

CITY COUNCIL E-MAILS

October 7th (after 4:00 p.m.) – October 24, 2019 (9:00 a.m.)

OCTOBER 28, 2019 Council Meeting

UPDATED 10/28/2019 THROUGH 3:00 PM

New content begins Page 3

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jacqueline Cali-Pitts (cali0917@aol.com) on Monday, October 7, 2019 at 16:18:15

address: 40 Bedford wayregture ulate y

comments: Please forgive the lateness of this message, hb 102 has been retained in committee. . This bill would give cities and towns the power to regulate these products, It is the constitution and the legislature in play here, Has the municipal association been contacted? How about the attorney general. California has experienced a 120% rise in heavy plastic bag use, I have seen convoluted legislation but truly could not figure this one out,and all it's ramifications. Postpone. 3rd reading so more work can be done not .just understand it after we pass it ...sounds familiar. We all agree we need to stop what is happening to our planet it is how we go about it that is in question

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Tara Schoff (cgmschoff@gmail.com) on Monday, October 7, 2019 at 17:07:58

address: 134 Fairview Ave.

comments: I oppose the mandated cost-sharing plan that requires residents to pay even 20% of the cost of the sewer expansion.

The cost for residents to tie-in to the sewer line will be a significant financial burden - there should be no other expense.

The City created this situation and should bear the costs of installation. The residents should not be penalized which they will be under this proposal.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Paul Messier (pemess@icloud.com) on Monday, October 7, 2019 at 18:44:08

address: 171 Walker Bungalow Rd.

comments: City of Chatham, MA, is in the middle of a new sewer collection system. Some low pressure, some gravity.

-City pays the whole shot.

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Denise Croteau (Jeffdenise111@comcast.net) on Tuesday, October 8, 2019 at 17:06:05

address: 241 Walker Bungalow Rd, Portsmouth

comments: Hello City Counsel members,

I attended the City Council meeting last night and feel the need to follow up with you on a few points. First off, thank you for tabling the vote on the funding plan for the Sagamore Ave. sewer project. However, I would like to express three concerns regarding the public dialogue session. First, the insistence that all discussion of the project be limited to one half of the council members means that the other half did not hear my neighbors concerns first hand. I do not trust the city manager to relay our statements accurately and without spin. There was simply too much information. Second, with only 45 minutes scheduled for discussion, it was very poor form for the city manager to use up a significant portion of that time reading his proposal to us. If that information had been made available prior, the limited discussion time would not have been used up in that way. Third, I found it unbelievable that the city manager cut-off and talked over some of my neighbors including David Witham whose comments I was eager to hear.

In closing, thank you for tabling the vote. Hopefully going forward, the full city council can have a thoughtful discussion of the sewer extension with the residents of Portsmouth.

Respectfully,
Denise Croteau

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Manuel Garganta (souzagar@aol.com) on Wednesday, October 9, 2019 at 12:29:07

address: 471 Colonial Drive

comments: Dear Council Members,

After watching then listening(Technical Difficulties) to the Council Meeting on Oct. 7, 2019 I began wondering why Councilor Perkins wants to build housing at the Pease TradePort?

It was never the mission of the PDA to become a residential landlord.

Knowing Peter Loughlin laid out very good reasons why this is not a good idea..

Why would any one want to place housing that would probably include children on a place that has environmental problems?

The PDA has done a remarkable job in creating an economic engine that is the envy of every Municipality that has to deal with a base closure.

I agree with Mr. Bohenko that "the state can take our revenue" which they would love to.

Is this just a campaign ploy? I sincerely hope not. I do hope calmer heads prevail on the rest of the council. We have greater issues that need to be addressed in the City than this.

Please do not poke the Bear, it could come back to bite us.

Sincerely,
Manuel S. Garganta

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

New content begins:

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Nicole LaPierre (nicoleglapierre@hotmail.com) on Sunday, October 27, 2019 at 20:44:23

address: 44 Rock Street

comments: Dear Council,

I am writing in support of the proposal Councilor Roberts will be presenting at tomorrow night's meeting regarding a revision in fees at the Foundry Garage. It is an important first step in addressing the city's current parking issues. It will be beneficial to the many people that come into the city everyday working in a multitude of different positions and industries that help our city to thrive. It would also be of aid regarding the low occupancy rates at the garage. As the city continues to grow, parking issues need viable solutions. I was happy to hear of this initiative and also look forward to revisiting the Neighborhood Parking Pilot in the new year. For those of you moving on and not returning, thank you for your service. For those of you campaigning, I admire your continued desire to serve. It's thankless work and that is not lost on me.

Best,
Nicole

includeInRecords: on
Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Jane Zill (janezill@comcast.net) on Sunday, October 27, 2019 at 22:41:04

address: 27 Shaw Road

comments: Dear City Councilor,

This is in regard to the Sagamore Avenue Sewer Extension Project. Some of you will recall that I spoke about it in the spring and summer of 2017 during public comment and at hearings for bonding.

Back then I expressed concern for the impact on my unsuspecting neighbors, some of whom had recently installed new septic systems. I asked for information recognizing their need for time -- to respond and for planning -- given the significant financial consequence to each residence. The direct costs have most recently been discussed, but let's not forget that indirect costs, for example, septic tank de-commissioning, grinder-pumps, generators, and landscaping are also likely to be substantial.

At the July 10, 2017 meeting, Paige Trace also discussed the Sagamore Sewer Extension Project, emphasizing it's a mitigation item in the Consent Decree Second Modification due to the failure of the city government to comply with the Clean Water Act and 2009 Consent Decree.

She questioned the fairness of expecting private residents to fund mitigation that is the responsibility of the entire city and asked for more information, including how the other mitigation items will be funded:

"Why is it that we can't have as residents an open list of the projects that are being undertaken as part of the mitigation... under the consent decree... just a list - today we're doing this, tomorrow we're doing that.?"

I question the ambiguity, and ... as someone who is ...involved ... in the second modification, I'm privy to a lot of things that perhaps other residents aren't, such as CLF gets \$500,000, half a million dollars, over the course of 5 years.

Well, I look at that as our fault, our bad, as a city, and CLF is getting this money because we didn't meet the consent decree first modification... and so that's part of the mitigation.

Does that come out of this bonding? Has it already been paid for privately by the city? Where does that stand?

The other issue I have is, again, from the same stand point with the whole Sagamore Avenue, I agree, no, we shouldn't have any chance of waste going into any part of the channel, the back channel over there, from

Sagamore Avenue, yes, it's a good idea to hook people up to the sewer. But the city did something ...by not being able to adhere to the consent decree. Now we're going to do this as part of the mitigation, we're going to attach people, but the residents, as I understand it, are going to have to pay for attaching themselves to the sewer, X number of dollars per foot of frontage over there.

Should those city residents be forced to pay for part of this when it's the city who is doing this as mitigation? I don't know if this makes sense. I just see a lot of resident who wouldn't otherwise be having to do this right at this point, now suddenly some of them will be paying \$30,000 -\$40,000 or whatever it is to hook up to sewer because the judge ordered the city to connect to sewer over there. Anyway, they are my questions. I wish we could a little more in the future, more transparent list in the future. So we can be comfortable and we can fully accept what you're doing."

Esther Kennedy also spoke. She said, "Do people on Sagamore understand how this will impact their living situation?... Does Sagamore Avenue know what this means?" We have to think about our transparency..."

The city manager said, "The city council...We're going to have a lot of public meetings on it ... we're going to bring people in...not different than what was done in the past...we would work with city council...on what cost share will be ... 10 year loan ...This will have a lot of public input, we'll bring in the city...We'll have to have a policy discussion on cost share... might be different due to location."

However, information was not forthcoming, not even on the DPW website until September (2019), leading many of my neighbors to conclude, throughout 2017, all of 2018, and most of 2019, that I was mistaken in my understanding of the project.

Their confusion is understandable. They mistakenly presumed that our municipal government employees would have involved the city council in the matter as well as those residents impacted by the project. They reasoned that if the project were expected to happen, there would be information online for the public. This confusion did not result from missteps or mistakes regarding community outreach, but intentional evasiveness on the part of city employees about a large and expensive project with novel legal origins, that is a federal consent decree.

Finally, in September (2019), at the first public meeting sponsored by DPW, a city staffer presented information about the project. Stunned and upset residents were promised more information on the DPW website, not only of the direct costs of the project, but also the indirect costs of the grinder pump, generators for back-up (given the pumps run on electricity), decommissioning septic tanks, and landscaping. To date, this promise has not been kept. Residents have been left to scramble to obtain as much information as possible.

And, the city still has not provided residents with the promised opportunity for "a lot of public input" (Manager Bohenko) even though preliminary project work has begun.

The affected Sagamore residents must be allowed to gather more information and discuss options with each other and the staff engaged in planning because this project has the potential to impact each involved family, their neighborhood, and the community profoundly for decades to come.

But, as things stand, the next DPW project meeting for the public is to take place in March or April of 2020, six full months into the future, and after the after initiation of preliminary work has been completed and a general contractor selected. Construction work is to commence in June.

Meeting dates for the involved residents need to be established as soon as possible, and definitely before a Council vote, whether in December or by the new Council next year.

Yours,

Jane Zill

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by Diane Messier (Dianemessier@comcast.net) on Monday, October 28, 2019 at 11:01:16

address: 171 Walker Bungalow Rd

comments: I am very concerned that we are not receiving updates to the Sewer project proposed for my neighborhood. Many of my neighbors as well as myself attended a City Council meeting a couple of weeks ago and were assured by our town manager and Councilors that we would be informed and included in this very complex project. This affects my property and finances and I would like to know what progress, if any has been achieved since we last met!

includeInRecords: on

Engage: Submit