

## REGULAR MEETING

Monday, September 19, 1927.

The Common Council of the City of Indianapolis met in regular session in the Council Chamber at 7:30 P. M., Monday, September 19, 1927, President Claude E. Negley in the chair.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Hon. Claude E. Negley, President, and six members, viz: Otis E. Bartholomew, Boynton J. Moore, Robert E. Springsteen, Austin H. Todd, O. Ray Albertson, Walter R. Dorsett.

On motion of Mr. Dorsett, seconded by Mr. Albertson, the reading of the minutes of the previous meeting was dispensed with.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE MAYOR

September 13, 1927.

*To the Honorable President and Members of the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana:*

Gentlemen—I have this day approved with my signature and delivered to Wm. A. Boyce, Jr., City Clerk, Appropriation Ordinance No. 4, 1927:

“AN ORDINANCE, appropriating moneys for the purpose of defraying current expenses of the city government of the city of Indianapolis, Indiana, and for the use of the several executive departments thereof, for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 1928, and ending December 31st, 1928, including all outstanding claims and obligations and fixing a time when the same shall take effect; repealing all general and special appropriations in any manner in conflict therewith.”

## GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 56, 1927.

“AN ORDINANCE, to amend General Ordinance No. 114, 1922,

entitled: 'An ordinance dividing the city of Indianapolis into districts for the purpose of regulating and restricting the location of trades, callings, industries, commercial enterprises and the location of buildings designed for specified uses; of classifying, regulating and determining the area of front, rear and side yards and other open spaces about buildings; of regulating and determining the use and intensity of use of land and lot areas within such city; creating a board of zoning appeals; defining certain terms used in said ordinance; and designating a time when the same shall take effect,' and fixing the time when the same shall take effect."

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 58, 1927.

"AN ORDINANCE, to amend General Ordinance No. 114, 1922, entitled: 'An ordinance dividing the city of Indianapolis into districts for the purpose of regulating and restricting the location of trades, callings, industries, commercial enterprises and the location of buildings designed for specified uses; of classifying, regulating and determining the area front, rear and side yards and other open spaces about buildings; of regulating, and determining the area and intensity of use of land and lot areas within such city; creating a board of zoning appeals; defining certain terms used in said ordinance and designating the time when the same shall take effect,'" and fixing the time when the same shall take effect."

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 59, 1927.

"AN ORDINANCE, to amend General Ordinance No. 114, 1922, entitled: 'An ordinance dividing the city of Indianapolis into districts for the purpose of regulating and restricting the location of trades, callings, industries, commercial enterprises and the location of buildings designed for specified uses; of classifying, regulating and determining the area of front, rear and side yards and other open spaces about buildings; of regulating and determining the use and intensity of use of land and lot areas within such city; creating a board of zoning appeals; defining certain terms used in said ordinance and designating the time when the same shall take effect,' and fixing the time when the same shall take effect."

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 63, 1927.

"AN ORDINANCE, to amend General Ordinance No. 114, 1922, entitled; 'An ordinance dividing the city of Indianapolis into districts for the purpose of regulating and restricting the location of trades, callings, industries, commercial enterprises and the location of buildings designed for specified uses; of classifying, regulating and determining the area of front, side and rear yards and other

open spaces about buildings; of regulating and determining the use and intensity of use of land and lot areas within such city; creating a board of zoning appeals; defining certain terms used in said ordinance; providing a penalty for its violation and designating the time when the same shall take effect,' and fixing the time when the same shall take effect."

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 68, 1927.

"AN ORDINANCE, to amend General Ordinance No. 114, 1922, entitled: 'An ordinance dividing the city of Indianapolis into districts for the purpose of regulating and restricting the location of trades, callings, industries, commercial enterprises and the location of buildings designed for specified use; of classifying, regulating and determining the area of front, rear and side yards and other open spaces about buildings; of regulating and determining the use and intensity of use of land and lot areas within the city; creating a board of zoning appeals; defining certain terms used in said ordinance; providing a penalty for its violation and designating the time when the same shall take effect,' and fixing the time when the same shall take effect."

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 80, 1927.

"AN ORDINANCE, providing for bond to be furnished by all taxicab companies operating the same on and over the streets and thoroughfare of the city of Indianapolis, providing for the advertising of the same, fixing a penalty, repealing all ordinances in conflict thereto, declaring an emergency and fixing a penalty, repealing all ordinances in conflict thereto, declaring an emergency and fixing a time when the same shall take effect."

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 83, 1927.

"AN ORDINANCE, to direct the Indianapolis Water Company to comply with an order of the Board of Public Works ordering the Indianapolis Water Company to install a water main on East Twenty First Street from Sherman Drive to the city limits, prescribing penalty for each day's violation of the same, and designating a time when the same shall take effect."

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 86, 1927.

"AN ORDINANCE, changing the name of Ketcham Street between Tenth (10th) and Sixteenth Streets (16th), in the city of Indianapolis, to Sharon Avenue, and fixing a time when the same shall take effect."

## GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 90, 1927.

“AN ORDINANCE, fixing and establishing the annual rate of taxation and tax levy for the year 1927 for the city of Indianapolis for each fund for which a separate tax levy is authorized by law to be collected and expended in the year 1928, and fixing a time when this ordinance shall take effect.”

## GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 94, 1927.

“AN ORDINANCE, appropriating money out of the gasoline tax fund for the repair of permanent improved streets.”

*Be It Ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana:*

Section 1. That the sum of thirty-six thousand and twenty-one and no-one hundredths (\$36,021.00) Dollars, be and the same is hereby appropriated out of the Gasoline Tax Fund for the purpose of defraying the expense of labor and repairs for the permanent improved streets.

Section 2. That the aforesaid sum be appropriated to the Street Repair Department of the City Civil Engineer's Department.

Section 3. Be it further resolved that the same shall be in full force and effect on and after its passage.

J. L. DUVALL, Mayor.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY OFFICES

*To the President and Honorable Members of the Common Council, Indianapolis, Indiana:*

September 14, 1927.

Gentlemen—Attached please find copies of a General Ordinance transferring various sums of money and reappropriating same.

I respectfully recommend the passage of this ordinance.

Yours very truly,  
 CLAUDE F. JOHNSON,  
 City Controller.

August 12, 1927

Wm. C. Buser, City Controller, City of Indianapolis.

Dear Sir—Certain funds in departments under the jurisdiction of this Board having been depleted to the extent it is impossible

to continue further without transferring funds, we respectfully request that you prepare and transmit to the Common Council for their approval, the following transfer ordinances:

Transferring Twenty-Five Hundred (\$2500.00) Dollars from Fund No. 33 in the Police Department, reappropriating Fifteen Hundred (\$1500.00) Dollars to Fund No. 25 in the Fire Department, and One Thousand Dollars (\$1000.00) to Fund No. 33 Fire Department.

Transferring One Thousand (\$1000.00) Dollars from Fire Department Fund No. 32 and One Thousand (\$1000.00) Dollars from Fire Department Fund No. 72 and reappropriating to Fire Department Fund No. 45.

Transferring Five Hundred (\$500.00) Dollars from Dog Pound Fund No. 41 and reappropriating to Dog Pound Fund No. 34.

Emergency Appropriation of Fifteen Hundred (\$1500.00) Dollars to Gamewell Fund No. 44. This ordinance made necessary by the recent storm.

Yours respectfully,  
BOARD OF PUBLIC SAFETY,

By A. B. GOOD,  
Bookkeeper.

Mr. Wm. C. Buser, City Controller, City Hall, Indianapolis, Indiana:

Dear Sir—The Board of Public Works being in regular session and having been advised of the condition of several accounts in the subdivision of this Department, request that you have prepared and presented to the Common Council for passage an ordinance transferring funds as indicated below:

From Account No. 36 Board of Works Admr. \$100.00 to Account No. 72 Board of Works, Admr.

From Account No. 41 Public Bldgs., \$300.00 to Account No. 32 Public Buildings Dept.

From Account No. 71 Street Comm. \$250.00 to Account No. 25 Public Bldgs.

From Account No. 71 Street Comm. \$250.00 to Account No. 34 Public Bldgs.

From Account No. 71 Street Comm. \$500.00 to Account No. 32 Public Bldgs.



From Account No. 71 Street Comm. \$1,590.00 to Street Comm. Account No. 44.

The above transfers are absolutely necessary for the maintenance and operation of these departments.

Yours truly,

BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS,

By Wayne Emmelman, Clerk.

#### OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

*To the Members of the Common Council, Indianapolis, Indiana:*

Gentlemen:—We wish the public records to show that we regard the 1928 appropriation and tax levy ordinances, as finally adopted by the city council, unsound and unwise. We can see only a gloomy outlook for city finances in the year 1928 under the program, or rather, lack of financial policy,, adopted.

Our Civic Affairs department offered and gave its services in establishing the appropriations and tax rates for next year, in an effort to set up a sound and economical financial program. We regret that major charges were made which, as the detailed explanations below will show, are certain to be detrimental:

#### ANALYSIS OF 1928 CIVIL CITY APPROPRIATION AND TAX LEVY ORDINANCES

In general, the final council action was to eliminate almost \$400,000 of what may be regarded as fixed charges which inevitably will have to be paid and to add about \$200,000 for increased salaries and increased personnel of city employes. The council adopted a levy of \$1.085 plus .4 of a cent additional sanitation levy ordered by the state tax board for a previous year, which will make the total city levy next year \$1.089 instead of a levy of about \$1.095, which a study of city finances supported.

This levy is 4.9 cents above the 1927 levy. The proposal of a levy of approximately \$1.095 was used as a basis by the finance committee of the council in formally recommending to the council a levy of \$1.104. The recommended increases were almost exclusively for retiring deficits and increasing the appropriation for track elevation. With those provisions included, the limit of \$1.095 suggested by the civic affairs department was reached only by cutting many other appropriations below the 1927 amounts. It is perfectly clear that the slight cut to \$1.089 has been made merely

by the postponement of huge amounts which some day must be paid, in order to add to salary payments for which no reason, whatever, was given.

One or two results are to be expected. The end of 1929 will find not only the same deficits in a great many city funds (not including salary funds which have been amply provided for), that have been complained of this year, but even larger deficits, and if such a policy is repeated next year in adoption of the 1929 budget, we can be sure that in 1930 the city will face the necessity of a very large tax increase to pay the bills incurred by this administration.

What we regard as errors in final adoption of the 1928 budget may be summarized as follows:

1. Elimination of  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent on the city sinking fund levy which will have the effect of producing \$32,500 less than actually will be needed in payment of bond obligations in 1928. This deficit will have to be made up from some source next year.

2. Elimination of 1 cent from the track elevation levy amounting to \$5,000 when, with that amount in the levy, there would have been barely enough to pay what is expected to be the 1928 requirements of track elevation.

3. Elimination of  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent from the street resurfacing levy when, admittedly, the amount requested would not have produced sufficient money to pay the city's share of the cost of street resurfacing.

4. Elimination of \$20,000 in the interest appropriation of the city finance department and this, too, will have to be made up from some other source.

5. An increase of approximately \$140,000 in salaries of every person connected with the police and fire departments from janitors up to the chiefs of the departments, the increase amounting to \$110 annually, irrespective of positions, and further, not only failure to make elimination in personnel that had been agreed on by the finance committee of the council and which would have effected a saving below the amount of appropriation recommended by the controller, but additions of twelve men to the departments over the 1927 budget limits.

6. Elimination of the entire amount of money requested by the board of public works with which to retire the deficit in the light and water funds, amounting to \$272,000 and in addition, re-

duction of the appropriation for next year's bills by \$47,000 below the amount which experience of this year indicates will be needed, so that at least \$300,000 of deficit against the city for lighting the streets and furnishing fire protection will be outstanding at the end of 1929.

7. Not only failure to make eliminations of needless positions in the city civil engineer's department, amounting to almost \$20,000 annually, which were recommended by the finance committee, but an increase of \$180 in the net salaries of the department by eliminating two positions and adding two at higher salaries.

8. Reductions in the recommended appropriations for the sewer department and the unimproved streets department in the city street commissioner's office which had been planned in the 1928 budget.

9. Reduction of the park department general levy by  $1\frac{3}{4}$  cent which will reduce the revenue of that department by at least \$115,000 and which we believe will hamper the department.

The city sinking fund levy requested by the controller and approved by the finance committee of the council was  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents. A careful check of the bond payments falling due in 1928 revealed that  $3\frac{1}{2}$  cents was barely enough, yet the council's action was to reduce this levy to 3 cents.

The track elevation levy was recommended at 3 cents by the city controller although the board of public works requested 6 cents. Our inspection of the bookkeepers figures revealed a need for at least 4 cents and we, therefore, recommended that amount, and the finance committee accepted the recommendation. The railroads are prepared to let contracts next year on Belt railroad elevation and elevation of the Pennsylvania and C. I. & W. tracks eastward across Southeastern avenue totaling at least \$1,800,000. A 4 cent levy with a balance now remaining in the track elevation fund, additional tax receipts of 1927, and a return of \$135,000 from the county, owed to the city, would make available barely enough to pay the city's share of the 1928 expenditures on contracts in that amount. It is interesting to note that the amendment, by which the reduction of 1 cent was made, was offered by a councilman whose district will receive the first benefit from elevation of the Belt railroad. We refer to Councilman Otis Barthlowmew. He takes refuge behind the assertion that additional money, if needed, can be provided by the issuance of bonds. There is serious question whether the city may issue bonds for track elevation work except when it has collected the maximum levy by



direct taxation permitted under law and finds that sum insufficient. If that theory is correct, and it has been followed by some administrations in the past, failure to provide a sufficient levy in 1928 may be expected to retard progress in track elevation.

The councilmen followed somewhat the same reasoning in reducing the street resurfacing levy and there again, they merely postponed the evil day of payment. It is true that the last legislature has made it possible for the city to finance its share of the cost of street resurfacing, partly by the issuance of certificates of indebtedness, but the council is required to levy an amount sufficient to pay off all such certificates of indebtedness in the year following their issuance, and so if street resurfacing is not retarded in Indianapolis next year, the 1929 levy will bear an additional burden to pay for 1928 resurfacing and in addition, there will be a not inconsiderable item of interest on the certificates of indebtedness.

In the controller's office the finance committee had agreed to recommend the elimination of a utility stenographer but the councilmanic action was to retain this position at \$1500 a year and to eliminate another stenographer at \$1320. The result of this, of course, will be to add \$180 to a stenographer's salary. In addition, the position of field license inspector was created at a salary of \$1800 a year. This work is now being done by a policeman and the result will be to add one more to police duty than the budget of police salaries would indicate. In this office also, the request for interest for 1928 was \$200,000 which did not include any amount for interest on temporary loans. It had been determined by the finance committee of the council to add \$15,000 for this purpose and this would have made the appropriation barely sufficient to pay the known interest charges in 1928. Instead, councilmanic action was to reduce this appropriation to \$195,000—at least \$20,000 below requirements.

It had been agreed by the finance committee also to eliminate a clerk in the purchasing agent's office but the elimination was not made by the council.

A striking example of the procedure followed is shown in the appropriation for stenographic service in the legal department. Two stenographers have been employed at salaries of \$1320 each. These salaries were increased respectively to \$1680 and \$1800 which are unusual salaries, even for stenographers in the city employ. The legal department had requested an appropriation of \$15,000 from which to pay awards and indemnities against the city and had supported this item with a statement showing that the expen-

ditures this year will be approximately that amount. Notwithstanding, the councilmen reduced this appropriation to \$11,000.

The council also added \$2,000 to an appropriation with which to publish all council proceedings and legal advertisement in 1928.

At a hearing on the board of safety budget it was admitted that the positions of secretary and bookkeeper could be combined and so we recommended that this be done. Nevertheless, the council not only failed to combine the positions, but added \$500 annually to the salary of the secretary.

We note also that council was careful to eliminate some very small appropriations which had been included for office supplies of the civil service commission, which appears to be an indication of opposition to civil service in the police and fire departments. At the council hearings on the board of safety budget, the then chairman of the board of safety eagerly defended civil service for appointment of policemen and firemen, asserting it had given the departments a much better type of manpower and that its worth was shown by the fact that last year the board was compelled to discharge almost 50 incompetent men who had been appointed under the old method. The old method is well known in Indianapolis. By it, every person who thought he had a pull with the administration sought to put men, many of them wholly unqualified, on the police and fire forces as rewards for political service. We sincerely hope that the gains we have accomplished by civil service will not be lost. Indeed, we firmly believe there is opportunity for vast saving by instituting civil service in selection of all city employes, a policy for which the Chamber long has been on record.

We note also an increase of \$500 in the salary of the market master and we note that two positions in the weights and measures department, which the finance committee of the council had recommended be eliminated, are retained.

The finance committee had determined to recommend a reduction of \$10,900 in the building commissioner's salary list. Instead, \$2,400 was eliminated.

The increase of \$110 each in the police and fire departments was applied to the Gamewell department also, and whereas the finance committee had recommended a net reduction of \$5,970 below the amount approved by the controller for salaries, there is a net increase of \$3,058 above the controller's recommendation.

By creating a new position and recalling two men on duty in

the Gamewell department, whose places are being filled by regular appointment in the 1928 budget, the fire department had created a new battalion chief and two privates in addition to the number in service this year. The finance committee had agreed to eliminate these. However, they are retained in the council's action, and this, along with the \$110 increase, has added more than \$70,000 to the salary list as recommended by the finance committee. We note that an appropriation for heat, light and power in the fire stations was reduced from \$8,000 to \$5,000 when bills already rendered this year revealed the need for almost \$7,000.

The police budget had included provision for one new captain. We had recommended that this position be eliminated and that, in addition, one lieutenant be recalled to active duty in the department, that two sergeants proposed be eliminated because two on duty elsewhere were being returned, that the number of first grade patrolmen be reduced by five below the 1927 list, and that the number of second grade patrolmen not be increased. The council, however, left the additional captain in the budget and failed to eliminate the other positions, and not only that, but it added three first grade patrolmen above the number in service this year and ten second grade patrolmen above the number of this year and one accident prevention lieutenant, although it reduced the number of detective sergeants by five. We had recommended that a number of the policemen on duty outside the department, of which there are admitted to be 29, be recalled to police duty in order to provide additional policemen which the then chief said were needed. The net result of the councilmanic action on the police budget was to add approximately \$80,000 on account of salary increase and personnel, above the amount recommended by the finance committee. However, the council arbitrarily eliminated \$14,000 from an appropriation with which to pay the 1927 salaries of 15 policewomen, all of whom have been working since effort was made to dispense with their services and court action prevented their release. This item will probably eventually have to be paid.

The light and water deficit estimated to reach \$272,000 at the end of 1927 was the cause of serious concern, and the finance committee finally agreed to recommend that slightly more than one-half of this deficit be provided for in the 1928 budget so that by the end of 1929 at least, the city could have paid its debts fully. The council's action now commits the city to the course of refusing to pay not only the deficit that exists at this time, but a part of the bills that will come due on account of service rendered next year, thus increasing the deficit to more than \$300,000.

We understand that there is some thought of the companies rendering these services making a charge for interest against the city, and if such a charge should be made and should succeed, the councilmanic action will mean a still further burden of many thousands of dollars for interest which could have been avoided if the city had honorably set out to raise the money to pay its bills.

In the city engineer's office there is a large personnel which, patently can be reduced. While a number of employes of this department have been working this year in the assessment bureau (which had been handicapped this year, but which is provided for fully in the 1928 budget), the engineer's department has not been hampered by lack of personnel, and the finance committee of the council recommended reductions totaling \$19,840. Instead, the council eliminated two offices totaling \$3,120, but added two positions totaling \$3,300.

We had recommended that a position we regarded as useless in the city garage be eliminated, but instead, there was an increase in salary of \$300 to one of the employes.

The council also added 15-100 of 1 cent, or about \$9,000, to the sanitation general fund levy when the president of the board had agreed to live within the lower levy.

There was also an increase of  $\frac{1}{2}$  cent in the board of health levy over the 1927 levy, notwithstanding the fact that the board of health budget as presented to the council plainly showed evidence of padding.

The park department requested an increase in its levy from 7 cents to 9 cents. The finance committee decided first against any increase, but later recommended a small increase of about \$9,000. The department had asserted that many needed improvements in parks, such as cleaning of the lagoon in Garfield park, completing and building golf courses, improving Christian, Dearborn, and other new parks, repairing boulevard roadways and equipping and improving other park and recreation property which had been acquired in the past year, made necessary an increase in the levy. We felt there was an opportunity for a saving in this department by a reduction in the number of employes and therefore we did not disapprove the finance committee's first decision to make no increase. The council's action, however, of reducing the levy to  $5\frac{1}{2}$  cents will give the park department \$115,000 less in revenue than it will have this year and it is, of course, useless to expect that sufficient savings



in personnel can be made in order to permit even a small part of the improvement program the park board had outlined.

An appeal of the city's tax levy to the state board of tax commissioners would not accomplish the restoration of items that ordinary business practice requires, but an appeal might accomplish the elimination of some of the unsound increases made by the city council. When it was learned that some of the councilmen were urging an increase in salary for police and firemen, a survey was made of salaries paid in other cities, and it was found that among the cities of Minneapolis, St. Paul, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, Kansas City, Louisville, Toledo and Columbus, only Toledo was paying an appreciably higher salary, the Milwaukee and Minneapolis salaries were very slightly higher and the Cincinnati, Kansas City, St. Paul, Columbus, and Louisville salaries were much lower.

The salary range in Toledo is from \$1,920 to \$2,400 a year. The salary range in Milwaukee and Minneapolis is from \$1,800, which is lower than the Indianapolis minimum, to \$2,040, slightly higher than the Indianapolis maximum. The salary range in the other cities is from \$1,460, very much below the Indianapolis minimum, to \$1,909.20, slightly below the Indianapolis maximum.

These are the only cities that may be compared with Indianapolis, both in population and economic conditions. It is true that some eastern cities pay higher salaries, but living conditions in these cities and population of these cities are very different from Indianapolis conditions. The city of Rochester was pointed to by the councilmen as an example. It pays its first year patrolmen \$1,800 and all other patrolmen \$2,100. Indianapolis, under the 1927 budget pays \$1,916.25 to the first grade patrolmen and \$1,982.50 to second grade patrolmen. Under the new budget it will pay \$2,026.25 to first grade patrolmen and \$2,92.50 to second grade patrolment. The Indianapolis police and fire protection costs per capita, according to the latest governmental reports, are far above the per capita, according to the latest governmental reports, are far above the per capita costs in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Cincinnati, Louisville, Toledo, Columbus, Denver, and many other cities. The per capita costs of police protection ranged from \$2.24 in Columbus to \$3.43 in Milwaukee. The Indianapolis per capita was \$3.08, the third highest in this group of cities. Only Milwaukee and Kansas City were above it.

The per capita cost of fire protection ranged from \$1.98 in Louisville, to \$4.43 in Indianapolis, Indianapolis having a higher per capita cost than any of the cities in the group. The nearest approach was St. Paul with a per capita of \$4.01. Under the 1927

budget appropriations the Indianapolis per capita for police protection will be approximately \$3.30, and although a reduction has been accomplished in fire costs since the report in 1925, the 1928 per capita for fire protection will be approximately \$3.50.

Approximately \$220,000 was added to the salary appropriations of the general fund, above the amounts recommended by the finance committee.

Approximately \$475,000 was eliminated from fixed charges in the general fund appropriations, and in other levies such as track elevation and street resurfacing. The reductions made by the council were therefore not reductions at all, for eventually these sums will be paid by the taxpayers, and with interest.

#### CIVIC AFFAIRS BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE

September 9, 1927

FRANK B. FOWLER, Chairman.

#### REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

Indianapolis, Ind., Sept. 19, 1927.

*To the President and Honorable Members of the Common Council,  
Indianapolis, Indiana:*

Gentlemen—We, your committee on Works to whom was referred General Ordinance No. 92, 1927, entitled "Fixing Width of Sixty-Third Street" beg leave to report that we have had said ordinance under consideration, and recommend that the same be paved.

AUSTIN H. TODD, Chairman.

BOYTON J. MOORE.

O. RAY ALBERTSON.

#### INTRODUCTION OF GENERAL ORDINANCES

By City Controller:

#### GENERAL ORDINANCE 95, 1927

AN ORDINANCE transferring the sum of Two Thousand Five Hundred (\$2,500.00) Dollars from Fund No. 33, Department of Public Safety, Police Department and re-appropriating the same to; One Thousand Five Hundred (\$1,500.00) Dollars to

the Department of Public Safety, Fire Department Fund No. 25 and One Thousand (\$1,000.00) Dollars to the Department of Public Safety Fire Department Fund No. 33; transferring the sum of One Thousand (\$1,000.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Safety, Fire Department Fund No. 32 and One Thousand (\$1,000.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Safety Fire Department Fund No. 72 to the Department of Public Safety Fire Department Fund No. 45; transferring the sum of Five Hundred (\$500.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Safety City Dog Pound Fund No. 41 to Department of Public Safety City Dog Pound Fund No. 34; transferring the sum of Five Hundred (\$500.00) Dollars from the Finance Department City Controller's Interest Account Fund No. 51 to Finance Department City Controller's Printing and Advertising Account No. 24; transferring the sum of Twenty (\$20.00) Dollars from the Finance Department Interest Account Fund No. 61 to the Finance Department City Controller Rent Fund No. 54; transferring the sum of One Hundred (\$100.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Administrative Account No. 36 to Department of Public Works Administrative Account No. 72; transferring the sum of Three Hundred (\$300.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Public Buildings Account No. 41 to Department Public Works Public Buildings Department Account No. 32; transferring the sum of Two Hundred Fifty (\$250.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Account No. 71 to Department of Public Works Public Buildings Account No. 25; transferring the sum of Two Hundred Fifty (\$250.00) Dollars Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Department Account No. 71, to Department of Public Works Public Buildings Account No. 34; transferring the sum of Five Hundred (\$500.00) Dollars from Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Department Account No. 71 to Department of Public Works Public Buildings Department Account No. 2; transferring the sum of One Thousand Five Hundred Ninety (\$1,590.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Department Account No. 71 to Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Department Account No. 44; transferring the sum of Two Hundred (\$200.00) Dollars from City Controller's Fund No. 61 Interest to City Plan Commission Fund No. 33 Motor and Supplies.

WHEREAS, The above named funds have been depleted and exhausted, and

WHEREAS, There are no funds available now to replenish the same without making a transfer, and

WHEREAS, An emergency is declared to exist, NOW THEREFORE

*Be It Ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana:*

Section 1. The following sums of money are now hereby transferred and re-appropriated from the following funds to-wit:

Transferring the sum of Two Thousand Five Hundred (\$2,500.00) Dollars from Fund No. 33, Department of Public Safety, Police Department and re-appropriating the same to: One Thousand Five Hundred \$1,500.00) Dollars re-apportioned to the Department of Public Safety, Fire Department Fund No. 25 and One Thousand (\$1,000.00) Dollars re-appropriated to the Department of Public Safety Fire Department Fund No. 33; transferring the sum of One Thousand (\$1,000.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Safety Fire Department Fund No. 32 and One Thousand (\$1,000.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Safety Fund No. 72 and re-appropriating the same to the Department of Public Safety Fire Department Fund No. 45; transferring the sum of Five Hundred (\$500.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Safety City Dog Pound Fund No. 41 and re-appropriating the same to the Department of Public Safety City Dog Pound Fund No. 34; transferring the sum of Five Hundred (\$500.00) Dollars from the Finance Department City Controller's Interest Account Fund No. 61 and re-appropriating the same to the Finance Account No. 24; transferring the sum of Twenty (\$20.00) Dollars from the Finance Department Interest Account Fund No. 61 and re-appropriating the same to the Finance Department City Controller Rent Fund No. 54; transferring the sum of One Hundred (\$100.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Administrative Account No. 36 and re-appropriating the same to the Department of Public Works Administrative Account No. 72; transferring the sum of Three Hundred (\$300.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Public Buildings Account No. 41 and re-appropriating the same to the Department of Public Works Public Buildings Department Account No. 32; transferring the sum of Two Hundred Fifty (\$250.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Account No. 71 and re-appropriating the same to the Department of Public Works Public Buildings Account No. 25; transferring the sum of Two Hundred Fifty (\$250.00) Dollars Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Department



Account No. 71 and re-appropriating the same to the Department of Public Works Public Buildings Department Account No. 34; transferring the sum of Five Hundred (\$500.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Department Account No. 71 and re-appropriating the same to the Department of Public Works Public Buildings Department Account No. 32; transferring the sum of One Thousand Five Hundred Ninety (\$1,590.00) Dollars from the Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Department Account No. 71, and re-appropriating the same to the Department of Public Works Street Commissioners Department Account No. 44; transferring the sum of Two Hundred (\$200.00) Dollars from the City Controller's Fund No. 61 Interest and re-appropriating the same to the City Plan Commission Fund No. 33 Motor and Supplies.

Section 2. This Ordinance will be in full force and effect from and after its passage.

By Mr. Moore:

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 96, 1927.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Public Welfare.

AN ORDINANCE to amend General Ordinance No. 114, 1922, entitled: "An ordinance dividing the City of Indianapolis into districts for the purpose of regulating and restricting the location of trades, callings, industries, commercial enterprises and the location of buildings designed for specified uses; of classifying, regulating and determining the area of front, rear and side yards and other open spaces about buildings; of regulating and determining the use and intensity of use of land and lot areas within such city; creating a board of zoning appeals; defining certain terms used in said ordinance and designating the time when the same shall take effect," and fixing the time when the same shall take effect.

*Be It Ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana:*

Section 1. That the U3 or business district as established by General Ordinance No. 114, 1922, be the same as hereby amended, supplemented and changed so as to include the following described territory:

A strip of territory 670 feet wide, extending from the North Bank of Fall Creek North to the center line of Maple Road, the North and South center line of which shall be the center line of Meridian Street.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage and publication according to law.

BOYNTON J. MOORE.

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 97, 1927.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Public Safety.

AN ORDINANCE, providing for school zones regulating the speed of traffic therein, providing a penalty for the violation thereof, declaring an emergency and fixing a time when same shall take effect.

WHEREAS, There have been numerous accidents greatly injuring and costing the lives of a number of our school children of the city, and

WHEREAS, There are a great many dangerous crossings and intersections in the vicinity of our school buildings in the City of Indianapolis, and

WHEREAS, The hazardous condition can be greatly relieved by the reducing of the speed in these vicinities, NOW THEREFORE

*Be It Ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana:*

Section 1. That hereafter the area within two squares of any school building within the city limits of the City of Indianapolis, Marion County, Indiana, shall be known as a school zone.

Section 2. It shall be unlawful for any person or persons driving a motor vehicle within any school zone within the City of Indianapolis at a rate of speed to exceed twelve (12) miles per hour from seven A. M. to five P. M. of each and every school day in each week, the same being Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, holidays excepted.

Section 3. Any person or persons found guilty of violating any

of the above sections of this ordinance upon the first conviction shall be fined in any sum not to exceed Five (\$5.00) Dollars. Any person or persons found guilty of violating any of the above sections of this ordinance upon second conviction shall be fined in any sum not to exceed Twenty-five (\$25.00) Dollars to which may be added ten (10) days imprisonment in the Marion County Jail. Any person or persons found guilty of violating any of the above sections of this ordinance upon the third or subsequent convictions shall be fined in any sum not to exceed Fifty (\$50.00) Dollars to which shall be added thirty (30) days imprisonment in the Marion County Jail.

Secion 4. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage.

BOYNTON J. MOORE.

By Mr. Bartholomew:

GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 98, 1927.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Public Safety.

AN ORDINANCE, To amend General Ordinance No. 17, 1927, entitled: "An ordinance to regulate traffic in the streets, alleys and public places of the City of Indianapolis, defining violation thereof, repealing all ordinances in conflict therewith, declaring a penalty and designating a time when the same shall take effect," and fixing a time when the same shall take effect.

*Be It Ordained by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana:*

Section 1. That section 6 "parking prohibited" as established by general ordinance No. 17-1927 be and the same is hereby amended, supplemented and changed so as to apply to and include the following described street:

There shall be no parking, at any time, on the north side of Prospect Street from Madison Avenue to Southeast Street. Parking shall be permitted on the south side of Prospect Street from Madison Avenue to Southeast Street.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage.

O. E. BARTHOLOMEW.

By Mr. Dorsett:

RESOLUTION NO. 24

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Law and Judiciary.

WHEREAS, The members of this Common Council have conscientiously worked and tried to further the interests of the City of Indianapolis and have spent untold hours in this endeavor and

WHEREAS, The newspapers of the City of Indianapolis have in many instances reported actions of this body and its individual members in a manner which has led people to believe that which is wrong and

WHEREAS, If it were possible to fully acquaint the public with the actual happenings of this body in session, the best interests of the City would be conserved,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis Indiana, through its proper officers, make arrangements with The Indianapolis Commercial, a daily newspaper of general circulation dealing with official and legal matters, to publish the proceedings of this Common Council in full within forty-eight hours after each meeting, so that the public may be fully informed of the actions and deliberations of this body.

WALTER R. DORSETT.

Which was read a first time and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS

Mr. Albertson announced that there would be a public hearing on General Ordinance No. 96, 1927, Friday, September 30th, at 2:30 P. M.

Mr. Albertson made a motion that the City Clerk be instructed to get a letter from the City Plan Commission either approving or disapproving General Ordinance No. 87, 1927, and General Ordinance No. 88, 1927.



The motion was seconded by Mr. Dorsett, and passed by the following vote:

Ayes, 7, viz: Mr. Albertson, Mr. Bartholomew, Mr. Dorsett, Mr. Moore, Mr. Springsteen, Dr. Todd, President Negley.

Mr. Dorsett called for General Ordinance No. 45, 1927, for second reading. It was read a second time.

Mr. Albertson made a motion that General Ordinance No. 45, 1927, be stricken from the files. The motion was seconded by Mr. Moore, and passed by the following vote:

#### ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING

Ayes, 7, viz: Mr. Albertson, Mr. Bartholomew, Mr. Dorsett, Mr. Moore, Mr. Springsteen, Dr. Todd, President Negley.

Mr. Albertson called for General Ordinance No. 92, 1927, for second reading. It was read a second time.

On motion of Mr. Albertson, seconded by Mr. Moore, General Ordinance No. 92, 1927, was ordered engrossed, read a third time and placed upon its passage.

General Ordinance No. 92, 1927, was read a third time by the Clerk and passed by the following roll-call vote:

Ayes, 7, viz: Mr. Albertson, Mr. Bartholomew, Mr. Dorsett, Mr. Moore, Mr. Springsteen, Dr. Todd, President Negley.

#### UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Bartholomew addressed the Council and presented his arguments in answer to the communication from the Civic Affairs Committee of the Chamber of

Commerce regarding the 1928 budget and tax levy, as read to the Council under Order of Business of Other Communications.

On motion of Mr. Albertson, seconded by Mr. Moore, the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis adjourned at 8:43 P. M.

We hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full, true and complete record of the proceedings of the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Indiana, held on the 19th day of September, 1927.

In witness whereof, we have hereunto subscribed our signatures and caused the seal of the City of Indianapolis to be affixed.

*Claude E. Negley*

Attest:

President

*William A. Boyce, Jr.*

City Clerk

(SEAL)