

**St. Albans City Council  
Minutes of Meeting  
Monday, July 11, 2016  
City Hall, Auditorium**

A regular meeting of the St. Albans City Council was held on Monday, July 11, 2016, at 6:30 pm in the City Hall Auditorium.

**Council Present:** Mayor, Elizabeth Gamache; Aldermen: Scott Corrigan, Chad Spooner and Jim Pelkey and Alderwoman Kate Laddison.

**Council Absent:** Alderwoman Tammi DiFranco and Alderman Tim Hawkins.

**Staff Present:** Dominic Cloud, City Manager; Chip Sawyer, Director of Planning & Development; Marty Manahan, Director of Operations & Business Development and Gary Taylor, Police Chief.

**Visitors:** See attached sign-in sheet.

1. Executive Session re: water and wastewater litigation; Hard'ack agreement; appeal of land use permit.
  - i. Motion 1: premature general public knowledge would clearly place City or person involved at a substantial disadvantage (D&V).

**A motion was made by Alderman Corrigan; seconded by Alderman Spooner to find that premature general public knowledge would clearly place City or person involved at a substantial disadvantage. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**
  - ii. Motion 2: To enter Executive Session for the purpose of discussing pending litigation, real estate development, and contract negotiations (D&V).

**A motion was made by Alderman Spooner; seconded by Alderman Corrigan to enter Executive Session at 5:30 pm for the purpose of discussing pending litigation, real estate development and contract negotiations. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**

**A motion was made by Alderman Pelkey; seconded by Alderman Spooner to exit Executive Session at 6:16 pm. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**
2. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance.

Mayor Gamache called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and led the pledge of allegiance.
3. Public Comment.

Marie Bessette, a resident of North Elm Street introduced herself. She expressed concern over the excess speeding on her street and wondered if speed bumps could be put installed. After speaking with Chief Taylor, she explained that he recommended installing divets and asked that she bring her concern to the Public Safety Committee. Ms. Bessette stated that there are families with young children living on North Elm Street in addition to a daycare. She added that she would also like to see speed bumps between Lake Street and LaSalle Street and between LaSalle Street and Pearl Street.
4. Second reading and public hearing regarding greenbelt ordinance and sidewalk ordinance.
  - a. City Manager response to request for additional research at June meeting.

Mr. Cloud noted that at the last meeting, council asked staff to take another look at the greenbelt ordinance. The primary objective has been to evaluate if there was a way to allow temporary or occasional parking in the greenbelt without first receiving permission and particularly when no damage is caused. Mr. Cloud explained that the following challenges were encountered:

- Allowing temporary or occasional parking in the greenbelt weakens the current regulatory framework which prohibits parking in the greenbelt.
- Staff couldn't figure out how to clearly and objectively define temporary? Not more than once? Less than an hour? And how staff would efficiently enforce this? Every ticket would have to demonstrate a time period or that it was multiple infractions. The City doesn't currently have the resources allocated to this program for that level of enforcement nor does it seem a prudent use of City resources.
- In some areas and in certain times of the year, significant damage can occur after one event. With the objective of the ordinance being to prevent damage by prohibiting the acts, it didn't seem that permitting the action but prohibiting the damage that would likely occur would be the right course.

Mr. Cloud explained that for all of these reasons, staff does not believe it is possible to amend the ordinance in this manner without substantially weakening the objectives which led to the creation of the ordinance. Rather, staff believes greenbelt parking enforcement is best approached similar to other municipal ordinances where staff focuses its resources on the most egregious violators but allow the ordinance to remain clear and objective. In addition, staff plans to follow the one warning per license plate per year protocol for greenbelt violators similar to Main Street.

b. Council discussion.

Mr. Spooner asked Mr. Cloud if a vehicle parked only 6" on the greenbelt would get a warning. Mr. Cloud stated that the primary personnel enforcing this ordinance will be the Parking Enforcement Officer which will be a better use of the Police force's time and will help achieve better consistency. Mr. Spooner asked if staff will work with property owners that have put substantial investments in their greenbelts to come up with a resolution and noted two on the corner of Edward Street and Lake Street that were paved. Mr. Cloud responded that Mr. Sawyer will be discussing some necessary by-laws amendments that will make it easier for folks to create parking on their property and staff will work with everyone that is currently using the greenbelt for parking to find alternative parking options. Mr. Cloud added that the trigger won't be substantial investment but will be parking in the greenbelt. Mr. Spooner expressed that he believes this ordinance is a no brainer as long as enforcement is done at a slow pace and makes sense to improve residential areas with the major investments being made in the Downtown and throughout the City.

Ms. Laddison asked how the one warning per license plate initiative has been working in the Downtown on Main Street. Chief Taylor responded that he hasn't heard any complaints but has received a handful of compliments and believes it is working quite effectively. Mayor Gamache asked if there are a lot of repeat offenders. Chief Taylor responded negatively.

Mr. Sawyer stated that he believes people will begin changing their behavior with the rollout of the ordinance. Mr. Spooner stated that he also thinks it will help curb speeding because more vehicles will be parking on the street. Mr. Corrigan stated that he disagrees because he witnessed a State Trooper traveling through that stretch at 40 mph. Mr. Corrigan stated that he too aspires to have a beautiful neighborhood and appreciates the effort staff has put in but at this time, doesn't believe its Council's right to tell property owners what to do with their property.

Mr. Pelkey shared Mr. Corrigan's concerns and expressed that he believes there could be some potential litigation over an ordinance like this. He is not opposed to keeping vehicles off of the greenbelt so long as alternative parking is available. He expressed that his wife and others he has spoken to are concerned not so much about prohibiting parked vehicles on the greenbelt but concerned with what you can and cannot do to the greenbelt without first asking for permission. He gave the example of not being allowed to plant a tree in the greenbelt.

Chief Taylor stated that some of the issues will be self-corrected as new curbs are installed. He believes that the City Manager's approach is thoughtful and tactful. Mayor Gamache stated that she has heard from both sides and has heard more on the side of seeking to improve the sense of quality of life in the City's neighborhoods and creating a sense of safety and security. She believes cleaning up the greenbelts will help invite interest in living in the City's neighborhoods. She agreed that it's a change but believes the approach is thoughtful in a way that staff is willing to work with property owners to find solutions. She expressed support in the proposed ordinance and believes it's a good plan to move forward. She suspects that after a certain point in the transition, results will be apparent.

Mr. Spooner stated that Brown Avenue is one of the streets that had several apartment buildings that used greenbelts for parking and noted how great the street looks now that the tenants are parking in driveways.

Mr. Cloud spoke on the notion that the City is taking land from property owners. He stated that this is a dense community and the greenbelts are land that is encumbered on the top by the City's public right of way. He believes it's reasonable to ask for permission to plant something in the right of way which can impact vehicle and pedestrian traffic. Mr. Cloud stated that you can do an awful lot of things on the greenbelt, you just can't park on it and you can park on it temporarily with permission. He doesn't believe those who have the mindset that the land is being taken, have done their research. Mr. Sawyer added that it's not just the City that has property rights to the greenbelt and explained that the utilities are able to prune trees under the surface line. He stated that the portion of the ordinance that speaks to getting permission before planting in the greenbelts is not a new change and is the way things have always been.

5. Consider adoption of greenbelt and sidewalk ordinance (D&V).

**A motion was made by Alderman Spooner; seconded by Alderman Laddison to adopt greenbelt and sidewalk ordinance. Vote was 3-2 with Aldermen Pelkey and Corrigan opposed. Motion did not pass.**

6. First reading: ordinance related to Land Development Regulations for driveways.

a. Overview, Chip Sawyer.

Mr. Sawyer stated that these amendments to the Land Development Regulations have been proposed in light of properties that have been historically constrained in terms of how many vehicles that can fit there under the City's rules. The issue came up during the discussion of greenbelts and finding other locations for residents to park. There are a lot of properties in the City that are very dense and the density is only really becoming an issue now that households own more vehicles than they used to. Rules exist about where parking can be placed on a lot which mostly has to do with making sure things look orderly, maintaining the character of neighborhoods and making sure that the front entrance to a home is one of the primary characteristics of the neighborhood with vehicles to the side or behind the home. The rules also avoid nuisances with neighbors by not allowing parking right on a side property line. Mr. Sawyer added that there are however, plenty of neighborhoods where these things already exist and are grandfathered and the City doesn't hear many complaints about it.

Staff designed a situation where if you have a historically constrained lot and don't have 2 parking spaces for a single family home or 4 for a duplex, it would allow parking in the side set back and if there is no space there, it would allow for parking in the front set back. In the interest of finding other places for people to park their vehicles off-street and addressing the viability of the property, staff drafted an ordinance, approved by the Planning Commission. Corner lots are in the crosshairs of this change because they have two front setbacks and many of these lots were not laid out with ample room on the back or side to tuck in the vehicles. Mr. Sawyer explained that the handout also

talks about some of the principles that the City is trying to follow and there is a lot in the proposal to make sure someone doesn't game the system and ensures that someone can't convert a single family home into a duplex knowing that they can obtain additional parking. He explained that a date would be set at the time the proposal was passed that would only allow property owners to add parking based on what their situation is right now. The proposal also has controls so a property owner can't build a shed next to their house in the hopes of getting permission to park in the side setback.

Mr. Sawyer noted page 4 of the handout and explains that staff had to better define what a driveway is. A distinction was drawn between a single family home and a duplex and all of the other uses of the City because site plan review is required for anyone that owns a triplex or greater. For single family homes and duplexes, the whole parking area is considered a driveway. A driveway is now defined as a private road providing access to a street or highway and including any off-street parking located on a residential lot used as a single-family residential dwelling unit or as a two-family residential dwelling unit. A garage or other parking structure is not considered part of a driveway.

In Section 509 – Location of Driveways, a lot of language has been stricken out and relocated to a new section. In Section 515.1 – General Requirements, “or otherwise exempt by these regulations” was added as new language. Mr. Sawyer stated that Section 515.8 – Driveways and Curb Cuts, is a brand new section. The Planning Commission put a premium on making sure this sort of allowance would only be applied to the constrained lots in the City. There are design standards for driveways making sure there is ample room to park; the 18 foot rule. It keeps the limit of the widest a driveway can be to 20 feet which is the access portion of a driveway. Mr. Sawyer stated that Item C allows for more than one curb cut on a property if that's necessary to make this work for a constrained property. Item C.2. states that the property does not currently have adequate space to accommodate two (2) parking spaces for a single family home or four (4) spaces for a duplex and is really indicative of the sorts of lots staff is speaking of. Mr. Sawyer commented that there are duplex lots in the City now that have less than 4 spaces and single family homes that only have 1 space that can fit under the current rules. Similarly, there are duplexes in the City that have no driveway at all and would be given some options with these proposed changes. Items D, E & F are preexisting language that was moved to this new section. Item G is the item that has always said you cannot have parking in required setback areas.

Mr. Sawyer explained that under Section G.2., an applicant would come to the Permitting Administrator, and at the time of the application, the property is permitted or legal non-conforming. The properties in question don't have space for 2 vehicles for a single-family home or space for 4 vehicles for a duplex. The applicant is not proposing any more than 2 spaces for a single-family home or 4 spaces for a duplex. There is not room to expand the existing driveway that wouldn't involve the demolition of any structure that existed at the time the rules were adopted. Mr. Sawyer explained that there is a hardship test; the Planning Commission wanted to be able to keep existing structures and not have to demolish something to create room for a driveway. The result in parking cannot be more than 2 if the property in question was a single-family home at the time these rules were passed.

Mr. Sawyer referenced Article 6, Section 604 – Waivers and explained that the DRB may waive setback requirements if any district for single story attached garages, decks, porches, and/or accessory structures up to 50% in cases where conditions exist which affect the ability to otherwise meet setback requirements. Mr. Sawyer explained that the DRB is allowed to give waivers for other issues and would only require a sketch of the property as opposed to a full site plan. Mr. Sawyer

stated that the rules are written in an aspirational fashion and explained that not every City lot looks like a “classic” lot. These proposed rules would serve the public good making it less likely that people will park vehicles in the greenbelt or load up on-street parking.

b. Council Discussion.

Mr. Pelkey noted the 18 foot minimum for a driveway and stated that he believes there are some driveways in the upper part of the City that didn’t meet that. Mr. Sawyer responded that they would be grandfathered. Mr. Sawyer explained that the rule about the length of driveway outside of a garage came about because of a property that was approved on a corner lot whose driveway leading up to the garage was so short that if a vehicle parked there, it would block the sidewalk. The 18 feet is reflective of the size of a car and any driveway that is not that long would be grandfathered. Mr. Pelkey noted that this proposal pertains to single-family and duplexes and asked about properties that are larger than a duplex. Mr. Sawyer responded that part of that has to do with the fact that right now in the City, development of a single family home or duplex does not need to go before site plan review with the DRB. If a property owner is doing anything with a tri-plex or larger, they would have to update their site plan and come before the DRB. Mr. Pelkey noted the neighbors across the street from him that live in a four-plex on Hoyt Street that park in their very small front lawn in the winter. Mr. Sawyer stated that he’s not sure staff will be able to find a fix for every situation.

c. Consider motion to advance ordinance to second reading (D&V).

**A motion was made by Alderman Corrigan; seconded by Alderman Spooner to advance ordinance to second reading. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**

7. Public hearing for City Police Dept. application for a Vermont JAG allocation.

Mr. Sawyer stated that the JAG allocation is an annual allocation that the Police Department has been receiving. The grant is Federal money that passes through the State and spent on equipment. This year, the Police Department is asking for a video system and a climate control radio enclosure which is typical of what the money is spent on every year. Mayor Gamache asked what a climate control radio enclosure is. Chief Taylor responded that it’s a climate controlled equipment box that will sit in a repeat tower site in Highgate. Mr. Spooner asked what the WatchGuard Video System is for. Chief Taylor responded that it’s the in-car video recording system. Ms. Laddison asked if the grant money would allow for the purchase of an additional system. Chief Taylor responded that it will replace one that is unserviceable.

8. First reading: an ordinance related to archery.

a. Overview, Chief Taylor.

Chief Taylor stated that he was asked by the City Manager to do some research because some recent problems related to archery have been identified. He explained that he looked at similar ordinances in different communities across the country and came up with the following ordinance:

*Bow and Arrows, Crossbows and other Bow Projected Devices*

*No person shall shoot, fire, or otherwise discharge any arrow or projectile through the use of a bow or other device within City limits, except when done in lawful defense of the person, property or family.*

*This prohibition does not apply to archery activities sponsored, supervised, and sanctioned by a school and conducted on property owned by the school, or at a privately owned, enclosed archery shooting gallery or ranged permitted and licensed in accordance with state law and in full compliance with City zoning and permitting regulations.*

b. Council discussion.

Mr. Spooner noted that the ordinance doesn't speak to the difference between compounds, recurves or long bows, doesn't speak about property owners with long back yards having the ability to shoot at a downward angle, the distance of shooting or size or length of the property. He doesn't see the sense in regulating property owners' backyards and enforcing the issue because of something that one person did. He believes that the person should be taken care of without punishing everyone else. Mr. Corrigan stated that the Police have tried to address the problem but the person in question refuses to stop and the Police have no recourse without an ordinance. Mr. Corrigan stated that his concern was primarily in the high density residential district. Mr. Spooner asked Chief Taylor if this is the first incident regarding archery that he's had to deal with. Chief Taylor stated that it is and is a persistent issue. Mayor Gamache asked where this is occurring. Mr. Corrigan responded that it's happening on High Street and the person in question shoots from the edge of the sidewalk. Mr. Spooner asked if there's any other way to stop this guy. Chief Taylor responded that the rules cannot be enforced on some and not all. He added that there is an ordinance in place that prohibits firing arrows over roadways or parks.

Mr. Pelkey asked if an ordinance exists that prohibits discharging a firearm in the City. Chief responded that he would have to check and stated that you cannot discharge a firearm in a park or public area. Mr. Corrigan expressed that he doesn't like the idea of taking rights away from anyone but stated that this is a dangerous activity. Mayor Gamache asked Chief Taylor if having an archery ordinance is typical of other communities. Chief responded that it's not widespread and has been vehemently opposed in many other communities where it's been presented.

Ms. Bessette noted that several years ago, an arrow landed on the roof of her mother's house in the City. Chief noted that there should be additional concerns regarding crossbows with the legalization of crossbows through Vermont Fish and Game.

c. Consider motion to advance ordinance to second reading (D&V).

**A motion was made by Alderman Corrigan; seconded by Alderman Pelkey to advance ordinance to second reading.** Mr. Spooner stated that he would like to see the type of arrow/bow added to the language and believes zoning archery out entirely is punishing a lot of people for one person's actions. Mayor Gamache agreed but wasn't sure how to further define what is and isn't acceptable. Chief stated that killer arrows which are designed to kill large game would be the type of arrow he'd suggest prohibiting. Ms. Laddison asked if it's just target practice, is it life threatening. Mr. Spooner stated that the person in question has posted on social media that he's shooting at 90 yards and is very irresponsible. Mr. Corrigan welcomed any other ideas and believes it's a total lack of commonsense. **Motion carried, 4-1 with Alderman Spooner opposed.**

9. First reading: an ordinance related to commercial building inspection.

a. Overview, Chief Taylor.

Chief Taylor stated that the department assigned a new MOU with the Division of Fire Safety for the State of Vermont and trying to find a one-stop shop that is more convenient for the inspection program and rental registry. Chief Taylor stated that it's a new agreement that the Department will be taking on to conduct building inspections in the City for existing construction. He added that the State doesn't conduct commercial inspections unless it's a change of use or a new construction. The department would require that commercial space be inspected every 2 years because of its high traffic by nature. Chief Taylor explained that they tried to set the fee consistent with what would be charged to a rental property.

Chief Taylor stated that commercial buildings or business inspections would be assessed a fee of \$125 per inspection, or \$100 per hour for large commercial and/or industrial building/facility inspections, not to exceed a maximum fee of \$500. On-going and no-break or change in use fire and

life safety inspections will be conducted every 2 years. Chief Taylor explained that it would take a lot longer to inspect a facility like Mylan, for example, opposed to the natural food store on Main Street. He added that the time of sale or change of use inspection has also been added to the ordinance. Oftentimes, the sale of a property will require an inspection and wanted to make sure that was covered in the ordinance.

Chief recalled that the council recently adopted a liquor ordinance that requires inspections. He explained that it would be unfair to treat a property owner differently and not charge them for an inspection because they are a liquor establishment and therefore set the annual fee for inspections of licensed first class liquor establishments at \$75. Chief Taylor asked for further clarification from council; he stated that it would appear in the liquor ordinance that an inspection is required before the issuance of a liquor license and asked if that was the intent. Mayor Gamache responded affirmatively.

- b. Council discussion.  
No council discussion took place.
- c. Consider motion to advance ordinance to second reading (D&V).  
**A motion was made by Alderman Pelkey; seconded by Alderman Spooner to advance ordinance to second reading. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**

10. City Manager Report.

- a. Notice of changes in dispatch budget.  
Mr. Cloud explained that on June 28, 2016, after passing the budget, staff received a letter from the Grand Isle County Mutual Aid Association notifying the City that they no longer want the City to be their dispatch provider. Mr. Cloud stated that the result is an \$87,000 hit on the \$800,000 budget. The City will have to respond to that with some impacts on personnel and capital to the extent that those choices involve policy discussion and substantial changes in service and will circle back to council. Mr. Cloud stated that he will be talking with union employees about some of the ideas he's been discussing with the Chief. Mayor Gamache asked what alternative they chose. Mr. Cloud responded that they decided to go with the Town of Shelburne which is an E-911 provider like the City. Shelburne has a different fee structure based on calls per service which makes it very difficult to plan a budget. Mr. Cloud stated that it is possible they will return to the City of St. Albans in future years but at this point are comfortable having emergency responders talk to someone in Shelburne. Mr. Sawyer added that the decision boiled down to price; not the product or service.

Mr. Spooner asked if moving forward, the City would have an annual contract due months prior to the start date so this doesn't happen again after the budget's been made. Mr. Cloud responded affirmatively; for many years the City was the only game in town that could offer a competitive product and that has changed with some technological advances and grants that are available. Mr. Cloud asked Chief Taylor how many agencies the City currently dispatches for. Chief Taylor responded with 38. Mr. Cloud stated that the City hadn't heard any signs of discontent. The benchmark that the City's always measured with is whether we could do it cheaper for ourselves.

- b. Consider authorization of appeal of land use permit (D&V).  
Mr. Cloud stated that there is a new development at 91-93 Messenger Street that staff has concerns with regarding their land use permit. Staff is in active discussions with the property owner and developer to try and find a solution but in the event that does not happen, staff is asking for an authorization of an appeal against the Permitting Administrator's decision.

**A motion was made by Alderman Pelkey; seconded by Alderman Spooner to authorize appeal of land use permit. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**

Mr. Pelkey asked to revisit greenbelt ordinance. He stated that he didn't recall asking the public for their input. He added that one of his big oppositions to the ordinance is Section 4356. Mr. Pelkey stated that he is in favor of vehicles not being allowed to park on the greenbelt but does not agree with the section that prohibits a person from doing landscaping or altering the greenbelt without written permission. Mayor Gamache stated that she did ask for public comment and unless there's been a procedural error, the hearing is closed.

11. Consider Approval of Minutes: Reg. Mtg. 6/13/16 (D&V):

**A motion was made by Alderman Spooner; seconded by Alderman Corrigan to approve 6/13/16 meeting minutes. Motion carried, 4-0 with Alderwoman Laddison abstaining.**

12. Consider Approval of Warrants: 6/24/16 & 6/30/16 (D&V).

**A motion was made by Alderman Spooner; seconded by Alderman Pelkey to approve 6/24/16 warrant. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**

**A motion was made by Alderman Pelkey; seconded by Alderman Spooner to approve 6/30/16 warrant. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**

13. Other Business.

Mayor Gamache noted Ms. Bessette's concern brought up during public comment about the speed of traffic in the City. Mayor Gamache stated that she believes the traffic being re-routed due to construction also is having an impact on the issue of speed of vehicles in the City. She stated that she would like to hear from councilors in terms of how much excess traffic and speed they are seeing in their wards as well as hear from the City Manager to determine how much of the problem is temporary due to construction.

Mr. Spooner commented that Sawyer Street continues to be a problem; he has talked to Chief Taylor about using speed dips and is something he would like to discuss with the Public Safety Committee. He stated that they don't have to be removed in the winter and are working well in Colchester. Mr. Spooner noted that the barriers prohibiting traffic down Hudson Street have been removed and asked why Hudson Street hasn't been reopened to traffic. He believes it would alleviate a lot of traffic trying to get from the southeast portion of the City to the northwest portion of the City. Mr. Spooner added that in early May, a traffic study was done on Sawyer Street and 2300 cars traveled on that street in a one week period. The following week, a study was conducted on South Elm Street and 15,946 vehicles were counted in a one week period. He stated that everyone is avoiding the Lake Street/Federal Street intersection. Mr. Cloud noted that Hudson Street is still closed under the belief that people will park in front of City Hall and not realize they can access the front of the building. The intent was to create a pedestrian corridor. Mr. Cloud stated that staff discussed the issue this morning at a department head meeting and will work to get the Hudson Street back open to traffic and have the front of City Hall accessible to the public within a week or so.

Mr. Spooner stated that he's received a few complaints of garbage trucks backing at 5:30 am in the downtown area. He noted that he hasn't received any complaints from the neighborhoods. Mr. Cloud stated that the City has the noise ordinance but isn't the best tool for this type of issue and needs a garbage ordinance.

Mr. Spooner asked if the Sawyer Street sidewalk is still in the plans. Mr. Cloud responded that he did not know but will check with Allen Robtoy. Mr. Spooner asked if the parking ordinance on South Elm passed. Mr. Cloud responded affirmatively and stated signage will be going up this week. Mr. Spooner noted that he's received a lot of complaints about people speeding but has also seen a lot of people pulled

over by officers which is helpful. Ms. Bessette noted that it's especially happening in the evenings. Mr. Spooner stated that during the one week traffic study, he witnessed 5 cars going over 65 mph. Ms. Laddison noted similar complaints on Upper Welden Street and is experiencing more traffic due to the rerouting of vehicles. She stated that there were a couple of days where the City Police sat and watched for speeding vehicles but it was on a Sunday afternoon and asked if it could occur during weekday afternoons and during the busier commute time in the mornings.

Mr. Pelkey asked if the right turn only sign was removed from the top of Kingman Street. Mr. Cloud responded negatively. Mr. Pelkey noted that vehicles are turning both directions at that location. He also noted an increased volume of traffic on Hoyt Street and vehicles traveling the wrong way down Hoyt Street.

Mayor Gamache asked Mr. Cloud what his thoughts are on temporary vs. ongoing concerns. Mr. Cloud responded that he thinks staff should take a pulse from Public Works and do a pilot on dips. He believes the traffic on South Elm is due to people avoiding Lake and Federal Street which is a big problem because construction will be taking place there next year as well with the Federal Street project. On a positive side, a lot of that construction will be on Market Street and won't have nearly the impact and won't take up the whole roadway. Mr. Cloud stated that council may wish to consider preventing right turns onto Welden Street if they really want to stop traffic from traveling down Elm Street and not spilling over to Edward and Russell Street. Similarly, council might want to consider preventing right turns out of Mylan and Immigration. Mr. Cloud stated that he doesn't suggest doing that now and would recommend waiting until this round of construction is over and starting the practice in the winter. He stated that staff can also do more traffic enforcement in targeted areas. He added that the Police are issuing an awful lot of warnings vs. tickets and are currently 3 officers down. Ms. Laddison wondered if the Police could change their patrol route. She noted that she sees officers on her street but it seems they are using the street to get somewhere else vs. doing a slow roll through the neighborhood. Mr. Pelkey noted the parked South Burlington cruiser on Lower Welden Street and asked if it's a decoy. Mr. Spooner responded that it belongs to a resident.

Mr. Spooner stated that the police are very proactive about engaging with people in the community and noted an officer who stopped to play basketball with a kid on Cedar Street. Ms. Laddison noted a traffic stop recently where she witnessed an officer showing children how the radar gun worked. Mr. Pelkey stated that the City can take a lot of pride in its police force. Mr. Spooner stated that he has heard good things about the tickets given out for creemees.

Mr. Sawyer recalled that council gave the new St. Albans Community Arts Committee (SACA) the job of brainstorming some public art possibilities in the City. One area would cover the walkway between Twiggs and Eaton's but would include many other areas of possibility as well. The charge was also for SACA to think through the process and the logistics and SACA would like to see if council thinks they are on the right track. SACA has been speaking with local artists and the Downtown Board about their ideas. Mr. Sawyer noted the handout and stated that the first couple of pages list potential locations for art and ideas for what the art could be with a focus on the downtown. Ideas include everything from projection screens to public painting boards to murals which in many cases are being proposed as removable panels. Mr. Sawyer stated that each one of these proposals is a great idea that would still have to go through more iterations and be given more thought allowing artist to be involved. He added that this is the first shot at coming up with all of the opportunities and ideas that are possible.

Mr. Sawyer explained that the next section of the handout includes photos of areas in the downtown with photo shopped art showing what a mural might look like using removable panels. SACA spoke with local artist Jon Young about the price of these panels; a 4' x 4' panel would cost \$57, a 6' x 6' panel would cost \$108 and the artist's time would cost anywhere from \$200 - \$300.

The following pages of the handout show the process of what SACA thinks the public art installation process would have to go through. Mr. Sawyer stated that the DAB, Downtown Board, Council and Parks Commission would have to be involved depending on where the art would be installed. Mr. Sawyer stated that the next step would be to work more with staff and eventually property owners and create a prioritization process to determine where to focus first.

Mayor Gamache asked if there was a significance to the symbols on the handout. Ms. Stumpf responded that they belong to a map that wasn't printable. The double star were the first locations that she thought might be good for a pilot project to see how the art would weather throughout the winter. Ms. Stumpf explained that there are 3 locations for murals and the possibility of an art wall in Taylor Park. Mayor Gamache asked if the art wall would allow anyone to paint. Ms. Stumpf responded affirmatively. Mayor Gamache stated that she is intrigued and likes the notion of having movable panels. As this moves forward, Mayor Gamache stated that she believes it will be important to make sure there are opportunities for artists to bid and participate in the program and believes quality is also important. She stated that she could see this distinguishing the City if it takes off and believes getting it right from the beginning is important.

Ms. Stumpf stated that she has put a call out to all artists to help create a concept and the first step would be to pull in as many sketches as possible to get a feel for the different options available and part of that would be a discussion with the building owner and allowing them different options to choose from while being vetted by at least a 3 person panel. Ms. Laddison asked Ms. Stumpf if she's thinking she would like to use local artists only. Ms. Stumpf responded that the call has been put out to artists located throughout Vermont.

Mr. Spooner stated that he'd like to see something underneath each piece of art explaining the art and/or the artist. He also gave kudos to Twiggs who has chalk available for children to draw on the sidewalk. Ms. Stumpf added that the idea of making the pieces of art semi-permanent is to be able to preserve the historic buildings and hoping to put in masonry studs to easily swap out art. Mr. Spooner asked what the artists would paint on. Ms. Stumpf responded that Jon Young recommended Masonite because it is light weight and will hold up well throughout the winter.

Ms. Laddison commented that she believes this idea makes great sense to have this start in the park and believes it could be a great transition into the neighborhoods. Ms. Stumpf stated that these can definitely move from park to park. She added that another idea is story boards which creates an event for people to visit the downtown and participate and is a great way to tie in all of the generations. Mayor Gamache thanked Ms. Stumpf for her work and asked what can be expected next. Mr. Cloud stated that it's a mid-course opportunity for council to weigh in and staff will work to refine the idea.

14. Adjourn.  
**A motion was made by Alderman Pelkey; seconded by Alderman Spooner to adjourn meeting at 8:01 pm. Vote was unanimous, 5-0.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Kristen Smith  
Community Relations Coordinator