City of Salem, Massachusetts

"Know Your Rights Under the Open Meeting Law, M.G.L. c. 30A ss. 18-25 and City Ordinance Sections 2-2028 through 2-2033."

The City Council Committee on Government Services co-posted with the Committee of the Whole will met in the Council Chamber on November 17, 2021 at 6:30 P.M. for the purpose of discussing the matters(s) listed below. Notice of this meeting was posted on November 10, 2021 at 2:57 P.M.

(This meeting is being recorded)

ATTENDANCE

CTE: McCarthy

Flynn

Prosniewski

COW: Turiel

Morsillo

Riccardi

City Clerk Ilene Simmons

Matt Killen from IT

ABSENT WERE: Dibble

SUBJECT(S)

#279 Council Rules and Orders Sec. 28C

#315 Naming of Streets in Strongwater Crossing Subdivision (Osborne Hill Dr., Amanda Way, Chanelle Cir. & Strongwater Dr.)

RM - need a better system for naming streets, KIA is a good place to start

RM - Motion to approve the street names , seconded by councillor Prosniewski

CP - neighbors should have input, public safety aspect

JT - Give developers some leeway to select names to market, the people who are doing the work should have say, give some deference. City Council ultimately has naming approval authority

IS - asked for an order about the naming of streets from Councillor Morsillo. Ilene working with Beth on a form for a street naming application, was previously addressed by Ilene and others

RM yes

TF- yes

CP - yes

TH - yes

28c

MK - working with SATV actively. Made progress, down to one audio feedback issue. Confident it will be resolved in the course of the next several weeks, should be ready by January to go Hybrid.

IS - getting close to being comfortable to go hybrid. We've made strides in a short amount of time. We'll be ready to go hybrid by January

MK - special legislation runs to march, state goes back to original open meeting law requirements.

IS - Councillor Madore continued until Nov 30

IS - need to work out process for committee meetings

JT - dissapointing to see. Question on procedure, are speakers causing feedback? If that's the issue could we turn the speakers off

MK - some bounceback with audio and SATV

IS - audio video equipment is pre-covid, pre zoom, dissapointed we can't have meeting in chambers in december

PM - Matt K, can you go over the setup and mechanics of how the meetings are going to run? Will there be recordings?

MK - if the meetings are hybrid they will be recorded as they are now, audio is complicated due to audio bounceback, picking up audio from equipment, feeding into device.

PM - how does video work?

MK - entire zoom screen will be piped out via HDMI to displays . . Satv and overhead tv

PM - what are people seeing at home?

MK - room will be a brady bunch box, camera will grab that box

MK - trying to preserve character of room, not add too much equipment

PM - committee meetings should be hybrid, that's where work happens, if we don't get it that's a miss

MK - that's the goal, think we'll get there

PM - can't be reliant on SATV

BM - December meeting - I would prefer we're in person. What is precluding us from being in person? We could be in person under old rules. Hybrid approach works well for us. We have five councillors leaving, we should do everythign we can to be in chambers to pay tribute to the councillors who are leaving. We should try if we can

MR - confirm one question about the zoom experience. Will there still be a hybrid zoom link?

MK - yes

MR - could we update our ordinance to meet as committees in the annex where it is technologically feasible

MK - If there is flexibility about meeting locations, that opens up some doors

MK - if we can modify layout that changes things

IS - if everyone is onboard for december in person meeting, that would be wonderful,

MK - an in person meeting with cable broadcast would just be a matter of not hooking some things up

IS - focussed on council meetings first, will continue to look at setup of room

TH - layout of room - what difference will this make

MK - 3 cameras required with current layout

MK - it does open up interesting possibilities

CP - Is there any reason why we can't go back to how we were doing business before covid hit

MK - nothing in open meeting law which prevents us from meeting in person, we can deliver hybrid in January

PM - sends a bad accessibility message, we're almost there and ready to go hybrid, we're setting tax rate

PM - I'm 100% in favor at looking at the layout of the room. Physical accessibility is very poor

TF - would like to know opinion from city clerk, switching back while setting tax rate is a bad look

IS - I'm very confident that we are ready to go hybrid in January, not a big turnout from public for tax rate. We're not ready for hybrid, it wont look good for us. It's the will of council, I'll do whatever the body wants

JT - we're looking at public participation, these meetings have made possible to attend meeting wthout SATV or coming down. The accessibility has been useful, I hope we can get an in person meeting streaming on facebook. If we can be in person and stream that would be ideal

MK - we could broadcast on facebook, participants could not give testimony

BM - I would love to be in person with my colleagues. Want to be respectful of what we've accomplished over the last 18 months, what we've accomplished. Want to give respect to everyone who has served. Maybe we hold a special meeting?

BM - motion remain in committee until city clerk and IT gets back to us with their recommendation for hybrid meeting

BM - talk to council president and city clerk tomorrow

BM - Yes

Flynn - Yes

Pros - yes

TH - Yes

MK - thank you for your patience, remote participation is through the roof.. Want to make sure experience is smooth and easy

BM - Adjourn

TF - second

On the motion of C. McCarthy the meeting adjourned at 6:24P.M.

(Chairperson)