Town of Brookline
Advisory Committee Minutes

Sean Lynn-Jones, Chair Date: April 7, 2016

Present: Carla Benka, Clifford M. Brown, Carol Caro, Lea Cohen, John Doggett, Dennis Doughty, Harry K. Friedman, Janet Gelbart, David-Marc Goldstein, Neil Gordon, Amy F. Hummel, Angela Hyatt, Alisa Jonas, Janice S. Kahn, Steve Kanes, Bobbie Knable, Fred Levitan, Robert Liao, Pamela Lodish, Sean M. Lynn-Jones, Shaari S. Mittel, Mariah Nobrega , Michael Sandman, Lee Selwyn, Charles Swartz, Christine Westphal

Absent: * Stanley Spiegel, Sytske Humphrey, Jennifer Goldsmith, Kelly Hardebeck

---

Also attending Allison Steinfeld, Planning and Community Development; Fire Chief Ford; Sandra Debow-Huang, Director of Human Resources; Peter Ditto, DPW; and Melissa Goff.

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 PM.

1. REVIEW OF WARRANT ARTICLE 15: CARLTON STREET FOOTBRIDGE EASEMENTS

Clifford Brown presented the report of the Subcommittee.

Federal government requires a permanent easement because the funding is 80% Federal.

A MOTION was made and seconded

> VOTED that the Town take the following actions: (1) authorize the Board of Selectmen to grant and acquire, as necessary, permanent easements on Town of Brookline property for structural footings, stairs, accessible ramps, pedestrian walkways and other components of the Carlton Street Footbridge Rehabilitation Project, as substantially shown on the plan submitted for inclusion in the 2016 Annual Town Meeting Warrant signed by the Board of Selectmen on March 15, 2016 and entitled "PERMANENT EASEMENTS ON TOWN OF BROOKLINE LANDS FOR FOOTBRIDGE FACILITIES."; and (2) authorize the Board of Selectmen to grant and acquire, as necessary, temporary construction easements on Town of Brookline property for construction activities associated with the Carlton Street Footbridge Rehabilitation Project, as substantially shown on the plan submitted for inclusion in the 2016 Annual Town Meeting Warrant signed by the Board of Selectmen on March 15, 2016 and entitled "TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENTS ON TOWN OF BROOKLINE LANDS FOR FOOTBRIDGE REHABILITATION."

Vote: With a vote of 21 in favor, 0 opposed with 2 abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on the motion voted under Article 15.

2. REVIEW OF WARRANT ARTICLE 16: CARLTON STREET FOOTBRIDGE EASEMENTS

Article 16 is a construction issue, land owned by the city of Boston and/or the MBTA. Need to be able to obtain easements from the City of Boston and the MBTA – via license or gift, if that doesn't occur the Town needs to have authorization to use money to buy easements. The money is already in the CIP. In 2009 the Town Meeting authorized a debt service allocation of up to 4.1M dollars but the sum to be paid cannot be more than 60% of the costs. Cost is expected to fairly minor and it is coming out of money that is already appropriated.

Any additional liability? NO.

We are giving an easement to ourselves - does that mean we can take it back? Yes and No – we could but it would be a violation of the Federal Grant.

Useful life for the renovation – we wouldn't have to do any renovation of consequence for 20-30 years.

Q: How long are the ramps?

A: 200 feet total more or less with more on the river side.

Comment: I hope this will be on a screen when this comes up at Town Meeting. It was difficult to see the diagrams in the print out.

A MOTION was made and seconded

> VOTED that the Town take the following action: 1. authorize the Board of Selectmen to acquire, if necessary, temporary construction easements from the City of Boston and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, Rail and Transit Division, under which the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) operates, to conduct construction activities associated with the Carlton Street Footbridge Rehabilitation Project, as substantially shown on the plans submitted for inclusion in the 2016 Annual Town Meeting Warrant signed by the Board of Selectmen on March 15, 2016 and entitled "TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT FROM THE MBTA FOR FOOTBRIDGE REHABILITATION" and "TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT FROM THE CITY OF BOSTON FOR FOOTBRIDGE REHABILITATION." and 2.authorize the Selectmen to raise and appropriate, if necessary, funds for the acquisition of all easements required for the project, said funding to be drawn from the Town's bond funding previously authorized for the Carlton Street Footbridge project.

Vote: With a vote of 21 in favor, 0 opposed with 2 abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on the motion voted under Article 16.

3. REVIEW OF WARRANT ARTICLE 17: RESOLUTION RELATED TO MECHANIZED TRASH COLLECTION

Alisa Jonas provided an overview of the Public Safety Subcommittee report on Warrant Article 17.

Warrant Article 17 is a resolution that urges implementation of an exception system to the anticipated mechanized pay-as-you-throw curbside solid waste pick-up. Residents could use an alternative to toter carts to store solid waste for curb pick-up if toters would be impractical. The Petitioner filed the article to address the difficulties of using toters, which are larger and heavier than regular trash receptacles, by residents who lack adequate storage room, are elderly or physically disabled, or who otherwise would have difficulty bringing toters to curbside from their storage locations. The subcommittee unanimously supported passage of an amended version of the article.

The WA concerns some difficulties with the toters including but not limited to homeowners finding places to store them (no yards, driveways, side yards, etc. – only option could be a basement which would prove difficult to haul up and out to the curb), and manipulation of toters for those who are elderly or physically challenged . Another concern is the aesthetics of keeping the toters in front yards Or on front porches or in other locations within the view of the public. This article provides for an exception to having toters if people can show why they need the exception. DPW is already considering an exception system, even before this Warrant Article came up.

Harry Friedman, the petitioner discussed the intention of the Warrant Article. He heard about the toters as a way to pick up garbage and learned that they would be were similar to the recycle bins we use now. This is perfect if you live in a town where you have a driveway, a garage, and side yard or accessible backyard. That is not a description of Brookline. This means you either put it in a basement and it takes up a lot of space. To get it in and out of the basement you have to go up and down steps. Many basement doors are not tall enough. Alternately people leave it in their front yards 24/7 creating an eyesore – a sea of blue toters. Another option is that people don't end up recycling. The problem is you cannot chose to not throw out your garbage. Thought this effort was not applicable to most of Brookline. Have never heard people express concern about trash pickup.

In the budget there are two line items for the lease for the trucks that will pick up the toters - we ought to have conditions that that money is not spent until after the Fall Town Meeting which will give us a sense of what this exemption system will look like and how it will be implemented. We are being asked to vote on a system that is not yet in place.

Whether you are for or against pay as you go, I think this is something the Town needs to buy into and the only way that will happen is if there is a discussion at Town Meeting.

1. Reconsider DPW budget
2. Take up Article 8 move an amendment then
3. Added to the conditions of appropriation as another way to address this

We do have a lease agreement and we are in the second year of that lease agreement. Last year was the first year.

We could introduce a warrant article to change the by law to implement Pay as You Throw.

What are you opposed to?

Opposed to use of toters whether we use Pay as You Throw and against PAYT until Town Meeting weighs in on it. It goes through on a vote of the Selectman and all of the sudden we have PAYT. Dots were not connected.

Tried to figure out the connection between toters and PAYT – the two were linked because it was impossible to achieve the efficiencies of the pickup of Toters unless you limit/reduce the amount of trash allowed. PAYT reduced the number of toters.

Some clarity on using semi automated pick up that would require toters, but for PAYT there is no clear guidance on this.

Perhaps in some neighborhoods we shouldn't use toters.

I would be in favor of moving to reconsider the DPW budget at some point. There are too many murky areas that will blindside people. Need a clearer understanding of what we are getting.

Town Administrators Task Force met and relationship between Automation and PAYT is that a strong connection in terms of recommendations about variable sized toters charging different amounts for the amount of trash you dispose of. The task force started out with a belief of just one size toter. They were not linked that way at the start. There was a very clear financial plan put in place by DPW. The automated program was supposed to save a significant amount of money. As we went through the calculations savings attributed to the automation was going to come anyway because of other things that were going to be happening, yes a cost savings but not a million dollars or whatever the original numbers were.

Solid Waste Advisory group supported PAYT. A system that charges people for the amount of waste they produce and removes some of the financial burden from the town. Bag system subject to hygiene-related issues from rodents and the like, but the SWAC did canvas communities that use bags and toters whether they have a significant problem with animals. Even though bylaws call for all waste to be placed in receptacles there are bags in my street, but not trash strewn around.

At one point we assumed savings from PAYT because it would move more to recycling but now recycling is more costly.

No real correlation between bags and / or toter use and rats and other wildlife.

Intending not to use only toters or only bags but bags in a receptacle of some sort. There are viable PAYT systems that don't involve toters.

Why don't people who would have trouble with toters have difficulty with other types of receptacles?

They are lighter weight, can be stacked, etc.

Went after $200,000 of State money to use toters. This has all been generated over money, all money driven. What is wrong with program we have now? People won't put up with this. It is a Selectmen-driven process and the DPW. We need to put an end to it. We are inconveniencing 60 thousand people.

Under what circumstance would people opt for private haulers so they wouldn't have to deal with the Town system? What would keep private haulers from stepping in to do this at the same price without toters?

$50 a quarter pays the whole thing? No, some of it is covered by tax dollars. If my money is going for town pick up then I want town pick up.

Can we get back to the specifics of the resolution?

Should this resolution come up before the budget at Town Meeting? Should the Moderator be asked to change the order?

Remind people that the point was to get people to be more cautious and circumspect and conscious about what they are pitching and tossing in a landfill?

In favor of PAYT for the environmental reasons stated previously. But I have a driveway and a garage so I don't have trouble with toters but sensitive to the issues raised by the petitioner and am in favor of the resolution.

Backed into PAYT by beginning a discussion of mechanization – how do you implement PAYT and how do you charge per pound for trash? This time we started with toters and revealed that it only worked with PAYT.

PAYT may not do as much minimization of landfill. DPW puts up barriers for getting smaller toters for recycling. If we go to PAYT it will save some people lots of money but in neighborhoods that are high density the town will see a loss of revenue.

Regarding pricing, it had to be a revenue neutral pricing model – recommendation was for a revenue producing model. Pricing be both fixed and variable associated with size of amount of trash you were giving out. Depends on implementation.

One of the reasons we got into discussion of achieving efficiencies in trash pickup was that it would decrease the size of the override last year and increase revenues for Schools along with parking meters. Relied on stuff that is no longer true. The recyclables are being buried by the recycling guys anyway.

Price of oil based chemicals and price for recycled paper. Maybe someday this will change and revenue will go up again.

Other things that haven't been worked out by DPW - what happens on times like Labor Day; what happens if your neighbor puts his trash bag next to your toter and it doesn't get picked up? Towns most like us – Cambridge and Boston. Newton has a contractor happy to come out and pick up overflow bags. We don't have that. Never ever had public hearings on any of this despite statements to that there would be an open process.

The original article was amended by the subcommittee and the petitioner.

A MOTION was made and seconded to recommend favorable action on an exemption system

Resolution Regarding the Mechanization of Trash Pickup by the Town

TO SEE IF THE TOWN WILL ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, the Town, through its Department of Public Works ("DPW") is seeking efficiencies in the way in which it picks up curbside trash from Brookline residences; and

WHEREAS, the way in which it is anticipated to effect these efficiencies is by having residents deposit trash in Toter Carts (of a size yet to be determined), similar to those currently used for recycling; and

WHEREAS, these carts are not designed for use by those who have storage issues, and/or are unable to easily maneuver the carts due to where they will be located *(example- up or down stairs)* and/or because *[delete: of] the person using the cart is elderly* or has physical limitations;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that Town Meeting urges the adoption of an exception system for those residences where the use of the Toter Carts is impractical. This exception system could involve, for example, the use of garbage bags instead of Toter Carts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the DPW will make a determination of which residences are entitled to be covered by the exception system, using criteria which shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Availability of places in which to store the Toter Carts other than in front of residences, and thus visible from the street
- Ease of getting the Toter Carts from the storage location to and from the curb; and

[Delete: Be it further resolved, that the exception system will not impose an unfair financial burden on the participants,]

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that at least three months in advance of the implementation of mechanization, mailings informing residents will be sent to all residents on Town trash pickup, and

neighborhood meetings shall take place in each neighborhood to publicize and inform residents of the changes in trash pickup.

Or act on anything relative thereto.

Vote: With a vote of 22 in favor, 0 opposed and 2 abstentions the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on the motion as amended.

Can we agree to put reconsideration of the DPW budget on our schedule at some point? Yes.

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the Advisory Committee will be on April 12.

Upon a MOTION made and seconded and voted unanimously, the meeting adjourned at 8:55 pm.

Documents Presented at Advisory Committee Meeting:

CAPITAL SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON WA 15 AND 16
PUBLIC SAFETY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON WA17
MEMO FROM ANDREW M. PAPPASTERGION RE: WA17 AUTOMATED WASTE COLLECTION/PAYT SYSTEM