

Town of Brookline
Advisory Committee Minutes

March 17, 2020

Present Remotely: Vice-Chair Carla Benka, Ben Birnbaum, Harry Bohrs, Clifford Brown, Carol Caro, John Doggett, Dennis Doughty, Harry Friedman, Janet Gelbart, David-Marc Goldstein, Neil Gordon, Susan Granoff, Amy Hummel, Alisa Jonas, Janice Kahn, Steve Kanes, David Lescohier, Carol Levin, Fred Levitan, Pam Lodish, Carlos Ridruejo, Chair Michael Sandman, Lee Selwyn, Kim Smith, Claire Stampfer, Charles Swartz, Paul Warren, Christine Westphal, Neil Wishinsky

Also present: DPW Commissioner Andrew Pappastergion, Director of Water and Sewer Fred Russell, Director of Parks and Open Space Erin Gallentine, Director of Highways and Sanitation Kevin Johnson, Director of Engineering and Transportation Peter Ditto, and Transportation Administrator Todd Kirrane, as well as DPW Senior Civil Engineer Jared Duval. Members of the public Jules Milner-Brage, Bob Miller, Mark Levy, John Harris, Nancy O'Connor

Announcements: Pursuant to this Board's Authority under 940 CMR 29.10 (8), all Advisory Committee Members will be participating remotely via telephone or video conferencing due to emergency regulations regarding the Corona virus.

The Chair has reviewed the requirements of the regulations. There is a quorum physically present and all votes taken will be recorded by roll call so all above listed Advisory Committee members will be allowed to vote.

AGENDA

7:00 Discussion and vote on an Emergency Reserve Fund Transfer Request: To Transfer \$350k from the reserve fund to the Select Board's account to be used for Covid-19 purposes.

Mr. Pappastergion presented the request on behalf of the Town Administrator's Covid-19 Task Force.

Questions & Comments

Q: Is food under schools for continuation of lunch program? **A:** Don't have details on each item.

Q: Cleaning supplies – Do they actively disinfect or are they so green they don't? **A:** Don't know exact products but there is a committee that met and has a full inventory of all products in all departments so we know what we have and can share moving forward. All are antibacterial and antiviral so sterilizing surfaces.

Q: Why the need for cleaning products if offices, schools and other facilities are closed? **A:** Many offices and services are still running and we have increased cleaning protocols.

Q: What is request for additional laptop computers about? **A:** For employees who are working from home they should not use personal computers to access the VPN so these will be used instead.

Q: Are there any special precautions regarding what protective items trash collectors need to wear? **A:** All essential services will continue during this crisis. The Department has worked out a staffing plan to minimize exposure and insure the safety and wellbeing of their staff.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to approve a Reserve Fund Transfer request of \$350,000 into Select Board account to be used for COVID19 purposes. By a **VOTE** of 25 in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions the RFT is approved.

BENKA - YES	GORDON - YES	RIDRUEJO - YES
BIRNBAUM - YES	GRANOFF - YES	SELWYN - YES
BOHRS – YES	HUMMEL - YES	SMITH - YES
BROWN - Absent	JONAS - YES	STAMPFER - YES
CARO – YES	KAHN - YES	SWARTZ - YES
DOGGETT - YES	KANES - YES	WARREN - Absent
DOUGHTY - YES	LESCOIER - Absent	WESTPHAL - YES
FRIEDMAN – YES	LEVIN - YES	WISHINSKY - YES
GELBART – YES	LEVITAN - YES	
GOLDSTEIN - YES	LODISH - YES	

7:15 Review and Possible Vote on FY 21 Operating Budget - Department of Public Works

Capital Subcommittee member Harry Friedman offered highlights of the subcommittee’s discussion and vote regarding the DPW FY21 Operating Budget the details of which are thoroughly articulated in the subcommittee report at the end of these minutes. The DPW has one of the largest operating budgets in the town totaling \$23,558,575. (Note: this includes Water and Sewer, but excludes payments to the MWRA.) The Subcommittee, by a vote of 4-0-0, recommended \$16,749,438 for the FY21 DPW budget.

Andrew introduced the DPW Team and acknowledged the excellent report drafted by Harry.

Questions & Comments

Q: What is the per ton cost for solid waste and recycling per ton? **A:** Page 5 and 6 in the report. Solid waste is \$330 per ton. For recycling curbside collection and processing is \$363 per ton all in. It is state law and you cannot put recyclable materials in the waste stream.

Q: \$75K approved at Town Meeting for bicycle and other pavement markings. Concerned that Town Meeting supported this and people are concerned about pedestrian safety. How likely to get funding for that? **A:** We did request \$75K in additional funding as part of the proposed budget and covered what we thought we could accomplish based on the Town resolution to get things repainted. All we can do is request the funds and we compete with many other needs across the Town. It is up to the Town Administrator and trying to find ways to fund it. Possibly use TNC – this is not clear - funds but we can hold firm and once we get ok and funding we will fast track it.

Todd noted that there are a growing number of departments looking to fund their projects with TNC funds. We will be making recommendations but can’t speak as to whether it will be included or not.

Q: Is there a specific downside for not going ahead with installation or upgrading to parking meters that accept credit cards, thus saving data storage fees and directing those funds to pavement markings? Keep it in TNC but not actually use it till next year? **A:** We lose efficiency – newer meters (IPS) can change meter rates electronically and rates are digitally displayed – otherwise have to manually change them as well as change stickers on each. Going back on promises made to business leaders that we made in 2016. The final bulk

purchase is for meters located along Beacon Street, exclusive of commercial districts and on streets (Babcock, etc.) adjoining commercial districts.

Comment: Suggest we add this to our expansion list.

Comment: Revenue and expense projections based on certain assumptions prior to the virus. Experts are suggesting that we may not peak until July 1. It is not a good use of our time to delve into details because we have to understand that these projections will change. As we pursue and examine the remainder of the budgets we haven't already approved we should assume we don't know what is going to happen and recommend flatline or approve what was last year with the assumption that everything will change. We are not leading if we talk about this budget as if the world is going to return to normal by the end of this fiscal year.

Comment: Understand and appreciate the cost of refuse going up, but the fees should not go proportionally up but should follow our sustainability plan. Dissuade people from throwing away more stuff based on our climate action efforts.

Andy Pappastergion responded: When rates were designed in 2017 we did weight the larger containers and lowered the price for smaller containers to encourage their use, but more people opted for the larger ones. Then we have found that we have a glut of small containers in our inventory. Our solid waste tonnage continues to decrease.

We do not have differential sizes for recycling and that turns out as more costly for us.

Comment: We talk a lot about what was passed at fall Town Meeting, unfunded mandates were not well defined programs. This one had 2 compelling characteristics – good idea of the costs and good idea of the objectives for the project. Way more compelling than lots of other items that were emotionally passed last fall.

Comment: I would also like to reiterate what Carol said. We are in uncharted waters now. Restaurant fees are gone, hotel excise tax is drying up, parking ticket fees less, so we may have less money coming in. I think we should go ahead with what we have now knowing it will change between now and then.

Comment: I think we have been presented a budget and should proceed with that. Regarding the parking permits for tradesmen, I think it would be reasonable to raise it to \$5. Also want to thank Andy for his service and attention to concerns about snow plowing in North Brookline.

Q: Solid waste collection? What are we doing to look into compost collection and would that contribute to the lowering costs for trash collection in a few years? **A:** We are looking into curbside composting and put out a RFP for a pilot program to complement other programs. Get favorable pricing and increase marketing to increase customer base so it becomes cheaper for everyone. It may reduce small percentage of solid waste tonnage not sure savings would be significant and may actually end up costing us more money. Pilot to test participation, gain incentives to use force of Town to pilot it and see where it goes.

Comment: Is there any concerns about the use of compost and spreading the virus? We should check with medical professionals before we propose new programs.

Q: Complete Streets-recent pavement markings have been a result of Complete Streets; any way to use paint for other things? Ask for public amenities from developers can we add this to the list – contribute to a fund for pavement markings. **A:** Complete Streets is a competitive grant initiative so we can't use funds for pavement markings on any projects. Also the project has ended for the short term. Regarding funds from developers is decided by Zoning Board of Appeals. The mitigation is used to offset/reduce the impact the development is

having. We have gotten things like ADA compliant pushbuttons on signals, for example. Not meant for maintenance.

Comment: Concern raised about the fee structure for trash pick-up and how there is an imbalance and one group – those residents who use private companies- seemingly subsidizes trash pick-up services for the rest of the Town. Tax dollars should not be used to pay for the solid waste program; user fees should cover all costs.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to approve the DPW FY 21 Operating Budget - \$16,749,438. By a **VOTE** of 23 in favor, none opposed and 4 abstentions, the budget is approved.

BENKA - YES	GORDON - YES	RIDRUEJO - YES
BIRNBAUM - YES	GRANOFF - YES	SELWYN - YES
BOHRS - YES	HUMMEL - YES	SMITH - YES
BROWN - Abstain	JONAS - Absent	STAMPFER - YES
CARO - YES	KAHN - YES	SWARTZ - YES
DOGGETT - YES	KANES - YES	WARREN - Abstain
DOUGHTY - YES	LESCOHIER - Abstain	WESTPHAL - YES
FRIEDMAN - YES	LEVIN - Abstain	WISHINSKY - YES
GELBART - YES	LEVITAN - YES	
GOLDSTEIN - YES	LODISH - YES	

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to AMEND approve the DPW FY 21 Operating Budget - \$16,749,438 plus \$75K.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to TABLE THE AMENDMENT. By a **VOTE** of 18 in favor, 3 opposed, and 4 abstentions the motion carries to TABLE THE AMENDMENT adding \$75K.

Vote to Table the Amendment

BENKA - YES	GORDON - YES	RIDRUEJO - YES
BIRNBAUM - YES	GRANOFF - YES	SELWYN - NO
BOHRS - YES	HUMMEL - YES	SMITH - NO
BROWN - Abstain	JONAS - Absent	STAMPFER - YES
CARO - YES	KAHN - YES	SWARTZ - NO
DOGGETT - YES	KANES - YES	WARREN - Abstain
DOUGHTY - YES	LESCOHIER - Abstain	WESTPHAL - YES
FRIEDMAN - YES	LEVIN - Abstain	WISHINSKY - YES
GELBART - YES	LEVITAN - YES	
GOLDSTEIN - YES	LODISH - YES	

7:45 Review and Possible Vote on FY 21 Operating Budget - Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund

Harry continued his recounting of the Capital Subcommittee’s review of the Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund details of which are captured in the Subcommittee’s report. The Subcommittee, by a vote of 4-0, recommended approval of \$29,568,210for the FY21 Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund budget.

Andy added that major increases are MWRA assessments – the budget as written proposes a \$619,000 increase in those costs but a decrease in overhead costs. Water and Sewer rates are currently estimates; final numbers from the MWRA will be available in June.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to approve the FY 21 Operating Budget – Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund of \$29,568,210. By a **VOTE** of 25 in favor, none opposed and 2 abstentions, the budget is approved.

BENKA - YES	GORDON - YES	RIDRUEJO - YES
BIRNBAUM - YES	GRANOFF - YES	SELWYN - YES
BOHRS - YES	HUMMEL - YES	SMITH - YES
BROWN - Abstain	JONAS - Absent	STAMPFER - YES
CARO - YES	KAHN - YES	SWARTZ - YES
DOGGETT - YES	KANES - YES	WARREN - YES
DOUGHTY - YES	LESCOHIER - YES	WESTPHAL - YES
FRIEDMAN - YES	LEVIN - Abstain	WISHINSKY - YES
GELBART - YES	LEVITAN - YES	
GOLDSTEIN - YES	LODISH - YES	

8:15 Review and Possible Vote on FY 21 CIP Requests - Department of Public Works

Carla Benka gave an overview of some of the items in the DPW CIP request that were reviewed by the Capital Subcommittee which can be found at the end of these minutes.

Questions and Comments

Q: St. Mary’s with bicycle route – will bump- out at crosswalk be eliminated? **A:** No bump- out stays. Bikes go around it.

Q: Beacon Street Bike Path between St. Mary’s and Carlton – how many members have attempted to park in this new configuration on the Boston side. Poles seem very easy to bang into and knock down. Passenger side now has to be aware if there are bikes coming. Also the set-up is difficult for handicapped person getting out of car without endangering themselves. We ought to think about this a little bit more before we go forward with this.

A: I park there often. All issues were discussed at the Transportation Board Meeting. It was supported by Brookline Commission on Disability. We went head to head with the State and they insisted on putting the spots there. There have not been any accidents to date. There are only two small gaps where they don’t have this configuration from Boston Common upward and it has been proven safe. It was also recommended by Bicycle Advisory Committee, as well. Two handicap spots are separated from the curb by the bike lane, first and last space after the crosswalk.

Comment: Not a fan but move forward; it was approved by Transportation Board, let’s see how it plays out.

Comment: Support bike lanes being part of the budget and continuing participation of the Transportation Board to make sure they remain safe. Encourage use of pavement markings for bicyclist for the safety of pedestrians. Make safe and available.

Comment: Appreciate what is being done for safety for bikers, but share concern for pedestrians. Worry when I park there about opening my door to oncoming traffic. I am more careful when driving and alert to bikes and pedestrians both and those things being placed to slow drivers. Accept fact that roads are being shared.

Comment: This is my front yard. I have parked near there. Time your exit from the vehicle with the light and don't whip your door open. Multiple bike car conflicts on the St. Mary's stretch and this bike lane will increase safety for all and reduce amount of conflict.

Comment: The bike lane is not a buffer for drivers or car doors, best solution implemented for bicycles. Not a convenience lane other than for the bicyclists.

Q: Some concerns will go away when the Beacon Street Bridle Path goes in effect. Bicycle access will be transferred to center of street and this will go away. **A:** Yes when funded and constructed the parking will go back to the curb and the lane will shift and space for bikes will go to the median as envisioned in Olmsted's original plan. Nothing in this design precludes the Bridle Path from moving forward.

Comment: These CIP expenditures – need for them is not dependent on economic activity or people are sheltering in place. These are investments in our infrastructure and need to go forward regardless of the next few months.

Q: Do we have an opportunity to increase the charge for cost of water for gardens and would that provide any increase in revenue. Larz Anderson is the least accessible park for many people for walking – improvements might be deferred to another year because of other pressures in the budget and unknown costs for dealing with Corona virus? **A:** When we adjusted water and sewer rates we increased irrigation meters and we will have had a year of experience with the rates and perhaps add further tweaks in this coming fiscal year. Larz Anderson has sustained deferred neglect for decades now and crumbling infrastructure that is unsafe and should not consider deferring further.

Comment: Agree we have deferred Larz Anderson too long. Important to many people. Gazebo used for weddings when renting the park so a source of revenue. These things only get more expensive the longer we put them off. We have other pressing needs but we still need to mind the store.

Comment: Respect concerns about unknown effects of Corona but we need to look at that in the operating budgets not these capital improvements. Need a frame work for talking about this period of uncertainty but it is not about not investing in our infrastructure.

Comment: About not being inaccessible, the park was chosen as a potential site for a 9th school because it was within ½ mile walking idstance of a significant number of school age children. In addition, the park is used by our schools for after school athletics and by soccer teams.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to recommend favorable action on the FY 21 CIP Requests for DPW and Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund. By a **VOTE** of 23 in favor, one opposed and 2 abstentions the budget is approved.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to AMEND have a separate vote on Item 15. By a **VOTE** of 10 in favor, 16 opposed, and 2 abstentions the **AMENDMENT** fails.

Amendment Vote

BENKA - Abstain	GORDON - NO	RIDRUEJO - NO
BIRNBAUM - YES	GRANOFF - YES	SELWYN - YES
BOHRS - YES	HUMMEL - NO	SMITH - NO
BROWN - NO	JONAS - ABSENT	STAMPFER - NO
CARO - YES	KAHN - Absent	SWARTZ - NO
DOGGETT - YES	KANES - NO	WARREN - NO

DOUGHTY - NO	LESCOHIER - NO	WESTPHAL - NO
FRIEDMAN - YES	LEVIN - NO	WISHINSKY - NO
GELBART - YES	LEVITAN - NO	
GOLDSTEIN - YES	LODISH - NO	

Main Motion Vote

BENKA - YES	GORDON - YES	RIDRUEJO - YES
BIRNBAUM - YES	GRANOFF - YES	SELWYN - Abstain
BOHRS - YES	HUMMEL - YES	SMITH - YES
BROWN - Abstain	JONAS - Absent	STAMPFER - YES
CARO - YES	KAHN - Absent	SWARTZ - YES
DOGGETT - YES	KANES - YES	WARREN - YES
DOUGHTY - YES	LESCOHIER - YES	WESTPHAL - YES
FRIEDMAN - NO	LEVIN - YES	WISHINSKY - YES
GELBART - YES	LEVITAN - YES	
GOLDSTEIN - YES	LODISH - YES	

On behalf of the Department, DPW Commissioner Andrew Pappastergion thanked the Advisory Committee and shared these comments:

“I would like to take a moment to thank the Advisory Committee for their commitment to the Town and their support for Public Works. With your help, the DPW has accomplished and completed many important initiatives that have been of great benefit to the Town. Most notable have been single stream recycling, pay-as-you-throw and automated waste collection, complete streets, LED street light conversions, water & wastewater system rehabilitation, fire alarm box wireless conversion, Fisher Hill Reservoir Park, renovations to Brookline Reservoir Park currently underway and the one that we are most proud, achieving APWA National Accreditation in 2011.

It has been my honor to have been fortunate enough to lead this incredible agency over the past decade and work alongside the most professional and devoted managers and staff. Brookline, and you, should know that as I prepare to leave the best public works agency in all of North America will still be here providing the best quality of life for all Brookline residents. Thank you and all the best!”

A **MOTION** to adjourn was made, seconded and voted unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 9:16 pm.

Documents Presented:

- Capital Subcommittee Report on FY 21 Operating Budget - Department of Public Works and Water & Sewer Enterprise Fund
- Capital Subcommittee Report on FY 21 CIP Requests - Department of Public Works
- Public Comments regarding Bike Lanes and Markings

**Department of Public Works
FY 2021 Operating Budget
&
Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund FY 2021 Budget
March 17, 2020**

INTRODUCTION

The Advisory Committee's Capital Subcommittee held a public hearing on the FY21 operating budget for the Department of Public Works, which includes six Public Works sub-programmes (Administration, Engineering/Transportation, Highway, Sanitation, Parks and Open Space, and the Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund), on March 9, 2020, at 7:00 p.m., in Room 308 at Town Hall.

ATTENDEES

In attendance were Deputy Town Administrator Melissa Goff, DPW Commissioner Andrew Pappastergion, Director of Water and Sewer Fred Russell, Director of Parks and Open Space Erin Gallentine, Director of Highways and Sanitation Kevin Johnson, Director of Engineering and Transportation Peter Ditto, and Transportation Administrator Todd Kirrane, as well as DPW Senior Civil Engineer Jared Duval.

Also in attendance were Subcommittee members Harry Friedman, Fred Levitan, John Doggett, and Committee Chairman Carla Benka; Other persons in attendance were Bicycle Advisory Committee member Cynthia Snow, Park and Recreation Commissioners Nancy O'Connor and Antonia Bellalta, Pedestrian Advisory Committee Chairman David Trevvett, as well as Paul Saner TMM 13, Hugh Mattison TMM 5, Jules Milner-Brage TMM12, Tina Kurys, and Susan Helms Daley.

BUDGET SUMMARY

The DPW has one of the largest operating budgets in the town totalling \$23,558,575. (Note: this includes Water and Sewer, but excludes payments to the MWRA.) The DPW provides essential services to Brookline residents and is one of two departments directly responsible for maintaining the capital assets of Brookline. The DPW budget contains six Public Works sub-programmes, including Administration, Engineering/Transportation, Highway, Sanitation, Parks and Open Space, and the Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund.

The DPW assists with the work of the following Boards and Commissions: Transportation Board, Conservation Commission, Park and Recreation Commission, Cemetery Trustees, Tree Planting Committee, and Solid Waste Advisory Committee. A number of these Committees have subcommittees such as the Public Transportation Advisory Committee, Bicycle Advisory Committee, etc.

TOTAL DPW OPERATING BUDGET

	<u>FY20 Budget</u>	<u>FY21 Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Variance</u>
SALARIES	\$8,714,295	\$8,738,183	\$23,888	0.27%
SERVICES	\$4,068,061	\$4,803,009	\$734,948	18.07%
SUPPLIES	\$997,750	\$997,750	\$0	0.00%
OTHER	\$53,500	\$53,500	\$0	0.00%
UTILITIES	\$1,075,059	\$1,111,996	\$36,937	3.44%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	0.00%
BUDGETED CAPITAL	<u>\$1,086,500</u>	<u>\$1,025,000</u>	<u>-\$61,500</u>	-5.66%
Total	\$16,015,165	\$16,749,438	\$734,273	4.58%

There is

an overall budgetary increase of \$734,273 or 4.58%. Most of this involves the Sanitation Division. This is discussed in greater detail below.

The budgets for the different divisions of the Department are as follows:

ADMINISTRATION

	<u>FY20 Budget</u>	<u>FY21 Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Variance</u>
SALARIES	\$811,736	\$814,545	\$2,809	0.35%
SERVICES	\$97,904	\$97,904	\$0	0.00%
SUPPLIES	\$4,500	\$4,500	\$0	0.00%
OTHER	\$22,900	\$22,900	\$0	0.00%
BUDGETED CAPITAL	<u>\$17,955</u>	<u>\$17,955</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>0.00%</u>
Total	\$954,995	\$957,804	\$2,809	0.29%

HIGHWAY

	<u>FY20 Budget</u>	<u>FY21 Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Variance</u>	
SALARIES	\$3,455,605	\$3,456,592	\$987	0.03%	
SERVICES	\$501,685	\$501,685	\$0	0.00%	
SUPPLIES	\$694,322	\$694,322	\$0	0.00%	
OTHER	\$9,000	\$9,000	\$0	0.00%	
UTILITIES	\$715,688	\$744,781	\$29,093	4.07%	
BUDGETED CAPITAL	<u>\$556,756</u>	<u>\$623,055</u>	<u>\$66,299</u>	<u>11.91%</u>	
Total	\$5,933,056	\$6,029,434	\$96,379	1.62%	
Capital	TRUCKS- BUD	\$169,577	\$193,500	\$23,923	14.11%
Capital	LEASED ROLLING STOCK	\$375,179	\$429,555	\$54,376	14.49%
Capital	BUD-MAINTENANCE EQUIP.	\$12,000	\$0	-\$12,000	-100.00%

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

	<u>FY20 Budget</u>	<u>FY21 Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Variance</u>
SALARIES	\$2,520,137	\$2,530,884	\$10,747	0.43%
SERVICES	\$717,772	\$766,986	\$49,214	6.86%
SUPPLIES	\$204,958	\$204,958	\$0	0.00%
OTHER	\$11,600	\$11,600	\$0	0.00%
UTILITIES	\$344,603	\$347,216	\$2,613	0.76%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	0.00%
BUDGETED CAPITAL	<u>\$347,494</u>	<u>\$311,547</u>	<u>-\$35,947</u>	<u>-10.34%</u>
Total	\$4,193,190	\$4,193,190	\$0	0.00%

ENGINEERING/TRANSPORTATION

	<u>FY20 Budget</u>	<u>FY21 Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Variance</u>	
SALARIES	\$1,055,670	\$1,062,114	\$6,444	0.61%	
SERVICES	\$262,844	\$353,354	\$90,510	34.43%	Storage Rentals up \$81,000
SUPPLIES	\$18,330	\$18,330	\$0	0.00%	
OTHER	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	0.00%	
BUDGETED CAPITAL	<u>\$27,500</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>-\$27,500</u>	<u>-100.00%</u>	Truck
Total	\$1,374,344	\$1,443,798	\$69,454	5.05%	

SANITATION

		<u>FY20 Budget</u>	<u>FY21 Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Variance</u>
SALARIES		\$871,147	\$874,049	\$2,902	0.33%
SERVICES		\$2,487,856	\$3,083,080	\$595,224	23.93%
SERVICES	D P EQUIP R & M	\$2,700	\$2,700	\$0	0.00%
SERVICES	COMPUTER SOFTWARE R & M	\$4,800	\$4,800	\$0	0.00%
SERVICES	OTHER EQUIP R & M	\$5,250	\$5,250	\$0	0.00%
SERVICES	SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL CT	\$2,434,566	\$3,029,790	\$595,224	24.45%
SERVICES	OFFICE/CLERICAL SERVICES	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$0	0.00%
SERVICES	PROFESSIONAL/TECH SERVICE	\$6,540	\$6,540	\$0	0.00%
SERVICES	POSTAGE	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$0	0.00%
SUPPLIES		\$75,640	\$75,640	\$0	0.00%
UTILITIES		\$14,768	\$20,000	\$5,232	35.43%
BUDGETED CAPITAL		<u>\$136,795</u>	<u>\$72,443</u>	<u>-\$64,352</u>	<u>-47.04%</u>
Total		\$3,586,206	\$4,125,212	\$539,006	15.03%

MAJOR DOLLAR CHANGES:

There were two larger-than-average dollar figure changes for the department, although they are of completely different magnitudes.

- **Utilities Up 3.44%**

Utilities for the overall department have increased \$36,937, or 3.44%. Utilities account for 6.6% of departmental expenses. Other departments have also seen utility increases for FY 21.

- **Services Up 18.07%**

Services increased \$734,948, or 18.07%. Services account for 28.7% of departmental expenses. This increase was felt most strongly in the Sanitation programme (up \$595,224). Remaining major service increases included \$81,000 related to parking meter conversions, and \$49,000 related to landscaping services. About \$40,000 of that was due to the lease of the Maimonides School, since all school buildings, owned or leased, are charged a portion of the landscaping budget.

SOLID WASTE/RECYCLING

Solid Waste

**CURRENTLY—\$287/TON TO COLLECT AND DISPOSE OF SOLID WASTE
 PROJECTED—\$330/TON TO COLLECT AND DISPOSE OF SOLID WASTE, A 15% INCREASE**

Sanitation Program Cost Breakdown			
	FY20	FY21	Increase
Total Sanitation Program Cost	\$4,187,837	\$4,796,043	15%
Municipal Solid Waste (MSW)			
Disposal	\$663,000	\$1,003,000	51%
Tonnage	8,500	8,500	0%
Cost per ton	\$78	\$118	51%
Commercial Waste Credit	-\$140,000	-\$139,200	-1%
Net Disposal Cost	\$523,000	\$863,800	65%
Net Disposal Cost per ton	\$62	\$102	65%
MSW Curbside Collection	\$1,912,461	\$1,944,443	2%
Collection Cost per ton	\$225	\$229	2%
Net Disposal Cost + MSW Collection	\$2,435,461	\$2,808,243	15%
MSW Cost per ton	\$287	\$330	15%
Special Waste Disposal	\$94,800	\$94,800	0%
Yard Waste Disposal	\$78,950	\$78,950	0%

Brookline handles the collection of solid waste in-house. It costs about \$225/ton to collect. Disposal is handled by an outside company. It currently costs \$62 per ton to dispose of solid waste. Thus, the total cost per ton is about \$287.

In FY 2021, collection is predicted to rise just a bit to \$229/ton. However, disposal is expected to increase to \$102/ton, for a total cost of \$330/ton, an increase of 15%. Brookline used to dispose of trash on site. Later, it was shipped to landfills. However, Southbridge, the last of the large Massachusetts landfills, closed in 2018. We now utilise waste-to-energy plants, which are more expensive. There is some reflection of this in the projected disposal costs going forward.

Total tonnage of municipal waste remains at about 8,500 tons per year. Thus the budget increase related to collection and disposal of municipal waste is about \$372,782.

Recycling

CURRENTLY—\$316/TON OF RECYCLABLE GOODS

PROJECTED—\$363/TON OF RECYCLABLE GOODS, A 15% INCREASE

Single Stream Recycling (SSR)				
Collection	\$1,228,626	\$1,379,050		12%
Tonnage	5,000	5,000		0%
Collection Cost per ton	\$246	\$276		12%
SSR Processing	\$350,000	\$435,000		24%
Processing Cost per ton	\$70	\$87		24%
SSR Total Cost	\$1,578,626	\$1,814,050		15%
SST Total Cost per Ton	\$316	\$363		15%

Brookline, like other communities, continues to suffer from the lack of a strong market for recyclable goods. China, the former market leader, continues to demand contamination rates that simply cannot be met.

Brookline's contamination rates are under 5%. Newton averages 9% to 11%, while Boston's is much higher. However, China will only accept a rate of .5%.

For recycling, under the current contract we pay both a flat fee per ton for collection, and a variable fee per ton for disposal/processing. We currently pay \$246/ton as a flat fee. This is projected to increase to \$276/ton, a 12% increase.

The variable fee per ton depends on the average monthly commodity price Casella Waste Systems, our hauler, can get. If the average price they get for recyclables is \$75/ton, the variable fee is \$0/ton. If they get \$65/ton, we pay a variable fee of \$10/ton. If they get \$85/ton, we actually get back 70% of the overage, or \$7/ton.

In 2017, we got money back. The commodity market then collapsed, causing us to pay more for processing/disposal each month. Our current processing costs are \$70/ton, projected to rise to \$87/ton. Thus, the current recycling cost per ton is \$246 (fixed) + \$70 (variable) for a total of \$316/per ton. This is expected to rise to \$363/ton, a 15% increase.

Contract Situation

The current contract for disposing of municipal solid waste is a 5-year contract that expires at the end of June 2020. The current contract for recycling is a 6-year contract that also expires at the end of June 2020. We are

trying to get a 5-year extension for both. Control is lost if we go out to bid on either, and the department is especially fearful on the recycling contract that we could end up in a worse situation.

EXPANSION REQUESTS

The Department requested \$1,020,926 in Expansion Requests. Of these, four of the 11 expansion requests, representing \$684,734, were granted. The granted requests are as follows:

- Casella Waste Systems Contract (\$595,224)—this covers municipal waste and recycling, and the town is contractually required to cover it. However, the town has a proposal to partially cover it, described further on in this report.
- Increased Parking Meter Services Related to Parking Meter Replacements (\$81,000)—this is part and parcel of the CIP project replacing old parking meters with IPS meters.
- Producing Parking Permits (\$4,000)
- Synchro Modelling Software (\$4,410)

The expansion requests which were not granted are as follows. NOTE: The Capital Subcommittee did not discuss the expansion requests, and is thus not making a recommendation as to which might join a list of suggested items to be funded.

- Increased Funding for Forestry Services (\$102,000)
- Sustainable Transportation Engineer (\$82,000)—help with safe routes, Complete Streets, etc. Called for under warrant article 31. There is some hope that TNC funds might fund this.
- Increased Painting for Pedestrian/Bicycle Markings (\$75,000)—called for under warrant article 7. There is a chance that TNC funds might fund this.
- School Portion of Gardener Pay Raise to \$18/Hour (\$27,163)
- Seasonal Pay for Gardeners from \$14 to \$18/Hour, and Park Rangers from \$15 to \$20/Hour to Better Compete in the Labour Market (\$26,455)
- Over Time Increase for Forestry Crew to Respond to Emergency/Storm Response (\$15,000)
- Position Upgrades (\$8,574)—Scale Operator from LN3 to LN5.

PLANS TO MEET THESE INCREASED EXPENSES

Refuse Fee Increases

After Proposition 2½ was approved in the early 1980s, a separate fee was instituted for collection of residential trash. The fee was originally meant to cover 75% of the sanitation costs, with the property tax making up the remaining 25%.

In FY20, the fees covered 71% of the sanitation budget. With no increase in fees, in FY21, the fees would cover approximately 62%, assuming no change in volume.

Approximately 50% of town residents use the town trash services.

In order to restore the fee to the 75% level, the following refuse fee increases are being proposed.

CART PRICING		FY 20 Current Rates		FY 21 Proposed Rates		
Cart Size Gallons	# of Carts	Fee to Resident	Revenue Generated	Fee to Resident	% Increase	Est. Revenue Generated
35	5,923	\$190	\$1,125,370	\$230	21.05%	\$1,362,290
65	4,540	\$252	\$1,144,080	\$304	20.63%	\$1,380,160
95	2,243	\$312	\$699,816	\$376	20.51%	\$843,368
Bags Only	57	\$156	\$8,892	\$192	23.08%	\$10,944
	12,763		\$2,978,158			\$3,596,762

Overflow Bag Pricing (Roll of 5 Bags)

FY 20 Current Rates	FY 21 Proposed Rates	
\$15	\$18.50	23.33%

Cart Swap Service Charge

Currently 320 cart swaps per year

Limit swaps to 1/year, in June (for active accounts), and charge \$40 to cover cleaning, disinfecting, and repair costs.

New property owners may swap carts initially at no charge

The proposed increases require the approval of the Board of Selectmen.

Parking Meter and Permit Increases

Meters:

Type of Meter	Current Hourly Rate	Year Estab.	Proposed Rate	% Increase
Regular hour space	\$1.25	2016	\$1.50	20%
13-hour spaces	\$0.75	2016	\$1.00	33%
LMA meters	\$2.00	2016	\$2.50	25%

1,637 Single-space Meters

30 Multi-space Meters

491 spaces in 13 lots

Payment Methods

Quarters

Credit Cards

Passport & ParkBoston Apps

Projected Additional Revenue--\$750,000/year

Neighbouring Towns

Boston (2019) range of \$2 to \$3.75/hour

Cambridge (2017) range of \$1 to \$1.50/hour

Somerville (2019) increase by \$.25/hour

Newton (2019) variable with max. rate of \$3.75/hour

Parking Permit System:
4 Programmes

Commercial Daytime On-street Permit

Current Fee (2008): \$500/year Proposed: \$600 (20% increase)

523 permits issued in FY2019

Projected additional revenue: \$51,000 annually

Commercial Daytime Lot Permit (Centre, West, John street lots)

Current Fee (2008): \$78/month Proposed: \$100 (28% increase)

700 permits issued in FY2019

Projected additional revenue: \$18,000 annually

Tradesmen Daytime On-street Temporary Parking Permit

Current Fee (2008): Free Proposed: \$1/day

1,199 permits issued in FY2019 for a total of 40,000 days

Projected additional revenue: \$40,000 annually

Note: Select Board pushing for a higher fee, perhaps \$5/day

Resident Daytime Permit

Current Fee (2007): \$25/year Proposed: \$30 (20% increase)

2,643 permits issued in FY2019

Projected additional revenue: \$13,000 annually

Note: Permit charges are limited by law to covering administrative costs of programmes.

Meter/Permit Approval Process

- Staff meetings with business community (Feb. and March 2020)
- Transportation Board public hearing (April 13, 2020)
- Transportation Board vote (April 20, 2020)
- Select Board hearing (early May 2020)
- Select Board vote (mid-May 2020 in order for DPW to send out permit invoices in mid-May)
- Effective date of July 1, 2020

OTHER ISSUES RAISED DURING THE SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING

Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APSS)

At various Brookline street crossings, there are signals to ask for a “Walk” sign. The more sophisticated of these devices are known as Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APSS). This is defined as an integrated device that communicates information about the “WALK” and “DON’T WALK” intervals at signalized intersections in non-visual formats (i.e., audible tones and vibrotactile surfaces) to pedestrians who are blind or have low vision.

If the APS is either malfunctioning, or acting per specification but missing the aural signals, this can pose a special danger to blind persons. This was raised at the Subcommittee hearing by two members of the blind community, as well as a member of the town’s Pedestrian Advisory Committee, which issued a report on this, *Brookline’s Pedestrian Walk Signals: Are They Working?*, in October of 2019.

While the report noted a number of inconsistencies in the ways various types of walk signals worked, the findings related to those living with visual impairments were the focus of what the Subcommittee discussed.

For someone who is blind, it is important that the APS have the following working parts:

1. A constantly beeping “locator tone” that allows the blind person to find the signal request button.
Note: the locator tone can also have implications for nearby residents if the tone is loud enough for them to hear.
2. A button to request a walk signal.
3. A voice that announces “Wait,” once the button is pressed, but before it is safe to walk.
4. A raised arrow, on or near the button, which aligns with the crosswalk, so the person knows in which direction to walk.
5. An LED light that indicates the walk request has been made.
6. A component, such as the button itself, that vibrates when it is safe to walk.
7. An audible tone or voice indicating it is safe to cross the street. At an intersection, this may need to indicate which street has the walk signal.

The report found that:

- APS devices were most common on Beacon Street. However, away from Beacon, most intersections lack APS devices. One example is Harvard and Kent, in Brookline Village. There is a visual “Walk” signal, but no aural signs that it is safe to cross the streets.
- There is no programme aimed at installing APS equipment. A person can request an installation, and when signals at an intersection are upgraded, an APS may be installed. Pavement reconstruction does not automatically trigger an upgrade.
- Maintenance is complaint-driven. Most sighted residents are unaware of what a properly functioning APS device does, so they are unlikely to spot and report a malfunction.

The report noted that of the 55 intersections it surveyed, only 26 (48%) had full or partial APS devices, and of those 26, 21 were on Beacon Street.

There is currently nothing in the CIP regarding upgrading the Walk Signal System. (The Town had applied for a grant for upgrades, but the grant was not awarded.) The report had gone to the Transportation Board, which requested a priority list.

The DPW said that as things that are broken are reported to them, they do and will fix them. The longer-range issue appears to be upgrades, which will require CIP funding.

Historic Street Name Signs

Last year, Mr. Friedman noted that another year had passed without the historic cast aluminium street name signs being put back on Beacon Street. When the Beacon Street project was done several years ago, the Town

had agreed, in its contract with MassDOT, to put these signs back up. The Commissioner stated they would go back up soon.

Mr. Friedman was happy to note that the signs have returned to Beacon Street.

Personnel Changes

After a combined 102 years of service to the Town (51 for each), Commissioner Andy Pappastergion, and Director of Engineering and the Town's Fence Viewer, Peter Ditto have officially retired. Both have continued to work on a contractual basis for the Town. The Subcommittee thanks them for all their hard work, and wishes them the best in retirement.



RECOMMENDATION

The Subcommittee, by a vote of 4-0-0, recommended \$16,749,438 for the FY21 DPW budget.

Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund - FY21 March 2020

The Water and Sewer Division is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the town's water, sanitary sewer, and storm water collection systems which include 135 miles of water mains, 10,770 service connections, 1500 Hydrants, 2,000 valves, 111 miles of sewer mains, and 117 miles of surface water drains and 3,296 catch basins. An Enterprise Fund established by Town Meeting in 2001, finances the Water and Sewer operations and fully reimburses the General Fund for expenses incurred, including OPEBs. Since FY09, the cost of debt service is no longer reimbursed to the General Fund but is budgeted within the Fund itself.

WATER AND SEWER

		<u>FY20 Budget</u>	<u>FY21 Budget</u>	<u>Variance</u>	<u>Variance</u>
SALARIES		\$2,776,505	\$2,839,650	\$63,145	2.27%
SERVICES		\$353,798	\$365,398	\$11,600	3.28%
SUPPLIES		\$123,020	\$147,020	\$24,000	19.51%
OTHER		\$293,397	\$299,897	\$6,500	2.22%
UTILITIES		\$102,061	\$102,061	\$0	0.00%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL		\$20,653,997	\$21,272,997	\$619,000	3.00%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL	MWRA WATER CHARGES	\$7,284,294	\$7,502,794	\$218,500	3.00%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL	MWRA SEWER CHARGES	\$13,349,703	\$13,750,203	\$400,500	3.00%
INTERGOVERNMENTAL	DEP ASSESSMENT	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$0	0.00%
BUDGETED CAPITAL		\$630,330	\$444,300	-\$186,030	-29.51%
DEBT SERVICE		\$1,313,347	\$1,667,140	\$353,793	26.94%
DEBT SERVICE	PRINCIPAL-MAT DEBT	\$1,206,128	\$1,386,290	\$180,162	14.94%
DEBT SERVICE	INTEREST-LONG TERM DEBT	\$107,219	\$280,850	\$173,631	161.94%
INTERFUND TRANSFERS OUT		<u>\$3,038,020</u>	<u>\$2,429,747</u>	<u>-\$608,273</u>	<u>-20.02%</u>
Total		\$29,284,475	\$29,568,210	\$283,735	0.97%

The FY21 budget shows an increase of \$283,735 or .97%. The largest parts of the budget are the rates paid to the MWRA. The final rates are not set by the MWRA until June. Past experience has been that they will be a bit lower than the estimates above, but there is no guarantee of this.

The Subcommittee, by a vote of 4-0, recommended approval of \$29,568,210 for the FY21 Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund budget.

**CAPITAL SUBCOMMITTEE - FY 21 CIP RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR DPW AND WATER AND SEWER ENTERPRISE FUND REQUESTS**

MARCH 17, 2020

**FY 2021 Financial Plan
VII-32 through VII-48**

14. TRAFFIC CALMING / SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS

Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (Washington Street at Gardner Road)

Recommendation: \$81,500 (Revenue Financed)

Funds have been requested to install solar powered Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons (RRFB) at the two crosswalks across Washington Street at Gardner Road to increase safety for pedestrians crossing this well traveled roadway. The RRFB signal is approved for usage as a warning beacon to supplement standard pedestrian crossing warning signs and has shown to increase the safety of crosswalks by improving the yielding rate of motor vehicles for pedestrians in a crosswalk. The Town has installed RRFBs in similar high pedestrian and motor volume locations with success in improving safety.

15. BICYCLE ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Bicycle Access Improvements are a program of the Transportation Division of the Department of Public Works. They seek funding on an annual basis to implement the recommendations of the Green Routes Master Network Plan, developed by the Bicycle Advisory Committee and approved by the Transportation Board.

Recommendation: \$125,000 (Revenue Financed) and \$50,00 (State funds)

1. Green Street Contra-flow Bike Lane (\$36,199)

One of the FY 21 Bicycle Access Improvement projects calls for the installation of a contra-flow bicycle lane on the entire length of Green Street from Dwight Street to Harvard Street. Contra-flow bicycle lanes are bicycle lanes designed to allow bicyclists to ride in the opposite direction of motor vehicle traffic. They convert a one-way traffic street into a two-way street: one direction for motor vehicles and bikes, and the other for bikes only.

The second block of the proposed contra-flow bike lane, from John Street to Harvard Street, would be bollard protected. The lane will provide a safer, lower stress connection allowing a cyclist to travel legally from Dwight or John Streets to Harvard Street and make a network connection to the existing north/south bicycle accommodations on Harvard Street from the neighborhoods to the north/east of Harvard Street.

Additionally, the Green Street Contra-flow Bike Lane will allow cyclists on Beacon Street seeking to travel north on Harvard Street to bypass the last block of Beacon Street (where the bike lane ends) as well as the intersection of Beacon Street and Harvard Street to make this connection via John Street and Green Street.

The proposed design includes current best standards for such an installation: 1) using a buffered yellow lane line marking between the motor vehicle and the contra-flow bicycle; 2) BIKE STOP signs as you approach the cross streets of John Street and Harvard Street; and 3) a bike walk next to the existing crosswalk for cyclists to safely cross Harvard Street to enter the southbound bike lane.

The Town of Brookline has had several contra-flow bicycle lanes installed for many years without any reported incidents of accidents, which mirrors the experience of Cambridge and other municipalities.

2. Beacon Street Westbound (St. Mary's Street to Carlton Street) Parking-Protected Bike Lane (\$55,262)

The second Bicycle Access Improvement project proposes to replicate the parking-protected bike lane installation on Beacon Street in Boston immediately before the Town-line by relocating the existing westbound bike lane to the right of the parking lane so that it becomes a bike lane protected by the curb on one side and parked vehicles on the other.

The bike lane will have the additional protection of bollards installed in line with the parking meters to ensure parked vehicles do not encroach on the bike lane or door zone buffer. These parking-protected bike lanes are a lower cost way to provide safer, protected accommodations for cyclists on high stress roadways with multiple lanes, high traffic volumes, high parking turnover, and a high number of double parked vehicles.

An additional benefit is the creation of a splitter island that will provide a year-round location for the popular BlueBikes bike share station that is currently removed in the winter due to its location on the public way.

3. Olmsted Beacon Street Bridle Path Feasibility Study (\$33,539)

The remaining funds in the Bicycle Access Improvement Program request would be added to the existing \$117,757 appropriated from the 2019 Transportation Network Company Funds and \$50,000 in State funds to underwrite a study for determining the feasibility of the restoration of the Olmsted Bridle Path on Beacon Street.

The restoration of the Bridle Path was rated one of the highest priority projects at the June 2019 Select Board Sustainability Summit. It is included in the Transportation Board approved Green Routes Master Network Bike Plan and has the support of local and regional groups with a wide array of perspectives including transportation and access for the disabled.

Determining feasibility includes identifying necessary relocation or removal of infrastructure and estimating the construction cost to provide for a 10 to 15 foot dedicated multi-use path for use by bikes, scooters, joggers, runners, wheelchairs, and other non-vehicular transportation modes.

16. PARKING METER TECHNOLOGY UPGRADE

Recommendation: \$322,080 (Revenue Financed)

In 2013, the Town of Brookline undertook the upgrading of metered public parking spaces to provide customer convenience, ensure a regular turnover of spaces in high demand areas, and improve municipal maintenance and collection operations. This effort included the installation of both Digital Luke multi-space parking meters in public parking lots and over 500 IPS single space, credit-card-accepting parking meters in high-use districts along portions of Beacon Street, Harvard Street, Kent Street, and Brookline Avenue. Replacement of the remaining 1,320 coin-only single head parking meter mechanisms with the IPS credit-card-accepting meters continues. The per-unit price of \$610 per mechanism includes meter mechanism, installation and commissioning, and an extended 12-month warranty. Upgraded parking meters will also accept coins.

It should be noted that the cost of data storage services for meters is expected to increase by \$81,000, reflecting the installation of new IPS meters.

18. TRANSPORTATION NETWORK COMPANY FUNDS (State)

Because of the timing of the announcement and availability of funds for the municipality by the state, this budget item will require appropriation as part of the November Special Town Meeting.

19. STREET REHABILITATION – TOWN

Recommendation: \$2,649,916 ((Revenue Financed))

In 1992, the Department of Public Works undertook a comprehensive study of its roads (331 streets which add up to 97.6 miles of paved surface) and implemented a pavement management system. The system was designed to bring Town-owned streets to a sufficient level of repair such that the roads could be maintained without undertaking costly full reconstruction. From 1992 to 1997, the Town made some progress in this regard, but funding was inconsistent. Starting in 1997, the Town began allocating \$1 million per year to streets, in addition to utilizing Chapter 90 funding from the State for certain thoroughfares.

Based on the recommendations of the 2007/2008 Override Study Committee, the 2008 Override approved by the voters included \$750,000 for streets and sidewalks, to be increased annually by 2.5%.

A subsequent assessment and report, indexing roadways according to their condition, noted that roadways with a 75 rating could be kept in good repair with maintenance instead of needing more expensive and time-consuming reconstruction. Reconstructing streets costs at least twice as much as performing preventative maintenance.

In 2014, there was a backlog of \$18,492,001, exclusive of curbing, sidewalks, etc.; in 2018 that backlog was approximately \$ 23.5 million, an increase of approximately \$1.2 million over 2016, attributable to inflation and deterioration. In order to maintain the PCI (Pavement Condition Index) that existed in 2014, the Town would have needed to invest approximately \$2 million dollars in street rehabilitation. As of 2018, to maintain a PCI rating of 73, the amount of needed funding was \$4 million. Stantec Consulting Services recommended that the minimal funding for road rehabilitation increase to \$3 million “to keep the network in ‘good’ condition and backlog relatively sustainable in the future.”

Beta Engineering has recently been hired to conduct a road conditions assessment/pavement management study and to present a report with findings and recommendations. Town engineers give the current overall condition of Brookline roads a 67 or 68.

The FY 21 CIP calls for \$2,649,916 for Street Rehabilitation purposes. Warren Street from Lee Street to Heath Street and Woodland Road from Heath Street (west) to Hammond Street will receive 3” mill and overlay treatment. Walnut Street from Warren Street to Dudley Street; Crafts Road from Cleveland Road to Eliot Street; Lowell Road from Stanton Road to Greenough Street; and Columbia Road from the city line to Harvard Street will be reconstructed. Six other streets in North Brookline will be treated with a bonded wearing course, while 22 streets throughout the town will have surface cracks sealed and/or patched.

It should be noted that work on Warren Street, Walnut Street, Crafts Road, and Lowell Road will be undertaken with a combination of Town and State Funds.

20. STREET REHABILITATION - STATE
\$960,605 (No recommendation or vote required)

The State provides monies under its Chapter 90 program for improvements to certain streets. About 1/3 of Brookline's streets are eligible for 100% State reimbursement. This money supplements the funding appropriated from Town funds for street rehabilitation. Assuming an annual \$300 million statewide appropriation of Chapter 90 funds, the Town anticipates an annual State grant of \$960,605.

In FY 21, State funds will be combined with Town funds to undertake work on Warren Street, Walnut Street, Crafts Road, and Lowell Road.

21. SIDEWALK REPAIR
Recommendation: \$336,000 (Revenue Financed)

Sidewalks that are not reconstructed as part of the street reconstruction program will be reconstructed with funds from DPW's Sidewalk Management Plan. Using the formula recommended by the 2007/2008 Override Study Committee and approved by voters in the 2008 Override, DPW has requested \$336,000 for sidewalk repair in FY 21.

In accordance with DPW policy, concrete rather than asphalt will be used in sidewalk reconstruction, except in cases determined by the Tree Warden in which asphalt will be used near street trees.

24. STORMWATER IMPROVEMENTS & PERMIT COMPLIANCE
Recommendation: \$300,000 (Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund Budget)

The Environmental Protection Agency's Stormwater Phase II Rule establishes an MS4 stormwater management program that is intended to improve the Town's waterways by reducing the quantity of pollutants that stormwater picks up and carries into storm sewer systems during storm events. This project includes consulting services required for compliance with EPA's Phase II MS4 Permit and installation of structural lining in existing drain crossings along the MBTA C Line and D Line.

25. WATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS
Recommendation: \$2,000,000 (Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund Bond)

The plan for Water System Improvements has three primary objectives: 1) system redundancy elimination; 2) fire flow improvement; and 3) identification and replacement of water mains prone to leaks and/or breaks. Requests for funds for improvements will continue yearly through FY 26.

26. WATER METER MOBILE TRANSMISSION UNIT (MTU) REPLACEMENT **Recommendation:**
\$280,000 (Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund Budget)

The Town's water meters and infrastructure were installed in 2006. The batteries of the mobile transmission units, which transfer meter consumption numbers to the collectors for billing are nearing the end of their useful life. This program will continue to replace all 10,000+/- units through FY 22.

27. WASTEWATER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Recommendation: \$3,000,000 (Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund Bond)

This on-going project provides funding for the rehabilitation of the wastewater collection system (sanitary sewer). Rehabilitation was based on the recommendations of the Wastewater Master Plan completed in 1999. Previously construction projects to correct sewer system deficiencies targeted: 1) structural improvements, 2) sewer and storm drain separation and 3) hydraulic capacity restoration. Moving forward the primary focus will be on the removal of inflow and infiltration sources with the overall goals of eliminating sewerage backups into homes and businesses and lowering MWRA wholesale costs by reducing extraneous flows. This project should ultimately enhance the efficiency of the wastewater collection system and help to lower MWRA wholesale costs.

28. WATER GARAGE ELEVATOR RENOVATION

Recommendation: \$260,000 (Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund Budget)

The elevator in the Water Division Garage on Netherlands Road is one of 47 elevators, Limited Use/Limited Application, and wheelchair lifts in Town and School buildings. When a building is renovated, most elevators are upgraded, however others continue to age without improvements being made. Maintenance becomes an issue, with parts being increasingly difficult to find. The elevator's controller needs to be upgraded or replaced as technology progresses and older technology is not supported. The elevator in the Netherlands Road facility is twenty years old. This project will upgrade it with new equipment.

32. LARZ ANDERSON PARK

Recommendation: \$2,200,000 (General Fund Bond)

Comprising over 65 acres, Larz Anderson Park, listed on the National and State Registers of Historic Places, is the largest park in Brookline and the flagship park of the Town. Within its borders are not only architecturally significant buildings but also athletic fields, play equipment, picnic areas, walking paths, an ice rink, significant trees, a lagoon, sweeping slopes and magnificent views of the City of Boston.

After \$2,200,000 in FY 21 CIP dollars are added to funds approved in previous years, work can commence on roadway and path improvements, restoration of the "Temple of Love" next to the lagoon, and stabilization and repair of the walls at the top of the hill.

35. ROBINSON PLAYGROUND

Recommendation: \$1,150,000 (General Fund Bond)

The Margaret E. Robinson Playground is a 2.38-acre park located at Cypress and Franklin Streets in a densely populated neighborhood. It was built on the site of the car barn lot for the Boston Elevated Railway Company in the 1890s. Current playground facilities include a youth baseball/softball field, paved basketball court, multi-use court play area, playground equipment, picnic area, and water play. The Playground is a participant in the Green Dog Program.

Renovation plans include new playground equipment for older and younger children; water play, new irrigation and field renovation; basketball and multi-use court improvements; pathway and drainage improvements; and fence replacement.

36. SCHICK PARK

Recommendation: \$160,000 (Revenue Financed)

In 1945, six house lots atop Aspinwall Hill were purchased from George B. Sargent for recreational purposes. The 1.1-acre "Addington Park" was opened five years later, and later renamed Lotta Bradburn Schick Park. Lotta Schick was a graduate of Wellesley College who was active in Brookline civic affairs for 35 years, 15 of which she served as a member of the School Committee. The park currently features picnic tables, a playground, paths/trails, basketball courts, a baseball/softball field, benches, and a picnic shelter. It was last renovated in 1997-8.

Accessed via Addington Road, Schick Park is in need of a full site renovation to meet new safety and accessibility requirements. Renovations will include new play equipment for older and younger children, repointing the stone walls, repair of the wooden picnic shelter, field renovation, fencing, paving and site furniture. FY 21 funds are requested for planning and design services.

46. PARKS AND PLAYGROUNDS REHABILITATION & UPGRADE

Recommendation: \$310,000 (Revenue Financed)

This annual, town-wide program directs CIP funds to the evaluation, repair and replacement of unsafe and deteriorating park, playground, fence, and field facilities or components. Items funded under this program include fences, gates, backstops, retaining walls, picnic furniture, turf restoration, infield refurbishment, bench replacements, play structures, safety surfacing, and drainage improvements. This program avoids more expensive rehabilitation that would be necessary if these items were left to deteriorate.

47. TOWN/SCHOOL GROUNDS REHAB

Recommendation: \$165,000 (Revenue Financed)

Town and School grounds require on-going structural improvements and repair. These funds will be applied to maintain or repair landscapes and hardscapes, including plant installation, regrading, reseeding, tree work, repair to concrete or asphalt walkways through the site, trash receptacles, bike racks, drainage improvements, retaining walls, and repairs to stairs, treads, railings, benches, or other exterior structures. This funding does not include replacement of areas over building structures or directly connected to the buildings, such as entrance stairways and ramps into the buildings. Projects such as those are under the Building Department's jurisdiction. This program avoids more expensive rehabilitation that would be necessary if these items were left to deteriorate.

50. TREE REMOVAL AND REPLACEMENT / URBAN FORESTRY MANAGEMENT

Recommendation: \$235,000 (Revenue Financed)

The tree removal and replacement program represents the Town's effort to balance street tree removals with plantings. It is critical to remove trees that have matured or have been impacted by storm damage or disease before they become public safety hazards. New tree plantings are also critical since they directly impact the tree-lined character of the community, improve storm water quality, provide oxygen, and reduce heat impact in the summer. Both the planting and watering of new trees are in-house operations, resulting in cost savings and better quality control.

There are other uses for the funds within this CIP allocation, including the removal of trees identified as safety hazards or concerns in the Town's four conservation areas and in its parks as well as structural and safety pruning of trees in the parks. In addition, funds may be used for new trees, planted in anticipation of the ultimate loss of existing mature trees.

Approximately 200 trees are removed and 350-450 replacement trees are purchased each year. Last year 223 trees were removed. In February of this year 303 trees representing 34 different species were purchased to be planted on the Town's streets in the spring. It is important to note the growing gap between contractual services related to tree removal and replanting and currently available funds.

This line item also includes funding for Urban Forestry Management in the Town's parks and open spaces. Storm damage, disease, and old age continue to reduce tree canopies. The funds are utilized to address such needs as tree removal, crown thinning, soil amendments, woodland canopy gap management, removal of invasive species, pest management, health and structural pruning, and planting. Such measures have been developed with the goals of supporting resistance to disease and pests and countering the rapid decline of trees left unmanaged in an urban environment. Work in this regard continues to be undertaken in collaboration with the Olmsted Tree Society of the Emerald Necklace Conservancy.

PUBLIC COMMENT RECEIVED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGARDING BIKE LANE IMPROVEMENTS

From: Deane Coady [mailto:deanecoady@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 2:43 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Support the funds for the biking lane improvements

As a 38 year resident of Brookline, a mother, grandmother, retired teacher, and active Brookline mothers out Front member (we work hard for a quick and just transition off of fossil fuels and into renewable energy), I urge the sub-committee to fully support the Beacon St and Green St bike lanes as approved by our Transportation Board.

Why? We are in a climate emergency NOW. We must act locally, statewide, nationally and globally to reverse global warming. Locally that means building the infrastructure to support more walking and biking. Please live up to your important duty to make Brookline a better safer more environmentally healthy place for us and future generations.

Thank you for the volunteer work you do.
Deane Coady
Walnut Street

**Oxidize less. Photosynthesize more.
(Ponder this for a while)**

From: Toffel, Michael [mailto:mtoffel@hbs.edu]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 2:42 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Writing to Support Funding for Bike Lanes on Beacon and Green Streets

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Mike Toffel, and I live at 25 Abbottsford Road, and I use my bicycle to commute, shop, and exercise.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for two projects that would improve safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists: (1) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (2) the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic. The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard. The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Mike Toffel
25 Abbottsford Rd
TMM Precinct 8

From: Jan Preheim [mailto:janpreheim@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 2:31 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Funding for bike infrastructure

Dear Capital Subcommittee

I use my bicycle daily as I do not own a car.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green.

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lanes would increase safety and access. I use the two routes for shopping trips, and many others do too. I also see many commuters on these routes. I urge you to fund these important improvements.

Sincerely,
Jan Preheim
217 Walnut St, Brookline, MA 02445

From: Regan, Susan,Ph.D. [mailto:SREGAN@mgh.harvard.edu]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 2:28 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Please fund bicycle infrastructure!

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

I am a resident of Brookline and a daily, year-round bicycle commuter.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (i) the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments

on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Regards,
Susan Regan
53 Lawton Street

From: Elissa Yanover [mailto:elissayanover@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 2:11 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Support for funding for bicycling improvements

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Elissa Yanover. I live at 27 Osborne Road, and I use my bicycle to go shopping, visit friends and to go to restaurants.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (ii) the contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed changes would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bike lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bike lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The contra-flow lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

From: David Kroop [mailto:dkroop2@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 12:56 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Pls. Support Funding for Bicycle Lanes on Beacon St. and Green St.

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is David Kroop. I live at 27 Osborne Road, and I use my bicycle when I visit friends, eat out, run errands, and go to the Coolidge Corner Cinema.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) contra flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street and (ii) the parking protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's.

The Green Street Contra Flow Lane

The contra flow lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

The Beacon Street Parking Protected Bicycle Lane

I also urge the Subcommittee to recommend funding for the proposed parking-protected bike lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's.

The proposed changes would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bike lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bike lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

--

David Kroop

27 Osborne Road
Brookline, MA 02446
(617) 869 – 71

From: Uri Mariash [mailto:urimariash@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 3:00 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Cc: Beatka Julia Zakrzewski
Subject: Support of Funding for Bike Lanes on Beacon and Green Streets

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Uri Mariash, I live at 59 Green st, unit A, and I use my bicycle to get to work. My wife (Beatka Zakrzewski), who's cc'ed also bikes to work.

We are writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (ii) the contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Uri and Beatka

--

Uri

-----Original Message-----

From: Robert Thomas [mailto:bthom@me.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 3:46 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Capital Subcommittee funding of Beacon Street and Green Street bike lanes.

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Bob Thomas. I live at 5 Beals Street. I no longer own a car and use my bike for transportation to work and around Brookline.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for both the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street and, the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street.

I frequently travel inbound from Boston on Beacon street. For much of Beacon street there is a clear bike lane. However there are two sections that are very problematic and potentially dangerous. The first is the area around St. Mary's. The proposed bike lane will make that stretch much safer. The second problematic area is the last block before Harvard Street. The bike lane suddenly disappears and bicyclists are thrust into a lane with cars. The contraflow lane on Green Street would provide an alternate and very safe route.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Bob Thomas

From: Marian Lazar [mailto:mlazar@verizon.net]

Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 4:04 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Protected bike lane on Beacon Street in St. Mary's

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's.

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

Sincerely,

Marian Lazar

32 Craftsland Road

Brookline MA 02467

From: E. Tamayo [mailto:e.tamayo@outlook.com]

Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 6:32 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Cc: et46@cornell.edu

Subject: I WANT The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane AND the contra-flow bikelane on Green Street

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

Bicycles, in my opinion, is what will save the planet... If it's NOT too late!!

My name is Enrique O. Tamayo. I live at 30 Parkman Street (#2), Brookline, MA 02446 and I use my bicycle daily {as long as there is NO imminent rain nor snow. I bike on average about 400-500 miles per year, 90% within an 8-mile radius.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (i) the contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is **regularly used** by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is a parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner and towns WEST of Brookline (such as Wellesley, Medway... just to mention a few places, where I bike to visit family) without having to use higher-stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Enrique O. Tamayo
30 Parkman Street (#2)
Brookline, MA 02446

From: Harry Margolis [mailto:harry@margolis.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 7:46 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Making Biking Safe

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Harry Margolis. I live at 144 Clark Road and I use my bicycle to get to work, for shopping, and go to the movies in Coolidge Corner. However, I don't use my bike as much as I'd like because my wife does not feel safe biking in Brookline.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (ii) the contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic. This is dangerous, especially at night. Why not keep bikes and cars separated so that biking can be safe? If more people biked and fewer drove, traffic for those who have to drive would move more easily to everyone's benefit.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route. Given Boston's poor biking infrastructure it's a black mark for Brookline that Boston is ahead of us here.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

With these and other bicycle infrastructure changes, maybe my wife would join me to travel in town by bike, keeping one more car from competing for Coolidge Corner parking.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Harry S. Margolis
harry@margolis.com

Check out my new book, [*Get Your Ducks in a Row: The Baby Boomers Guide to Estate Planning*](#).

From: Len Wholey [mailto:lwholey@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 7, 2020 9:21 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Funding Bike Lanes on Beacon St and Green St

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Len Wholey. I live at 119 Lancaster Ter, and I am a Town Meeting Member from precinct 11. I use my bicycle to commute to work.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (ii) the contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane is safer than the current bike lane. Motor vehicles frequently park in the current bike lane, and cyclists riding past them are prone to being "doored."

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

I frequently ride my bicycle while commuting to work. By adding the contra-flow lane on Green Street, this would allow me to avoid cycling on Beacon St which is stressful.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,
Len Wholey

From: alroberts [mailto:alroberts@rcn.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 8, 2020 8:06 AM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Please support bike lanes on Green st and Beacon St

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Andrea Roberts. I live at 122 Naples Rd, right near Coolidge Corner and Green St. I am a daily bicycle commuter to the Longwood medical area, and use my bike to run errands in Coolidge corner and often bike to the Landmark center (involving the proposed protected bike lane on Beacon) for work or shopping.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (ii) the contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street.

The Green St bike lane is critical because it allows bikers to avoid the neighboring streets with heavier traffic and many double-parked cars. Double-parked cars blocking the bike lanes are a main issue on Beacon St as well, where people park in front of Whole Foods and the restaurants there. This forces bikers into car traffic.

Synopsis here:

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this

parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

From: Todd MacFadden [mailto:todd.macfadden@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 8, 2020 12:43 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Support of Funding for Bike Lanes on Beacon and Green Streets

Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

I am writing to urge the Subcommittee to recommend funding the following two important bicycling improvements that were approved by the Transportation Board earlier this year: (1) a parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (2) a contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street.

(1) The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

(2) The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration.

Todd MacFadden
194 Clark Road, Brookline

From: Thomas Gallegos [mailto:tfgallegos@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 5:12 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: green st./ Beacon Bike comment - Please yes!

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Thomas Gallegos. I live at 6 Rice St. #2, and I ride my bicycle and drive my car in Brookline for all types of commutes.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (ii) the contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

This is very important to me. Having cycled from home to Charlestown for work for years, I've cycled this length of Beacon many times. This area is extremely unsafe when motorists decide they'll just clear the driving lane by pulling into the bike lane. It is a fact that unprotected bike lanes ARE parking lanes in this city (and nationally). If they are not protected cars will park in them for convenience and drive the cyclist into the precarious position of having to swerve around the obstacle into an automotive lane. The solution is simple, protect the bike lane. The St. Mary's business district is particularly prone to this behavior. Please help solve the problem.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

This wide street can accommodate a bicycle lane just fine, and the painting of a lane would codify a safe path for bikes which sometimes ride this route against traffic anyway. Unfortunately, the Green street north-side sidewalk in between Harvard and John has an obstacle (pole) which regularly puts a pedestrian into the street to make way for another on the inside, and would put them into the bike lane. That said, I still prefer the bike lane over the live street, which is the present condition.

Thank you,
Thomas Gallegos

From: Blair Hines [mailto:bh@verdantla.com]
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 9:02 AM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: funding Bicycle Improvements.

Dear Members of the Advisory Board:

Green Street Counterflow Bike Lane: As a regular bike commuter from far western Brookline (near Beaver Country Day School) to my office in Coolidge Corner, I often bike to meetings in Boston and travel to and from Coolidge Corner via Beacon Street. The last block of Beacon west bound to Harvard Street is particularly hazardous and the proposed counterflow bike lane on Green Street will provide a slightly longer but safe route via John Street to the proposed Green St. counter flow lane to Harvard Street. I welcome this safety improvement. I hope you provide the rather modest funding this requires.

In regard to Beacon Street @ St. Marys protected bike lane proposal. I frequently travel this block of Beacon Street. The current bike lane that is outside the parked cars is almost always blocked by one or two double parked vehicles forcing me to merge into the traffic. Continuing the protected bike lane that Boston provides will be a huge safety improvement that deserves the modest funding this requires.

Blair Hines,
Brookline Planning Board

Blair Hines, Principal

VERDANT

Landscape Architecture

318 Harvard Street, Suite 25

Brookline, MA 02446

o 617-735-1180

m 617-645-6716

From: Dave Porter [mailto:dcporter@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2020 11:56 AM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Beacon Street Bike Lane

Hi,

My name is Dave Porter, I live at 21 Clark Road, between Sumner and Boylston. I use my bike to get to the St. Mary's Whole Foods, and to and around Coolidge Corner. I'm writing in strong support of funding the protected westbound bike lane on Beacon, and the counter-traffic Green Street lane.

To be blunt, the protected lane on Beacon will make me feel safe, instead of in constant danger. The Green Street counter-flow lane will open up a much-needed route through Coolidge Corner while avoiding the most dangerous parts of Coolidge Corner. (And hopefully it'll convince drivers on Green Street to slow down a bit!)

Larger, safer bike lane networks means more people deciding to use their bikes instead of their cars. That means less traffic, which benefits everybody — even (or especially) the folks that still need or want to drive.

Thanks,

Dave

From: Jeff Miller [mailto:jeffmfje@gmail.com]

Sent: Sunday, March 8, 2020 9:27 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Bike Lanes

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Jeff Miller. I live at 200 Freeman Street, and I use my bicycle for nearly all transportation if that does not involve my kids. If we could get proper bike infrastructure in Brookline, I would also be able to bike places with my kids.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (i) the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

From: Joshua Blouwolff [mailto:j.blouwolff@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 11:28 AM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Support for Beacon & Green St bike lanes

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Joshua Blouwolff. I live at 63 Summit Avenue, and I use my bicycle to get to work, go shopping, etc.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (i) the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

From: Elena Huisman [mailto:huisman.elena@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 12:03 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Consider Funding Bicycle Infrastructure in Brookline

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Elena Huisman. I live at 1157 Beacon Street, and I use my bicycle as my main form of transportation, which includes biking to and from work, restaurants, the gym, grocery store, and to attend a number of public meeting at Town Hall.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (ii) the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.
Elena Huisman

From: Joanna Messing [mailto:jmessing@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Bike lanes

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Joanna Messing. I live at 85 Highland Rd, and I use my bicycle to get to work. I would use it for much more if the roads were safer.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (i) the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Brookline has the potential to be an incredibly livable town, but the cars and congestion are one of the main issues we have. Bikes are a powerful way to make us a community of the future!

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.
Joanna

From: Charlie Homer [mailto:charlie.homer@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 12:47 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Biking in Brookline

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Charlie Homer. I live at 76 Green St, and I use my bike to get to work and to events, to do errands, to exercise and to visit family and friends .

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and the contra-flow flow bicycle lane on Green Street

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Charlie

From: Qian Mei [mailto:qmei.design@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 9, 2020 1:15 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Bicycle lanes on Beacon and Green Streets

Dear Members of the Capital Subcommittee of the Brookline Advisory Committee:

My name is Qian. I work in Brookline Village and bike through Brookline every day, twice a day, to get to work and to get home. My friends live in Brookline, and this town is where I meet them for lunches, dinners, and many outings.

I am writing to urge the Capital Subcommittee to recommend funding for the (i) the parking-protected bicycle lane on the westbound side of Beacon Street in St. Mary's and (ii) the contra-flow bicycle lane on Green Street. I used to live at Beacon and St. Mary's and I'm extremely attached to the local businesses in the area. I strongly believe, as a bicyclist and after reading research, that bicycle and pedestrian-friendly infrastructure makes more better commerce and more sociable streets. I love seeing people on the street and saying hello, even if in passing while on my bicycle.

The Beacon Street Parking-Protected Bicycle Lane

The proposed parking-protected bicycle lane would eliminate the very unsafe conditions that exist there now, where a painted bike lane is regularly used by motorists to stop and stand in front of commercial establishments on Beacon Street, forcing people on bicycle to merge in and out of motor traffic.

The proposed changes are consistent with what has been done on Beacon Street on the Boston side of the Town Line, where there is parking-protected bicycle lane from Arundel Street to St. Mary's Street. Continuing this parking-protected bicycle lane into Brookline would enhance bicyclist safety on this important and heavily used route.

The Green Street Contra-Flow Lane

The proposed contra-flow bicycle lane would allow me to access many of the destinations I go to in Coolidge Corner on bicycle without having to use higher stress streets like Babcock, Pleasant, Beacon and Harvard.

The contra-flow lane would also provide traffic calming on Green Street by narrowing the motor traffic lane and by making motorists more cautious because of their need to be aware of people on bicycle coming from the opposite direction.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

My best,
Qian

--

Qian Mei
443-303-7417
quanmart.net

From: Hudson Doyle [mailto:hudsondoyle@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 6:18 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: cycling road markers

Hello,

My name is Hudson Doyle and I live at 24 Summit ave. My family and I use our bicycles to get around Brookline everyday, for all our activities.

It is evident to us that the road markings are in disrepair--frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This is risky and unacceptable.

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

thank you,
Hudson

From: Merav Shohet [mailto:mshohet.p@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 5:30 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Safe Bicycling in Brookline

Dear Brookline Advisory Committee,

My name is Merav and I live on Addington Road in Brookline. My son and I use our bicycles in good weather to get around Brookline, particularly to the Runkle School, to work (at Boston University), and oftentimes to the library (on Washington Street and in Coolidge Corner), and to day camps around town during the summer.

As we bicycle in Brookline, I notice that road markings relating to pedestrian and bicycle safety are not maintained as they should be. They are frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This creates unacceptable risks to people getting around on foot or bicycle.

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. While I realize that you may be preoccupied with the COVID-19 situation right now, it's more imperative than ever to provide safe ways to bicycle and walk around town without using public transit, for example, not to mention cars, which we try to avoid as much as possible. I therefore respectfully urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

Thank you,

Merav Shohet

mshohet.p@gmail.com

<https://bu.academia.edu/MeravShohet>

From: Bettina Neufeind [mailto:bettina.neufeind@gmail.com] **On Behalf Of** Bettina Neufeind

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 5:29 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Funding road markings for bicycle safety

Dear Advisory Committee,

My family of five and I live at 20 Amory Street and use our bicycles as our primary means of transportation, whether to commute to work, go to school at Lawrence and BHS, make doctor, grocery store, and social visits as well as for exercise.

As I bicycle in Brookline, I notice that road markings relating to pedestrian and bicycle safety are frequently barely visible - markings are often faded, worn out, and difficult to see, or in some cases simply too subtle to be noticed by the driver of a fast-moving vehicle. This creates real and constant risks to life and limb of cyclists as well as others who share the road and who depend on clear signage and road markings to plan their movements.

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

Such funds should be calculated to include funds for creating brightly colored, highly visible green bike lanes with physical barriers added, rather than simply a white-lined space which is too often mistaken as an "idling" zone for ride shares, pick ups and deliveries, and other conveniences not suited to an active traffic lane.

Note that signage (especially such as "shadows" or other unprotected bike lanes or cyclist right of ways, such as at Dummer Street) without resources for public information dissemination and enforcement is of limited utility, and I would urge the Advisory Committee to also appropriate funds for public education as well as enforcement of bicycle lane and cyclist right of way violations in the vein described above.

All of these measures are in keeping with the Green Streets and similar climate-conscious measures adopted at TM in November (and December -!) 2019. Many thanks in advance for your kind assistance with this important matter. Your squeaky (bicycle) wheel,

Bettina Neufeind
Bettina Neufeind
20 Amory Street
Brookline, MA 02446
TMM Precinct 1
bettina@pobox.com
617.935.4117

From: Gina Crandell [mailto:ginamcrandell@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 5:25 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Bike lane markings

I am 71 years old today and I love to bike around Brookline. When I see bike lanes or sparrows that have worn paint I really worry that cars won't see me. I also wish for more protected lanes. Please include maintenance of bike lanes in your budget.

Gina Crandell
117 Stedman Street

From: Joshua Blouwolff [mailto:j.blouwolff@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 5:19 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: FY21 budget for signs

My name is Josh Blouwolff and I live at 63 Summit Ave. Me and my children use our bicycles to get around Brookline, particularly to commute to work, go to school and make social visits.

As I bicycle in Brookline, I notice that road markings relating to pedestrian and bicycle safety are not maintained as they should be. They are frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This creates unacceptable risks to people getting around on foot or bicycle.

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

Thank you

From: Harry Margolis [mailto:harry@margolis.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 4:43 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Sharrows

Dear Advisory Board,

My name is Harry Margolis and I live at 144 Clark Road. I am a town meeting member from Precinct 12.

I have heard that you are taking up the fiscal 2021 budget tonight and that it does not include additional money for maintaining sharrows and other important markings for bicyclers and pedestrians on the roads. As I'm sure you know, they are frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This creates unacceptable risks to people getting around on foot or bicycle.

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

Thank you.

Harry
Harry S. Margolis
harry@margolis.com

Check out my new book, [*Get Your Ducks in a Row: The Baby Boomers Guide to Estate Planning*](#).

From: Jan Preheim [mailto:janpreheim@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 4:43 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Please find painting faded bike markings

Dear Advisory Committee,
My name is Jan Preheim and I live at 217 Walnut Street. I am car-free and bicycle almost every day.

The road markings are frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This makes me feel unsafe. When we keep up with maintenance of markings, it also helps pedestrians and cars

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

Jan Preheim

From: Bob Miller [mailto:tmm8@isgmarketing.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 1:43 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: DPW Budget

Dear Lisa:

I am writing to you about a distressing disregard for the will of Town Meeting. Warrant Article 7 from the November 2019 Special Town Meeting said:

"Now therefore, be it resolved that the Town evaluate and repaint or refurbish all roadway markings as needed when any markings on a segment of a road are repainted.

And further, be it resolved that the Town operating budget shall provide sufficient funds to allow for proper maintenance of street markings for automobile, bicycle, and pedestrian use, as well as any other markings that are provided on the public way for the safety of users."

It has come to my attention, as one of the petitioners, that the Department of Public Works is planning to put forward a budget that does not provide for the painting of street markings as outlined in the above text as passed by Town Meeting.

The vote on this article was 206 in favor, 2 opposed and 3 abstentions. Clearly there was an overwhelming desire on the part of Town Meeting for this action to be implemented. I would also like to point out that Town Meeting voted for the strongest language version of this Warrant Article.

If this kind of message from Town Meeting can be ignored by Town departments, this threatens the legitimacy of Town Meeting and our system of representative government. This is a safety issue. It should not and can not be ignored.

You will be considering the DPW budget at 7:00 PM this evening. I ask the Advisory Committee to make sure that the actions of Town Meeting be honored by Town departments.

Thank you for all that you do and for your time and attention to this matter,
Bob

Bob Miller
Town Meeting Member - Precinct 8
tmm8@isgmarketing.com

From: Biking Brookline [mailto:bikingbrookline@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 3:34 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Funding for Maintenance of Bicycling and Pedestrian Road Markings

My name is David Kroop. I use my bicycle to get around Brookline, particularly to run errands, visit friends, and eat out in restaurants.

As I bicycle in Brookline, I notice that road markings relating to pedestrian and bicycle safety are not maintained as they should be. They are frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This creates unacceptable risks to people getting around on foot or bicycle.

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

--

Biking Brookline

Our Mission:

Working through advocacy, workshops, and social events, in cooperation with other users of our streets, to promote bicycling as a fun, friendly, and safe form of transportation that improves mobility in Brookline while promoting our health and the environment of Brookline and our planet.

From: Ruth Nemzoff [mailto:rnemzoff@brandeis.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 3:40 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Road mArkings

My name is Ruth Nemzoff and I live at 1160 Beacon ST. I bicycle recreationally to get around Brookline.

You are to be congratulated for increasing the safety of bicycling by road markings. It is imperative that these markings be maintained.

I urge the town to provide funding for this function Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting recommended 2021

Thank you .

Ruth Nemzoff, Ed.D. www.ruthnemzoff.com

Resident Scholar, Brandeis Women's Studies Research Center

Author and Speaker: Don't Bite Your Tongue: How to Foster Relationships with Your Adult Children , Don't Roll Your Eyes: Making In-Laws Into Family

From: Dirk Englund [mailto:englund@mit.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 3:46 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: Fund Maintenance of Bicycle/Ped Road Markings

My name is Dirk Englund and I live at 116 Pleasant Street, Brookline. My family use our bicycles to get around Brookline. I bike to and from work at MIT just about every day, summer and winter.

As I bicycle in Brookline, I notice that road markings relating to pedestrian and bicycle safety are not maintained as they should be. They are frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This creates unacceptable risks to people getting around on foot or bicycle.

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

Dirk R Englund

Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science | Mass. Inst. of Technology

From: Toffel, Michael [mailto:mtoffel@hbs.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 3:55 PM

To: Lisa Portscher

Subject: AC meeting tonight re DPW budget review

Please share this comment with the AC re tonight's meeting.

Brookline road markings relating to pedestrian and bicycle safety are not maintained as they should be. They are frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This creates unacceptable risks to people getting around on foot or bicycle. Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, highlighted Town Meeting Member's shared view that these shortcomings should be overcome by providing sufficient funds in DPW's budget to ensure proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

Thank you,

Mike Toffel, TMM8
25 Abbottsford Rd, Brookline

From: Elissa Yanover [mailto:elissayanover@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2020 3:49 PM
To: Lisa Portscher
Subject: Budget should include maintaining road markings

My name is Elissa Yanover and I live at 27 Osborne Road, Brookline. I use my bicycle to get around Brookline, particularly to visit friends and run errands.

As I bicycle in Brookline, I notice that road markings relating to pedestrian and bicycle safety are not maintained as they should be. They are frequently faded, worn out, and difficult to see. This creates unacceptable risks to people getting around on foot or bicycle.

Warrant Article 7, passed in the fall 2019 Town Meeting, was intended to address these shortcomings by mandating that the Town "shall" provide sufficient funds for proper maintenance of road markings. I urge the Advisory Committee to include this required item in its recommended 2021 fiscal plan.

Sincerely,
Elissa Yanover