

# Neighborhood & City Services Meeting Minutes

## Newburyport, MA City Council Committee

---

**Date:** Tuesday, February 8, 2022 - 5:00pm

**Location:** Remote Only

**Agenda:**

ODNC00103\_01\_10\_2022 Streets, Sidewalks, and Other Public Places Alterations & Maintenance

ODNC102\_11\_08\_2021. Late File - Ch. 17 Stormwater Management Revisions

**Recording:** [https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/vySo-1Y2782JKkoG59Sy07rmK5sdIK0D8\\_UEQHs5-LmRxNnIwT2cbkD46czC1Lzt.mX3XHTzyQcwgG2-i?startTime=1644357808000](https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/vySo-1Y2782JKkoG59Sy07rmK5sdIK0D8_UEQHs5-LmRxNnIwT2cbkD46czC1Lzt.mX3XHTzyQcwgG2-i?startTime=1644357808000)

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Christine Wallace, Chair, Ward 4 Councillor

Jennie Donahue, Ward 2 Councillor

Connie Preston, Councillor At-Large

**Other City Representatives in Attendance:**

Afroz Khan, Councillor At-Large

Jim McCauley, Ward 5 Councillor

Sean Reardon, Mayor

Andrew Levine, Chief of Staff

Jamie Tuccolo, Deputy DPS Director

Jon-Eric White, City Engineer

Nick Federico, Stormwater Engineer

*Please note: the dialogues in these minutes are not direct transcriptions and have been edited for brevity and clarity. These minutes summarize the general substance of the content discussed.*

**Agenda Item: ODNC00103 01 10 2022 Streets, Sidewalks, and Other Public Places Alterations & Maintenance**

**Introduction:**

- *Clr. Wallace* – This ordinance is the same as was passed in 2021 Council 7-4. Was vetoed by the former mayor at the end of December. We decided to reintroduce this just as a new ordinance. Allows for more transparency to the public to have to require a list of roads and sidewalks to be worked on for minimum two years. Also has a requirement to get approval by order by the city council for any sort of alteration to the road.
- *Clr. McCauley* – Council wants to fund projects. We're asking to be included in the process that exists today on the executive side. We'd like to include more of the public to make sure that they're aware of that as well. Transparency is a good thing. Know what we spelled out here is consistent with what is listed in most of the manuals. As we look at definitions of alterations and maintenance. We want to make sure that we're clear on that. We want to make sure we're consistent. We want to make sure that we're complementary to the work that's being done today. And we'd like to be included in that process so that we adequately fund this.

**Discussion:**

- *Clr. Preston* – Given the strong rationale in the veto, around the fact that the charter is very clear that the city council should not be directing department heads. What's the rationale for a bringing this back and be bringing it back as an ordinance as opposed to having it be something that the mayor works through as a plan with DPS?
- *Clr. McCauley* – What we are is within our purview, which is funded, different activities along the way. So this is clear that we are not directing any department on maintenance, or we're not directing any department as to how they

want to alter streets, but altering the streets is within the council's purview. And funding those alterations is clearly within Council's purview. So that's the rationale behind it. And we'd like to be, as I said, a partner in this.

- *Clr. Preston* – we still have control over the process through funding with or without this.
- *Clr. McCauley* – So that's a nuanced question because today there's a request for \$1.5 million additional road funding, and streets to be named after the fact, and work to be done on those streets to be named. And so it's not consistent. What we would anticipate is a working relationship where we will try to be complimentary.
- *Clr. Donahue* – I like the premise of what this is trying to do in that I think it would be really beneficial to have something in place, at the very least, for Ward councillors to be able to know what's happening in the neighborhoods, and to be given that information by the appropriate departments. I'd like to hear more from staff what this actually would entail for them and hear from the mayor and see if there is a compromise.
- *Jamie Tuccolo* – The city council wouldn't have any say, I believe that's what you said, that you're not going to give any direction. But under Section 12-203 f for example, which is trees being removed or planted. There's actually a tree ordinance that's already on file with the City Council that gives the tree warden authority to give permission to remove or replant a tree.
- *Clr. McCauley* – I respectfully disagree. What says is prior to the alteration of the public right of way, the applicant, which is the city, shall submit in writing to the city to follow the scope of work, cost estimates, abutter notification of construction, location, and trees being removed. Like we didn't say don't remove the tree, we just said if you're going to remove the trees or plant more trees, you should write it down as part of your plan.
- *Jamie Tuccolo* – A lot of this happens during operations, which is under the charter, not in your wheelhouse. Under alterations where it says, alterations falls on you guys. On the alteration, which is drainage and utility installation or reconstruction, but then if you go into maintenance it says maintenance shall be defined as sidewalk and curb repair, drainage and utility repairs. Well, that's contradictory to what it says in the prior page. It's either one or the other, there is no in between when it comes to utilities, period. Construction or reconstruction.
- *Clr. Khan* – want to hear from Mayor Reardon as well. There are some aspects that I believe when this was put together, were well intentioned to try to get some kind of planning, especially for ward councillors when specific projects are going to happen. I do want to make a point in terms of the funding and kind of that direction of knowing what streets are being done when you do have the funding. Just to give some context is the bond. The bond amount of money that was approved for the \$1.5 million kind of came from a different direction, meaning the council is the one that actually were the ones that said, we'd like to put that much money towards streets and sidewalk repairs. Then from the administration, here's some projects we want to do. And this is the request for funds to do this. Well, in this case, it did come from a different direction. We knew when we did the \$1.5 million annually to bond for that, we knew that we didn't have the listing of streets and sidewalks but the anticipation was the operational side would look at it based on the beta engineering study and the information they know and that they've assessed. Because as operations we know that and recognize that the flow of communication and the prioritization does come from that direction. When do we get those plans? When does that communication come in? And I see those things coming in as communications or other mechanisms. I was one of the ones that didn't support this when it was ordered and say before, really, it's because I feel like not codifying this as it is right now. It is unusual to put it in our code of ordinances. And I would love to know what code of ordinances do have this specificity.
- *Mayor Reardon* – I'm trying to do more transparency and process, right away. I did instruct the Deputy Director immediately when I took office to put together a five-year plan for streets and sidewalks \$2 million a year. When he gets to present this, it's really going to spell out, what our plan is moving forward. We've put together a plan that's going to address wards, one, three, and five, in year one, and then wards two, four and six in year two, and follow that pattern for the five years. \$2 million a year is more money than we've ever put towards streets and sidewalks. And we also want to do it in a way where that list is public. So someone will be able to log on to our new revamped website, which is also a project that we're working on right now, and be able to click on their street and see when it's going to get worked on where it falls on our list. And again, this list was created off of the beta plan. We've talked about this a lot during the campaign, but there's a lot of neighborhoods in town that have been neglected. I don't know if it's necessary to codify this in an ordinance. I do want to make this more a transparent process for residents to be able to access the information and again, I think that's about planning and good planning leads to good results, which is why we're working on this five-year plan to have in place and we have a couple of different funding mechanisms that we're

going to look at to put that plan into action. But I think the most important thing is that it's done in a transparent way and that the public can see that we are looking at this as a long term you know, long term plan and looking at our infrastructure here in town.

- *Clr. Wallace* – This came about because we currently do not have oversight of what happens on our public streets. There is oversight of water and sewer with Water and Sewer Commission. We have oversight of the parks with the Parks Commission. So any decisions made are done by a voting board. There are many communities that have boards of Public Works or communities that have transportation boards or communities that have voting traffic boards that review roads. So right now there is not a guaranteed mechanism where residents are allowed to comment on what's going to happen on their street. I completely agree with Mayor Reardon and I applaud his efforts for transparency. But there is also a piece where the public needs to be allowed to comment on projects. And the way that this is done is it's using the city council's existing structure to allow that public process. Getting public feedback is vital. Because you find out there's a problem here or there. And then you fix your sketch, or revise your memo, whatever you're going to do, and then you have a better product. So when you construct it, you already know what the issues are. And the public knows what to expect. Ward councillors will get the phone calls. I understand that is inevitable for construction. But sometimes residents need to schedule sewer replacement or water replacement and they're scrambling. It's basic good planning, engineering, to get this work done ahead of time. Doesn't need to be construction plans. But something where we can get everybody on the same page early and make sure our complete streets policy is taken into account in areas where it's possible, make sure every ramp is accounted for, make sure every crosswalk is where residents need them to be. This is a guaranteed procedure, we could start now for this construction season and over the next couple of years, and maybe would have a Board of Public Works at some point. But this is the structure we have. I think it's critical to residents to know what's going on and I think we owe it to them. That's how I feel it needs to be an ordinance because it is that important to residents. And it's that important to me.
- *Clr. McCauley* – A list is just a list. We've seen a couple of lists from beta engineering and that list needs to be activated. We're asking to share some of that information with the public to activate that going forward. We not only have trees, we have an ordinance for complete streets and we have policies now on traffic calming, sidewalks and materials, we have requirements for ADA and sidewalk. And yet we get to the end of some projects, and they're not complete, don't have the right sidewalks put back, mixing materials on certain streets, haven't had traffic calming. We've not had any public input on complete streets and safe routes to schools or anything like that. I'm not suggesting that we dump all of this on DPS. What I'm asking and suggesting through this ordinance is that we work together and let the council do what the council does best - interact with the public. We had proven that with Merrimac Street safety zone as well as the striping plan. We held three meetings with the public, we got tremendous input, made some modifications at the next council and brought back the answers to that and it was executed flawlessly by the DPS department. We had very little complaints. We're not suggesting that we're directing people. What we're trying to do is be that bridge between the public and the execution plan along the way. We want to be more transparent than the current process, doesn't allow the public to get involved.
- *Clr. Preston* – I'm hearing a clear commitment from both the mayor and DPS to have a transparent process not only to the council, but to the general public. I understand point of oversight commission or committee, but I'm not convinced city council is right body to be overseeing that. Not all of us have sort of the expertise to bring to the table to be able to be the right forum to make decisions around this. Why couldn't we use something like TSAC for public forum to have input into this planning process? Rather than have it come to council?
- *Clr. Wallace* – We had worked previously with Councillor Eigerman and we looked at options for different types of boards. But apparently, if you do have a board with staff on it, then you have to adjust their contracts. So it would be a bigger effort.
- *Clr. McCauley* – You can't ask staff to take on something else without contractual obligations. That was a KP law direction. There are other cities that having a DPS oversight board. There's over 200 of them. And they have specific specs, some are cities, some are towns. West Newbury has already published the six roads they plan to address this year in their construction season. And the public was well aware of it, they posted probably three months ago. So I don't know why we can't get to a point where we're sharing this type of information with the public. Again, I'm not suggesting we make DPS do it all. I'm suggesting that the council and ward councilors in particular, have the ability to interact with the public, those concerned citizens and be able to offer a public forum.

- *Clr. Preston* – Why would we not use something like TSAC as a place for a public forum? Certainly any ward Councillor has the ability to interact in public, with an individual project, individual Street, whatever that may be. But I appreciate the point that there is no ability for people to come and have a public forum to have input into the process of what street goes first, second, third, fourth, fifth. So we have an existing board with TSAC, why couldn't we use TSAC as that board?
- *Clr. McCauley* – TSAC was set up by the mayor to be a Traffic Safety Advisory Council. It advises the mayor as to what some of the traffic issues are. There was also a parking Safety Advisory Commission that again acts advisory to the mayor, but they don't have authority in terms of decision-making in terms of those things that will come back to the council. We use TSAC as a shared forum, to be able to bring ideas. For example, we had a communication that asked us to look into a crosswalk on Pleasant Street. We brought that to TSAC. We had some ideas. We did a site walkthrough. We brought that plan back to the council. The council has a plan and order for that, hopefully for next construction season. That's the role and function of TSAC. But it is not a legislative body, and it's not one that has decision making.
- *Jamie Tuccolo* – We have been working on a plan. And once he's ready to release it, he will release it to everybody. As far as the water and sewer boards, that's not necessarily true. No operations in the city reports to anybody except for the mayor, just so we're all clear, all of the water and sewer. That's all financial, just like you guys are. So there is no oversight of the water sewer, when it comes to construction, or what it is the projects that we're going to do. We present to them, the projects that we would want to do, just like we do come soon to funding with we have to go to City Council. It's the same premise. To Councillor McCauley's point, you do have a sidewalk ordinance. The thing that you said about mixed material use, that hasn't happened in two and a half years. That happened at the beginning when it was directed to be done to get more bang for the city's buck. Since then, it's been concrete or brick only. As far as ADA, DPS is always talking about ADA. A couple of you guys have asked us to put crosswalks in and we actually denied them because they were not ADA. So everything that you're basically asking in this ordinance is currently being done, have followed all the processes. For transparency I 100% agree with you. Under the direction of the mayor now we're in a new realm where the transparency is going to be key. I think it's going to thrive if we just give it a shot.
- *Clr. Preston* – I appreciate the need for a forum for public input into the prioritization process. I still don't understand why TSAC couldn't be appropriate place for that. Councillor McCauley mentioned that that's not a legislative body, I don't feel that we need a legislative body to be able to gather public forum comment. I feel like we it gives us a forum for that public comment. Then I feel like the prioritization of what streets to be done is best handled between DPS and the mayor's office. The city council holds the purse strings on this. I'm hearing from the mayor and DPS that they are planning to have a very transparent process that gives not only the council the information that we're looking for, in terms of what is the plan, it also gives, hopefully a lot more transparency to the general public on what is the plan so that they can plan their own projects around that. I struggle as to why we would need to go so far as to have an ordinance as opposed to giving the mayor and DPS the opportunity to create a prioritized plan with a forum. Hopefully TSAC, maybe something else but a forum so that there is public input.
- *Clr. Khan* – I just want to reference the complete streets policy, which I think that was mentioned by Councillor McCauley. You know, that's not really codified. It was actually adopted by the city council in January of 2018 as a policy. I think we're we're kind of agreeing that there's some good aspects here, transparency is great, we do hear that there's the entities committed to doing this. But in terms of the format for getting this work done, or providing some guidance, I again, I go back to I don't think it needs to be codified. I do think we have examples with say, if you go to the city's website, you could see the complete streets policy, and there is a good framework here to start from. If there is a desire for us to create something similar, especially on how that policy gets implemented. If folks will want to refer to the complete streets policy, the Traffic Safety Advisory Committee is the one identified there that they will hold a public meeting at least once a year to discuss the prioritization of potential transportation and infrastructure projects that involve complete street elements. So with input from the general public, perhaps take this out of the format of an ordinance may be a policy, or if we do decide to codify something maybe look a little differently than this kind of formatting in our code, and maybe something that does talk about the policies in place, such as Complete Streets, which if you do a search in our code of ordinances, nowhere, do we even have reference to the complete streets policy currently in our code. I think there's a lot of things that are coming out of here as some great work to be done. I do agree with Councillor Preston that I think TSAC is an entity that could be used effectively for engagement of the public.

- *Clr. Wallace* – So the complete streets policy, it's a policy, and it's very detailed. To my knowledge, it hasn't been followed. It talks about what the standards should be, and every project has to look at this and that. I've worked with Livable Streets and heard maybe Complete Streets needs a little more teeth. Actually in the first draft of this, and we cut it down quite a bit, we had Complete Streets in there saying it had to comply with the complete streets policy, and even called it out by name. In this draft, Complete Streets is mentioned in there. Because that's the heart of it is that people need to be able to say, we have to be able to cross here or we need it safe here. Complete Streets takes all users into account. Otherwise, I don't know how many people are making these decisions. Is it two or three people? And we're just saying the public doesn't need to weigh in? Listening to the residents is really important. This is a task that the council can help with and I think it's vital. If we want to make progress on our streets, it's really important we have an oversight board, and we do it sooner rather than later.
- *Clr. Donahue* – I do agree that maybe we should explore an oversight board or committee of some kind, but I can see where there might be some conflict with it just being with being TSAC in that TSAC is just an advisory board and I don't know if they have the bandwidth. I'd like to explore the idea with the Mayor or the Council or however it happens in forming a committee or board that would be made up of people that have experience and knowledge in these areas like all of our other boards and commissions, but I'm on the fence of it being TSAC. Another point I'd like clarification on whether this proposed ordinance addresses when residents pay to have the brick sidewalks done themselves, and what kind of oversight there is on those projects. There was actually an instance where homeowners were the ones that redid their brick sidewalk, they were told they didn't have to put in a ramp. I'm wondering what kind of oversight there is even in place for when the projects are being done on our public ways, but by homeowners. It was on Merrimac Court, within the last couple of years.
- *Jamie Tuccolo* – I believe that someone that has a medium strip in the middle of it is the reason why because it can't be ADA because you can't put ramps in a medium strip. That's a long strip. So if you can't put an ADA compliant ramp on both sides, you might as well not have a medium strip.
- *Jon-Eric White* – TSAC was created for traffic safety. Then parking started being added to the agenda and now it's heavily loaded with parking issues. If we were to add construction projects and have oversight for construction, that would completely dilute TSAC. I highly recommend that in lieu of using TSAC, the mayor can easily create an advisory committee at least in the short term to review construction or large public works projects. I think that will give him the oversight that we need with the public. We're on the same page that we need public oversight for public works projects. Any public works projects that get submitted right now does not go through any public review, per se, even with Water and Sewer Commission. They really don't get vetted like, site plan, review, site plan reviews with the planning board. And we really should have that in the city. So my vote is to create a board similar to TSAC, but not TSAC. I do feel that we don't want to turn this into an ordinance. I had the same belief last time, I really do think an order is better. I really do like the intent of the sponsors for this, as everyone's saying it is very well intended. But I think we can find a better way of doing it in a different realm.

Public Comment:

- *Jane Snow, 9 Coffin Street*: Mr. White just said what I was going to say that I've been to several of the TSAC committee meetings. It was basically your fire chief, police chief, and they were all reporting about issues and that was their main theme, and parking the last time I went in, is pretty much what the meeting was about. I agree with Mr. White that I don't think that that's quite the place to put something like this. The only other question that I have is the beta report we did. That was done, I believe back in 2017 or 18 and it's still not available to the public. I'm wondering if anybody could answer the question as to why. I think sometimes it would be helpful for people to be able to refer to it so that they would know some of the things for instance, on my street in the last six months, we've had two water main breaks. Is it because the piping needs to be addressed or is it because the connection to the houses? I just was curious as to why the beta report isn't public yet.
- *Jamie Tuccolo* – The first part is the report was finished mid 2020. I don't know where you're getting 2017 Jane. If there was something done, there was a sidewalk plan done back in the day, but this road plan is not from 2017. So that's number one. Number two, as far as your water pipes. The difficulty with water pipes is we basically go by age. Then there's always that you got a bad couple pipes that were installed back in the day, and they're just letting go, I really don't have a good answer on that one. Other than the fact that when they base upon replacement like how many water breaks have been in that area for umpteen years and how old is the actual pipe.

## Further Discussion

- *Clr. Wallace* - We can either take a vote and send this out to the full council for next week. Or Councillor McCauley and I could perhaps schedule a time to meet with the Mayor.
- *Clr. Preston* - I would very much like to give the mayor a chance here to ultimately run the city. That's what we elected him to do. I am hearing from him a dedication to transparency. He certainly had a lot of campaign promise around the streets and sidewalks, I do firmly believe that he's committed to it. So I would really like to see the mayor be able to weigh in here and explore an opportunity to create a forum for public comment. I appreciate Mr. White's comment to the fact that TSAC may not be that place. But I would very much like to see this go back to the mayor, as opposed to bringing it to council.
- *Clr. Donahue* – echo Councillor Preston that it would be a good idea, given the new administration and the new direction of what's trying to be done that, that we give him the opportunity to work with you guys on this and see what you can come up with, that just is going to be that much more amenable to everybody and ultimately get us the results we're looking for without it necessarily being a codified ordinance. I apologize to Miss Snow that she didn't actually get her question answered about the beta plan. I don't have a copy of the beta plan. Is this something that's going to happen?
- *Jamie Tuccolo* – Again, from what I've been told, the mayor is gung ho on having transparency and having the public and the council all involved with this.
- *Clr. Donahue* – Is the Beta plan going to get released to the public, or at least to the councilors?
- *Mayor Reardon* – I have no problem with that. The deputy director put together the five year plan, and he was basing it off the beta plan, so I have no problem putting that as part of something that the public can view and see where their street falls on it. I think what Jamie was trying to say was in the past, that was a mayor's decision about whether that was shared at all. So I don't know whether councilors have seen the beta plan before. I'll be honest, I haven't seen it yet.
- *Clr. Donahue* – a lot of the public has heard about this beta plan, but no one has seen it. From what I understand councilors haven't either.
- *Jamie Tuccolo* – The plan was two years old and with COVID and everything we had to look at a couple of things. Now that it's basically completed, I do have to schedule to sit down with the mayor to actually show him where we're at and he can take it from there.
- *Clr. Donahue* - I am opting to go with your second suggestion, like Councillor Preston said.
- *Clr. Wallace* – I would like for co-sponsor Councillor McCauley and I to meet with the Mayor to discuss these options, because I do think we're all on the same page and what I'm hearing mostly is we need some sort of oversight. But what's the best way to do that? I think this has been a great discussion. We're going to keep it in committee and come back to it.

## Committee Action

- Staying in Committee

## Agenda Item: ODNC102\_11\_08\_2021 Late File - Ch. 17 Stormwater Management Revisions

- *Clr. Khan* – We had gone through an effort of going through all the code of ordinances to try to create some consistency and updates were needed. We had about eight people in this ordinance Review Committee, of which some were department heads of the city. It was pointed out that some of these sections should be sent to those who are actually the ones who are implementing these codes and these chapters and to find out if there's any updates that we need to do. When I did, it was pretty clear that there were a number of modifications and changes that had to happen to the entire chapter. So the recommendation from the ordinance review committee was, highlighted what chapters need to change, and that was presented to the council. But then individually different sections were being done by those responsible for those specific sections. So Jon-Eric White at the end of last year, maybe it was even, September, October, had provided some initial drafts. My timing was to make sure I was able to put them all into a format that we

could put into Council and it got introduced last year, November of 2021. Due to the breadth and the number of additions here we decided to move it to the new session. Some of its already really just updating antiquated language. But I will go ahead and turn it over to Jon-Eric White and other members of his team who have really gone through to make sure this chapter is relevant.

- *Jon-Eric White* – We're looking at six pages of changes to the stormwater ordinance. The stormwater ordinance is 17 pages long. The reason we're only looking at six, is simply comes from the committees, that's their way of getting these changes to the clerk to actually do the strikethrough. So the question that Nick and I had this morning that caused confusion, which I apologize for, is the fact that why is this only six pages not 17? It's because she pulled out just the paragraph that changed. So we reviewed all of these last November, Nick went through every single change, and in general it was good. In the event that this review committee sent these ordinances to KP for absolute last minute legal review, I asked to include the rules and regs to make sure that our changes to the ordinance are properly referenced to the rules and regs. So Councillor, Khan, did this get sent to KP for review?
- *Clr. Khan* – it did not get sent to KP law. Once it gets approved and changes get talked about if there's additional amendments that get vetted in committee. At that point when it's approved by the council, it could go to kp law for that final blessing. In terms of this chapter, and changes being vetted in advance, that was not done. If there is a need to do that, we could still do that effort and keep it in committee. I feel like our law gets vetted with KP law before it gets published.
- *Jon-Eric White* - what we will do is keep modifying our rules and regs to comply with the requirements of NPDES for which I can explain to people on this group that aren't aware of what that is, and especially the new mayor, Mayor Reardon will eventually like to know. But for now, we're all set for this. The only request I have for Councillor Wallace is now that this is in your new subcommittee. These were changes from the EPA NPDES, MS4s that were required to be made last year. Guess what, we have more requirements that are due this June 30. I'm going to turn it over to Nick right now to summarize what NPDES is required to do for June 30. The question for this committee is whether we'd like to extend this meeting and get back to you with a better update.
- *Nick Federico* – these were completed last November, in preparation for year three permit requirements, which would be the 2022 fiscal year. And that requirement has come and gone and this has stayed in committee which has not been a problem for us, given how progressive the ordinance was developed in the 2003 requirements. So we are ahead of the game on that. As we move into year four, where the final requirement to update your stormwater ordinance and Bylaw is outlined, and I could go over the permit language, but the basis of it is three requirements. So there's a requirements update to be in compliance with the 2008, Massachusetts stormwater handbook, but also be in compliance with the 2016 NPDES permit. So those are two overlapping documents have varying levels of compliance that they're trying to make more uniform. And that's where they want to see the changes in the city's ordinance. So everything listed here, it was a part of the year three requirements and we are currently working with our consultant, Merrimack Valley Planning Committee on year four requirements. They're doing a formal review of our ordinances. That should be completed in the next couple of months. Once we have that formal review completed, we'll know if we're missing any anything that needs to be added to this change.
- *Jon-Eric White* – I'd like to extend approval of this stormwater ordinance in front of us. We can sit down with the mayor and this subcommittee to explain in detail what Nick is talking about for the year 4 requirements. We are in compliance with last year. The option would be to pass this now and maybe have to revise the same ordinance, this coming May or June, to meet our next requirements, which are due June 30. I prefer to sit down with the mayor and the city council, whoever wants to over the next month. I'm asking now is if we put a hold on this.
- *Clr. Wallace* – it's really your timeline and it doesn't make sense to do it twice if they're not going to penalize you for not having it done. In my experience there's a lot of leeway for municipalities. Keep in mind that when this does go to the city council, sometimes things take a while. might make sense to look at what the city council meetings they are work backwards. Especially if you're going to have MVPC review it. I'd like to take a closer look and we could send our comments to Councillor Khan or to both of you. I'm ok continuing to our next meeting whenever that may be.
- *Clr. Preston* – I don't have any comments other than when John Eric, when you say next meeting, would you be aiming to make these edits to submit to our next meeting, which would be the 22nd. So that we can then bring it to council on the 28th.
- *Clr. Wallace* – Sorry, let me let me clarify. you don't have to have it in two weeks. just give me a heads up.

- *Jon-Eric White* –I don't think it'll take more than a couple of weeks for Nick and I to go through it but I'll talk to him, he's got a better a better understanding with MVPC. So we'll let you know when we're ready.
- *Clr. Wallace* – one thing that might be helpful. I know that you had done a presentation or maybe if you just have a few slides about the MS4 program. I think other Councillors may be interested in that as well.
- *Jon-Eric White* – I asked Nick to set up another stormwater committee meeting. Nick, do you mind giving us an update on that when we can possibly get a meeting going?
- *Nick Federico* – I've been actively trying to host one, I'm willing to do that any time we can get everyone together.
- *Clr. Wallace* – How long do you think that would take to present what you need to?
- *Nick Federico* – I'm ready now just take me a couple of days to put together the presentation. But just a comment on the MVPC contract, they received a grant to look at the bylaws of all towns in the region. So I'm going back and forth with them. That's an additional bonus to the review that we've already had in house in the engineering department. So we're kind of ahead of the game with that. There shouldn't be much more that would be added to the ordinance. Any additional changes we can make in the rules and regs and that's why we're saying in a couple of weeks, we should have a better idea if this can be a final ordinance or if there's any more changes to that.
- *Clr. Donahue* – I don't have any questions. I think it makes sense to keep it in committee and bring it out when it's ready and go from there.
- *Clr. Khan* –I was just going to add for Jon-Eric, and also for Nick, that in terms of the ordinance and approval, it would be helpful to have that storm water advisory committee actually talk about this and vet it. It'll be good for us to bring that back to the committee that it has been vetted and discussed there, and then the Council could approve. So I definitely would recommend that. Please include me on when that is I could also look at the calendar, but we could talk offline and figure out so that I can attend that as well.
- *Jon-Eric White* – We'll definitely do that. Nick will schedule the stormwater committee meeting, invite the appropriate Councillors and make it public.
- *Clr. Wallace* – Great. I think we're all set with that.

#### **Committee Action**

- Stays in Committee

#### **ADJOURN**

Motion to adjourn by Councillor Donahue, seconded by Councillor Preston. Roll call vote 3 yes. Motion passes 3-0.