

**Town of Brookline
Advisory Committee Minutes**

Sean Lynn-Jones, Chair

Date: May 8, 2019

Present: Carla Benka, Ben Birnbaum, Cliff Brown, Carol Caro, John Doggett, Dennis Doughty, Harry Friedman, Janet Gelbart, David-Marc Goldstein, Neil Gordon, Amy Hummel, Alisa G. Jonas, Janice S. Kahn, Steve Kanes, Carol Levin, David Lescohier, Pamela Lodish, Sean Lynn-Jones, Mariah Nobrega, Lee L. Selwyn, Kim Smith, Claire Stampfer, Charles Swartz, John VanScoyoc

Absent: Susan Granoff, Stanley L. Spiegel, Kelly Hardebeck, Michael Sandman, Bobbie Knable, Christine Westphal

Also attending: Petitioners for Article 23 Jesse Gray and Heather Hamilton; Deputy Town Administrator Melissa Goff, School Committee Members Susan Wolf Ditkoff and Julie Schreiner

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

MEETING AGENDA

1. Review and possible vote on Article 23 Resolution regarding electrification of the town's motorized fleet (Gray, TMM 10, Hamilton, Select Board)

Pam Lodish gave an overview of the Capital subcommittee's review of WA 23, the substance of which is available in their report. The goal is to reduce Town's carbon emissions by beginning to electrify the Town's fleet. Transition would be budget neutral with higher costs in the near term and lower in long term due to higher purchase prices and installation of charging stations. In the long-term, maintenance will be much lower so cost neutral. Subcommittee generally accepted the idea of an electric fleet and voted to support the article as amended.

This could be on the Select Board's agenda for possible reconsideration this week.

Petitioner Jesse Gray gave a presentation regarding the costs and benefits of Electric Vehicles.

Melissa Goff explained that the Newton model wouldn't work in our case because of insurance. It was noted, that there are over 300 vehicles in the overall Town fleet. Have to insure for any potential driver.

The resolution is broad and doesn't specify whether we need to buy or lease.

Q: Financial sense and the only requirement be that it be practical and there is nothing about financial reasonableness or the impact. A: The resolution stipulates something to the effect of bringing a policy to the Select Board for them to adopt.

Like the climate change impact aspect of the resolution and think this is a wonderful article. Newton has set out a plan as a municipality to pursue energy efficiency and lowering their carbon footprint. Hope we get to the same place as a Town.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to recommend favorable action on WA 23. By a **VOTE** of 20, none opposed and no abstentions, the AC recommends favorable action on WA 23. **Below is the petitioner's amended version of Warrant Article 23**, submitted by: Jesse M. Gray, TMM10, Heather Hamilton,

TMM3 and received on **May 3** (Jesse Gray reports that it has been agreed upon by Town staff as well as the co-sponsors.)

To see if the Town will adopt the following resolution:

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE ELECTRIFICATION OF THE TOWN'S MOTORIZED FLEET

Whereas, Brookline has a strong desire to assist the rest of the world in stopping climate change; and

Whereas, the Town must dramatically reduce its emissions via implementation of "strong and immediate" policies if it wishes to assist in keeping global warming below 1.5°C, per the December 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report; and

Whereas, fossil fuels for the Town's own motorized vehicles are a significant source of atmospheric carbon emissions, and all Town vehicles burn fossil fuels (although many sedans are hybrids); and

Whereas, a variety of all-electric vehicles (and sources of 100% clean electricity) are now available, with more becoming available every year; and

Whereas the Town and its fleet are an important and visible model to the public, shaping culture and belief in collective climate action; and

Whereas transportation and transportation-related emissions are primarily a function of (1) vehicle energy efficiency; (2) the carbon emissions associated with vehicle energy use; (3) vehicle miles traveled; and (4) other factors related to vehicle use, *e.g.*, vehicle size and demand for vehicles, which may be influenced by encouraging the use of route optimization, virtual meetings, and alternative modes of transport such as biking, scooters, walking, and MBTA;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Town Meeting calls upon the Town to electrify the Town's motorized vehicle fleet and to create a comprehensive vehicle policy to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from motorized vehicles and equipment to zero by 2050, or as soon as is possible.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Town Meeting calls upon the Town, as of July 1, 2020, or using funds allocated in the budget for FY2021 and fiscal years thereafter, not to acquire via purchase, lease, or otherwise fossil fuel-consuming vehicles including cars, trucks, buses, emergency vehicles, street sweepers, lawn mowers, snow blowers, skid-steers, or any other motorized portable equipment for which a PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVE is acquirable via a contract or procurement process that complies with MGL Ch. 30B. For the purposes of this resolution, a PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVE shall be defined as one or more commercially available electrified device(s) that singly or in combination meet the required needs with equivalent utility for the intended use. The department head requesting the vehicle, after consultation with the Chief Procurement Officer and Fleet Manager, will determine whether available alternatives qualify as PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVES.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Town Meeting calls upon the Town to create a policy to prioritize higher ranked PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVES over lower ranked ones, in the following order:

1. Fully electric equipment (e.g., Battery Electric Vehicles [BEVs]);
2. Partially electric plug-in hybrid equipment (e.g., Plug-in Hybrid EVs [PHEVs]);

3. Partially electric non-plug-in hybrid equipment (e.g., conventional hybrids).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Town Meeting calls upon the Town Administrator to amend the vehicle policy within the next year to integrate fleet management and purchasing practices that advance zero-emission vehicles, fleet rightsizing, route optimization, reductions in vehicle miles traveled, and other relevant considerations that are needed for a stable climate, environmental stewardship, equity, sustainable budgets, and community health.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Town Meeting requests Town Departments to note the energy source(s) of vehicles in budget requests (e.g., fossil fuel, plug-in hybrid, non-plug-in hybrid, or fully electric).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT for the purchase of Public Safety vehicles, the following standards must continue to be complied with, as set forth in the following:

A. For Police Department vehicles, acceptable Michigan State Police vehicle test results for the current model year police vehicles, and;

B. For Fire Department vehicles, the NFPA 1901 Standard for Automotive Fire Apparatus; the NFPA 1911 Standard for the Inspection, Maintenance, Testing, and Retirement of In-Service Emergency Vehicles; the NFPA 1914 Standard for Fire Apparatus Refurbishing; and the NFPA 1915 Standard for Fire Apparatus Preventive Maintenance Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT although much of the Town's school bus and school van transport is currently provided by contract, such that vehicles are not owned or leased by the Town, the Town Meeting nevertheless encourages the Town and Schools to explore electrification of the contracted fleet and, as soon as is practical and cost effective, to transition the contracted fleet to fully electric vehicles, by modifying or switching the contract and/or by acquiring some or all of the Town's own fleet via purchase or lease.

Or act on anything relative thereto.

2. Review and possible vote on Article 9 Special Appropriations:

- Item 67: Driscoll School Reconstruction
- Item 68: Baldwin School Renovation and Expansion

We voted the FY2020 budget that did not include the special appropriations for the Driscoll and Baldwin School items and opted to postpone until override vote, which was yesterday.

Select Board motion includes both items but there may be a possible reconsideration.

What is the status of Oak Street? We own them and looking to finance in March. We would disposition of land requires a Town vote and bidding if the Town decides to sell the property.

John Doggett Motion (take original language and add contingency clause or condition of appropriation).

“ARTICLE 9, CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM ITEM 67 – DRISCOLL SCHOOL (see pp. 9-85 to 9-86 of the Combined Reports)

Contingent on a debt exclusion vote pursuant to General Laws, Chapter 59, Sections 21C(k) and (m) on or before September 15, 2019 approving the payment of principal, interest and costs on the

borrowing as set forth below, appropriate \$108,800,000, to be expended under the direction of the Building Commission, with any necessary contracts over \$100,000 to be approved by the Select Board and the School Committee to reconstruct the Driscoll School and, to meet the appropriation, authorize the Treasurer, with approval of the Select Board, to borrow \$108,800,000, under General Laws, Chapter 44, Section 7(1) as amended, or pursuant to any other enabling authority; and authorize the Select Board to apply for, accept, receive and expend grants, aid, reimbursements, loans, and all other forms of funding and financial assistance from both state and federal sources and agencies for such purpose. Any premium received upon the sale of any bonds or notes approved by this vote, less any such premium applied to the payment of the costs of issuance of such bonds or notes, may be applied to the payment of costs approved by this vote in accordance with Chapter 44, Section 20 of the General Laws, thereby reducing the amount authorized to be borrowed to pay such costs by a like amount.”

COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

This motion would allow Town Meeting to act on this and approve it – Select Board can then take it up. Any annual Town Meeting that has language about a debt exclusion has to happen by September 15. Have a 35 day window which is open for offering that to the Town to approve the item.

Perhaps we should exclude the amount of money; it is required to have an amount of money in there. If it changes it changes downward not a problem, if it changes up it could be a problem.

Redesign school for 200,000,000 this would be of no value and they would have to come back to everyone.

Would Town Meeting be changing the scope of the project – would require more work at the schematic design level and there are some contingency funds but don't know how much. Valuing to that number or potentially coming back to Town Meeting.

Not sure why the design would change. Has a way forward with an unbundled vote for a project that we think has a lot of support.

Remove the need for it to come back to a special town meeting.

Q: If just one school is selected, how would you incorporate that into your planning to satisfy the academic needs of student community? A: There hasn't been a School Committee meeting so can't speak for them.

We can't assume that we can turnaround in 35 days and expect that Driscoll will accept that.

The ink on the ballots is still wet, just happened last night, we haven't heard from the School Committee and we don't know how the other players will come in. Believe it is premature and not prudent for us to support this at this early stage until we have more input.

Only building a new Driscoll because the other is falling apart or we would be repairing the old one for \$10million less. School Committee one way or the other needs to do something about the Driscoll one way or the other so not sure this is all that premature. Something needs to be spent.

This offers the Select Board an option and is an incentive – a preapproved loan for the Driscoll project – this is what this motion gives to the Select Board. No need to have further approval at Town Meeting. I find it illogical in so far as what was rejected in this election is the three pronged approach – approval of any piece of this plan requires approval of all parts of the plan. People have doubts about the Baldwin part and that is what is clear regarding the vote yesterday. Public expectation that we will move Driscoll part forward because it is an emergency need for a school that is near the end of its life.

We have time for another meeting before Town Meeting to consider this further.

Understand what both sides are saying – lots of questions about implication of this if not designed as an option. What would happen if you had a situation where you go back for a Driscoll debt exclusion – close vote – at a Town Meeting would you get the 2/3 vote? It would apply to this motion and it is preloaded and ready.

Feel that resolutions are a waste of time, don't see them as binding, although some people do. Still Select Board needs to do its job and they should be able to do what they want.

Consider role of politics in this- what does the Driscoll community really wants – have Town Meeting get preapproved loan to the Select Board to move forward with a 4 section school.

How many more meeting do we have before Town Meeting? Possibly one more meeting before supplemental is due – 13th or 14th of May to file a motion or a report before noon on the 15th.

We will meet on the 21st the first night of Town Meeting.

We don't know how any individual or collective of the public how people voted and we don't know how the public feels about this particular motion and the Driscoll School. This committee is not about politics but finance and advising Town Meeting accordingly.

Only 2 prongs of the 3 prong solution were before the public yesterday. Pierce was invited by MSBA to move forward. Clock starts ticking June 1st for the Town to go through a process in 180 days to fulfill our obligation to make sure we get through the first hoop of the process so we can bring the Pierce debt exclusion before the voters.

I think 24 hours is not a rational amount of time to make a decision. Let's hear from School Committee and Select Board.

Bundling took away voters choice to their own priorities and to know why the voters voted the way they did. Some voted no because of the tax increase, or didn't think we needed a 9th school. We have no idea as to why they voted this way. I don't see we have the right to omnisciently figure out what voters think. We should be bringing Driscoll back but let's see what we have – Driscoll has to be enlarged because we don't have Baldwin, renting a building from Menomenies, and Newbury – these will not be resolvable in the next week let alone 2 or 3 so suggest a special town meeting.

Not our role to fulfill the promises of the “No” committee to the public. These are promises other people made. As a finance committee we need to review a plan.

This just says can we put on piece of the three prongs back in front of the public.

I would hope that the bodies within the Town that have responsibility for addressing these issues have a plan B that we can be reviewing. This is a lot of money and we know what we are potentially encumbering the tax payers within the context of the plan from the School Committee. Premature despite the pledges of the “No on 1” group.

A huge and complex problem that none of us have worked on as much as the School Committee has. Acting too quickly makes it seem that the Town doesn't have a plan.

Doesn't mandate anything just provides a path and for that reason I would support it.

One way to move forward but if we don't do this, what do we imagine the timeline would be? I don't see why testing the waters, taking it to the voters.

No faith that there is a coherent plan B and I need to hear something more before voting on this.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to table this until late next week when we have more information from School Committee and Select Board.

School Committee member Susan Wolf Ditkoff noted that they have a reorganization Meeting next Tuesday – so the likelihood is low that a plan will be developed by Tuesday.

The **MOTION** to table was withdrawn.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to move NO ACTION on Item 67 as offered by John Doggett.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for FAVORABLE ACTION on Item 67 as offered by John Doggett.

By a **VOTE** of 9 in favor, 12 opposed and no abstentions, the motion fails.

John and John could offer the amendment – not as an Advisory Committee amendment but an amendment to the Advisory Committee vote. We would review it on the 21st. Would that allow from us to hear from the Driscoll School PTO before we make our decision?

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for Favorable Action on the following John VanScoyoc Resolution:

A RESOLUTION TO SEEK AN OVERRIDE VOTE TO APPROVE A DRISCOLL 4-SECTION SCHOOL

WHEREAS on May 7, 2019 voters of Brookline rejected Question 1 on the Town Election ballot; and

WHEREAS Question 1 called for debt exclusion overrides for the Driscoll School and the Baldwin School, as approved for schematic design by votes of Town Meeting on 12/18/2018; and

WHEREAS Question 1 was a so-called "bundled" vote, limiting voters to saying "Yes" to both the Driscoll and Baldwin projects or "No" to both the Driscoll and Baldwin projects; and

WHEREAS Question 1 was widely debated during the period leading up to the 5/7/2019 election, with opposition to Question 1 focused on the flaws of the Baldwin project; accompanied by warnings of the forced harm posed by the bundled vote to the Driscoll project; and

WHEREAS Spend Smart Brookline led the opposition to Question 1 while vowing to "bring back Driscoll" for a separate vote on a future override ballot.

WHEREAS the position of Spend Smart Brookline prevailed by a margin of 9 percent; now therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that Town Meeting urges the Board of Selectmen to meet at the earliest convenient date to set a date no sooner than 35 days but no later than 9/15/2019 for a debt exclusion for the 4-section Driscoll School project; and for that question to be offered to Brookline voters for approval.

There is a difference between this resolution and item 67 which would have just put money in budget against the wishes of the public. This resolution is something I could support.

Suggest strike out "4-section" piece I could support this. It is up to the School Committee and the Select Board to plan this one way or another.

This needs to be word-smithed and suggest we don't vote on it tonight.

Passing a resolution like this we are allowing the Select Board to move forward without getting the information they need to inform a plan.

I see this as putting this before the voters the choice they didn't have. Propose that the resolution that puts Baldwin back on the ballot.

Do you want to spend \$80,000 something on Baldwin and \$100,000 something on Driscoll?

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to table this resolution until next week. By a **VOTE** of 6 in favor, 10 opposed and 3 abstentions, the motion to table fails.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for NO ACTION on the resolution. By a **VOTE** of 12 in favor, 9 opposed and no abstentions the Advisory Committee recommends No Action.

3. Review and possible reconsideration and vote on the following Articles:

- Article 6: Special Appropriation Close-outs/Debt Rescission (Select Board) – we had voted favorable action previously.

Article 6 concerns \$4 million funding for the HVAC system at Driscoll. Deputy Town Administrator would recommend NO ACTION - capacity to fund Oak Street if the override failed. But we could refile in November. Recommend waiting until we have more information. Can't use this funding for replacement parts for a building we are going to knock down a year later. We would use Reserve Fund to cover any emergency needs.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for reconsideration of Article 6. By a **VOTE** of 19 in favor, none opposed and 1 abstention, the Advisory Committee will reconsider Article 6.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to recommend NO ACTION on Article 6. By a **VOTE** of 19 in favor, 1 opposed and 1 abstention, the Advisory Committee recommends no action on Article 6.

- Article 17: Amendment to Section 6.8.2 of the Town's General By-Laws pertaining to members of the Public Facilities Naming Committee (Gordon) – Select Board voted favorable action on the petitioner's motion.

There was no motion to reconsider.

- Article 18: Amend Section 8.6.7 of the Town's general By-Laws pertaining to the restraint of dogs in designated off-leash areas (Commissioner of Public Works) – Select Board voted favorable action on the change to include ADA language. Caitlin's intent is to draw attention to it and bring it to the forefront of people's minds and she will want to bring it back to all bylaws. She can do the same thing where we changed Board of Selectmen to Select Board ...

There was no motion to reconsider.

- Article 26: Resolution pertaining to the engagement of a race and equity review consultant (Brown, Wolf Ditkoff, Sandman) - The Select Board adopted a slightly different motion.

There was no motion to reconsider.

There being no further business, the meeting ADJOURNED at 9:50 p.m.