

**Economic Development Advisory Board  
Lab & Bio/Life Sciences Subcommittee  
Minutes**

August 25, 2021

8:00-10:00 AM held remotely via Zoom

*EDAB Board Lab Subcommittee members in attendance (noted by Y/N)*

Cliff Brown	Y
Marilyn Newman	Y
Carol Levin	Y
Paul Saner	Y

*Staff present:* Kara Brewton, Meredith Mooney, Dr. Jett

*Members of the Public:* Jennifer Gilbert and an unidentified caller

The meeting began at approximately 8 am. It was reported there was no further feedback yet from dan Bennett or Jonathan Simpson on the regulatory concept outline.

The committee discussed a spreadsheet prepared by Kara that shows lots in Town believed to have sufficient size and depth for a life science development. It was noted that several of the largest parcels were in L zones such as TJ Maxx. At several points in the meeting there was a discussion about what zones to recommend the new use definition for. Cliff stated that a Metric for minimum size doesn't address possible assemblage, and Paul noted that many of the G zone parcels are small similar to L zones. Waldo Durgin was cited as a G zone assembly. Some L zones have larger scale commercial than others. There is a perception that L zones are more proximate to residential neighborhoods than those in G zones. Cliff maintained we shouldn't pre determine market interest by being restrictive. Kara pointed out this use allowed for L zone parcels of a minimum size doesn't factor in many with irregular site shape.

Since Dr. Jett joined the meeting, the L zone discussion was deferred. Dr. Jett indicated that he had reviewed the draft regulatory concept outline, and it looked great, heading in the right direction, with Nothing standing out as an issue. Marilyn's and carol's municipal research about the practice of biosafety advisory councils was mentioned.

Marilyn then led conversations related to several open public health issues. She referenced additional feedback was provided by Dr. Henry warren who is knowledgeable about animal research. Our first topic was possible limits on species for research. The committee didn't support non-human primates like monkey's being regulated in Brookline, and did support Mice and rats and other creatures like insects and zebra fish being allowed. Carol observed that this level of research is much easier operationally and requires less space as reasons this level is so common. A long discussion ensued about whether to recommend Intermediary warm-blooded

animals be regulated such as dogs, cats, or other species such as rabbits or hamsters. The Federal Animal Welfare Act protects a wide range of warm-blooded species, and there is no easy way to draw the line beyond non-human primates. It was noted that Harvard's agreement with Cambridge excludes non-human primates. Carol suggested beyond allowing mice and rats that we propose a waiver for the dogs and cat category. Dr. Jett pointed out that Brookline can't deal with turkeys.

Marilyn stated that Warren pointed out that major research centers have a separate institutional use committee for animals with veterinarian professionals. That is separate from institutional use committees for the biolab operations. While not mandated by regulations, this oversight is required by funders, so we will not specifically recommend this.

We then discussed operating principles for staff and consulting resources to support public health. The establishment of a regulatory oversight for a bio research program would require specialized consultants to be paid for by the first developer proposing this use. Peer review consultants would then be needed to Review user license requests. The ongoing program oversight advised by the biosafety council may also require specialized consultants. All consultants need to be independent and working for the Town. Application and licensing fees along with reimbursements for consultants should cover all program expenses. Dr. Jett did feel that the Town would need additional staff support to manage consultants and administer the program. That position would Guide applicants through the licensing process, and advise the Director and biosafety advisory council. A discussion of the process of establishing this public health program led to Kara at a future date attempting to network with Watertown who has recently begun this. Dr. Jett then left the meeting.

The question of existing uses in Town was raised. There is no public data on existing lab level. quest Diagnostic was cited as a likely lab operation, perhaps regulated by The Commonwealth's Department of Public Health.

We then returned to the topic of what recommendations to make about this use and zones to be allowed in. Cliff noted we had been focused on for profit development in existing commercial areas. The committee decided to include a recommendation that the Town continuously pursue opportunities identified in the Major Parcel Study, especially larger institutionally owned land that might otherwise be developed as single-family homes. The decision was to reference the Major Parcel Study, recommend the G and O zones, and as corridor studies are pursued to consider other possible sites for this use, including possible larger L zone sites being converted to G.

Carol walked the committee through drafting and other questions about the report. It was decided to reference Mass Bio-Council rankings, but not recommending a specific ratings goal. Legal restrictions related to public benefits beyond mitigation along with What commercial linkage it was also discussed. It was decided to not include commercial linkage.

Timeline recommendations were reviewed. It was concluded to recommend to the Select Board that the use zoning change for g zones be for the Fall of 2022 along with the recommended biosafety public health general by law. The committee will recommend that a study committee begin working with Bulfinch at 10 Brookline Place in January of 2022. Marilyn then departed the meeting.

Clarifications were suggested by Carol and Cliff to the tax certainty reference, as well as what various Uses would be referenced in the report. Carol proposed that the committee next meet Thursday morning, September 9<sup>th</sup> to review any open issues prior to the September 13<sup>th</sup> full EDAB meeting. Paul indicated Hearing from dan and Jonathan before EDAB would be ideal. The need to pull together a PowerPoint summary of our report to present at a public hearing likely on September 29<sup>th</sup>. The committee will likely need to meet after EDAB on the 13<sup>th</sup> to review any comments from that meeting as well as the PowerPoint.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10 am.