

CITY COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEE  
**Ordinances & Administration**  
**Monday, January 30, 2012 – 6:00 p.m.**  
**1<sup>st</sup> Fl. Council Conference Room – City Hall**  
**-Minutes-**

**Present: Chair, Councilor Sefatia Theken; Vice Chair, Councilor Robert Whynott; Councilor Steven LeBlanc, Jr.**

**Absent: None.**

**Also Present: Mayor Carolyn Kirk; Councilor Ciolino; Councilor Verga; Linda T. Lowe; Jim Duggan; Donna Compton; Suzanne Egan; Bill Sanborn; Jeff Towne; Michael Hale; Mark Cole; Gary Johnstone; Deputy Fire Chief Aiello**

**The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Councilor Theken** declared there was a quorum of the City Council present. **Items were taken out of order.**

**1. Continued Business:**

- A) CC2011-043 (Tobey) Generate Request for Proposals seeking non-profit cultural partner re: City Hall (Cont'd from 11/14/11)

**This matter was postponed by the Committee until otherwise informed by Councilor Tobey.**

- B) CC2011-053 (Verga/Tobey) Establishment of City Ordinance re: Securing and Maintaining Vacant Properties and Properties in the Process of Foreclosure (Cont'd from 12/05/11)

**Councilor Verga** explained he met with Max Schenk, Interim Health Department Director; Bill Sanborn, Building Inspector; Mark Cole, Assistant DPW Director. The reason for putting this order forward was in his professional capacity he sees a lot of bank owned properties, and a couple of abandoned properties in the City no one is caring for which drags down the value of the surrounding homes. Mr. Sanborn pointed out there was something already on this in the GCO; but there are a couple of 'holes' in the ordinance. In their meeting they looked to fill in these holes and give the enforcement of the ordinance "some teeth", as that appears to be lacking. **Mr. Sanborn** added the City has had the ordinance in effect since 2008. When his office is notified of a vacant building, they send the last property owner of record acknowledging they've been by the property which appears to be vacant which will place it on a vacant property list; that they are responsible for maintaining that property. If the property isn't maintained, then the City takes over that function. There is a fee charged to the owner of record which goes up incrementally each year for that service; \$500 year 1, \$1,000 year 2, \$3,000 year 3. There are approximately 75 buildings on that list. There is a great deal involved in this process. In three years these fees have amounted to \$72,000 with \$20,000 that stays in the revolving account, the balance gets transferred out to the General Fund. They maintained a variety of properties, spending \$16,400. If the property fails to be maintained and they can't find the owner, they go in and clean the property up, hiring a company to do this. The object is to maintain the property so it does not appear vacant. **Councilor Theken** inquired why they hire a company to maintain these properties to which **Mr. Sanborn** responded it is too great a burden to the DPW due to the time involved, and that it is very difficult to trace the owner and to get the money back. Whereas, if they hire someone, they do the work, then they submit the money down to the Treasurer's office. Then when the property transfers they are flagged to contact the Building Inspector's office and are informed as to what they owe. They get their money in the transfer of the property. **Jeff Towne, CFO** stated this is new. Every time Mr. Sanborn sends them a list of the vacant buildings, they flag the account so they bring it up for any kind of payment - sewer/water payment, taxes owed; the property is on the vacant property list etc. They can then put the owner onto the Building Inspector and coordinate it in the system. He felt this process is working well. **Mr. Duggan** stated this was something Mr. Sanborn brought forward to the Administration to address the problem and to have a mechanism to recoup funds in order to make properties safe so that they are not an eyesore. **Councilor Theken** asked about Columbia Street where there is a well-known vacant building that is a problem in that neighborhood. The complaints have been about vermin and vagrants in the building. **Mr. Sanborn** stated it becomes a real problem when people break into the building and was the biggest threat to any building. **Councilor Theken** expressed her concern should a fire break out; the Fire Department wouldn't know if anyone was in it. **Mr. Sanborn** explained the Fire Department under a different program uses a visual aid on the building to show there is no one in it. He added with this program they have in place, they have a company come in and board

up these properties. They have boarded up Columbia Street five times and have called Action Emergency Response who are trained to do it. That company has started their own program to go after the property owner to try and collect their fees. This particular property is one that the bank has walked away from which he found out just the previous week. He and the City Solicitor are working to see it torn down, hopefully in the next two weeks.

**Councilor Theken** commented if the City tears the building down, they lose the tax income and all they've spent on the property to that time. City Solicitor, **Suzanne Egan** stated they can lien the property for the expense of tearing it down. Because they had such a difficult time locating the owner and making sure they're giving the right notice to make sure to give due process that the City is intending to come in and tear it down, that takes a lot longer.. Once they go through that process, then they'll be able to tear it down. The selling of the property becomes the next problem. **Councilor Whynott** stated this is a common problem for many communities around the country; with banks walking away from properties. **Mr. Sanborn** noted this property is the first one the City has had where a bank has walked away, to his knowledge. With most of these types of properties the problem starts once the bank tells the property owners they're foreclosing. The bank has to go to court to get ownership. During that time and process, nothing will be done on the property. That is where his department usually spends the money on the property. They try not to board them up, however. They cut the grass when it gets high; trim bushes to give the appearance that the property is being kept up. They also have a sign that they will put by the back door (which he displayed to the Committee but was not placed on file) that is a notice for the City departments acknowledging the building's status. Their biggest problem is managing the process and the properties. There is a lot of time involved; more than they thought it would be, with his clerk spending on average 15-20 hours a week to manage this situation for his department. As soon as a property is foreclosed, banks sell a subsidiary, then one after the other and to other banks; ownership becomes hidden; and they do not record them. **Councilor Verga** stated it is not like they have a lot of abandoned properties. He noted there is a difference between vacant properties and abandoned properties. **Mr. Sanborn** explained there are 75 buildings on the vacant property list; 48 are inactive, meaning they are resolved. By the ordinance there is a billing cycle of November, but he felt it should be as they happen. **Councilor Verga** expressed this needs more review by the legal department and by Mr. Towne; and that perhaps the Administration might give the Building Inspector a part-time person for this time-consuming issue in Mr. Sanborn's office, given there is a revolving fund. **Mr. Duggan** suggested could also be a talking point. **Councilor Verga** felt this to be a necessary program. Most of these properties are going to change hands at some point and someone will eventually make good on the cost of maintaining the property by the City. The Councilor requested that the Deputy Fire Chief also give input for language that would be helpful to his department. **Councilor Theken** suggested that Councilor Verga, Deputy Fire Chief Aiello, Mr. Sanborn, Mr. Towne, and the City Solicitor work together and come back at a later date to see how they can move forward on this issue to amend the ordinance as it now stands in the GCO. She added that the Fire Department is also doing a fine job with this matter. **Deputy Chief Aiello** mentioned he thought the Worcester ordinance (which the O&A is studying) has some very good provisions (on file).

**This matter is continued to March 19, 2012.**

- C) CC2011-054 (Mulcahey) Amend GCO Sec. 22-287 (Disabled Veteran, handicapped parking) re: across from Central Grammar Apartments driveway in front of Mason Street #6-8 (Cont'd from 12/05/11)

The Committee determined based on the recommendations of the Traffic Commission (on file), that they would not endorse the request for an additional handicap parking space on Mason Street.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Whynott, seconded by Councilor LeBlanc, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 0 in favor, 3 opposed to amend the Gloucester Code of Ordinances Sec. 22-287 (Disabled Veteran, handicapped parking) by adding one (1) handicapped parking space across from Central Grammar Apartments driveway in front of Mason Street #6-#8.**

- D) CC2011-055 (Verga/Ciolino) Possible Adoption of MGL re: assessment of water betterments and deferral of betterments; and Amend GCO Chapter 23 "Utilities" Article III accordingly (Cont'd from 12/05/11)

**Councilor Verga** explained to the Committee at the O&A's December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting they had asked the City Solicitor to craft language for an ordinance amendment regarding water betterments, and that she had forward such language to them prior to this meeting (on file). The lack of adequate City water in some areas became an issue due to a house fire in May 2011 in the Becker Lane area. They had the DPW Director and Fire Chief give a presentation regarding

that area's water supply at City Council. There seemed to be inadequate water supply for the Becker Lane area and that it was suggested they put language into an ordinance to alleviate this situation, and so that matter went to the legal department for crafting of that language. **Ms. Egan** stated the Council had adopted MGL c. 40, §42G, §42H, §42I, §42K concerning assessment of water betterments and MGL c. 40, §42J concerning the deferral of such betterments. Now before the Committee is draft ordinance language to be considered for the Code of Ordinances which allows the City to assess betterments for the laying of water pipes. She looked at what was already in the Code of Ordinances in terms of sewer assessments/betterments and adapted it to this [situation].

Sec. 23-64 of the proposed ordinance language provides that anybody who has land who is going to benefit from the laying of the water pipes; either it abuts the ways or it does have a benefit even remotely connected to it, then the assessment can be made against that property for a portion of laying the pipes. She and Mr. Hale discussed whether they had the authority to assess for improvements of water pipes versus just laying out the water pipes. The statute says it is a "laying" of the pipes; and they can assess for any of the incremental costs in terms of that construction. If there is a laying of pipes that is required they can assess it. If it is just for infrastructure work, they will have to be discussed whether it is included. The issue that occurred, and which raised this issue, this ordinance language would take care of it. Right now there are water pipes in that street (referring to Becker Lane) that are on private land. If they determine this is an appropriate area, is to put the pipes in the street, this ordinance language would allow for assessing a betterment. **Councilor Theken** stated if they did this and only one house really needs it, but five houses existed on the street, all five properties would still be assessed. **Ms. Egan** stated, "Yes". They're not required though to hook up to it. They're not going on their property. **Mr. Hale** explained regardless of what street it is, if water pipes are laid from point A to point B, anyone who benefits from the laying of that pipe will be assessed the betterment, whether they connect to it or not, they would be assessed. Sewer is different; a property owner may have a working septic system. He thought if there was a working well, there may not be a need to connect, but the property has been bettered because there is a full-sized water main they have access to. **Councilor Theken** asked if she had a well, and they put that pipe in, she'd still be responsible for a betterment. **Ms. Egan** stated "yes", as did **Mr. Hale**. There are several deferrals for low income and elderly and undeveloped land. **Councilor Theken** clarified if she had a well, and pipes were laid, and she didn't connect to the City's system, she still would be assessed a betterment to which both Mr. Hale and Ms. Egan responded, "Yes". **Ms. Egan** added there is also a provision if you have undeveloped land, similar to the sewer, that it can be deferred until the property is developed. There is also the elderly and low income deferral included in this. **Councilor Ciolino** inquired who makes the determination that a particular area of the City needs this water service; is it a vote of the property owners; how would it be determined. **Mr. Hale** stated he's never seen water done by a vote. Sewer projects have been to the Ward Councilors and to the attention of the City Engineer and the DPW. They go through a process. Ultimately the City Council has to authorize the funding, so there is that entire public process. If he was going to do "X" street feeling there was a need for it, he would request the through the Mayor for a loan authorization to be forwarded to the City Council, then it's referred to B&F, then back to the Council for public hearing. **Ms. Egan** stated what the Councilor was referring to was the paving of a private way which is a different process. **Councilor Ciolino** stated it is the purview of the DPW Director to determine that there is a need which **Mr. Hale** confirmed, and from there it goes through the legislative process just described by Mr. Hale. It is also the DPW Director's purview to put in fire hydrants appropriate for the area and to determine how many. **Mr. Hale** explained there are standards; particularly for new projects they always consult with the Fire Chief or whomever he designates, as to where the right place is to put them and how many spacing them out evenly every 300 or 500 ft. Neither of the two Fire Chief's he's dealt with have ever wanted a fire hydrant at the very end of a line. They told him they'd never fight a fire from the furthest point in. They always bring the hoses to the fire; and reiterated this is done in consultation with the Fire Department. **Councilor Ciolino** stated by paying the betterment they'll have good City deep water available to tap into; and it is at the homeowner's expense to tap into it from the property line on. They will also have adequate fire protection and be better for firefighting. **Mr. Hale** commented the volume of water coming through these lines can never be increased. The only way to improve that situation is to relay (pipes). At that point there would be adequate fire protection for a neighborhood. Out of that there would be adequate potable water for residential homes wherever the neighborhood was. **Councilor Verga** noted that the DPW Director had said once they had done this sort of ordinance, he would come up with a master plan in the director's opinion as to what areas are to be done in what order. He asked if there was a City loan program now for such a water betterment as has been done with sewer betterment projects; however, this water situation is not mandated. **Mr. Towne** stated he didn't think there was from what he has seen. He looks at how they would cost share this. With all the City's water projects currently being undertaken by the City and the ones still to come, the water rate is 'jumping', very similar to sewer where they'll decided as a Council, based, he hoped, on his feedback, that says it is 100% on the property owners. He didn't believe there would be an opportunity to do cost sharing unless they did something regarding a fire service

line where the General Fund picks up a portion of it because they're providing fire service that area, for instance. Whether or not there is cost sharing is very important to the water rate. **Councilor Ciolino** noted most betterments have a an incremental program to pay back. **Mr. Towne** stated it was 10 or 20 years. He noted deferrals are difficult to manage from his perspective for a variety of technical reasons with a great deal of coordination that goes into it briefly describing that process to the Committee. **Councilor Ciolino** asked what the next step would be. **Ms. Egan** stated the ordinance as drafted does not provide for a City share, and indicated this was just a start. If there is a determination that they want a City contribution, then that language can be inserted. **Councilor Verga** thought it very important to look at what the fire (suppression) contribution aspect would be; if that was a legitimate City expense, then it should not be overlooked. **Mr. Towne** stated he has experience of that in previous communities, explaining it was a 10% factor. If you put a trunk line down a street that was on fire service protection which is based on a number of calls versus how much it cost to put it out there; there was no real rationale to it, but it made sense to put 10% on it. On inquiry by **Councilor Theken**, **Mr. Hale** stated there are pockets in the City without any fire hydrants; Rust Island is one as there is no deep water past Lobsta Land Restaurant. It is a fairly isolated geographic area. There are areas of the Wingersheek Beach and Coffin's Beach that took it upon themselves because they're on summer lines. There are certain isolated streets, mostly in Ward 5, without hydrants. All new subdivisions are required to put them in, but there have only been a handful in the last 15 years in the City. **Greg Doe**, 7 White Mountain Road stated this came about from their neighborhood's situation in the Becker Lane area. The City permitted this area 20 years ago, to allow the expansion of the neighborhood. They pay their water bills. They're getting what he considered dirty water, and poor water pressure. They are helping to pay for infrastructure work all over the City, but would have to pay for their water improvements now. **Councilor Theken** stated there those who have wells; those who do their own drainage and do not use City water. But they use city roadways and other City services, like the beaches, like the schools etc. **Mr. Towne** added most of the City system has been there since the early 1900's. When all those pipes were laid, Mr. Doe was not a rate payer. A significant portion of those pipes he referred to were all paid for by other rate payers. **Mr. Doe** felt that was the same reason they should receive this benefit and expressed that the City had an obligation to "fix their mistakes" without making them bear the cost. **Councilor Theken** stated this process is to amend the ordinances. The financial portion will be handled by the B&F Committee. They are aware that they do need to do something about this area. **Mr. Hale** stated in his conversations with the Fire Chief regarding the fire on Lexington Avenue, there was no water to pull because the main trunk line was insufficient from Essex Avenue all the way through Magnolia Point. The area by the home that had a fire in the Becker Lane area, a brand new water main is going to be put into Concord Street. They would pull off that main in the event of a fire. He gave the example in the case of the Lorraine fire, the Fire Department pulled water from a main on Rogers Street. They don't set up necessarily set up right at the fire site. Concord Street would be the appropriate location to set up for pumping water to a fire. The fire hydrant at the corner of Flume Road and Lexington Avenue had the equivalent of 700 gallons/minute and now has 5,000 gallon/minute flow which is a big difference in the fire flow brought to that neighborhood. **Councilor Theken** stated even if this ordinance passed today, they wouldn't be doing the work in the Becker Lane area right away. **Mr. Hale** responded what neighborhoods get done depends on the funding source. There is about \$15 million of work to be done in the next 18 months in the City that benefits everyone. Water underneath the canal that feeds East Gloucester to West Gloucester and visa versa; the water storage tanks; Ward 3 pipes with water that travels east to west/west to east causes brown water whenever there is a break. There are necessary improvements to the West Gloucester Water Treatment Plant. These are "once-in-a- generation" infrastructure projects that were deferred for 25-30 years. They have to be done now. If they lose the water under the canal, it will be a significant issue for the City. He also touched upon water transmission for the entire system. If, however, it is not a funding issue, like in the case of Way and Page Streets sewer project which eventually became a City project; it worked because it was 100% on the homeowners. **Mr. Towne** added that the rate structure for water and sewer fund gives Mr. Hale very little money towards maintaining the existing assets. The rate structure doesn't include enough for the DPW to relay existing pipe. **Councilor Theken** asked how much it would cost to do, for example, Becker Lane; which **Mr. Hale** ball parked at \$800,000. **Mr. Doe** commented it would be about 15-20 homes affected. **Councilor Ciolino** stated they acted at City Council by asking the DPW Director to help out this neighborhood not understanding there was no ordinance to cover such a situation. The first step is to have an ordinance for a mechanism to be in place. It has to be forwarded to B&F. **Linda T. Lowe**, City Clerk pointed out that there is Sec. 23-69 Betterment payment where she did not see any percentage put into the language there; and Sec. 23-64(2) where it is unclear because the last portion of it is an incomplete sentence. Neither indicated, in her reading of the language, as to what the actual betterment percentage is to the property owner. **Ms. Egan** explained the thought was to take out the provision where there is a contribution from the City, and to leave that to bring it forward to the Council to say what the determination of the contribution will be as a policy decision. This is the bones of that structure. **The Committee** discussed the process by which the

betterment percentage would be determined. **Mr. Duggan** stated no matter the number, the Administration's position is that it must be 100% (to the property owner); especially in light of all the capital work being done by the City. **Councilor Ciolino** felt some of the hydrant expense should be done by the City, as a policy, on any street. **Mr. Towne** and **Mr. Hale** discussed this briefly with Councilor Ciolino. **Councilor Theken** wished to continue this matter to the March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. B&F can make a recommendation with a number, and then they will consider the overall language. **Mr. Hale** explained to the Councilors he has no further capacity at this time for more projects to be undertaken for infrastructure work by his department. **Councilor Theken** expressed the Committee will make any amendments in the proposed ordinance at the March 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. A resident of the Becker Lane area expressed her concern that her need for water was great and that there was very little water pressure. **Mr. Hale** stated this person is paying for City water. There is insufficient water pressure in the neighborhood. The ordinance enables the City to take action. At this time he has no authority to make repairs even to that particular main which is on private property. It is not a subdivision; it was done through the property owner's right when meeting certain ANR; zoning requirements. It is unique to Massachusetts General Laws which **Ms. Egan** confirmed. **Councilor Theken** pointed out that the issues many neighborhoods have is that there are lines and mains put in as to what the code was when they were put in, not what the code is now; and is an important distinction. **Councilor Whynott** left the meeting at 7:57 p.m.

**This matter is continued to March 5, 2012.**

- E) Workshop: Adoption of MGL c. 32B, §21, §22 and §23 as relates to Health Care Reform (as referred back to O&A by the City Council on 12/20/11)

**Councilor Theken** explained that she wished to table the proposed workshop regarding the adoption of MGL c. 32B, §21, §22 and §23 as relates to Health Care Reform at this time until late summer after consultation with the Administration and the O&A Committee.

**This matter is continued to July 16, 2012.**

- F) Reappointment: Conservation Commission                      John Montoni                      (TTE 02/14/13)

**Councilor Theken** acknowledged the receipt of information that John Montoni is resigning his position on the Conservation Commission and is not seeking reappointment. The O&A Committee, by unanimous consent accepted the withdrawal of Mr. Montoni's reappointment.

**This matter is considered closed.**

**2. New Appointments:**

- |                                     |                |                |                    |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|
| Downtown Development Commission     | Jane Fonzo     | (TTE 02/14/14) | <b>(TBC2/6/12)</b> |
| Open Space and Recreation Committee | Heidi Wakeman  | (TTE 02/14/15) |                    |
| Capital Improvements Advisory Board | Michelle Sweet | (TTE 02/14/15) |                    |

The Committee questioned the new appointees regarding their respective Committee and Board, on their experience, background, professional affiliations as well as asking them to be familiar with the Open Meeting Laws and to file their proof of having taken the State Ethics Commission test with the City Clerk's office. They were asked also if they had any possible conflicts if they were on another Board, Committee or Commission in the City, of which there were none amongst the three candidates. The Committee expressed their appreciation at each of the appointees' willingness to step forward and volunteer on behalf of their City, thanked them for their commitment.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Theken, seconded by Councilor LeBlanc, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to appoint Heidi Wakeman to the Open Space & Recreation Committee, TTE 02/14/15.**

**Ms. Sweet** was asked if she was joining the CIAB to specifically focus on the schools which she stated she was interested in many things, not just to focus on schools. **Councilors Verga, LeBlanc** and **Ciolino** expressed their endorsement of Ms. Sweet. **Councilor Theken** excused Ms. Sweet from attending the City Council meeting on 2/14/12 as she was well known to the Council from her position as a former School Committee member.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor Whynott, seconded by Councilor LeBlanc, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to appoint Michelle Sweet to the Capital Improvements Advisory Board, TTE 02/14/15.**

**3. Management Reappointments:**

Purchasing Agent Donna Compton 02/14/13

**Councilors Ciolino and Verga** expressed that Ms. Compton has done a great job. **Councilor Theken** commented Ms. Compton has taken charge of her department and is doing a wonderful job, and has improved her performance and that of her department since her previous year.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to reappoint Donna Compton as Purchasing Agent, TTE 02/14/2013.**

Chief Administrative Officer James Duggan 02/14/13

**Councilor Ciolino** felt Mr. Duggan has an open door policy and lets them know how things lay which he appreciated. He added his respected of Mr. Duggan and the job he does for the City. **Councilor Whynott** also added his endorsement. **Councilor Verga** noted this job is high profile and that Mr. Duggan has been helpful to him. He appreciated Mr. Duggan's honesty with the Councilors. **Councilor Theken** felt last year was a difficult one due to the City's financial situation. There were disappointments; the job is not easy. She knew he defends the City; and understands he may not always be liked because of having to take unpopular stands. She, too, felt he had an open door policy. She appreciated working collaboratively with him and respected him. **Mr. Duggan** expressed it was an honor to work with the Mayor; and that the management team is wonderful. The wind turbines; the infrastructure issues; the budget, this year the management team took on a lot. He lauded the work of Ms. Compton, Ms. Egan; Mr. Sanborn; Mr. Cole and Mr. Johnstone.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to reappoint James Duggan as Chief Administrative Officer, TTE 02/14/2013.**

General Counsel Suzanne Egan 02/14/13

**Councilor Ciolino** stated he had worked with Ms. Egan for two years as Chair of P&D. At every opportunity she has helped the Committee on motions and legal advice. He felt they were lucky to have her as City Solicitor. **Councilor Verga** felt she did a great job. However, while it was resolved, he commented on the confusion who legal counsel worked for; that it is for the entire City. **Councilor Whynott** also expressed his endorsement. **Councilor Theken** noted she and Ms. Egan had their ups and downs. But she appreciated and respected her professional capability. She also mentioned the deed to Pavilion Beach and asked for the City Solicitor to make sure of the legalities involved. She wished to see that document also. **Ms. Egan** expressed she is working towards that.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to reappoint Suzanne Egan as City Solicitor, TTE 02/14/2013.**

Building Inspector William Sanborn 02/14/13

**Councilor Ciolino** expressed that Mr. Sanborn always returned his calls with correct information; and that he is very responsive, as one of the better Building Inspectors the City has ever had. **Councilor Verga** noted Mr. Sanborn runs a "tight ship" and has been doing a wonderful job. He looked forward to continue to work with him. **Councilor Theken** stated she has called upon Mr. Sanborn for help even on weekends; and he always answers. He is respectful and patient, helping citizens through some complicated processes. She finds him to be a help to her as a Councilor and is very respectful to constituents.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to reappoint William Sanborn as Building Inspector, TTE 02/14/2013.**

Chief Financial Officer

Jeffery Towne

02/14/13

**Councilor Ciolino**, noting he was on B&F, now for the third time, stated the City is lucky to have Mr. Towne as CFO. The Councilor was impressed with the Treasurer's part of the City's website. Mr. Towne continues to save the City a great deal of money and does a terrific job. **Councilor Verga** appreciated that Mr. Towne is very thorough. **Councilors LeBlanc** and **Whynott** also added their endorsement. **Councilor Theken** expressed that he is a part of a very good team. She also appreciated his excellent responsiveness, in a respectful manner. He is endlessly helpful and works so well with other members of the management team. She knew from her professional experience that he is also extremely helpful to the community. He works with the Council and Administration equally. He has been doing a great job. **Mr. Towne** stated this is the greatest team he has ever worked with and for. He couldn't do what he does without the staff in the Collectors and Treasurers' office. He expressed his appreciation for Charlene Pina who is retiring after 33 years.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whynott, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to reappoint Jeffrey Towne as Chief Financial Officer, TTE 02/14/2013.**

Director of Public Works

Michael Hale

02/14/14

**Councilor Ciolino** stated Mr. Hale is one of the best DPW Directors the City has ever had. He has gone through so much with the infrastructure. He is one of the "shining stars" of the Administration. He is looking forward to working with him for two more years. **Councilor Verga** stated Mr. Hale has worked closely with the Councilors and appreciates how he is working with the public and private road situations and his input on a variety of matters. **Councilor LeBlanc** has met with Mr. Hale and worked with him and felt he was top notch. **Councilor Whynott** expressed his thanks to Mr. Hale also. **Councilor Theken** noted she has known Mr. Hale for quite some time. He took on the job willingly, and is committed to it. She commented all the staff work together. His workers say he is "hands on", which is very much appreciated. He has proved himself with water breaks, the boil water order; he takes time away from his family in response to City emergencies. She appreciated and was pleased with Mr. Hale's prompt responsiveness to concerns and problems brought forward to him by Councilors and constituents. She stated Mr. Hale is doing a "phenomenal" job and was being endorsed by his staff. **Mayor Kirk** added when Mr. Hale was hired they conducted a search and did many interviews, and that Mr. Hale was clearly the most qualified. **Councilor Theken** stated he was doing a great job as a City Engineer, and didn't have to take this job. He has reshaped the way the DPW looks and works to the better. He jumped in with his eyes open to all that was facing the City and has done it very well. **Mr. Hale** appreciated the support of the Administration and the Council. Without the support and cooperation of his team on Poplar Street and the Annex he couldn't do his job; they do a lot of hard work to be a DPW the City can be proud of. They will continue to grow in the next couple of years.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whynott the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to reappoint Michael Hale as the Director of Public Works, TTE 02/14/14.**

Assistant Director of Public Works

Mark Cole

02/14/14

**Councilor Ciolino** felt Mr. Cole had come a long way in the past few years. He is much more responsive and is the go to person on the day-to-day issues. The Councilor noted he has worked with Mr. Cole while on the P&D Committee and that they relied on him a great deal. He would look forward to his next two years in this position. He also congratulated the Mayor on her choices for the staff who surrounds her. **Councilor Verga** found it easy to work with Mr. Cole. **Councilor Whynott** also endorsed Mr. Cole's reappointment. **Councilor LeBlanc** expressed he would look forward to working with him and Mr. Hale in the next two years. **Councilor Theken** knew Mr. Cole did a remarkable job with the cemeteries, the beaches, the parks in the summer, utilizing not only his regular crew but also his seasonal workers. He was a creative person, always looking for ways to make the process work well.

She expressed her thanks not only to Mr. Cole, but the entire management team who are respectful, extremely helpful and work hard for the City.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whycott, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to reappoint Mark Cole as the Assistant Director of Public Works, TTE 02/14/14.**

Assessor

Gary Johnstone

02/14/15

**Councilor Ciolino** stated each time he calls the Assessor's office, he solves many problems. He did a "terrific" job. He believed constituents feel they run a fair office. **Councilor Verga** acknowledging there is much that goes on in the Assessors office expressed his appreciation of their work. **Councilor LeBlanc** also added his endorsement. **Councilor Theken** appreciated that Mr. Johnstone patiently explains some of the more complicated issues to citizens regarding their home assessments and other matters related to his office like the CPA assessment. She appreciated his good work. **Mr. Johnstone** stated the Assessors Office views that they are there to support and educate.

**MOTION: On motion by Councilor LeBlanc, seconded by Councilor Whycott, the Ordinances & Administration Committee voted 3 in favor, 0 opposed to recommend to the City Council to reappoint Gary Johnstone as Assessor, TTE 02/14/15.**

City Engineer  
HarbormasterPaul Keene  
James Caulkett02/14/13 (TBC 02/06/12)  
02/14/15 (TBC 02/06/12)

**The Committee recessed at 6:50 p.m. The Mayor left the meeting at this time; and reconvened at 6:52 p.m.**

4. *CC2011-057 (Curcuru) Amend GZO Sec. 22-287 (Disabled veteran, handicapped parking) re: Lloyd St. #5 (TBC 3/05/12)*
5. *CC2012-002 (Ciolino) Request Legislative Delegation to file legislation re: naming of Gloucester Route 128 Extension (Grant Circle to East Main Street) to a "Purple Heart Killed in Action Veteran Highway" (TBC 2/6/12)*
6. *CC2012-004 (Ciolino/Cox) Amend GZO Sec. 22-287 (Disabled veteran, handicapped parking) re: adding two (2) spaces near intersection of Middle and School Street located near the apartment building at School St. #1(TBC 3/5/12)*
7. *Letter from Mayor to Superintendent Director of North Shore Regional Vocational School District Re: Reappointment of Melissa Joy Teixeira as the City's Representative*

**Documentation placed on file; with no further action deemed necessary by the Committee on this matter.**

8. *CC2012-001 (Hardy) Review salary of the office of the Mayor as in accordance with City Charter, Article 3, Sec. 3-1(c) and amend GCO Sec. 2-54 accordingly (TBC 2/6/12)*

**A motion was made, seconded and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 8:03 p.m.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Dana C. Jorgensson**  
Clerk of Committees

**DOCUMENTS/ITEMS SUBMITTED AT MEETING: None.**