



Public Safety & Transportation Committee Report

City of Newton **In City Council**

Wednesday, October 4, 2023

Present: Councilors Downs (Chair), Markiewicz, Lipof, Oliver, Lucas, Malakie, Bowman, and Grossman

Also present: Councilors Baker, Albright, and Kelley

City staff: Sergeant Michael Wade, Captain Damien Doucette, Newton Police Department; Chief Greg Gentile and Assistant Chief Michael Bianchi, Newton Fire Department; Jim McGonagle, Commissioner of Public Works; Jonah Temple, Assistant City Solicitor; Hattie Kerwin Derrick, Director of Community Engagement and Inclusion; Jini Fairley, ADA Coordinator, Scott Matthews, Assistant City Clerk and Cassidy Flynn, Deputy City Clerk

Others present: Jeremy Freudberg and NewTV

For more information regarding this meeting, a video recording can be found at the following link:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NrWkr4B6S3g&list=PLqJiDbsvfNjVWX8R9k0Ox5M_0URb-jS39

#148-23 Discussion regarding the security measures and any incidents during the 2023 Boston Marathon

COUNCILORS LUCAS, NORTON, LIPOF, MALAKIE, NOEL, WRIGHT, BOWMAN AND OLIVER requesting a discussion with the Chief of Police on security measures taken for the Boston Marathon, not limited to but including personnel hours and equipment used by the Police Department. Also requesting updates on any incidents, disturbances, interrogations, calls to dispatch, and/or arrests along the marathon route on April 17th.

Public Safety & Transportation Held 8-0 on 06/21/23

Action: Public Safety & Transportation voted No Action Necessary 7-0, Councilor Oliver not voting

Note: Ms. Kerwin Derrick joined the Committee.

Chair Downs stated that this Committee had a discussion on June 21, 2023, deciding to leave the issue with the Human Rights Commission, the Mayor, and Chief Carmichael to work with the running clubs and come back with a report on what next steps might be.

Ms. Kerwin Derrick provided the Committee a brief update on how the matter stands. She stated that the Human Rights Commission and the Mayor's office met with the three running groups and the BAA; it was a very productive conversation and one of many conversations that will happen before next April. On the table was a question of a "fun run," as well as other projects. It was clear that the running clubs were not interested in a "fun run." They felt it would be performative and not something in which they would like to participate. We're respecting that. One request they had was that the Mayor join them next year on Heartbreak Hill. We agreed to that request. Much of what needs to be discussed is between the running clubs and the BAA, and the city will be invited to participate. It is necessary to ensure that the same security measures happen in all communities involved.

Committee members comments, questions, and answers:

When is the next meeting scheduled? Ms. Kerwin Derrick answered that we are waiting to be invited. We were invited to this meeting by the BAA and the running clubs. There is a lot that needs to be worked out.

Who from the city attended this meeting? Ms. Kerwin Derrick answered herself, Mayor Fuller, Chief Carmichael and Superintendent McMains attended and met with the three running groups, the BAA, BAA operations person and BAA community engagement person.

Please continue the dialogue with the running groups and the BAA and thank you to the Mayors office, Police Department, Human Rights Commission, and the BAA for taking this issue seriously.

Without further discussion, Councilor Lucas made a motion to vote no action necessary. Committee members agreed 7-0, Councilor Oliver not voting.

#319-23 Petition request to repeal overnight winter parking ban

JEREMY FREUDBERG, ET AL., Petition to amend Motor Vehicles and Traffic Ordinance Chapter 19 Sec-174 (b) of the City of Newton Ordinances. To be amended by deletion of "(b) Other vehicles: From December 1st through March 31st, it shall be unlawful for any vehicle, other than one acting in an emergency, to be parked on any street, way, highway, road parkway, or private way dedicated or open to the use of the public for a period of time longer than one hour between the hours of 2:00 am and 6:00 am" as appearing in Sec. 19-174 in the Revised Ordinances of 2017 as amended. (30 Days: 11/01/2023)

Action: Public Safety & Transportation Motion to Approve Failed 0-7, Councilor Bowman not voting.

Note: Attorney Temple, Commissioner McGonagle, Captain Doucette, Ms. Fairley, Councilors Baker, Albright, Kelley and Mr. Freudberg, petitioner joined the Committee.

Chair Downs asked Attorney Temple to explain the Committee's legal options and deadlines under the City Charter.

Mr. Temple explained that the City Council must act within 30 days of the signatures having been certified. He did not have the date available [Nov. 1, according to the City Clerk's 9/29 memo] but stated that we're at the very beginning of the 30 days. Your options tonight, include the following: 1) To approve the initiative petition, 2) to reject the petition or 3) to approve an amendment or change to the overnight winter parking ban without repealing it entirely. If the Committee chooses option 3, that will be deemed a denial under the City Charter, and will allow the initiative petitioners to seek the 5% additional signatures needed to put the matter directly to the voters. They have 40 days. If they meet that deadline, then the petition will automatically go on the next regular municipal ballot in 2025.

Committee members questions and answers:

What is the final number 5% representing? Attorney Temple answered initially they needed to get the signatures of 10% of all registered voters, approximately 5000. To put a binding resolution like this on the ballot, they will need to get an additional 5% of all registered voters' signatures, or approximately 2500 [total of approx. 7,500 voter signatures].

If we take no action, in the next 30 days, this will go into effect? Attorney Temple answered if you take no action that's deemed a denial, it will not go into effect. If no action is taken within 30 days, then that will allow the supplemental signatures to be collected.

Mr. Freudberg, petitioner, stated that this summer, he took the initiative to bring forward this petition and hopefully, a ballot question to repeal the overnight winter parking ban. Many people perceive this to be very inequitable, difficult, and contrary to certain values, etc. We did collect enough signatures for the initial petition that was 10% of registered voters. I turned in over 6000 signatures and approximately 5500 were verified. We do intend to hit the next target. I did have many conversations with people, some of whom were skeptical. I learned that for a lot of people we have this overnight winter parking ban, which doesn't have a whole lot to do with winter. We know it's wrong and unjust laws shouldn't stand. We were trying to solve the problems that the current overnight winter parking ban does not solve beyond winter, this is not the tool that we would use which was one of the key takeaways I heard. I also heard that for a lot of people this is a major burden. The overnight winter parking ban does create hardships and a certain barrier. I'm glad that we're at this point where we have data and significant representation of how a good subset of Newton voters feel. We know that not every resident follows municipal issues.

One of the big reasons to consider repealing the overnight winter parking ban is that people sort of pay for this policy with their time, whether that's shuffling their cars or moving out to a

place that's less convenient. I think time is a very precious commodity. If there's some way that we can give people back their time, we should consider it. The case on safety has been proven. I've heard that the overnight winter parking ban actually decreases the cost of housing. Maybe that's true, but I don't think it's right to sort of subsidize other people's rent with other people's time. We should all be on an equal playing field.

Most people I talked with had driveways or sufficient parking. For them, it wasn't even about the hardship of lack of parking, but the overnight winter parking ban is a barrier for them to get together with friends and family who want to drive to visit and need a place to park. We want people to gather without unnecessary policies. There might be certain issues in certain places. In Traffic Council, we can craft a particular solution to a certain neighborhood where we can accommodate neighborhood desires, aesthetics, and safety. I don't see how a citywide policy is really the right tool for anything.

Committee members comments, concerns, questions, and answers:

With the additional 5% signatures, can the signatures be from the same voters or must they be new signatures? Attorney Temple answered that they must be different signatures for a total of 15%. Individuals who signed the initial petition cannot sign the supplemental petition. In total, you're collecting signatures of 15% of registered voters.

Is there a deadline for collecting the additional 5% signatures? Attorney Temple answered yes, 45 days from the date that City Council acts.

Is this initiative petition binding? Attorney Temple answered yes, it will be a binding ballot question. If the voters vote to repeal it, it is repealed.

If we approve the measure, is the overnight winter parking ban eliminated? Attorney Temple answered it will go to the mayor for signature or potential veto as any other measure.

If Council agrees with this petition and repeals the ordinance and/or if it is placed on a ballot and the ordinance is repealed, for what period of time is it repealed? No laws are permanent. Would other related laws be impacted? If instead we institute a citywide permit program, how would passage be interpreted in either event? Attorney Temple answered that in terms of its impact on other ordinances and regulations of the city, we'd review them one by one. I recommend that all other ordinances that work in conjunction with this one be amended to be consistent with it. I'm not sure if there are any ordinances that would need to be amended. We would read, interpret, and apply those ordinances to be consistent with the overnight winter parking ban no longer existing.

If the item were repealed by virtue of a ballot process is that an indefinite repeal? Attorney Temple answered that it is an immediate repeal after the election. We did look at the question of is there a certain two-year waiting period or any period of time before the Council could reenact the same ordinance again. There is no prohibition on that in theory. The Council could

turn around right after the election and recodify it. There's nothing legally prohibiting you from doing that.

Would we have the freedom of creating some other type of ordinance that maybe is not the same? Attorney Temple answered yes.

If before the ordinance initiative petition is voted on, we pass an ordinance that puts in a geographically constrained overnight winter parking ban, of perhaps a different duration because we realize there's a public safety interest in doing so, would that also be repealed by the initiative petition? Attorney Temple answered this is a tricky question. How this will come about is if the Council acts to deny the petition, and Mr. Freudberg submits the additional signatures, that locks in this measure going on the ballot in 2025. If in the interim, I would certainly recommend acting now on the ordinance or not touching it during that waiting period because it creates somewhat of an unknown. The best reading of the City Charter is that if you amend it to some other thing in the intervening two years while we wait for the election, whatever you amend it to, that's what's going to go on the ballot to be repealed.

In case of snow emergencies, if we approve lifting the overnight winter parking ban are we still able to require cars be moved off the street? Commissioner McGonagle answered that DPW definitely has that ability not only in snow events, but any weather related or emergency or utility breaks, etc. We rarely use this power, a handful of times throughout the year. For snow events, we use this power if we're expecting back-to-back snow storms. On a regular average storm, we normally don't need a parking ban. We would work with the police as we do now. Captain Doucette added that now with the overnight winter parking ban in effect, the possible number of vehicles we need to tow is limited. If we lift this ban, we're requiring everyone to get off the streets in an emergency. I see an extreme hardship on the Police Department to tow that many more vehicles. I think it makes the DPW's job significantly harder to clear the snow and we would see a significant increase in tows.

If we do a permit program allowing some people to park on a street or multiple streets overnight, would the Police Department have the capacity to enforce? Captain Doucette answered that it would probably be similar to the permit parking enforced now. It would require officers to check on certain streets to see if any given vehicle has a permit. Chair Downs added that to check permits, we would need new technology, perhaps automatic license plate readers, to enable a permit system at night in the winter.

In the past, we discussed a pilot of lifting the overnight winter parking ban in neighborhoods that are severely parking constrained and issuing permits to people who had no driveways with the understanding that they would have to move in a weather emergency. I have heard from the Police Department that in the snow and at night, patrol officers, are reluctant to get out of their cars to enforce, scrape off windshields, check permits or even check license plates. Is this correct? Captain Doucette answered that it probably would create a big hardship on the

department having every officer in their division have to get out of the car and check 50-60 cars to see if they've been issued a permit when there's a half a foot of snow.

Mr. Freudberg stated that when he drafted this petition, he was very careful to not touch other ordinances that related to snow. Chapter 19, states that the city can either ticket or tow for impeding snow or ice removal. The impeding snow removal definition is pretty broad. When you receive a ticket during a snow emergency, that's actually the ordinance that you are cited under regardless of whether your car is towed. This would still be on the table and expect that it would be something that could be used during a snowstorm.

A councilor said they would support a trial suspension of the winter overnight parking ban, if we're prepared to collect data and observe, especially during snow emergencies. I prefer an option of permitting, although it is more difficult than repealing this item and conducting a trial.

How would the petition, if passed, affect situations on a certain number of streets with only one side street parking allowed, or concerns about emergency and other vehicle access? If the opening up of on street parking year-round resulted in more cars, would the city be entitled to turn more streets into either no parking or one side parking streets? Will we have the ability to make changes on the spot, even if it is just a trial? Attorney Temple answered yes, you can continue to enact parking regulations through Traffic Council's regular process.

Were there any plowing issues during the pandemic when people were allowed to park on the street? Commissioner McGonagle answered that traffic volume was extremely low. It would not be a good indicator. It is not the reality we're facing today.

The issue I see with a trial, it's very hard in general when you give something to residents then take their rights away. If there is a problem or it doesn't work, can it be corrected? People will buy, move here, and bring cars knowing they don't have any restriction. Others will buy cars because they know that they don't have to worry about finding parking. Is a trial practical?

We've all heard that many of our initiatives that are green, mobility and zoning related, often raised the prospect of reducing car dependence and utilization, etc. People who support those initiatives, have always said if you increase parking, you will have more cars. I don't see that we can do a trial because we're counteracting these goals. If you create more parking, we will have more cars. If a trial is implemented, our parking regulations would have to be set to cover all safety issues that could arise if you allow people to leave cars on the street. Enforcement may not be viable because we only have 10-11 patrol cars during the day and 8 at night. We have approximately 100 different permutations of parking rules in the city. Enforcement, interpretation, etc. is challenging. A trial is more complex than simply repealing the ban.

If we consider and/or enact a trial, would it be necessary to go through Traffic Council first? Chair Downs answered that draft language indicates that we can do a trial with a sunset date. I think if we implement a trial, we will want to have more than one year of data.

I see our responsibility as enacting a policy for the city that makes the most sense. I understand we don't have a permit solution before us. The simple question of repealing this particular ordinance, I have a fundamental issue with what I see as opposing policy initiatives and goals that we are pursuing as a city, specifically, our zoning reform process and our climate action initiatives. If we're going to pursue the village zoning reform, we're going to do away with parking minimums. And we have approved very significant developments with very modest amounts of parking: in many cases, one or fewer, spaces per unit, I see it as in the complete opposite direction and goal of what we're being asked to consider in potentially repealing the ordinance. We do see people renting and buying who want fundamental change in our parking policy to allow more parking on our streets. We constantly discuss how to reduce our dependency on cars, the number of cars we drive, how we get around and looking to fundamentally change it. I see this as a complete 180 to that policy.

A trial may not be best and may be problematic because we may potentially have to change it.

I am not in favor of lifting this overnight winter parking ban permanently or temporarily because it is a complex issue. The solution sounds simple, but it is not. This isn't just about snow removal. This policy has become part of the fabric around which the Council we've been making decisions. If we think about the different myriad of problems that we've seen in emails, some of them are very compelling. I believe some of these issues we can and should solve. I don't believe this particular approach is the right one. It's going to cause at least as many problems as it solves. I believe people are going to park on our streets and leave their cars, which is going to cause other problems. It's not going to solve the problem for people who want to be able to park in front of their homes.

Councilor Oliver offered to work with Mr. Freudberg to figure out a better way to tease these issues apart and talk about solutions to each one. There are issues that we should be solving. I don't think this is the way to do it. I will not be supportive of a permanent repeal or temporary repeal of the overnight winter parking ban.

As long as we have the overnight winter parking ban, folks will not be able to have two cars for one household. I am opposed to repealing the overnight winter parking ban and a trial. It is up to us to come up with a workable solution to for all who have and are experiencing hardship. When it comes to parking on the streets in the winter, I think that's our responsibility. I like the idea of a hardship waiver program allowing those who really need to park on the street during those four months so that we don't open the floodgates, but also at the same time, help those who need it the most.

In response to the equity argument, repealing the overnight winter parking ban would actually make Newton more expensive because we would be eliminating the low-cost way for people to get into Newton by renting or buying that has inadequate parking. We'd be making the problem worse and burdening the so called more moderate income parts of the city, which tend to be the denser parts. People seem to think if I can park in front of my house, life would be great, my

problems will be solved. The issue is that you open it up to parking and everyone else can park in front of your house, too.

It may feel unfair, but basically, everything about life is unfair to people who have less money. I'm not in favor of temporary or permanent lifting of the overnight winter parking ban. If there is a vote in two years, it will be when more people are aware of the zoning projects in the city and how lowering the parking requirements in the zoning would interact with a repeal of the overnight winter parking ban and they could take that into consideration when they vote.

Councilors comments and concerns:

Particularly concerning to properties in the city, are other communities or educational institutions having long term impacts on neighborhoods. Brookline has an overnight parking ban all year. There are areas that are close to Brookline who would be affected. I would oppose the repeal and the trial.

I have a different perception on issues, topics or realities that were raised that I would like to express if not clarify. I think my colleagues tonight said that it is proven that people are not moving into some of these developments who want to be car light. If that was said, I think our experience is the contrary of that, if particularly we look at the newer developments. Austin Street and Trio have shown where we required much more parking than is being used. There is excess parking available and the people who have moved into those units do want to be car light. I heard that there is a fear over people who live in our neighboring cities and towns, parking on our streets. Many of our abutting towns also permit parking. Why would people bother moving their cars to Newton when they can park in their own town? I think that is not likely to be a big problem. I got involved in this topic four years ago after hearing from constituents that they have a problem not being able to park and have no onsite parking. There are parts of Newton, particularly on the north side, I'm not going to disagree with this that make a blanket ban, not a simple thing. Some streets are too narrow or curvy and those are reasons why we haven't been able to come up with an easy solution. I support a trial. A trial will give us the evidence, real life experiences and data in order to adapt a better solution at the end of the two-year period. If this comes to City Council, I will vote in favor of a two-year trial.

We must keep in mind if we vote on a trial, the people who are most hurt by the overnight winter parking ban are the ones least able to afford it. It tends to be folks in rental units, north side, and smaller properties with no driveways. I'm not as concerned about people with tandem driveways who have to shuffle their cars. I'm concerned about people who just don't have a place to park. There are many single mothers having to walk a distance with children after they park. Many of the emails we received talked about those issues. I am hopeful we keep these people in mind when we vote.

Ms. Fairley stated that there are many people with disability placards/plates in the city. There is a high percentage of older and young people with mobility issues. I try to make reasonable accommodations for individuals because they have no choice because they don't have parking

and can't walk the distance to a municipal lot. I recall a resident that has such severe asthma that the parents can't even wait for the ambulance to come and take her to the hospital. They jump in their car and go. I was able to get them a residential accessible parking space. The parent asked what can they do during the overnight winter parking ban when they have to remove their car from the street? How can I save my child? I do personally ask for reasonable accommodations for each individual requiring this. I'm concerned for the approximate 25,000 older adults. I beg you to consider whether it is possible to exempt vehicles with disability placards/plates from ticketing. I suggest repealing the overnight winter parking ban and to figure out a way to recognize disability placards/plates for people parking in front of their home.

Mr. Freudberg stated that there seems to be a lot of people on this Committee who expect that as soon as we repeal the overnight winter parking ban, there'd be this proliferation of cars. The only thing that stops people from having cars, is the ban. It could be true, but we would find out through a trial. We don't have to solve things in advance if there's no proliferation of cars. It's helpful to be a bit realistic. When gathering the signatures, a common thing I heard was, this doesn't affect me I have a driveway, but I'll sign. People have the cars they need. We do have instances where someone doesn't have a parking spot and struggles all winter to park. We also have plenty of cases where a person has a driveway and they don't need a car because the city worked hard to make Newton walkable, bikeable, etc. It comes down to the idea of will the floodgates open. Probably not. To be clear, the trial is not to see does repealing the overnight winter parking ban work, it's to identify where the problem areas are. We want people to stay in Newton. If someone's circumstances change where they used to be able bodied and could walk everywhere and now they need a car that doesn't merit kicking them out.

A Councilor addressed Mr. Freudbergs comments and stated that we are being incredibly realistic in terms of talking about some of the challenges we think we're going to introduce. They may not be challenges today, but might become challenges tomorrow.

A Councilor addressed Ms. Fairley comments and stated the example is the exact center of the topic that I was alluding to when I said we need to solve the real problems, tease them apart and fix the ones we can and should be fixing.

VOTING:

Chair Downs stated that tonight, Committee members will vote to approve, reject, or make a substitute motion.

Chair Downs asked for a motion to approve the initiative petition as written. I am asking for this motion so that we can vote on it and then we can take up the other two possibilities.

Councilor Oliver made a motion to approve the initiative petition to repeal the overnight winter parking ban as written. Council members voted 0-7 to reject, Councilor Bowman not voting.

Chair Downs stated that I'm listening to colleagues and the many people who signed the petition. I fully embrace many of the goals that you have brought up. I am aware that it'll be harder to implement the bike and ped plan if we have no overnight winter parking ban, because those spaces become more precious as more people depend on them. However, we will have a binding initiative before us in two years, because that's the vote we just took. I don't think it's difficult for the group to raise the additional 1,000 signatures they say they need. I'm going to align myself with Councilor Kelley's comments that it's better to have data than not to have data. I will be supporting a two-year trial. We do have draft language available if you want to review but I don't think it's going to pass this Committee. What's the will of the Committee?

Seeing none, we can move to our second option which is to reject the petition and not have a substitute motion. I believe the cleanest way to do that is to float the idea of a trial and have that voted down by the Committee. I suggest a substitute motion to trial lifting the ban for two years, knowing that in two years it will come to a vote. The public will have an idea of what it looks like. Yes, it may be hard to "put the toothpaste back in the tube" but on the other hand, we might see that we have issues to address. Perhaps we need more time than two years for Traffic Council to get through each neighborhood to work out plans solving issues that may happen. When we talk about various issues that may happen, we're basically speculating. If we trial this, we will have two years of data. I'm going to propose the trial. I'm willing to take comments or a vote.

Councilor Downs made a motion to approve a two-year trial. This motion failed 2-5, Councilors Oliver, Lucas, Malakie, Markiewicz and Grossman opposed. Councilor Bowman not voting.

Emails received at the time of meeting:

Repeal the overnight winter parking ban = 40 emails received.

Maintain the overnight winter parking ban = 31 emails received.

Trial = 5 emails received.

Other (snow, developments, exemptions, trash, etc.) = 4 emails received.

The Committee adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andreae Downs, Chair

**Memorandum**

TO: City Council

FROM: Carol Moore, City Clerk

RE: Initiative Petition – Repeal Overnight Winter Parking Ban #319-23

DATE: October 12, 2023

I wish to provide additional information for Docket item **#319-23 Petition request to repeal overnight winter parking ban.**

#319-23 JEREMY FREUDBERG, ET AL., Petition to amend Motor Vehicles and Traffic Ordinance Chapter 19 Sec-174 (b) of the City of Newton Ordinances. To be amended by deletion of “(b) Other vehicles: From December 1st through March 31st, it shall be unlawful for any vehicle, other than one acting in an emergency, to be parked on any street, way, highway, road parkway, or private way dedicated or open to the use of the public for a period of time longer than one hour between the hours of 2:00 am and 6:00 am” as appearing in Sec. 19-174 in the Revised Ordinances of 2017 as amended. (30 Days: 11/01/2023)

This initiative petition follows the process as stated in our City Charter, Section 10. The City Clerk’s office has certified 5,485 signatures which places this item on the City Council docket for action. As a result, there is now a 30-day deadline (Sec. 10-7) for the City Council to act upon this item that ends on November 1, 2023. If there is a recommittal to committee, to meet the November 1 deadline, a special PS&T committee meeting and special city council meeting will need to be held. If Council does not act, the measure is automatically rejected, and the petitioners can move forward with the process for the initiative measure to be placed on the ballot as a binding question.

The Public Safety & Transportation committee met on October 4th. The item was not approved with a committee vote of 0-7, Councilor Bowman not voting.

The City Council may act with respect to the initiative petition by: (1) rejecting the initiative measure as recommended by the vote of PS&T; (2) passing the initiative measure without change; or (3) passing some other measure in lieu of the initiative measure. Passing some other measure, such as amending the parking ban by changing its terms or implementing a suspension/trial period, is deemed a rejection of the initiative measure under the Charter. If the Council passes the initiative measure as proposed, it will become effective 20 days after adoption. The initiative measure cannot be subject to a charter objection.

Any action or failure to act, other than passing the initiative measure, will allow the petitioners to move forward with the process to place the initiative measure to the voters as a binding ballot question at the next regularly scheduled city election. This will require the petitioners to submit additional signatures equal to at least 5% of registered voters for certification within 45 days. The next city election will be in November 2025. Based on the statutory election deadlines, as well as practical considerations as to the printing of ballots, early voting, and vote-by-mail, it is not possible for the initiative measure to be submitted to the voters at the upcoming municipal election this November 7th.

Proposed language of Trial

Redline of Section 19-174

(b) Other vehicles: From December 1st through March 31st, it shall be unlawful for any vehicle, other than one acting in an emergency, to be parked on any street, way, highway, road parkway, or private way dedicated or open to the use of the public for a period of time longer than one hour between the hours of 2:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m.

(c) The restriction on overnight parking set forth in the preceding section 19-174(b) shall be suspended and ineffective for a trial period commencing December 1, 2023 and ending March 31, 2025. This suspension will expire on March 31, 2025 and thereafter section 19-174(b) shall resume effectiveness unless further amended.