

**Town of Brookline  
Advisory Committee Minutes  
Thursday, April 18, 2023**

**Meeting Recording:** <https://brooklinema.zoomgov.com/rec/share/GX5AAT1CMkZNYB8Lw4I-wdawJqCE3BKTitxJaC-02ACSSLxqFjILWiEkmez4Y58D.FmSPqpeQhnm1m-Yb>

---

**Present:** Ben Birnbaum, Harry Bohrs, Patricia Correa, John Doggett, Dennis Doughty, Harry Friedman, David-Marc Goldstein, Neil Gordon, Susan Granoff, Kelly Hardebeck, Amy Hummel, Anita Johnson, Alisa Jonas, Janice Kahn, Pamela Lodish, Joslin Murphy, Donelle O’Neal, Linda Olson Pehlke, Markus L. Penzel, David Pollak, Stephen Reeders, Lee Selwyn, Alok Somani, Carolyn R. Thall

**Absent:** Carol Levin, Clifford Brown, Katherine Florio, Carlos Ridruejo, Christine Westphal

**Also Attending:** Deputy Town Administrator Melissa Goff, Director of Planning and Community Development Kara Brewton; Director of Human Resources Ann Braga; Michael Rubenstein, Carla Benka, Perry Grossman, Deborah Mercer, Fran Perler and other members of the public.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM.

**Announcements:** Pursuant to this Board’s Authority under 940 CMR 29.10 (8), all of the committee members will be participating remotely via telephone or video conferencing due to emergency regulations regarding the Corona virus. The Chairman 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.

**7:00 pm            Public Comment**

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**7:15 pm            Review, Discussion and Possible Votes on WA 4 Close Outs (Select Board)**

Report was given by Deputy Town Administrator Goff. We use this every year for departments to update us as to what they are doing with special appropriations. You should have received 2 reports: one report shows bond financed accounts, and the other, capital revenue financed accounts. Those are the K accounts as we refer to them. Every department has gone through and filled out an update on their special appropriations. No action is needed under this article. The Comptroller has the authority to act on these accounts.

If anyone has any questions, Melissa can follow up with the appropriate department head. She recommends No Action.

Seeing no questions from the public, the Chairman closed the Public Hearing.

**PUBLIC MEETING**

**Comments, Questions, Discussion**

David-Marc Goldstein Q: If no action is recommended and Comptroller has responsibility for this, why is it brought here, why is it in the Warrant? A: It is an opportunity for Town Meeting to review the appropriations to potentially revisit any appropriation that's currently out there. All of these special appropriations Town Meeting could redirect to another use. So, it provides that opportunity, should you choose to do that. We've redirected accounts that have been declared surplus. Last year we had an account with the Fire Department that they indicated they weren't going to be able to use, and so we actually redirected that to the Building Department to support some of the funding that was needed in Charlie's budget.

Harry Friedman Q: The bonded articles, though, would have required action on our part, wouldn't they? A: Bond rescissions are generally needed in order to close out the accounts but there has been a change in legislation that does allow for minor accounts to be closed by the Comptroller. Need to check find out the exact threshold.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for Favorable Action on the WA 4 Close Outs. By a **VOTE** of 1 in favor, 19 opposed, and no abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends No Action on WA 4.

The Chairman noted that we have a report for this meeting having to do with the COVID and FEMA dollars but we're not noticed to discuss it? Was there an action that needed to be taken?

Melissa Goff responded this will be part of what we present that shows all of the special appropriations. This will be on the same list as revenue finance, CIP, and bond finance votes. There are other things on there like the HCA transfer and reauthorizing Robinson and Murphy playground. Those were already covered by a prior town meeting, but we had to put it back on because bond counsel had said that it wasn't listed properly in the Warrant so we had to re-issue it. You could either deal with it then or kind of deal with it separately, however you choose.

Amy Hummel asked what was inappropriate on the warrant so it doesn't happen again? A: It was included under the Budget Amendment but the warrant didn't explicitly list it. Every special appropriation that is bond financed needs to be explicitly listed in the warrant. Just having the budget open doesn't mean that you can add something like that.

### **Report from the Personal Subcommittee, Discussion and Possible Votes on WA 2 Collective Bargaining Agreements (Human Resources)**

Harry Friedman, a member of the subcommittee passed it over to Human Resources Director Ann Braga. She reported that they have no collective bargaining items yet. We are close on one, and we hope to have more information for you in the next week to 10 days.

The Personal Subcommittee made a **MOTION** to table discussion and vote on WA 2 until a date to be determined. By a **VOTE** of 20 in favor, none opposed with no abstentions, further discussion of WA 2 was postponed to a later date.

### **Report from the Public Safety Ad Hoc Subcommittee, Discussion and Possible Votes on WA 23 Resolution on In-Car and Body Camera (O'Neal)**

Alisa Jonas a member of the subcommittee gave a report on its review of WA 23 and the full report is linked to these minutes. The subcommittee made two minor amendments to the Article, and the Petitioner has approved both. The two changes are 1. The Article's "Therefore" clause directs that funding for the implementation of cameras "be included in the Brookline Police Department Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Budget." The FY24 budget will already be approved before this resolution is voted on, however. The amendment thus removes that directive in the "Therefore" clause and instead adds

the following Whereas clause: WHEREAS, funding for the purchase, maintenance, and storage of ICV, BWC and recordings from such equipment is included in the FY 24 CIP budget for the Brookline Police Department; 2. The Article's "Therefore" clause requests that the Select Board, Town Administrator, Human Resources Director, and Police Department work together to draft the ICV /WBC. Given the advisory role of the Police Commissioners Advisory Committee (PCAC) to the Select Board, the amendment explicitly calls for PCAC participation in an advisory capacity to the Select Board as it drafts the policy.

The subcommittee recommended favorable action on the following amended motion by a vote of 4-0-0.

To see if the Town will adopt the following:

RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO THE ADOPTION OF AN IN-CAR VIDEO AND BODY WORN CAMERA POLICY FOR THE BROOKLINE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

WHEREAS, In-Car Video ("ICV") and Body Worn Cameras ("BWC") are considered to be effective law enforcement tools that reinforce the public's perception of police professionalism and preserve factual representations of officer-civilian interactions; and

WHEREAS, ICV and BWC may be useful in documenting crime and accident scenes or other events that include the confiscation and documentation of incidental evidence or contraband; and

WHEREAS, ICV and BWC are expected to enhance the Police Department's ability to document and review statements and events during the course of an incident, and preserve video and audio information and evidence for investigative and prosecutorial purposes; and

WHEREAS, although ICV and BWC recordings may provide only a limited perspective of encounters and incidents, and thus should be considered with all other available evidence, such as witnesses' statements, officer interviews, forensic analysis, and documentary evidence, studies have shown that ICV and BWC are a contributing factor in reducing complaints against police officers, increasing police accountability, and enhancing the public trust; and

WHEREAS, the policy of the Brookline Police Department is to respect the legitimate privacy interests of all persons in Brookline, while ensuring professionalism in its workforce, and therefore, Brookline Police Officers should only use ICV and BWC within the context of existing and applicable federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and the Department's rules and policies;

WHEREAS, funding for the purchase, maintenance, and storage of ICV, BWC and recordings from such equipment is included in the FY 24 CIP budget for the Brookline Police Department;

NOW THEREFORE, be it resolved, that Town Meeting requests the Select Board, with the advice of the Police Commissioners Advisory Committee (PCAC), along with the Town Administrator and Human Resources Director or their designees, to work promptly, constructively, and collaboratively with the appropriate members of the Brookline Police Department to adopt a policy pertaining to the use of ICV and BWC by Brookline Police Officers, and that the use of such equipment be implemented as soon as practicable. ~~Be it further resolved that funding for the purchase, maintenance, and storage of ICV, BWC and recordings from such equipment be included in the Brookline Police Department Fiscal Year 2023-2024 Budget.~~

~~Or act on anything relative thereto.~~

Petitioner O'Neal declined to add anything at this time noting that Alisa covered everything in her report.

### **Comments, Questions, Discussion**

Janice Kahn, Public Safety subcommittee Chair noted this resolution was originally filed by Donelle in 2020, and he chose not to move it then because of the contract which in the Memorandum of Agreement which was for body worn cameras and in vehicle video. But between then and now one of the outcomes of the Police Reform Committees that met was to establish a Police Commissioner Advisory Committee. We did have the chair of that committee at our meeting who noted that they are Advisory to the Select Board so we added that to the Article.

Alisa added the Police Chief seems to be in favor, and the Union is in favor, and the arbitration decision is expected by the end of April. So, we'll have that information soon.

Lee Selwyn Q: Does the Police Chief support this? Did anyone from the Union or the Police Department meet with the subcommittee? A: She didn't explicitly provide support. The Union said that they have no issues with cameras. Yes, they were all there.

Amy Hummel highlighted some of the issues around the cameras.

- Recordings won't solve the human problems with which we are concerned.
- They won't necessarily increase transparency.
- They show things from one physical perspective, but that is not always the complete picture. Nor do we want an unlimited number of cameras filming just to get other physical perspectives. Just because you've got something on a camera doesn't mean you have what really happened.
- The ACLU does not take a position in endorsing cameras. They do not deny that there are some good uses for them, but when you use taxpayer money to put cameras on officers you extend the use of cameras.
- If used in someone's home, it becomes a privacy issue, and it may even impact how people approach the police.
- There are monetary costs, both for data storage, as well as for the cameras themselves, which break a lot. Communities have dropped them after a while because they came so expensive.
- Studies have shown that they've been used disproportionately for prosecution compared to police oversight.
- At what point are we just surveilling and collecting all sorts of data that is more invasive than we want in a free society?
- This comes down to the kind of policing we want in Brookline which is what we're talking about. Others can disagree, but the problems we do have are human problems, and these will not help us solve them.

I will be voting against this although I realize it will probably pass overwhelmingly and everyone will feel terrific about it.

Joslin Murphy said she had great respect for the Petitioner. She also appreciated Amy's comments. Joslin was a police officer for 10 years and she would have liked to have had a camera in certain circumstances but there is something to the privacy issue raised by Amy. Joslin noted she would abstain and would like to hear more from the Chief of Police and the implementation policies.

Linda asked about the cost of this program overtime and maybe incorporating Amy's point regarding longevity of the data and storage. A: The department has a contract with the provider for 4 years and it will include the equipment, maintenance, training, updating, and storage costs.

Will it roll out at once or it will be some get deployed, tested, etc.? A: It is all in arbitration right now. The Town and Union probably have positions as to how they will finalize terms.

Anita Johnson said she had no recollection of examples of gross police misconduct such that body cameras should be worn by everyone. A: Police support cameras because they want documentation that they have not been doing things as other communities. Alisa added that cameras, while not perfect, can offer more objective information than eye witnesses.

Joslin responded to Anita's question citing one incident at Walgreen's a number of years ago. In her experience body cameras would have helped the Town's case.

Petitioner Donelle O'Neal also added another incident that took place on Route 9 involving a shooting and car chase. There is a law suit because of that incident and he believes cameras could benefit both sides.

Janice Kahn responded to Linda's question – preliminary discussion with someone for \$800,000 contract and the first year would be more expensive but that amount for the 4 years. Sorry that Amy wasn't able to be at the subcommittee hearing to add her point of view and adds value to the discussion. This article is coming from the community that feels that transparency for them and the department is important. I don't want to stand in judgment whether it is good or bad and will support the article.

Lee said comments about "pictures don't lie," but now we have technology that allows for deep fakes and the ability to trust what you see on a video will be more difficult. I see merit from both perspectives because it establishes a baseline of truth. But you do need to consider that what you see may not be reality going forward.

Alisa noted that the important thing we need to have is security with storage. I guess we can't trust any kind of evidence and I think it is important that the storage of the footage is secure so police officers can't just go around playing with video.

Amy added that this will have to be stored in a particular way there are minimum requirements. People tasked with that also have concerns. Everything can be hacked.

Lee added let's not be lulled that we have a fool proof solution.

Neil Gordon added, we are faced with evidence in the form of competing videos – government video is less susceptible to manipulation by protocol than any individual cell phone video alleging bad behavior. Where is the risk of that? Recognizing privacy issues, in terms of creating a fake video and getting it into storage, seems way more difficult than showing up with a video saying look what your police officer did to me last week.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for Favorable Action on the WA 23 as amended by the subcommittee. By a **VOTE** of 14 in favor, 1 opposed, and 6 abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends Favorable Action on WA 23 as amended by the subcommittee.

## **Report from the Land Use, Zoning and Sustainability Subcommittee, Discussion and Possible Vote on WA 24 – MBTA Communities Act (Gordon, et. al.)**

Patricia Correa a member of the subcommittee gave a report on their review of WA 24. The report is linked at the end of these minutes.

Effective 2021, the Massachusetts legislature amended Mass. Gen. Laws Chapter 40, Section 3A, to require “MBTA communities” such as Brookline to create at least one zoning district of “reasonable size” within .5 miles of a transit station that permits multi-family housing as of right. Known as the “MBTA Communities Act (“MBTACA”, or “Act”), the Act directed the State’s Department of Housing and Community Development (“DHCD”) to “promulgate guidelines” for when a community is in compliance. DHCD’s MBTACA guidelines require the Town to enact zoning changes that implement no later than December 31, 2023, the end of this year. (As of this writing, DHCD has not responded to the Select Board’s March 28, 2023 request for a longer timeline and certain substantive changes to the guidelines).

As of this writing, the Planning Department’s proposal for compliance is through zoning changes in the vicinity of the Town’s Harvard St. corridor, with a stated goal of publicly releasing a draft warrant article in late June 2023, and with filing of the final draft by the early September deadline for the November 2023 Special Town Meeting.

The Petitioners’ resolution asks for a Moderator’s Committee to “identify additional potential options” for compliance with the Act beyond the Planning Department’s current proposal, with Planning Department staff and other support. Following the April 10, 2023, Subcommittee hearing, the Select Board appointed a committee to review options to the Planning Department’s Harvard St. proposal, which is to be Chaired by Co-Petitioner Richard Benka and whose membership includes Co-Petitioner Linda Olson Pehlke.

A vote for favorable action would ask the Moderator to appoint a Moderator’s Committee with Planning Department staff support that will “identify additional potential options” to the Planning Department’s current proposal to comply with the Act and the guidelines (including the existing deadline of the end of this year for legally necessary zoning changes).

By a vote of 3-1-1, the Subcommittee voted to table Article 24 pending its review of the Select Board’s charge to a committee to review MBTA Community Act compliance options, and steps to advance the work of the Committee in a prompt fashion.

There is a Select Board Committee on this Warrant Article, two Petitioner’s are on it as well as David Pollak.

### **COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, DISCUSSION**

Lead Petitioner Neil Gordon added that a Moderator’s Committee would be redundant to the committee formed by the Select Board. Petitioners are happy with the charge of the Select Board Committee and the members of the committee. Don’t believe that WA 24 would be moved for a Moderator’s Committee and is essentially moot.

Co-Petitioner Olsen-Pehlke added that she is not sure that all petitioners agree with Neil’s statement. Concerned that the Select Board gets to decide what goes on the warrant concerning options. My sense from the scope was that the idea of the committee was not to necessarily come out with only one option. She viewed Article 24 as kind of an escape valve or an insurance policy because there are so many moving pieces to this effort. We don't know what guidelines are going to change or if they might; we don't know how successful the zoning consultant is going to be; we don't know what kind of public feedback will be given, and how things might be changed, based on that feedback. We did request that there could be changes based on public inputs if that's in the actual contract with the zoning folks. It's kind of still all up in the air. Yes,

we don't need to have redundant efforts, and we do have some great people, and we're all committed to working together and coming up with some good ideas but it's up in the air. We don't know how it's really going to all turn out. There may be people who are petitioners who wish to carry the ball forward.

Neil clarified that the charge does not say “a” recommendation and technically speaking, there may be people who are not petitioners who will move an article that's on the warrant, and we can't stop them.

The Chairman offered that all of this would lead itself towards a recommendation of no action on the part of this body for this Warrant Article.

David Pollak shared names of other members Dick Benka (chair), Rick Fredkin, Carol Gladstone, Ken Lewis, Linda Olson Pehlke, David Pollak, Katha Seidman, Neil Wishinsky. There been 2 of the Planning Department community meetings and Kara has very good slides which are available on the website. There are a bunch of different decisions on how to put a package together and we'll see how the committee works. My guess is the committee can be very pragmatic to get something put together that is going to be both compliant and palatable to Town Meeting, and we only have 90 days to get something together because it has to go to DHCD where they do a lot of complicated geographical math to test it, to get their account of the units. It would have to be some member of Advisory to make a motion so it would be good to hear from Advisory Committee members is if we've heard enough to vote today so we don't have to deal with this on another day.

Harry Bohrs Commented: Thank you for the report, very good, and helpful. Clarified the MBTA issue. Inclined to vote no action since there is a committee in place.

Lee Selwyn noted his disappointment that omitted from the charge was anything relating to the fiscal implications for the Town and that what is included in the charge seems to have been predetermined by the Select Board. He added that when they had their subcommittee meeting on this Patty suggested that any discussion of the fiscal consequences in terms of having, for example, to accommodate additional kids in public schools was off the table. (Patty noted this was a legal opinion.) But at the same time, the AC heard 2 nights ago from School Department, and saw in their documentation that from their perspective they've got to consider new construction in their enrollment forecasts, and building planning. You have two Town departments basically taking absolutely opposite positions. The Planning Department says we should ignore the implications of the MBTACA activity on the schools, and we have a School Department saying that they're going to project enrollment, which, by the way, doesn't even include the implications of the MBTACA but enrollment from buildings that haven't yet been built in their sizing of their buildings. This is just not appropriate planning by any means. These 2 departments need to get their acts together and coordinate, and I'm very disappointed that the charge does not reflect this, and I think that the you know it seems to me that the purpose of this committee should be to look for alternatives to what the Planning Department's come up with, and not just to ratify it. And I'm although I'm pleased to see that people like Linda and Dick are on the committee, at the same time, I'm concerned that there are also people on there who seem to be have dropped the Kool-Aid on this issue, and I would not be upset if they were moderators committee that took a parallel course of action to look at this. I won't support no action.

Director of Planning and Community Development Kara Brewton corrected the suggestion that Planning Department and the School Department don't meet and discuss these matters. The Planning Department and the Schools meet once, if not 2 or 3 times a year to help them adjust any school enrollment projections. We've done that with the current superintendent as well as the 3 superintendents before him. This is quite a matter of routine. Across all of the

departments we have a very strong concern about tipping into the Fair Housing Act. There is a difference between saying, we don't want to comply and we don't want to have any units, because we are afraid of being able to house families in our Town. That is completely different from the way the charge was drafted which says that we should consider all the information we have in school capacity, and we can definitely say, if we're going to have additional housing, we should plan to take into account which areas in town that is, not whether there is housing.

Patty Correa had a follow up, clarifying comment: Her comment was directed to cautioning the subcommittee from factoring the legal obligation to house families in Brookline into our decision making. It was more question as Kara had interpreted, of what Lee was saying, whether we implement the act. Of course, we cannot discriminate against families, when making a decision like that. It seems that we're undertaking to deliberate the final ultimate question here on the warrant article. She said she didn't think there's anything to be gained, by the subcommittee meeting again before the full Advisory takes it up a second time, perhaps needlessly, and she would vote no action.

She added she is excited to see the different voices who are at this table and is of the strong opinion that everyone tries to work together to come up with one proposal. You can see from the report how extremely complex the issue is. There's so many factors and requirements. It would be painful and could lead to a lack of success at Town Meeting not to have a single proposal with all parties at the table working with the same State database spewing up numbers and trying to get to a place that isn't perfect, maybe in any one particular person's view, but accomplishes the objective of complying with an act that's intended to create housing for families and others in the Town of Brookline. She is very hopeful, and very excited to see this Select Board Committee start this work here.

Linda responded that she's not so sure we're going to come up with one solution in part because of the complexity of major zoning changes just in and of themselves then you add on the fact that this is a totally new form of zoning, and that we have a ridiculously compressed timeframe. Feel like we're being launched into mission impossible. People should keep their minds open about that because part of the reason for the warrant article was the realization that we may run out of time to get it right. Therefore, we may need to comply on paper at Town Meeting to avoid being out of compliance and continue working on whatever it is we're working on

She also asked there is a correction that needs to be made to the report before it gets distributed more widely.

Amy Hummel: is there a deadline that this Select Board Committee has for making a recommendation to Town Meeting? When is the committee scheduled to meet? A: July 15 for something to send to the State and then there will be the drafting of Warrant Articles which must be done by the beginning of September. There is a Doodle Poll and we should have a date posted tomorrow for the subcommittee meeting.

Kara noted that the language in the charge is to "strive to" and to be successful we might want to float some options to send to DHCD to see if we can get to a warrant article deadline.

The Chairman noted that we are obligated to vote on this and we need to have a report to distribute.

David-Marc Goldstein – Are we stuck with zoning once we put something in place? A: Kara answered we can definitely continue to change zoning as a local community, obviously need to remain in compliance one way or the other but anticipate that we may need to make changes. Would be shocked if State regulations wouldn't change over time as well.

Is approval from the State required to change the zoning? A: We can do it on our own but they have the authority to say whether we are complying or not.



Comment: Harry Friedman noted to make a change it requires a 2/3 vote, but if we make a change, that would require another 2/3 vote. Different constituencies in Town Meeting. A: The Housing Choice Act allows communities to change zoning where it's related to housing in a supportive way by a simple majority. How we set up those votes this fall is not set in stone – one vote, series of options, some votes set up would only require majority vote but if we added commercial it would require 2/3. Would want to check with Town Counsel to understand voting threshold based on what changes we want to make.

Patty added that DHCD guidelines indicate that DHCD has to be notified in all cases, not only of zoning changes, but of possible zoning changes.

Lee Q: What I'm trying to understand as the statute and how the regulation stands right now. We're not permitted to require commercial space on the ground floor? A: That is correct.

Linda added a comment about this issue of making a change and changing it later. In the Housing Choice Law, it states if it is housing only, and it's positive for creating more housing, it is a majority vote, but to change it back, or to undo it or reduce it in any way, does require two-thirds. That doesn't feel so good to those who believe in local control. People should understand that as well and the State is going to have something to say if we try to make a change that puts us out of compliance with the law. So really the point of the committee is to find ways to comply that may or may not add a whole ton of housing. To look for combinations of things and look for ways of making a change if we're not ready to do a major rezoning in town by the time fall town meeting comes by and still comply.

The Chairman reminded everyone that comments are germane to the question of whether we need warrant Article 24 and not what the state of Harvard Street will end up being. The question specifically is whether we need to vote in favor or opposed to the question of establishing a Moderator's Committee in parallel to the Select Board Committee.

David-Marc added one thing that has not come up is that the Town Administrator is interfering with the Legislative branch of our government by doing this end run around the Town Meeting warrant article. We have Town Meeting members who want to have a discussion in Town Meeting and this is an end run to make that moot. Don't think that's right. This should go before Town Meeting, and we should have a discussion.

David Pollak feels strongly that planning detail at this level is an executive function. Town Meeting can do whatever it wants, but to have a Moderator's Committee and Town Meeting write our zoning laws as opposed to its rightful role which is to pass or not pass our zoning would be a failure of government. Personally, he is pleased that the executive is stepping up to try to do this in the right way.

Regarding Linda's comment about what the expectation is and what's will have to happen on the committee, he thinks the charge to find ways to support housing development that are good for the Town is a good charge. The committee may not find any, but that's the charge. Pragmatically speaking he believes the committee is going to take an immediate interest in finding any and every opportunity to find and to designate acreage that's already developed with housing that can be designated as compliant with very little disruption or change, which is what Linda was saying. That's important to do. The committee is going to want to know is it even possible to totally comply with virtually no change. Then once we establish a baseline of what we can accomplish in short order, and be compliant, then we can say, Well, is there anything more ambitious we can do? Think that's the pragmatic approach that he hopes the committee will take with the short amount of time available.

Amy referred back to David Mark's point, it's a good one. She finds it always very chilling when the Select Board or the executive takes on this mantle. She's happy about it and does not want to chart a change but the town administrator is not a mayor, and each Select Board member is kind of 1/5 of that role. We do need leadership in some sense, but that comes from all of us. That is about everybody having a chance to participate in some way and not participate use all this volunteer time. Something like this is very complex, and there are a lot of important interests, a lot of stakeholders, and to have decisions like this made by the executive branch alone cuts the rest of that discussion off. Always on alert for that, it's a good thing to bring up and be wary of.

Also, she doesn't think that it's a good idea to have 2 competing groups at the same time, especially for resource reasons, if nothing else. She'd want some of the same individuals in both rooms depending on what their perspectives are. But overall Town Meeting needs to have this discussion not just in the committee, the committee is going to be doing a lot of hard work, but also just to get facts out there. The Town Meeting Members Association list doesn't do that right. So sometimes, at least in the floor of Town Meeting having a little bit of that is a good thing to do because corrections can be made in public by individuals with the correct information, and that exercise in and of itself is of great value.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for favorable action on WA 24. By a **VOTE** of 11 in favor, 6 opposed, and 4 abstentions, the Advisory Committee recommends Favorable Action on WA 24 assuming it will be moved.

**8:45 PM          Other Business**

The Chairman noted that while we had an excellent discussion on the budget on Tuesday, the voted override number stated was incorrect and will be corrected at a future meeting.

Vice Chairman Friedman gave a preview of the agendas for the next two meetings.

Other subcommittee chairs provided brief overviews of where they are with their hearings and meetings related to various warrant articles.

Upon a **MOTION** made and seconded to adjourn, and voted unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

**Documents Presented**

<https://www.brooklinema.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/4072>

- 2023 03 24 Administration and Finance Subcommittee Report on FY24 COVID FEMA.docx
- 2023 04 11 Public Safety Subcommittee Report on WA 23 REVISED
- capital report for tm with reqs (2023)
- k report for tm with reqs (2023)
- 2023 04 10 Land Use Subcommittee Report on WA 24 REVISED FINAL

**VOTES**

	<b>Vote 1</b>	<b>Vote 2</b>	<b>Vote 3</b>	<b>Vote 4</b>
<b># Votes Yes</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14</b>
<b># Votes No</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>
<b># Votes Abstain</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>

<b>Vote Description:</b>	<b>MAIN MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION on WA 4</b>	<b>MAIN MOTION: TABLE WA2</b>	<b>MAIN MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION on WA24</b>	<b>MAIN MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION on WA23 as amended</b>
	<i>Enter Y, N or A</i>	<i>Enter Y, N or A</i>	<i>Enter Y, N or A</i>	<i>Enter Y, N or A</i>
<b>Ben Birnbaum</b>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>Harry Bohrs</b>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>Cliff Brown</b>				
<b>Patty Correa</b>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>John Doggett</b>	N	Y	Y	A
<b>Katherine Florio</b>				
<b>Harry Friedman</b>	N	Y	Y	A
<b>David-Marc Goldstein</b>	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Neil Gordon</b>	N	Y	A	Y
<b>Susan Granoff</b>	N	Y	A	Y
<b>Kelly Hardebeck</b>	N			
<b>Amy Hummel</b>	N	Y	Y	N
<b>Anita Johnson</b>			N	A
<b>Alisa Jonas</b>	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Janice Kahn</b>	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Pam Lodish</b>	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Joslin Murphy</b>	N	Y	Y	A
<b>Donelle O'Neal, Sr.</b>			Y	Y
<b>Linda Olson Pehlke</b>	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Markus Penzel</b>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>David Pollak</b>	N	Y	N	Y
<b>Stephen Reeders</b>	N	Y	A	A
<b>Carlos Ridruejo</b>				
<b>Lee Selwyn</b>	N	Y	Y	A
<b>Alok Somani</b>			A	Y
<b>Carolyn Thall</b>	N	Y		
<b>Christine Westphal</b>				
<b>Dennis Doughty</b>				