnson</i>	<i>Elizabeth Reynolds</i>
<i>David Bates</i>	<i>Dennis Fruitt</i>	<i>Rita Marth</i>	<i>Marie Ritzo</i>
<i>Clarence Boatman</i>	<i>Herman Goodyear</i>	<i>Wolfgang Mergner</i>	<i>Carol Stewart</i>
<i>Yvonne Bolz</i>	<i>Paul Huebner</i>	<i>Elizabeth Pugh</i>	<i>Dawn Werner</i>

ADOPTED *this 26th day of February, 1996.*

Edward F. Sharp
Mayor

ATTEST:

Thomas H. Espinosa
Acting City Clerk

Introduced by: Councilmember Rubin

RESOLUTION NO. 1996-8

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CLOSING OF LAUREL AVENUE BETWEEN EASTERN AVENUE AND CARROLL AVENUE FOR THE OPERATION OF THE TAKOMA PARK FARMERS MARKET ON SUNDAYS FROM APRIL 21 TO DECEMBER 22, 1996, 8:45 A.M. TO 2:30 P.M.

WHEREAS, the City of Takoma Park has sponsored the Takoma Park Farmers' Market (the "Market") on Laurel Avenue in the Takoma Old Town Business District for the past thirteen years; AND

WHEREAS, the Market has proven to be a tremendous success that benefits the Takoma Old Town economy and the Takoma Park community as a whole; AND

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Takoma Park is therefore desirous of continuing to sponsor the Market on Laurel Avenue in the Takoma Old Town Business District; AND

WHEREAS, in order for the Market to operate in a safe and effective manner, Laurel Avenue must be closed between Carroll and Eastern Avenues to accommodate the participating vendors, their stands and their customers; AND

WHEREAS, Section 11-24(a) of the TAKOMA PARK CODE requires the approval of the City Council prior to closing a street.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND, THAT the City Administrator (or designee) is hereby authorized to establish and administer the Takoma Park Farmers Market.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND THAT in order to promote the effective and efficient administration of the Market, the City Administrator (or designee) is hereby authorized and empowered to develop, adopt, and promulgate such guidelines and policies as may from time to time be necessary to administer the Market.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND, THAT Laurel Avenue between Carroll and Eastern Avenues shall be closed to all through traffic on the following dates during the following times:

Every Sunday between (and including) 21 April 1996 - 22 December 1996, from 8:45 a.m. (local time) to 2:30 p.m. (local time)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND, THAT parking on Laurel Avenue between Carroll and Eastern Avenues shall be prohibited on the dates and during the times set forth above, except for officially permitted vendors participating in the Takoma Park Farmers' Market.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND, THAT in the event that there are fewer than ten vendors participating in the Market on a given Sunday, the City Administrator (or designee) may, at his/her discretion, open the northbound lanes of Laurel Avenue to through traffic between Carroll and Eastern Avenues. In this event, parking shall be permitted in those spaces so designated along the northbound lanes of Laurel Avenue.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF TAKOMA PARK, MARYLAND, THAT the City Administrator (or designee) is hereby authorized to arrange for the physical closing of Laurel Avenue between Carroll and Eastern Avenues and the posting of appropriate signage.

ADOPTED THIS 26th DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1996.

ORDINANCE NO. 1996-3

Authority to Negotiate for "On-Call and rotating" Contract for
Architectural Services

WHEREAS, the City of Takoma Park requires Professional Architectural capabilities for general architectural services; AND

WHEREAS, appropriate solicitation of interest through advertisement in the Washington Post on October 1, 1995 for Request for Proposal was followed; 30 proposals being received; AND

WHEREAS, The City Administrator appointed a Selection Committee to review submitted proposals in accordance with the Takoma Park Procurement Regulations; AND

WHEREAS, the Selection Committee properly convened for screening evaluation and subsequent interviews with a recommended short list of interested architectural firms; AND

WHEREAS, the Selection Committee has recommended that the architectural firms of Integrated Design & Construction, Travis Price, Architects, and Malesari, Steiner, Keyes & McCommons be selected on an "On-call and rotating" basis as architectural service providers; AND

WHEREAS, contractual arrangements with the above 3 architectural firms for "On-call and rotating" basis through open ended contracts is considered to be in the best interest of the City of Takoma Park.

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

SECTION 1: The City Administrator or her designee is authorized to negotiate with and enter into a contract with the architectural firms of Integrated Design & Construction, Travis Price, Architects, and Malesari, Steiner, Keyes & McCommons to provide general architectural services.

SECTION 2: THAT City Administrator be authorized to cover on-going City architectural projects from Public Works budget, not to exceed a cap of \$5,000 per project, without council approval.

ADOPTED THIS 26th DAY OF February 1996.

AYE: Chavez, Davenport, Elrich, Porter, Rubin, Williams

NAY: None

ABSENT: Sharp

ABSTAIN: None

Introduced By: Councilmember Elrich

Adopted: 2/26/96
(Single Reading)

ORDINANCE NO. 1996-4

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING SERVICES CONTRACT
AWARD OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS

WHEREAS, on September 26, 1994, the City Council of Takoma Park awarded a contract for traffic engineering consulting services to The RBA Group in the amount of \$19,800 (Contract No. 94-32); AND

WHEREAS, that amount has now been expended; AND

WHEREAS, due to increases in the amount of work required for some traffic projects, plus additional work the consultants performed on other items, not all traffic projects in the contract have been completed; AND

WHEREAS, the Council has allocated \$12,000 in the Fiscal Year 1996 City budget for traffic engineering services; AND

WHEREAS, it is in the City's interest to have The RBA Group complete the traffic projects under Contract No. 94-32;

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

SECTION 1. THAT an amount not to exceed \$12,000 is hereby added to Contract No. 94-32 between the City of Takoma Park and The RBA Group for the purpose of completing the traffic projects in the contract.

SECTION 2. THAT these funds shall be charged to General Fund Account No. 5000.6105.

ADOPTED THIS 26th DAY OF February, 1996.

AYE: Chavez, Davenport, Elrich, Porter, Rubin, Williams

NAY: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: Sharp

teconadd.ord