

**EXPLANATIONS FOR THE
NOVEMBER 17, 2009 SPECIAL TOWN MEETING
WARRANT ARTICLES**

ARTICLE 1

This article is inserted in the Warrant for every Town Meeting in case there are any unpaid bills from a prior fiscal year that are deemed to be legal obligations of the Town. Per Massachusetts General Law, unpaid bills from a prior fiscal year can only be paid from current year appropriations with the specific approval of Town Meeting.

ARTICLE 2

This article is inserted in the Warrant for any Town Meeting when there are unsettled labor contracts. Town Meeting must approve the funding for any collective bargaining agreements.

ARTICLE 3

This article is also used for debt rescissions, of which two are recommended. The \$100,000 related to the High School projects can be rescinded because the bids came in under budget. The \$1,000,000 related to the Newton Street Landfill can be rescinded because the Town was awarded a \$1,000,000 State grant from the Environmental Bond Bill.

ARTICLE 4

This article is inserted in the Warrant for any Town Meeting when budget amendments for the current fiscal year are required. For FY2010, the warrant article is necessary to balance the budget, appropriate the local option taxes approved at the August Special Town Meeting, seek a bond authorization for the Runkle School renovation/addition project, and seek a bond authorization for the Carlton St. Footbridge, per the position of the State Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs as reflected in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) recently executed by the Town of Brookline, City of Boston, and the Commonwealth.

ARTICLE 5

This Article authorizes the appropriation of \$1.4 million, to be expended if required, for the restoration of the C I Carlton Street entrance, including its footbridge, to the Riverway Park. This amount reflects the Town Engineer's best estimate of the current cost, plus contingencies and an annual cost escalation.

The restoration of the park entrance is a component of the Muddy River Restoration Project, a project that will remove the threat of flooding from a number of Brookline precincts. The goals of this \$91 million project -- 98.2% of which is funded by the Army Corps of Engineers, the Commonwealth, and Boston -- include flood control, improved water quality, landscape restoration, habitat enhancement, and historic restoration of the Muddy River portion of Olmsted's Emerald Necklace, a landmark on the National Register of Historic Places. It includes the 1996 flooding in Olmsted Park. Water level was 11 feet above normal. Places. dredging and removal of sediment and contaminated soil from Leverett and Willow Ponds, which is estimated to cost \$8 million and which the Town would be otherwise required to carry out at its own expense.

As one element of the restoration of the park's historic features, the Secretary of Environmental Affairs has required that Brookline renovate and reopen its Carlton Street entrance to Riverway Park - the Footbridge.

The Town has estimated its costs, including those for handicapped access, contingencies and cost escalation, to be \$1.4 million. The Town intends to submit an application to Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) in November for funding to defray these costs of restoration. The program, which provides funding for pedestrian improvements and gives priority to those that involve renovation of historic facilities and park improvements, could provide up to 90 percent of the costs of the Carlton Street project. This is the same program that funded part of the Beacon Street project.

In a letter from the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs (the Secretary) dated May 15, 2009, to the Chair of the Board of Selectmen, Ian Bowles states:

The Commonwealth has been carrying \$24 million on its capital spending plan for several years – a significant statement of the Commonwealth's financial support of Boston's and Brookline's Project. Such a clear commitment from the Commonwealth deserves a corresponding commitment on the part of the Town. I support and encourage the Town in its efforts to seek third party funding to assist in its restoration of the Carlton Street Footbridge, but I reiterate that the responsibility for achieving full restoration remain with the Town. Without a demonstrated and enforceable commitment on the part of the Town to complete the restoration of this historic structure, the Commonwealth will not be able to release the funds necessary to begin this important Project of flood control, environmental restoration, and historic preservation. Indeed, should the Town be unable or unwilling to live up to the commitments memorialized in previous Certificates, the Commonwealth will be forced to reconsider its continued commitment of these resources for the Muddy River Project.

In July 2009, the Board of Selectmen signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Boston and the Commonwealth setting forth the roles of each in the Muddy River Restoration Project. The MOU commits Brookline to complete the restoration of the Carlton Street park entrance by March 31, 2013 which conforms to the schedule that the Town has provided. It goes on to state that, "If the Town does not demonstrate enforceable commitments (to the entrance's restoration) by December 31, 2009, the Commonwealth may terminate this MOU or may limit its participation or funding under the MOU." This Warrant Article implements that requirement by appropriating funding for the park entrance's restoration, funding that would be available in the event that and to the extent that the Town does not obtain outside grants of other funds for the purpose.

In implementing the MOU requirement, the appropriation protects Brookline from the loss of state and federal funds for the Muddy River Restoration Project, including those for the cleanup of Leverett and Willow ponds. Should the Town not comply with the terms of the MOU by appropriating these funds, the river conditions that led to flooding in 1996 and 1998 will remain unaddressed, the fetid condition of the river would remain, and the Town would be obligated to remediation of Leverett and Willow Ponds (previously estimated to cost \$8 million).

ARTICLE 6

They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety. — Ben Franklin

For six months beginning in November 2008, Brookline engaged in an extended debate – in the community, at numerous public hearings, and at warrant article meetings. It culminated at last May’s Town Meeting in two votes sufficiently strong that the Moderator deemed counted votes unnecessary – one against Article 24, the selectmen’s “*Resolution to Support a Public Surveillance Camera Pilot Program*,” and the other for Article 25, a “*Resolution Opposing Police Surveillance Cameras from the Department of Homeland Security*” which “*urge[d] the Board of Selectmen to immediately terminate the trial period and order the removal of the general police surveillance cameras funded by the Department of Homeland Security.*”

Since the selectmen have yet to comply with these votes, this warrant article would achieve the intent of Town Meeting’s resolution against the DHS surveillance cameras by prohibiting the use of town funds for activities related in any way to their operation and use.

The main arguments for Article 25 were:

- The purposes of the cameras are unclear, shifting, and don’t justify the huge privacy losses;
- Whatever the purposes, there’s scant evidence the cameras will achieve them – especially, helping with evacuations and preventing crime;
- There are other methods available that do decrease crime, especially violent crime, such as improved lighting and community policing;
- The DHS camera system is not by any stretch of the imagination “free” of costs to the Town;
- As demonstrated in Britain, where there is now one camera for every 14 citizens, installing our first dozen cameras is stepping onto a long, slippery slope;
- Police surveillance cameras are different from private business cameras; these digital images are subject to the public records law and can be shared with other government agencies and databases; and
- A free society is one in which government does not track citizen activities in public places.

So what has changed since earlier in 2009, other than the passage of several months with the surveillance system still in full operation? Most importantly, the **May votes of Town Meeting!** However, the selectmen have kept the system operational 24-7 and instructed their Camera Oversight Committee to complete its one-year study of the results. In addition, they are now considering a “compromise” proposal by Chief O’Leary: leaving the cameras in place but operating them only for special events such as the Marathon and to deal with specific crime situations. And most recently, press reports have quoted the Chief concerning the usefulness of a DHS camera in arresting two men charged with a rape in Coolidge Corner.

Despite the extensive debate prior to and at the last Town Meeting, some of the same arguments in favor of the cameras are still being made. It is baffling to hear people who

don't themselves mind the privacy intrusion of the cameras say, "We're videoed by cameras in banks and stores, so what's the problem?" In fact, the community's privacy concern has never been the "legal" issue as circumscribed by four decades of a reactionary Supreme Court's Fourth Amendment jurisprudence, but a *subjective one*. The Town Meeting votes made it clear that most of our community *does* have major concerns about (1) the creation of a government infrastructure that allows our activities in public places to be watched and recorded, and (2) a sophisticated computerized camera system which, at a future time of pervasive fear, could readily be connected to the enormous DHS databases only recently used to data-mine our e-mails and phone calls.

Regarding the Chief's "compromise" proposal, it doesn't solve either of the two community concerns, subjective *expectations of privacy* or objections to *government data sharing*; and neither of these concerns can be weighed meaningfully by the 12-month trial period and study committee. As stated in the TAB's 7/2/09 editorial "*Town Meeting has spoken*," the Chief's proposal "**does an end-run** around the Town Meeting vote. The ... vote was not close. The body that most closely represents the residents of Brookline clearly does not want permanent surveillance cameras."

Lastly, has the recent sexual assault case changed everything? Not if we put emotion aside. Chief O'Leary, whom we all respect, says the cameras were "crucial" in locating the suspects. But that begs the central questions. How crucial? Would there have been a prompt arrest without them? And how often will a truly crucial image be captured? Further, and even more basically, the cameras obviously did not prevent the crime.

The Chief has noted that "the investigation also involved footage from private cameras." Specifically what information did the DHS camera provide that, in its absence, our highly capable detectives wouldn't have been able to obtain from the victim, other eyewitnesses or cameras, or police departments in neighboring communities? The key "break" was reportedly a Boston police officer who recognized the image of the suspect's truck from previous similar experience. The same result could well have been achieved through a routine, high-priority teletype/e-mail alert read at neighboring police department roll-calls: "*Brookline PD looking for a red pickup truck for an alleged rape in Coolidge Corner last night.*" Brookline's police have carried out excellent crime investigation for decades and can be relied upon to continue to do so without DHS cameras.

Although professional U.S. and British studies show that even widespread police surveillance cameras have not prevented crime or even increased the rate at which crimes are solved, we've always acknowledged that these cameras would probably help solve some cases. But the important questions have always been: *how much help will they provide* (hard to determine) and *how many cases* (perhaps easier). Answers to these questions – particularly the former – will be the most important product of the Camera Oversight Committee's work. Unfortunately, as members of that committee have observed, it will be nearly impossible for them to assess the extent to which the marginal benefit of the cameras outweighs the privacy concerns of many citizens.

We still maintain that comprehensive studies conducted professionally elsewhere are much more useful than anecdotal evidence, e.g., the recent BBC study that led to a story headlined "1,000 cameras 'solve one crime'," or the seminal 2005 British Home Office analysis of many different professional studies evaluating "13 Closed Circuit Television

Camera projects comprising 14 separate systems ... including town centres, city centres, car parks, hospitals and residential areas,” which concluded that the cameras had “no overall effect” on crime rates.

Finally, given the attention that the recent alleged rape incident will receive during consideration of this article, another TAB editorial, “*Cameras: Helpful, still wrong*”, written in the wake of that incident, is also worthy of quotation:

Everyone who cares about public safety and delivering justice for the victim has likely re-evaluated their position on the cameras. We did. And in the end, we came to the same conclusion as before: The cameras may be useful, but they're still not right for Brookline. ... It certainly seems that the cameras helped in this case. But we always knew they had that possibility, even if we couldn't have imagined how horrible the circumstances would be. We still need to ask ourselves if that's worth living under surveillance. ... [O]n a street crowded with shops and banks, there were private cameras that police may have used instead. There could have been witnesses who helped with the investigation

ARTICLE 7

A favorable vote under this Article will authorize the Board of Selectmen to execute a deed transferring the roughly 4.8 acre Town-owned parcel, currently enclosing two underground reservoirs on Fisher Hill, to an entity or entities controlled by New Atlantic Development Corporation for the development of a mixed income community, including a mix of market rate single family homes and affordable condominiums. New Atlantic Development Corporation's proposal and the Letter of Intent with the Town can be found on the Town's website at www.brooklinema.gov/planning and is also available for inspection at the Office of Planning and Community Development.

ARTICLE 8

This article, submitted by the Board of Selectmen with the support of the Zoning Bylaw Committee, would create a zoning overlay that would permit redevelopment of the Fisher Hill Town Reservoir site in conformance with the Request for Proposals that was issued for this site in 2008. This Zoning Amendment is a companion article to Article XX, which would authorize disposition of the Fisher Hill Town Reservoir site for redevelopment as mixed income housing. For much of the explanation of the Fisher Hill redevelopment process and proposal, please refer to the explanation under Article XX.

The base zoning for the reservoir is S-15. Therefore, currently, it can only be redeveloped only for single family homes on parcels of 15,000 square feet or more. This zoning overlay would permit redevelopment for up to 40 units under certain circumstances:

- the overall plan must be consistent with the vision developed for the site by the Town and articulated in the Request for Proposals;
- the project must follow design guidelines to be adopted by the Planning Board;
- more than 50% of the units on the site must be affordable;
- only single family homes are permitted along Fisher Avenue;
- the overall site must receive a Special Permit, and then individual buildings would undergo design review;

- the site must be developed with an overall landscape plan and even parcels remaining undeveloped for a period of time must be landscaped according to that overall plan.
- detached single family homes on the site are allowed up to 4,500 square feet and attached single family homes, located on the site's interior, are allowed up to 3,500 square feet;
- one larger building or set of buildings is permitted, set back from Fisher Avenue, and may exceed the existing 35 foot height by up to 10 feet; and
- an overall building program of no greater than 72,000 square feet, or a Floor Area Ratio of 0.4.

Any development of the site may be further limited by a warrant article authorizing conveyance of the property and by a land disposition agreement between the Town and developer. For example, the current proposal for the site by New Atlantic Development Corporation calls for 34 units, of which 24 are to be affordable.

ARTICLE 9

The Town passed a home rule petition for the purchase of the state surplus Fisher Hill Reservoir. The legislation was signed into law in 2008. The Town has since been working with DCAM on the purchase and sale requirements including completion of a site survey, language for both a preservation and conservation restriction on the park, the final appraisal report, and any other requirements for successful conveyance to the Town. This article authorizes the Town to purchase the land from the State.

ARTICLE 10

This article is being submitted by the Department of Planning & Community Development with the unanimous support of the Zoning Bylaw Committee. It would create a new Special District under Section 5.06 of the Zoning Bylaw. It is designed to provide the Town with some additional controls over the quality of development that might occur in the L-0.5 zoning district in Cleveland Circle by requiring design review of all projects in that district, and also requiring a Traffic Impact and Access Study of all Major Impact Projects in that district. It would also clarify that redevelopment of a site that is partially outside Brookline would still be viewed as if the entire development were in Brookline. While the current Zoning Bylaw probably would require such reviews in any case, this proposed overlay would eliminate any doubt.

The L-0.5 zoning district in Cleveland Circle consists of the front segment of the former Circle Cinema site and the Reservoir MTBA station yards. Both sites are possible development sites in the future- the Circle Cinema site most imminently because the theatre is closed and the property is for sale. The existing L-0.5 zoning will significantly constrain the redevelopment potential of both sites. However, since much of the Circle Cinema site is in Boston, where a higher density is permitted than on the Brookline portion of the site, it is possible that the site could be redeveloped in Boston and have an adverse impact on Brookline, even if none of the new development is in Brookline. This zoning amendment would explicitly require design review and transportation analysis of any such redevelopment proposal, which would include examination of how such a project would impact pedestrian, bicycle and transit access, as well as vehicle traffic

impacts on surround roads such as Chestnut Hill Avenue which historically have been mitigated due to traffic exiting the property directly onto Beacon Street in Boston.

ARTICLE 11

Prior to the fall of 2008, the Town of Brookline permitted “family day care homes” provided that the number of children did not exceed 6. At the same time, the state permitted family day care facilities with up to 10 children under certain conditions. A warrant article was proposed for the Special Town Meeting in 2008 that would permit these “large family day care homes” in certain zones by right and in others by Special Permit. This amendment allowed the several large family day care facilities in Town, most of which have been operating without issues, to come to the Town for legalization. However, due to concerns that this might not be the best approach to regulating large family day care facilities, and also due to the fact that the state was in the process of amending its own regulations related to these facilities, this amendment will sunset in June of 2010.

The Zoning Bylaw Committee (ZBL) met several times since the fall of 2008 to discuss this issue. First, it looked at some basic issues related to regulating large family day care homes. Next, it delineated the basic issues that would need to be addressed in any final zoning language. Finally, it reviewed and commented on a staff draft of revised zoning language. At its February meeting, it recommended unanimously to submit this proposal. This proposed language would:

- Clarify that such facilities are accessory uses, and therefore are limited in size and scale;
- Update the terminology to bring it in line with the new state regulations;
- Provide the Building Commissioner with clear submission requirements and allow him/her some discretion with respect to whether the smaller facilities can meet basic requirements that protect neighbors from impacts;
- Require Special Permits for Large Family Child Care Homes in residential districts, with a set of criteria to be used by the Board of Appeals in reviewing these facilities.
- Make other clarifications, such as stating that children who live in the building must also count towards the total number of children served.
- Provide the Town with enforcement ability if a Family Child Care Home produces excessive noise or other impacts on the neighborhood.

This language is fairly similar to the language that was submitted for the Annual Town Meeting last spring. However, that language had some formatting errors that could not be resolved within the scope of the article. This new language resolves those issues and also has benefited from the extra discussion at the Zoning Bylaw Committee.

ARTICLE 12

This zoning amendment is being submitted by the Department of Planning and Community Development with the support of the Zoning By-Law Committee. This amendment facilitates the provision of motor vehicles conveniently located throughout Brookline that are shared by multiple individuals through a membership-based Car Sharing Organization (CSO) available to the general public for hourly or similar short

term rental. This will allow Brookline to advance its environmental goals by (a) reducing the need for individuals, households and businesses to own, park and store privately owned vehicles and (b) encouraging people to travel less by single-occupancy motor vehicles.

This zoning amendment differentiates vehicles based on type and use rather than the type of plates issued by the state. The Zoning By-Law does not currently define commercial and non-commercial motor vehicles. Additionally, passenger vehicles belonging to Car Sharing Organizations are expressly identified as non-commercial vehicles for purposes of zoning. This amendment permits CSO vehicles and other passenger type vehicles that may have commercial plates to be located in residentially zoned areas.

ARTICLE 13

This zoning amendment is being submitted by the Department of Planning and Community Development with the support of the Zoning By-Law Committee. This amendment facilitates the provision of motor vehicles conveniently located throughout Brookline that are shared by multiple individuals through a membership-based Car Sharing Organization (CSO) available to the general public for hourly or similar short term rental. This will allow Brookline to advance its environmental goals by (a) reducing the need for individuals, households and businesses to own, park and store privately owned vehicles and (b) encouraging people to travel less by single-occupancy motor vehicles.

This zoning amendment allows up to 20%, but no more than 25 of required parking spaces to be rented or leased to a CSO by right in all zoning districts, and more parking spaces allowed by special permit. Currently, CSO vehicles are only allowed as an accessory by-right use in nonresidential districts that have more parking spaces than otherwise required by zoning and limited to four spaces. This amendment requires contact information to be posted for all parking facilities that rent or lease to a CSO. Additionally, this zoning amendment allows and regulates signage for individual parking spaces.

ARTICLE 14

What has prompted the reinstatement of bicycle registration is that bicycles traveling on the streets of Brookline are on the increase. Now is the time to have mandatory registration of bicycles. This would be for the protection of bicycle owners, as a result of theft or any other occurrences that may take place, and for their personal protection and the public's protection as well.

ARTICLE 15

The stipends that members of the Board of Selectmen receive have not been increased for at least 30 years. If the stipends had been adjusted for inflation from 1980 to the present, the stipend for the chair would now be over \$9,000 and the stipend for other members of the Board would be over \$6,400.

The stipends for members of the Board of Selectmen came up at the Fall 2008 Town Meeting when elimination of health care benefits for long-serving members of the Board was discussed. The Town effectively decreased compensation for members of the Board of Selectmen in 2008 by eliminating eligibility for health insurance through the Town for

long-serving members of the Board. A warrant article calling for the doubling of the stipends as compensation for the loss of health care benefits was introduced. This Article calling for adjustment to the stipends received little attention and Town Meeting voted “No Action.” No increase in the stipends was included in the budget submitted to Town Meeting in the Spring of 2009.

The cost to the Town of doubling the stipends (\$13,500) would be nominal in the Town’s overall budget. The health care benefits that were of concern in 2008 were costing the Town \$70,000 per year. The cost to the Town of doubling the stipends would be less than the cost of providing health insurance for the family of one Town employee.

Members of the Board of Selectmen may be too polite to initiate requests themselves for increases in their stipends. The Advisory Committee is an appropriate body to initiate periodic reviews of the adequacy of stipends since it is responsible for making recommendations on Town Finances to Town Meeting. The Advisory Committee reviews budgets of all Town departments including the Board of Selectmen.

ARTICLE 16

This Resolution is the result of an initiative by members of the Brookline Civic Association Steering Committee. Steering Committee members attending the BCA’s August meeting agreed that such an initiative would be consistent with the BCA’s ongoing commitment to “Good Government”, the essence of which is to provide excellent Town and School services on a sustainable and fiscally responsible basis.

Over recent decades, Brookline has experienced a rapid growth in the total amount that it owes—but has not funded—for the future health care costs of retired employees of the Town and the Public School system (also known as “Other Post Employment Benefits” or “OPEBs”).

A recent actuarial study performed for the Town projects that, as of June 30, 2010, the total retiree health cost owed by the Town for current and future retirees will fall within a range of \$231 to \$353 million. To date, Brookline has funded only about \$6 million of this massive obligation, including \$250,000 in the most recent fiscal year.

Meanwhile, the Town’s total unpaid retiree health care obligation is continuing to grow and even accelerate. The total liability is projected to exceed \$950 million over the next 30 years; the currently funded amount plus interest provides only a minimal offset to this enormous obligation.

The 2008 Override Study Committee recognized that unfunded retiree health care obligations are placing the Town’s financial stability in growing jeopardy. The Committee’s Report, recognizing the actuarial realities, stated that “*Ideally, the town should set aside \$4 million per year to finance future retiree health costs and increase this amount by 4% each year.*”

While this \$4 million annual funding need correctly quantifies what it would take to fully fund retiree health care costs over time, it does not assume any other significant actions, such as may be needed and appropriate to contain the growth of this daunting figure.

Following the 2008 general override (which did not designate any of its \$6.2 million added annual revenues toward funding OPEBs), the Selectmen appointed a special OPEB Task Force to examine this growing issue and to make appropriate recommendations.

The April 2009 OPEB Task Force Report concluded that *“the Town needs to pre-fund its OPEB liability”* that *“if the Town does not alter course with respect to OPEB funding, it will be faced with the stark choice of ballooning taxes or sharply reduced services (or both)”*. The OPEB Task Force Report further concluded, *“If we do not pre-fund the liability, it is highly likely that the Town will be unable to provide other Town and School services at the current levels, as most of the Town’s and School’s budget will be dedicated to paying for retiree health costs”*.

In addition to recommending a number of cost containment measures, the OPEB Task Force urged the Town to adopt a specific, sustained schedule for funding its OPEB obligations, beginning in FY2010 with a \$250,000 allocation, which amount should be increased by \$250,000 annually each year thereafter.

In addition to annual funding, the 2008 Override Study Committee also recommended that *“if the town receives other large one-time revenue increases, such as the proceeds from selling taxi licenses, the town should add these to the fund for retiree health.”*

This non-binding Resolution would put Town Meeting—representing the Brookline citizenry that is ultimately obligated to pay this massive outstanding debt—on record as endorsing present and future commitments by responsible Town officials to fund a significant portion of this huge obligation, including both annual appropriations and a one-time set-aside from anticipated taxi license sales proceeds.

The OPEB-recommended funding schedule endorsed by this Resolution is modest when compared to the actuarially projected requirement of over \$4 million per year. Totaling about \$116 million over 30 years, it would at first only begin to slow the rapid growth of this unfunded debt and then gradually to reduce the total. Various other funding and cost containment measures will also be needed in order, eventually, to fully fund this health care obligation to our retired employees.

Over the years, some individuals have argued that this accumulated retire health care obligation—not just in Brookline, but in other Massachusetts cities and towns and beyond—is so massive and daunting that eventually the state and/or ‘the feds’ will have to “bail us out”. While such a happy outcome is not inconceivable, recent financial distress at the state and national level, and the responses to such severe stress, do not bode well for their being able or willing to rescue financially stressed cities and towns—especially those considered affluent.

A fundamental principle behind this proposal is that the fiscal impact of public employees’ hiring, including their retiree health insurance, should be borne by those who benefit from their services as they are being provided; that it is unfair to impose such a huge debt burden upon future Brookline taxpayers who will receive no benefit from public services provided many years earlier.

This Resolution encourages our Selectmen and Advisory Committee, from this point forward, to fund the Town's retiree health care obligation and take other related measures that will assure fiscal stability in order that Brookline may be able to sustain our current excellent quality of Town and School services.

ARTICLE 17

Supporting the U.S. Conference of Mayors' call to President Obama to abolish nuclear weapons by engaging local community leadership in this effort is a powerful way to add vital grassroots momentum to the global movement for substantial reduction of nuclear arsenals worldwide. The Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference (NPT) will be held at the United Nations headquarters this spring, and that makes this a particularly important time for public action on this issue.

To this end United for Justice with Peace has enlisted the support of municipal bodies throughout the country. As a member of The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (an organization included in the UJP consortium) I present this Article with the hope that Brookline will join in this effort.

By now, most of us have read the story of President Roosevelt's response to the constituent who urged him to take action on a certain question: "That's a good idea. Build a movement and make me do it." Our leaders need public support to take the kind of actions we want to see. Our mayors have taken a big step in this regard; the rest of us must join with them.

ARTICLE 18

Any reports from Town Officers and Committees are included under this article in the Combined Reports. Town Meeting action is not required on any of the reports.