

**Town of Brookline  
Advisory Committee Minutes  
May 10, 2022**

**To access a recording of this meeting, click on the link and enter the passcode below:**

[https://brooklinema.zoomgov.com/rec/share/dFIQaKw1Du5o\\_S2VainBOIPLabkwNM4ECIT8AIUIE5\\_H-14VVatT7YZCvO3pNAGS.yowTTz8OBAVOwJAz](https://brooklinema.zoomgov.com/rec/share/dFIQaKw1Du5o_S2VainBOIPLabkwNM4ECIT8AIUIE5_H-14VVatT7YZCvO3pNAGS.yowTTz8OBAVOwJAz)

Passcode: %s7n.563

---

**Present:** C. Scott Ananian, Carla Benka, Ben Birnbaum, Clifford Brown, John Doggett, Dennis Doughty, Katherine Florio, David-Marc Goldstein, Neil Gordon, Susan Granoff, Kelly Hardebeck, Anita Johnson, Georgia Johnson, Alisa Jonas, Janice Kahn, Carol Levin, Pam Lodish, Linda Olson Pehlke, Donelle O’Neal, David Pollak, Stephen Reeders, Carlos Ridruejo, Alok Somani, Christine Westphal

**Absent:** Harry Bohrs, Harry Friedman, Amy Hummel (on sabbatical)

**Also Attending:** Deputy Town Administrator Melissa Goff, Associate Town Counsel Jonathan Simpson, Transportation Administrator Todd Kirrane; Economic Development Director Meredith Mooney; Judge Bonnie MacLeod, EDAB Co-Chairs Paul Saner and Anne Meyers; Petitioners for WA 27 Don Warner, Virginia Smith and Clint Richmond; Petitioners for WA 30 Carol Caro and Jeff Wachter; Brookline Chamber of Commerce Board President David Gladstone; Sheera Hefter, Jennifer Lewis, Kimberly Richardson, Roger Blood, David Trevvett, Karen Flannery, Sara Petras, Perry Grossman, Marissa Vogt, Deborah Brown, Fred Levitan, Gustavo Oliviera, Susan Healy, Liz Linder, Henry Winkelman, Faith Michaels, Regina Frawley, John Bassett, Eve Nightingale, Stanley Spiegel, Edward Bell, Martha Huntley, John Herbert, Mark Gray, Frances Winter, Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, Martin Rosenthal, Frances Shedd-Fisher, Hugh Mattison, Mike Toffel, 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 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.

**7:00 pm Public Comment**

**Susan Healy:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening, my name is Susan Healy, owner of HC Studio and I have been a business owner in Brookline Village for 22 years. I along with many other business owners have many questions and concerns regarding WA-30.

First and foremost, it is important for everybody here to understand that my opposition to WA-30 should not be interpreted as an opposition to Senior Affordable Housing. On the contrary, I am very much in support and will always advocate for Senior Affordable Housing. When the original RFP was discussed and passed several years ago, I gave 100% support for the project. Which clearly states that the 39 spaces in the Kent/Station Street lot would remain.

WA-30 now proposes, many years after the original RFP was determined, to remove the parking. This will have a very negative impact on our Business Community at large. Many of the business owners and the employees who service the Brookline Village Community cannot afford to live in Brookline or the surrounding areas and they must travel from suburbs in order to work, that is the case with my team. I have employees that travel from Providence, Harvard, Hanover, Scituate, Milton, Fitchburg, Walpole and Worcester. They rely heavily on being able to park here for their 10 hour shift!

Todd spoke at the Sub Committee Meeting last week and made it very clear that Brookline is tapped out as far as parking is concerned and if we try and “find” spots in the neighborhood for merchant parking, that will directly compete with consumers, residents, their guests and teachers. This is not a viable solution. We cannot afford to lose even one spot in Brookline Village!

There is no public parking garage, there is a waiting list for the \$600 per year parking pass for side streets as that program is already at its maximum capacity and the parking benefits district is only a program that can allocate money from existing metered parking that can be used to beautify the community. There are no choices and we need parking.

As our community continues to grow and develop, and as we bring more people into the village it is irresponsible and short sighted not to consider the ramifications of taking parking away. I believe that Brookline Village is a Community which by definition is “a feeling of fellowship with others, as a result of sharing common attitudes, interest and goals.” I am pleading with you to find a solution that will keep our community whole and not divided. This is not an either/or situation. We need both equally to keep our community alive and vibrant. I believe it can be done

**Liz Linder, Resident & Owner of Liz Linder Photography, Inc. elected TMM, Precinct 4.** Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. I’m clocking this at about 3 minutes, and as the saying goes, if I had more time, it would be shorter! Briefly, I’ve been either observing or participating in this project since close to its inception. I was drawn to this area for its unique vibrant culture and walkability. It’s where I live, and work for close to 20 years. I love the brick and beam historic buildings and I live in one, the closest abutting residence to this project. I’m also part of the merchant community, a brick and mortar, independent small business community that makes Brookline Village a thriving, desirable destination. I have to say, I’m wary around development in the lot adjacent to my home – it’s a small lot and building to scale in context seemed like a tight construction project to begin with. But affordable housing is important, my parents are in their 80’s and I’m in my mid 50’s and can see what I like to call ‘coming attractions’. I need to work and want to age in place. I helped with the RFP and helped select the developer. I invited the community to weigh in, and we came to a place that made sense. The green light on this project was tied directly to maintaining parking for the community, not only the business district but residents who live here also depend on available spaces as part of a livability factor – Frances Winter spoke about this in a previous meeting. Warrant Article 30 positions affordable housing in opposition to parking. It’s too easy to vilify parking as a fossil fuel issue

without taking into consideration context and unintended consequences. I was just elected into Town Meeting and would like to see smart and efficiently built affordable housing, potentially over parking lots, wherein the preserved spaces would accommodate more electric vehicles, turning these lots into green initiatives. Many small businesses following COVID, are so challenged, but the ones left standing are resourceful and resilient, but yet so vulnerable right now. You can see the response to our last minute petition, close to 60 and counting known and loved businesses are expressing concern, and keep in mind this word-of-mouth petition is from a handful of us pivoting daily and swinging from vine to vine as we strive to keep our businesses going and get the word out a day or two or hours before a meeting time is confirmed. I personally know several people who want to be here but can't figure out how to do so at the last minute or have technical issues with the digital interface. I personally am scrambling; this is turning into a mental and emotional endurance test. What makes this area a desirable location to age in place is the walkability and shops, restaurants, and services without which Brookline Village will become something of a big-box medical district / affordable housing district, where many people who can't take the T can't come and go easily (including visitors and services) because it's too hard to park. From my perspective, allowing this sort of short-sighted development decision to occur with too great a cost to the community and town constitutes an error in judgement. Make no mistake: removing parking we were assured – that this project's initial approval was based on -- will be the tipping point from which I imagine many businesses will not recover. We certainly need affordable housing for the elderly. Henry Winkelman introduced the idea of air rights to preserve parking and literally build on – and above it -- so that everyone wins. Warrant Article 34 – the genesis of this project – was to develop affordable housing over town owned parking using air rights. I've since been told that air rights aren't a realistic option. But If air rights were never part of a future reality, why was this part of the original petition? I was on board with finding a creative way to maintain the parking, and we did so with the RFP, but if Warrant Article 30 is approved, it suggests that the air rights were merely used to justify a project with minimal consideration for community impacts, or context. Undermining a neighborhood to put in a project that seems too compromised at these early stages is not a viable solution, and I urge this town to find a better way. I don't believe we are in a good position to vote for WA30 at town meeting, and need to work together towards creative solutions to better position the options.

**Henry Winkelman** shared a presentation regarding WA 30 and it is attached and linked to these minutes.

**David Gladstone:** Good Evening and thank you for allowing the voices from our business community to be heard in regards to Article 30. My name is David Gladstone a long time town resident of PCT 16. I am currently President Of the Brookline Chamber, a member of the Small Business Advisory Committee and a current member of THE CPC Joint Planning Committee for The U.S. Open in Brookline this June. I was also involved in helping to establish the Benefits Parking District in the village with Chris Dempsey. In addition I am on the planning group to bring a BID, business improvement district to Coolidge Corner JFK. Full disclosure I am the banker for many businesses in Brookline and the village and did 150 PPP loans during covid.

First and fore-most let me say that affordable housing is very important for Brookline and for making rents affordable in an age when many people can't afford to live in Brookline. The Chamber fully supports affordable housing both now and in the future. Article 30 while well intentioned creates an either-or scenario in Brookline Village. Affordable housing vs affordable parking for people who work in the village business district. This shouldn't be the case. Many of the business owners you will hear from tonight will tell you that Brookline can accomplish both at the same time.

The original article 34 which article 30 is looking to redress is that an idea came about that you have all these parking lots around in Brookline and why not build above them (air rights) to create affordable housing at a

reduced expense since you didn't have to pay for the land. The idea seemed credible and passed town meeting many years ago. The RFP which was floated talked about the affordable housing development with no loss of parking spaces... Let me repeat no loss of any of the 39 parking spaces which are currently used by the business owners and their employee's at a reduced price per hour once a permit is purchased from the town. These permits allow the cars to park there the entire day.

Once the studies got underway a developer was chosen who came back with designs which claimed that it would be too expensive to keep the 39 spaces. Explanations range from 100k per space for underground parking to above ground parking that the columns and elevator shaft wouldn't allow many spaces for parking. After hearing this, the petitioners put forward article 30 to request the removal of up to 39 spaces.

Our ask from the business district is that there can be a solution for both parties to win with an affordable housing development and available parking for the employees and owners of small businesses. That solution is to require within article 30 a rewrite which is being presented tonight as an alternative to the existing proposal. Some people claim that this rewrite is too restrictive. The business district begs to differ that this rewrite will create the expectation that the 39 spaces won't be lost but will be replaced someplace within the village to afford parking for our employees and business owners.

Let's face it - parking before covid in the village was almost nonexistent. I myself sometimes drive around looking for a free space to park in when I am servicing my business clients in the village. The village has the least amount of parking in any business district in Brookline bar none.

What will happen if these parking spaces aren't maintained or found elsewhere in the village? Right away not much. Employees will look for spaces and park in meters which will increase the non-availability of spaces for customers and visitors looking to enjoy the village. Over time the impact will have irreparable damage to the vitality and to the fabric of what makes the village a charming and cute place to live and shop in and own a business in. Look around the business districts and imagine an owner fed up with the lack of support for them attempting to make a living. Imagine new business owners coming in and passing Brookline by because it is too difficult to run a business here. This isn't to far fetched to imagine. We need to figure out a way to have affordable housing and also have affordable and available parking for our merchants. Let's not have a hand in helping to destroy the village with all we hold dear. Let's find a solution to maintain the 39 spaces and let's build developments so our elderly can age in place, not worrying that they may not be able to afford the rent or make a decision to buy less food to pay the rent. The rest as they say is up to you all. I strongly urge you to vote for the rewritten article 30 which will ensure a win by all. The B in Brookline also needs to stand for small business!! Thank you and let's make this a win/ win for all!

**Faith Michaels** shared additional comments about Leaf Blowers WA 27. HI ALL I'M BACK TO MAKE A STATEMENT ON THE LEAF BLOWER ARTICLE.

FIRST OFF I WANT TO POINT OUT REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE, THAT THE PETITIONERS CITE AN 11 YEAR OLD HALF BAKED STUDY ABOUT LEAFBLOWERS EMITTING THE SAME POLLUTION AS A TRUCK DRIVING CROSS COUNTRY. USING COMMON SENSE CAN ONLY LEAD ONE TO BELIEVE THIS IS VERY OLD FAKE NEWS. REMEMBER-THE LEAF BLOWERS MODERATOR COMMITTEE RECOGNIZED THAT NEW AND IMPROVED LEAFBLOWERS ONLY EMIT .038% OF US CO2 EMISSIONS.

I MUST SAY IT'S HARD TO MAKE CONCRETE COMMENTS BECAUSE I HAVE NO IDEA WHAT TOWN MEETING WILL BE ACTUALLY VOTING ON. SO INSTEAD I WOULD LIKE TO LET YOU KNOW HOW A TOTAL BAN ON GASPOWERED LEAF BLOWERS IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS WILL SEVERLY IMPACT MY BUSINESS I HAVE SO CAREFULLY BUILT OVER THE YEARS. THE PETITIONERS HAVE NO REALISTIC IDEA OF HOW WE DO OUR JOB AND HOW THE ELECTRIC BLOWERS JUST DON'T WORK AT THIS MOMENT IN TIME. BATTERIES WILL NOT HOLD ON HIGH AND THE ACTUAL CARRYING SYSTEM IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR A 9 HOUR DAY. I LOOK FORWARD TO THE DAY WHEN WE CAN SWITCH TO ELECTRIC BUT I ASSURE YOU WHAT'S OUT THERE NOW DOES NOT WORK FOR HEAVY CLEAN UPS.

IF WE LOSE THE ABILITY TO DO CLEAN UPS WITH GAS BLOWERS, I WILL CUT MY STAFF IN HALF WHO ARE MAINLY MINORITY WORKERS PROVIDING FOR THEIR FAMILIES. INSTEAD, I WILL FOCUS ON DESIGN AND BUILD. I'M LUCKY, I HAVE THAT SKILL BUT THE PEOPLE WHO WILL BE MOST HURT BY THE BAN ARE THE WORKERS WHO WILL LOSE OUT.

I WILL NO LONGER PROVIDE CLEAN UPS FOR MY ELDERLY, WORKING FAMILIES AND HANDICAPPED CLIENTS.

IT'S TAKEN ME YEARS TO BUILD MY BUSINESS TO WHAT IT IS TODAY AND I PROUDLY SHARE THE BENEFITS WITH MY WORKERS.

IF I HAVE TO REDUCE MY FIRM, I WILL NO LONGER BE ONE OF THE ONLY WOMEN OWNED AND RUN BUSINESS CONTRACTED WITH THE TOWN OF BROOKLINE TO CLEAN UP THE PARKS. I WILL NO LONGER BE ABLE TO VOLUNTEER MY SERVICES TO AMORY PARK, OR THE SPONSORSHIP OF THE PENDER ROTARY. I WILL NO LONGER ACT AS A LIAISON TO THE LANDSCAPE COMMUNITY. IN MY DISCUSSIONS WITH THEM, I HEAR I AM NOT ALONE. THEY TOO WILL PULL BACK ALL THEIR SERVICES TO THE TOWN, INCLUDING SNOW REMOVAL.

AT THE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING ONE OF THE PETITIONERS REMARKED THAT IT WAS "UNFAIR FOR A MINORITY OF WORKERS WITHIN THIS TOWN, MOST WHO DO NOT LIVE IN THIS TOWN TO SUBJECT RESIDENTS TO NOISE AND DESTRUCTION."

I BELIVE TO THE CONTRARY, THAT THESE ARE HARDWORKING INDIVIDUALS, DOING THE WORK THAT NO ONE ELSE WANTS TO DO, PROVIDING FOR THEIR FAMILIES AND GIVING A VALUABLE SERVICE TO THE RESIDENTS OF BROOKLINE.

IF YOU ARE GOING TO RECONSIDER, I HOPE YOU GIVE A RESOUNDING MESSAGE OF NO SUPPORT TO THIS ARTICLE. THANK YOU

**Gustavo Oliviera:** Don't know why you want to take away the tools that are part of my job. I can't really do my job with electrical ones. Thank you.

**Carol Caro** spoke in favor of Article 30 noting that the resolve clause states "no longer maintain that requirement to keep all of the existing 39 spaces in order to bring the cost of the project to a reasonable level while keeping as many parking spaces on the site as feasible to allow the Town to subsidize affordable housing." Believe there is a misconception that this article wants to do away with all 39

parking spaces but what it is saying is find a way so this project is affordable to the Town. She mentioned air rights over parks and noted the committee did look at this but found it would result in the loss of parking because of the structure that would need to be built over the area. There would need to be an elevator, stairs, etc. and that was cost prohibitive. Voting this article down because of fear of losing all parking is sad, while the need for low income housing for the elderly is acute and I hope this will help solve some of those problems. Thank you.

### **7:15 Public Hearing**

#### **Report of Third-party Review of Stanley Spiegel Indemnification Materials - Judge Bonnie MacLeod**

Judge MacLeod gave a brief presentation regarding her report which is attached and linked to these minutes. She then took questions from the public and the Advisory Committee. She reiterated her experience delineated in her report so everyone could understand the lens through which she reviewed this case. A more holistic approach needs to be taken here. For the sake of her review, she can assume that the indemnification issue is not before her – if indemnification were to happen, was this a reasonable fee, and she concluded it was. She believes the hourly fees granted by the magistrate judge were not commensurate with the experience and training of the lawyers involved.

The Judge noted that the Contingent Fee is reasonable and far less in similar situations that a lawyer would charge.

She noted that she has always been a public servant. Never had to keep hours, bill a client, pay for office overhead or staff. Most sitting judges come from the public sector so when they are reviewing private lawyers' fees, they seem expensive but that is the reality. In this case, hourly fees were already diminished because of what the judge felt might feel their lack of experience in the area. The judge gave them the fees akin to that of a first year associate in a large Boston law firm.

Jonathan Simpson, Associate Town Counsel for the Town, noted that his office will support the Judge's recommendations and reasonableness of the fees and they intend to advance it to the Select Board.

### **Questions and Comments**

The Chair invited the public offer questions or comments and asked them to disclose any relationship to any of the parties or subject matter.

Attorney Martin Rosenthal identified himself as Mr. Spiegel's lawyer, a 44-year Town Meeting Member and former Select Board member. He thanked Judge MacLeod for her analysis and noted his agreement and some disagreement with her conclusions. He gave Judge MacLeod a 90% rating on her monetary figures and a 67% on her conceptual approach, the 67% being first her analysis of the fees that have been paid and owed by Stanley Spiegel, which has basically been modified slightly since November Town Meeting debate because we've got the final figure with Judge MacLeod. So, it was basically reduced slightly so the bottom line becomes \$193,253 instead of \$198,000 that was conditionally appropriated in the Advisory Committee motion. Appreciate too her view about what Judge Kelly did which was thrown against us numerous times, since then it was largely irrelevant and is what lawyers call dictum. We

objected to her findings but Judge O'Toole, who was the judge above her in the case, did not address those objections because they were irrelevant to the decision because the \$20K was for deterrent and not to compensate for legal fees. This is the issue where I strongly disagree with Judge MacLeod. The reasonableness judgement on the first two figures is much more objective. There is a methodology for scrutinizing fees in terms of hourly rates and work that's been done.

Attorney Rosenthal concluded his comments.

#### Questions, Comments

Q: For information purposes, what did the Town pay Judge MacLeod for this work? A: To date we have paid less than \$10K for this matter which involved review of a substantial amount of invoice and many phone conversations.

Judge MacLeod added that she has spent over 12 hours and has only billed for 6. She hasn't yet submitted an invoice for reviewing the report and appearing at the AC tonight.

Comment: There were many people on the AC who were not questioning the fees so we have spent more than that to come to the same conclusion.

Q: I reviewed the mandate voted by Town Meeting in this matter, a neutral 3<sup>rd</sup> party to undertake this review. Counsel Simpson you appear to be acting as an advocate on behalf of the Town and Stanley.

Counsel Simpson responded that ultimately in discussion with the Select Board in executive session, the Town elected to present a position of advocating the magistrate judge's position but we maintain that we make a case to Judge MacLeod and leave the decision to her.

Comment: I do not believe that Town Meeting authorized you to pick a position, authorized Town Counsel to take a position, and particularly I don't think the Town Meeting authorized you to take a position with respect to the \$20,000, both of which you did in your submission which I think was out of line and inconsistent with what Town Meeting voted. Beyond the scope of what Town Meeting voted and this should be ignored and rejected.

Judge MacLeod said she wasn't persuaded to anything by anyone and served as a strictly neutral party.

Comment: Town Meeting voted to authorize \$198,000, which would represent the entire thing and basically did not deduct the \$20,000. I don't read Town Meeting's mandate as requesting that Judge MacLeod opine as to the position of the \$20,000 because basically Town Meeting voted 195 to 25, essentially, determined that the entire amount would be authorized, the entire amount without the \$20,000 deduction. And yet, based on your advocacy on behalf of the Town, which was not authorized in my opinion by Town Meeting, you apparently persuaded Judge MacLeod to deduct the \$20,000. Of the 25 negative votes, roughly 10 of those folks aren't even in Town Meeting anymore having either not run or were defeated a few weeks ago. So I think that the Advisory Committee to the extent that, I don't even know what our role is here other than to hold this hearing based on the Article adopted.

Jonathan Simpson responded: As to whether my advocacy was appropriate or not, and I will not comment on that. I will however point out that based on the way that financing, you know, the budget article of that that Special Town Meeting, Article One was, it's a one way ratchet. I don't believe that is appropriate to claim that because \$196,000 was authorized we had to give that amount. Very simply put: if you didn't authorize the maximum possible transfer, there would be no way to go up, so I would posit that it was appropriate to allow the greatest range of results by appropriating the full \$196,000. I do not believe that it is appropriate to claim that is a mandate for the reasonableness review to come out as \$196,000. That's all I have to say.

Comment: Echo Jonathan Simpson's comment and this was an upper limit and not the final figure. What are we doing here?

The Chair explained that the Advisory Committee was charged with holding a public hearing on this matter and hear comments. Not voting on anything.

Comment: Concerned that we appointed someone who worked with Marty for so long; question the optics. I don't think we should suddenly reconsider and question previous votes based on turnover in Town Meeting that is just how it works.

Comment: When I voted at Town Meeting I was under the assumption that what we were asking to have a neutral judge look at the reasonableness of the fees and that was the full scope. Interpreting what the judge who awarded \$20K was doing was beyond the scope. Surprised Judge MacLeod's opinion went beyond that.

Judge MacLeod was not informed about what the \$20K represented but simply reviewed ledgers about what came in and went out, not what it was for. If she had been informed that it had been decided she wouldn't have considered it. Since costs were paid and deducted she assumed she had to do this. She also noted that she could not pick Mr. Rosenthal out of line up. She looked at bills and deductions under Rule 11. That is all. Also discovered \$198K was not correct but a few thousand less.

Marty Rosenthal responded. Relieved to hear from Judge MacLeod regarding vote of Town Meeting and who determines reasonableness.

Marissa Vogt asked about Judge MacLeod's comment about "a Cadillac vs a Volkswagen" and the question of reasonable cost and reasonableness of fees? A: Yes. Difference between assessment of a magistrate judge and a bench judge (try to find a median) you have to consider reputation of the lawyer, their skills, etc. 8 different factors when making that assessment.

Comment: Should have been informed by Town Counsel about the \$20K and that it had been discussed and voted upon at Town Meeting. No offense intended.

Judge MacLeod replied that she wasn't aware that it had been addressed, dismissed, and should not have been part of her deliberation.

This will be discussed at the Select Board soon and the Chair encouraged interested members of the public to attend that hearing.

***Public Meeting***

**8:00 pm      Discussion and Possible Vote on Article 30: Resolution Regarding the Kent/Station Street Senior Affordable Housing Development (Wachter et al)**

Alisa Jonas, Chair of the Ad hoc subcommittee on WA 30 gave a summary of deliberations of the subcommittee, the full detailed account of which is attached and linked to these minutes. She noted a correction to the report regarding number of parking spaces indicated in the report from 50 to 39. The subcommittee voted Favorable Action on WA 30, as amended, by a vote of 3 in favor, 0 opposed, no abstentions. This Article is a follow up to WA 34 passed at the November 2016 Town Meeting which was a resolution to have the Town “pursue a suitable air rights development of age-restricted affordable mixed-income housing over the existing Town-owned parking lot...situated between Kent and Station Streets...”

The report and public comments highlight concern of local Brookline Village businesses that have employees who travel by car to work in the Town and need parking for more than 3-5 hours. Parking permits for businesses and their employees are restrictive. Residents also made comments about their difficulties finding parking, and that, as the number of residential units and offices continue to grow in Brookline Village, the challenges have become increasingly difficult.

The subcommittee amended the warrant article to reflect the balancing of these needs and also honoring the original 2016 warrant article that never intended to eliminate public parking, but to build above it. Given that this is apparently not feasible, the Kent/Station Street site may not even be the best for locating the structure. The Kent/Webster Street lot, for example, is large enough to use air rights over the parking lot. In fact, some subcommittee members were not fully convinced that we should recommend an amended article, but to instead recommend No Action, as EDAB has done, in light of the lack of an overall town planning process that would include analyses of parking needs and the most appropriate locations for additional housing developments. Nonetheless the subcommittee voted unanimously to recommend the amended warrant article that supports the continued pursuit of building an affordable senior housing development on the site, but not before first identifying an alternative solution to replace the all-day public parking currently available at the site. In light of the need for customer and visitor parking, the amended warrant article also stipulates that the alternative all-day parking not replace other metered parking used for those purposes.

The subcommittee added several Whereas clauses to make note of the parking needs of residents and businesses that are not addressed in the original warrant article. It also removes two Whereas clauses that the subcommittee believes are either incorrect or misleading. The fourth Whereas clause states that “a new parking garage [at 1 Brookline Place] has been constructed,” suggesting that it might be available for replacement parking. But the Town has enquired whether that garage could be used to provide public parking, and was told that once 1 Brookline Place becomes fully tenanted, there will not be capacity to provide for public parking. That same Whereas clause notes that “many construction projects that were

impacting parking options in Brookline Village have ended...". This implies that parking constraints have eased. In fact, the presence of more residences and offices has increased parking pressure. Moreover, construction is continuing and when the Pierce School construction begins, more temporary parking places will need to be located.

The fifth Whereas Clause identifying the Brookline Village Parking Benefit District Advisory Board as a possible organization to resolve parking issues is not realistic. The Board has no authority and is intended to deal with smaller-scale matters, and furthermore is inactive, with numerous vacancies.

(Petitioners' amendments are shown in red and the subcommittee's amendments are shown in blue)

### **Resolution Regarding the Kent/Station Street Senior Affordable Housing Development**

TO SEE IF THE TOWN WILL ADOPT THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS Town Meeting passed a resolution in 2016 to study the feasibility of building age-restricted affordable housing on the Kent/Station Street Town-owned lot (Parcel No. 140-05-00);

WHEREAS the Committee was formed, **including a stipulation in their mission to retain all of the public parking on site**, and, following a request for proposals issued by the Town, a developer was selected;

WHEREAS the cost to **provide the 39 permitted** parking spaces **onsite under the latest proposal considered by the Town** is estimated to cost millions more than initially proposed and will require the Town of Brookline to subsidize that amount in full;

~~WHEREAS many construction projects that were impacting parking options in Brookline Village have ended and a new parking garage has been constructed;~~

~~WHEREAS there is now the Brookline Village Parking Benefits District to assist with maintaining and regulating parking, improving the public realm, and recommending transportation improvements which may address parking issues;~~

WHEREAS Brookline is a member of the World Health Organization's international network of Age-Friendly Cities and has committed to taking meaningful actions toward becoming a more age-friendly community;

WHEREAS Brookline has an aging population in need of a substantial expansion of Brookline's supply of housing suitable for seniors;

WHEREAS Brookline's need for more housing that is affordable to seniors who make a low-to-moderate income is as acute as it was in 2016;

**WHEREAS the merchants in Brookline Village are heavily reliant on the 39 permitted public parking spaces for full-day employee parking and that no alternative to the 39 permitted public parking spaces currently exists in the Brookline Village area;**

WHEREAS residents of Brookline Village, many of whom now work remotely from their homes, have difficulty finding legal daytime parking near their homes;

WHEREAS the Town already issues more permits than there are parking spaces at the Kent/Station Street lot;

WHEREAS, although many construction projects that were impacting parking options in Brookline Village have ended, the newly constructed office buildings and residential units as well as future construction, including that of the Pierce School, will add more pressure on the already limited parking options;

THEREFORE, be it resolved, that this Town Meeting urges ~~the Kent/ Station Street Senior Affordable Housing project on (Parcel No. 140-05-00) no longer maintain the requirement to keep the existing 39 parking spaces in order to bring the cost of the project to a reasonable level and to allow the Town to subsidize affordable housing, not public parking.~~ the Town to pursue affordable senior rental housing on the Kent/Station Street site (Parcel No. 140-05-00) in a manner that is cost-efficient for the Town, but only after the Town's Department of Planning and Community Development and the Transportation Board have secured adequate sites for the 39 permitted merchant full-day public parking spaces currently located on the Kent/Station Street lot, whether or not located on the site, and without decreasing the total number of metered public parking spaces currently available in Brookline Village. Adequacy shall be determined by the Transportation Board and EDAB after holding public hearings.

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

Q: Reason to use the parking lot, the project would not have to acquire the land to make it more affordable? I have worked in Real Estate finance and have put together financing for projects like this. Did anyone consider or talk to anyone who specializes in this type of housing funding to accept lower rate of return? A: Roger Blood replied: The 2 prospective developers are non-profit corporations who develop affordable housing. No threshold rates of return and have capacity to raise private capital and access a range of affordable housing assistance funds (subsidies – state and federal, etc.). Don't require market rates of return and looking at this as a starting point and looking at Town subsidies to supplement.

Q: Why is the Town tasked to solving this parking problem? A: They worked to figure out a cost effective way that all 39 spaces are incorporated with whatever is built on that site. It isn't that the nonprofit will bring large amounts of private capital but a certain amount. The amount of the subsidy required to close the gap just kept climbing and broke the back of the thing. The cost per affordable unit would exceed anything we had done before.

Todd Kirrane shared more details about the process based on his understanding. I was not part party to the discussions, but I know that Joe Viola from Community Planning had discussions with One Brookline Place, Children's Hospital. Though they have capacity right now, their belief was that once their buildings are completely built out and occupied, One Brookline Place and then Two Four Brookline Place would not have the capacity to have free parking at that location or available parking at that location. There are also some questions within the Zoning Board of Appeals decision in that property where they are mandated to not allow satellite parking at that location, as well as to charge daytime parking at the market rate.

They're not allowed to charge below market rate per the ZBA. They do have to make a certain amount of parking available overnight for residents, however that is also at market rate.

So that's the largest garage in the area that has private parking that would not be available unfortunately for this project. The other garage is 10 Brookline Place and my understanding is that's going to be developed at some point in the near future, but also that they did not have capacity at that location either based on conversations that Joe had.

When we looked at the parking, the current usage of the parking at the Kent Street Station lot, essentially, the overnight parking, which is not very popularly used in the Kent station lot could be transferred over to the Kent Webster lot which is the lot that sits behind Starbucks and is closer to the village proper, and that that lot also has the capacity to house the two Zip cars that are currently in the Kent Station lot.

What it does not have the capacity to do is to absorb the daytime commercial parking that takes place in the Kent Station lot. And the reason for that is that if we were to do that we would displace all the customer parking that typically takes place in the Kent Webster lot not only for the retail stores, but also for the swim school, the medical offices and other offices that are in that area. So that would displace a well-used destination parking lot that supports the commercial district.

There was a discussion on whether we could find alternative parking, either in the neighborhood, through an expansion of the on-street permit parking program in Brookline Village, or at other potential meter locations. But we did not do any discovery in terms of this location versus that location. Based on the number of pre-COVID permits that we have today, the way the permit program works for that lot is that we typically oversell the number of permits and the reason why is because we do not guarantee a space for the merchants that have those hang tags, that's why they only pay \$25 per year, extremely low price for the hang tag. Then they pay a reduced meter fee. It's essentially first come, first served. With COVID, right now we are below the number of spaces available, or at this point, with the number of permits. However, if you do go through that area, you will see that not every space is occupied on every day. And I think that's the situation that we see as we come out of COVID, people have gotten used to the hybrid work, where they are working two days in the office, three days from home, etc. And I think what we'll see is when we come back fully out of COVID, I think you'll see sort of a middle ground of where we are now and where we were pre-COVID. So there will be excess demand for the number of spaces, but it will not reach the high excess demand that we had previously.

Because of that, I am confident that we could work with the merchants, as we did when we created this program, as we did when we created the commercial on-street program to find a combination of alternative locations to meet maybe not replace one-for-one every space, but certainly replace the vast majority of them. It could be a combination between metered spaces that for the past four years had been used by the construction workers that have been building One Brookline Place and then Two -Four Brookline Place that are no longer there and an expansion of the on-street permit parking program, it could be a combination of both or could be one or the other. But I'm confident that we can find and replace those spaces, the vast majority of them.

Q: Are you saying, even if we don't replace the metered spaces which also seem in high demand by customers and visitors? A: I'm saying that the metered spaces where I would target are not heavily used by customers going to the Brookline Village commercial area. They have been used for the past four to five years by construction workers for parking. Essentially they are the angled spaces along Station Street, next to the MBTA that stretch up towards Kent Street, not on the side where the businesses are, on the opposite side. We have been tracking their usage and you'll still see today, the leftover construction workers that are still working in the area, typically park there. They start parking there about six in the morning. So I would target those spaces. If we were to target metered spaces at all those are the ones that I would look for. Again, ultimately the decision would be with the Transportation Board after a public hearing and a series of public meetings that would decide on where these permits would be placed.

Comment: As a member of the Housing Production Working Group I am aware and supportive of need for all sorts of affordable housing. To do this production plan process important to consider number of parking spaces for affordable housing. I would join EDAB in no action, I don't see how finding parking spaces that it will not be taking away from other spaces that are already there on the street or at an unknown cost. Any other parking under the building is not an efficient way of using affordable housing money.

Comment: Two things – if I was going to look at the most suitable parcel for putting in affordable housing I would not gravitate to one of the most valuable parcels owned by the Town. Brookline Village is undergoing new development and if the Town really wanted to leverage this parcel to accomplish a variety of aims, it would probably be more effective to attract a for-profit developer rather than undergo affordable housing. I've always thought this was a backwards approach to citing an affordable housing development saying, well, where do we own land, and since that'll save us money, let's do it there because if you were really to allocate the full market value of this property to this proposed affordable housing development, it just wouldn't make sense.

Number two, as a resident of Brookline Hills, I get incredibly frustrated with trying to park in Brookline Village and I walk there as much as I can. And just because construction workers who are currently arriving at 6 am are going to be leaving, to me that's just saying finally there'll be some relief for all of us, all of the patrons of these commercial businesses in Brookline Village, because all those spots won't be parked up by construction workers, so I'm concerned to think that those spots when vacated by construction workers would then be considered the appropriate place to put employees of the local businesses. I'd really like to see it become easier for patrons of those businesses to find parking.

Comment: I was a member of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Warrant Article 30 and I was the one who had to run off and Chair the ad hoc Subcommittee for Warrant Article 12 and so I wasn't included in the vote. As Alisa said, I did support and do support the revised resolution language that says we urge the Town to look, not only on-site but also off-site to fulfill the 39 parking spaces. However, I did not participate in the discussion and do not support the restrictiveness of the language that the subcommittee brought forward saying that no meter can be compromised. And I think Alisa's question to Todd tonight and Todd's response in saying that the Transportation Board would have a public process, that there would be plenty of public input, etc. is the same thing that he said at the hearing. And I think that it's too

restrictive, and it sort of ties the hands of the Transportation Board and the Planning Department, and oversteps. Understand that other people could say, it really doesn't overstep, but we're responding to a resolution of a Town Meeting from six years ago. I think that if the Transportation Board and the Planning Department, the Economic Development Department, all find a solution that they think is best for Brookline Village, I think we could afford them some trust that they can do that and not tie the hands of the Transportation Board and say, 'You can't reduce by even a single parking meter to solve this problem' because I think that that's sort of saying build the subsidized housing for seniors, but with one hand tied behind your back.

Comment: I too was on the ad hoc Subcommittee and reluctantly voted for the resolution. It's a very constrained site. It's a very small place so we're talking about 54 units. And the reason for that is because of everyone that has built around them, and trying to not overwhelm the condominium owners, and the people that we also heard from who cared about that air and light, and so we can't really make it bigger. By having any kind of public parking on that site, that's what triggered the need for public bidding, and the prevailing wage. So, hearing from Carol that if we just get rid of some of the spaces I can guarantee you, they're going to absolutely need to have all the spaces off of that site. Then we're talking about finding suitable, or equivalent or, you know, parking. I don't think it exists. I know we just heard from Todd that he's thinking about a few meters here and giving people hang tags for the neighborhoods, but we also heard from Todd that in the neighborhoods, they've already maxed out the 40%, so there's a rule if you're going to give commercial permits in a residential area that only 40% of the curb spaces can be let out this way and we're already there in Brookline Village. We know that the construction of Pierce is coming, and that's going to bring another wave of parking mayhem.

We're asking our staff to do work - efficiency studies, maximum utilization studies, getting the Planning Department all involved in what I think is a failed idea. I agree with Carol that it's just not the right site but for completely opposite reasons. We didn't consider where it made sense to put a larger, maybe more efficiently built building that was in place where people could live more easily without cars and take advantage of amenities around them. For instance, the Harold Brown, by KI, that's a site that made more sense because it had more scale to it. So, I just feel like this is another one of the things that Brookline, and in Town Meeting and Advisory does all the time where they don't want to disappoint anybody, and they try to find a compromise. But in this case I really think the compromise is going to fail, and I think it's wasting our staff's time, and it is fundamentally violating what the original resolution was, which was to retain that parking. I think our business people deserve that assurance and I don't think, even though David doesn't like how tightly worded the compromise, I don't think it gives the businesses what they're really looking for. It just fundamentally is not a good site to continue pursuing in my opinion.

Comment: On how small the site and project are – It's not in my experience accurate to say that in development of affordable housing subsidized housing in today's market and I'll just give you an example of a project I'm working on. It started out as an 80 unit project, and it's actually being done as two separate 40 unit projects, because of the sweet spot in the subsidies. So, economically, a 54 unit project is actually something that's very commonly developed a subsidized housing and makes sense in that context.

Q: Follow up on Carol's concern about when construction workers are no longer there. Ease up parking for those looking for it, if construction workers are not there at 6 am. I'm hearing from David that it would be a good site, it does seem like a good site vis a vis housing. How much, how valuable is it to a commercial developer if it's such a small site? I'm just wondering Roger and Meredith if you have considered, all things being equal, if the original Article hadn't come across, what you think of that site, and possibly compared to alternative sites for either affordable housing or commercial development?

Roger Blood responded: We started with municipal parking lots and the general idea of, could you put senior housing over any municipal parking lot, informally surveying the Town. This was the one site that was perfectly located for seniors, especially without their own cars on site. But in the early public process, which was considerable, the prospect that there might be alternative sort of claims on that site from EDAB, for example, or alternative uses that were not low impact, that fit the site, nothing emerged during that first segment of a long slog that other uses would have been a better suited or other uses would have been more suitable for it than senior affordable housing.

Speaking for the Housing Advisory Board, we had the public hearing; we voted favorable action on the article, but only with the attached commentary. Even though we're affordable housing advocates we wanted to acknowledge and express the concern and the desire for the businesses legitimate parking interest to be addressed. I attended and enjoyed participating in the two hour subcommittee meeting where this language was formulated, and was impressed. The amended version of the article is fully in the spirit and the substance of what HAB was making in its statement when we voted unanimously for positive action but hopefully addressing the parking.

This project that David mentioned the scale of is roughly the same scale as the Brown house up on JFK Crossing, very similar number of units, and also it's my understanding that the, that whoever's had the discussion with the business owners that they are willing to consider the alternative approach to parking rather than being rigidly wedded to the 39 onsite spaces. So I would hope that that this isn't totally the end of the road. It's still going to be a little bit of a reach but that you all will allow the latitude of the amended version to proceed and at least to a little bit further exploration whether this is not a dead end or not.

Meredith Mooney: I'll defer to Roger's response and the EDAB co-chairs (Paul Saner and Anne Meyers) on Alisa's question.

Anne Meyer: We never looked at this site as a potential development site. It started with people for looking for opportunities for affordable housing. And we weren't involved until it became an issue for the commercial area.

Q: Would this be a good site for commercial development was that ever discussed at all?

Q: What was the original conception of this WA, which was to look at this proposal as a test case about 6 years ago about the concept of air rights? How many months were spent deciding this? How quickly was it decided that it wasn't practicable? Did we give up too quickly that things have changed in our current environment? It seems that the needs of local merchants should have been considered over these past

years during review of this? With all the best of intentions it is taking up a lot of people's time and not resulting in what is desired. Should we vote about not selling air rights as not practicable (California was given as an example)? A: Businesses didn't have to be consulted based on the original article because it was required that parking be located on site. Too bad we didn't have a better analysis of when in fact we need public bidding and prevailing wage kicking in.

Q: Is there still feasibility in the concept? Should we be exploring it elsewhere in Brookline, because it seems to have been very successful in California communities? What makes Brookline not a good place to utilize this when other communities have been utilizing it?

Comment: Roger Blood clarified details about air rights. Air rights and prevailing wage are not directly related but in terms of not knowing, the prevailing wage came in play rather late in the game. The first I've heard of it was fairly recently. Case law has emerged that you can't do things at a lower cost now than you could have done then. Air rights, per se, is a legal concept. And the process was basically to keep the 39 spaces and get senior housing over a municipal parking, but there were more than one way to do that and there were various real estate experts around the table that felt that the legal concept air rights wasn't the only way to get to the end result of but it really doesn't directly affect, the financial cost or feasibility and the you know the deep water that we started facing the longer we started working on this.

Comment: You know, we heard about four projects in California Air rights or, you know, obviously using a variety of these technologies around the country. What we don't know about those four projects, they use air rights, they had buildings over a parking lot, but you don't know what the size of the public parking lot was to begin with. We don't know when they were built and what the economics of those projects were relative to this specific site. I think the idea of using air rights is certainly something that the Town could still explore in other places, but it really will always become a project by project, location by location determination as to whether or not the economics work. The air rights idea was explored initially but because of a loss in land that would be taken up by columns and elevators and things of that nature you couldn't preserve the 39 spaces and that's when they went to the structured parking idea underground which then became too expensive. Again, it could just be that this is a site where it just doesn't work, and it's not always going to work it every site, it doesn't mean it's a bad concept, one that should be thrown out. We should keep it in our pocket and explore it in other cases, if it makes sense to do so.

Comment: Scott Ananian corrected a comment he made earlier regarding the Spiegel amendment indicating he had made the motion as Marty correctly said and he did end up voting against the final AC vote. Putting that aside I want to get affordable housing built for seniors near public transportation. Feel AC version puts up hurdles to getting this done. May need a compromise on number of spaces and feel that is the way to go here and support petitioner version.

Comment: I'm wondering what we could have done if we'd stopped doing this a year or two ago, I'm wondering if there are better projects that would have been a better use of the time and attention of the town employees, and the people on the committee. It just seems to me that this is going to make the

businesses in the area very unhappy, it doesn't seem to me that we're getting that many new homes for people. It just seems to me like we're spending a lot of time for not that big of payoff and for a lot of unhappiness and problems. So has anyone just taken a minute and said just put this aside completely. Do we have some better options that would just be faster, smoother? It seems like we're struggling to do something that just probably doesn't work. Affordable housing is very tough to do. I'm not saying that we shouldn't build the affordable housing, I'm just saying that maybe we've wasted time on this spot. We actually do need to get affordable housing, and maybe we should just walk away from this, and find a place that's feasible.

The Chair noted the variety of options for this Article.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for favorable action on Article 30 as amended by the subcommittee. By a **VOTE** of 11-12-2 the **MOTION** fails.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to **TABLE** this discussion and vote until next Tuesday. By a **VOTE** of 10-11-2 the **MOTION** fails.

An **AMENDMENT** to the subcommittee motion was made and seconded with the following edits.

WHEREAS Town Meeting passed a resolution in 2016 to study the feasibility of using air rights for building age-restricted affordable housing on the Kent/Station Street Town-owned lot (Parcel No. 140-05-00);

THEREFORE, be it resolved, that this Town Meeting urges ~~the Kent/Station Street Senior Affordable Housing project on (Parcel No. 140-05-00) no longer maintain the requirement to keep the existing 39 parking spaces in order to bring the cost of the project to a reasonable level and to allow the Town to subsidize affordable housing, not public parking.~~ the Town to pursue affordable senior rental housing on the Kent/Station Street site (Parcel No. 140-05-00) in a manner that is cost-efficient for the Town, including by revisiting the use of the Town's air rights over parking spaces, but only after the Town's Department of Planning and Community Development and the Transportation Board have secured adequate sites for the 39 permitted merchant full-day public parking spaces currently located on the Kent/Station Street lot, whether or not located on the site, and without decreasing the total number of metered public parking spaces currently available in Brookline Village. Adequacy shall be determined by the Transportation Board and EDAB after holding public hearings.

...

By a **VOTE** of 11-12-1, the amendment fails.

An **AMENDMENT** was made and seconded **SUBSTITUTE** the Petitioner's original MOTION. By a **VOTE** of 2-20-2 the amendment fails.

**8:20 pm          Discussion and Possible Vote on Article 33: Amend Article 2.1 of the Town's General Bylaws pertaining to Codifying the Town Meeting Handbook (Ananian et al)**

Kelly Hardebeck, Chair of Administration and Finance Subcommittee gave a report on the subcommittee deliberations on their examination of Article 33. Ultimately the Administration & Finance Subcommittee recommended No Action by a Vote of 3-0 with no abstentions on Article 33.

One of the petitioners for this article Scott Ananian added that the hope was to add minimal requirements to codify procedures and noted that Arlington has some restrictions for example on how long people can speak, etc.

Q: Will you still be moving this at Town Meeting? A: Yes.

I was hoping you would have pulled it at the last CTOS meeting. Not aware of any legal standing of the TMM handbook. Not compulsory or legally binding. It is just a guide to help resolve disputes and not legally binding. Town Meeting has become more politicized and this will further politicize the Moderator's position on how they do their job. Really flawed article and we should pull it.

Comment: I agree as a first step this is the wrong first step. The TMM Handbook is vague. I would rather see this come back as a movement to specify steps as they exist in the current environment rather than create a bylaw.

Comment: I refer to this as the point of order article. This makes it worse. To the extent that Town Meeting is difficult to understand for new town meeting members and even more so if we were to ask them to decide what the rules should be. There were 5 minutes speaking time to begin. And then it was decided to cut to 3 minutes. Not political but logistical.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for No Action. By a **VOTE** of 21-1-0 the motion for No Action passes.

**8:40 pm**            **Possible discussion and vote to amend previous votes on warrant articles including but not limited to**

- 1. Article 8 (Special Appropriation #7: \$1,350,000 for the upgrade of Washington/Harvard/Kent/Davis traffic signal)**

Q: What is the annual debt service/budget cost? A: But the price we pay now is bicycle safety and pedestrian safety but I don't have the actual number. But it was woven into our initial vote.

Comment: I don't remember when we last upgraded that intersection.

Todd Kirrane noted that this is one of the oldest intersections and we need to reconstruct it. Upgrading as it is today to ADA signals and wheelchair ramps and fire truck preemption for Station 1.

Q: There is potential for retiming this intersection. A: Yes. And we no longer use sensor markings. We now use sensors for vehicles as they are approaching.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded for favorable action for Washington/Harvard/Kent/Davis Traffic Signal Upgrade for \$1,350,000 (Bond). By a **VOTE** of 22-0-0 the Advisory Committee recommends favorable action on Article 8 Special Appropriation #7: \$1,350,000 for the upgrade of Washington/Harvard/Kent/Davis traffic signal.

- 2. Article 22 (Amend Town By-Laws to restrict PFAS)** – Public Safety subcommittee chair Janice Kahn gave a brief update. Last week the select board talked about different Article 22 and it was never written so we will stick with our original recommendation.

### 3. Article 27 (Amend Article 8.31 of the Town's General By-Laws pertaining to leaf blowers)

There are 3 elements to consider but if voted up or down there may be more granularity when presented to Town Meeting. There may be an opportunity to clarify this further.

A **MOTION** was made and seconded to **TABLE** Article 27 to Tuesday, May 17. By a **VOTE** of 22-0-0 the motion carries.

There was a Recommendation to begin the AC meeting on Tuesday at 6:30 pm given outstanding articles.

#### 9:00 pm      **Other Business**

There being no other business, a **MOTION** was made and seconded to adjourn. By a unanimous vote the meeting adjourned at 10:45 pm.

#### **Documents Presented (linked)**

<https://www.brooklinema.gov/DocumentCenter/Index/2590>

- 2022 05 05 Ad hoc Subcommittee Report WA 30
- WA30\_Petitioner Questionnaire - 2022
- AC Questionnaire for WA30\_supplemental answers
- EDAB Article 30 Memo 4.11.22
- WA30 Chamber of Commerce Letter to Select Board Members - warrant articles
- 220417 WA30-HAB Statement
- BVBA Article 30 Letter
- Kent Station St Project Negotiating Team 4.12.22\_KENT\_STREET\_MEMO.PDF
- Kent Street Negotiation Committee
- 2022.04.24 Amended Warrant Article 30 - Kent-Station Street Senior Affordable Housing Resolution
- RB\_big tech ballot question res\_Petitioner Questionnaire - 2022
- WA 30 Analysis of Parking - Available and Needed in Brookline Village
- Assorted Public Comment WA 30
- Todd Kirrane numbers of parking spots used
- Todd Kirrane Memo Re Kent Station Street Parking Utilization
- Todd Kirrane My 4 2022 Email re WA 30 Questions
- WA 30 Questions with T Kirrane Responses
- PROTECT OUR COMMUNITY AND PREVENT SHORT SIGHTED DEVELOPMENT
- Name of Business that oppose WA-30
- Spiegel Indemnification - Neutral Rpt 5.2.22
- 2022.05.05 CTOS report Art.33
- Leaf Blower Warrant Article 2022 4.26.22 - with petitioner and JSK.2 edits
- ACPH-DPH Memo RE Spring 2022 WA22v4

- 2022 05 05 Administration and Finance Subcommittee Report on WA33
- FY 23 CIP - traffic signal, Bkle Village Special Appropriation 57 under WA 8

## VOTES

	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6	Vote 7	Vote 8
# Votes Yes	0	10	11	2	11	21	22	22
# Votes No	0	11	12	20	12	1	0	0
# Votes Abstain	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0
Vote Description:	MAIN MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION ON WA30 AS AMENDED	MOTION TO TABLE SUBJECT MATTER OF WA30 UNTIL TUESDAY May 17	SG AMENDMENT	AS AMEND BY SUBSTITUTE PETITIONER'S MOTION	MAIN MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION ON WA30 AS AMENDED (BY SUBCOMMITTEE)	MAIN MOTION: NO ACTION ON WA33	MAIN MOTION: FAVORABLE ACTION ON CIP \$1,350,000 BONDED FOR TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM UPGRADES IN BROOKLINE VILLAGE (details in warrant)	MOTION TO TABLE WA27 TO TUESDAY
	<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>	<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>
Scott Ananian		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Carla Benka		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Ben Birnbaum		A	A	A	A	Y	Y	Y
Harry Bohrs								
Cliff Brown		N	N	N	Y			
John Doggett		N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Katherine Florio		Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Harry Friedman								
David-Marc Goldstein		Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Neil Gordon				A	A	Y	Y	Y
Susan Granoff		N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kelly Hardebeck		N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Anita Johnson		N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Georgia Johnson		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Alisa Jonas		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Janice Kahn		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carol Levin		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Pam Lodish		Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Linda Olson Pehlke		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Donelle O'Neal, Sr.		Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y

<b>David Pollak</b>		N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>Stephen Reeders</b>		N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Carlos Ridruejo</b>		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Lee Selwyn</b>		N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Alok Somani</b>		Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
<b>Christine Westphal</b>		A	Y	Y	Y			
<b>Dennis Doughty</b>			N		N			