

## **Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting February 22, 2018**

### Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Bill Cavellini, Rachel Weil, Ben Bradlow, Jacob Kramer, Ann Camara, Tori Antonino, Joanne Berry

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: 5

Co-Facilitators: Bill Cavellini and Rachel Weil

### **Agenda**

1. Welcome and introductions
  - o Bill reviewed the rules and welcomed the group. As of start we did not have quorum.
2. Approval of minutes of 2/15/18 meeting (5 minutes)
  - o Postponed until the council has quorum
3. Collection of Potential Conflict of Interest Disclosure forms
  - o 7 Have been collected, still waiting on several
4. CBA Committee Report (10m)
  - o Progress of additional inputs from organizations & individuals
    - i. Deadline for input is March 1, report will be done by the 15th.
    - ii. Ben Bradlow- other inputs are coming in from The Welcome Project, Jobs for Somerville.
    - iii. Somerville YIMBY will submit input
  - o Other
    - i. Who is the contact person for submissions?
      1. Jacob and Ben Bradlow's personal email addresses
      2. Submissions will be forwarded to the Google Group
    - ii. There is a draft outline for all who have expressed interest in writing the report. People are signing up to work on certain portions of the report
    - iii. Data from CBA Summit worksheets are being worked through to present the data in a simple understandable way.
    - iv. Andy Greenspon would like to be involved in the writing
    - v. Bill- Is there a timeline for getting us from the report to sitting down with the developer?
      1. Ben Bradlow- The report outline proposes a pathway to negotiation, as discussed at last week's meeting.
      2. The board can request amendments before approval
      3. Bill- Is it possible to get an earlier take on the timeline? Erik Neu has written up a timeline that can serve as a good starting point. It would be good to view and comment for next week's meeting.

4. Jacob- There are strategic considerations depending on the route we choose to take. Erik's timeline may take a different strategy than the CBA committee.
  5. Bill- things to include: MEPA process, construction season, time to prep the negotiation team with CBA experts, lawyers, etc.
5. Plan presentation of US2 site plan and scheduling possible site visit (10m)
- Bill- Afruza brought up last week that we should have a review of the site plan and possible a site visit.
  - Ann Camara- I think this is a good idea
  - Andy Greenspon- We don't have many details- just the block plan and the CDSP. A presentation would be based on that- What is planned for D2, discussion, and a site visit.
  - Ben Bradlow- What might be more useful would be to plan a trip for what is currently being planned by US2 and what other built interventions have been suggested by the community.
  - Tori Antonino- I see two things- A walk around the square to familiarize ourselves with the development is good. The other thing is the D2 parcel and the immediacy of that. US2 never did a follow up from the Open House. It's time for them to present again on the feedback from the open house. We could put pressure on US2 to get us a timeline.
  - Jacob- In the Saturday CBA Summit Tori showed some different possible plans for US2. That kind of visioning for what is possible is extremely helpful.
    - i. Also some question of how we go about getting what we want from the developer. The CBA is the best framework for presenting what we want and getting that enshrined in a legal agreement. We should use that tool to shape out input on the building design.
  - Peter Insley- We have to ask how much it would cost to have a design requirement in place vs some other request. A lot of people have asked for 2 parks, 40% affordable housing, etc. Getting what we want will depend on prioritizing these. Let's ask experts about how much these things will cost.
    - i. Bill Cavellini- this may be better suited to a CBA Committee discussion.
    - ii. Jacob- The issue is about what they're willing to do to get our support.
  - Andy Greenspon- It will be at least a month or two before any CBA negotiations have begun. In that time US2 is working on their D2 designs.
    - i. There are things in a CBA that require actual dollars. Design things can be more abstract and developers may not see them without community input. US2 has to go through

- design review committees and planning board but those processes will not likely produce substantive changes. We should get a jump on design concerns while we can.
- Bill Cavellini- Let's try to narrow down what this tour/presentation might look like.
    - i. Proposal to look at whole site plan
    - ii. Proposal to look at just D2
    - iii. Site plan or site visit?
  - Ben Bradlow- Proposal to do this soon after the board's acceptance of the CBA report. Then there is a document that people have reacted to.
    - i. Report will be presented on 3/15
    - ii. Joanne- Should we give ourselves two weeks? Weekend of 3/31-4/1
    - iii. Ben Bradlow-Proposal: I think the tour shouldn't depend on acceptance of the CBA report- 3/24-25
      - 1. Jacob seconds proposal
      - 2. Rachel- Report will be submitted on the 15th but will be deliberated on 3/22
      - 3. Tori will not be able to make that weekend
      - 4. April 1 is Easter Sunday
      - 5. Ben Bradlow- We can visit on the 17th.
      - 6. Andy Greenspon- seconded. Site visit won't depend heavily on the CBA report.
      - 7. Rachel- We could schedule two site visits.
      - 8. Bill- The proposal as it stands- site visit of whole site on Saturday March 17
      - 9. Vote: 8 aye, 0 nay
    - iv. Content: Jacob- I propose this be driven by the Built Envi Committee with contribution from CBA Committee. Responsibility for agenda and materials is with the Built Envi Committee.
      - 1. Ben Bradlow- key contribution from CBA committee- Draw out built envi issues from CBA summits and share with Built Envi Committee.
      - 2. Tori- Built Envi Committee accepts proposal
6. Built Environment Committee Report (10m)
- Tori- Well attended committee meeting on Sunday, addressing:
  - Somervision drive for 125- following up on 125 acres of open space. Putting pressure on the city to get a plan for this.
  - Zoning- Reviewed introductory part and assigned individuals different sections to report out on.
  - Reaching out to US2 and formalizing a letter for the approval of the board to request information about where they are at in the process

- i. Bill- Would you like this on the agenda for the next USNC meeting?
  - o Jacob Kramer- If we could review letters in advance of meeting for review that would be good
    - i. Tori- I will try to get them to the board on Monday
  - o Andy Greenspon- Either Somervision needs to be realistically modified to a realistic amount of open space (some believe 125 is too high). Or, if the city is going to refer to Somervision then there needs to be an implementation plan. Either way there needs to be an implementation plan.
    - i. Jacob- This group is a good formation to hold the city accountable to those goals. I would be in favor of pushing on them.
- 7. Discussion and Approval of response to Newmarket developers' offer to discuss proposal for 65-71 Bow St (15m)
  - o
  - o Bill- Right now it is the Lean Automotive Repair shop, owner is retiring.
    - i. Scott Zink is one of the partners of Newmarket Developers. He has done previous developments on Linden St.
    - ii. The developer has asked for our comments on their plans. We should respond in some way.
    - iii. Ann Camara- This development is going to turn into expensive apartments. Why wasn't it sold for commercial space?
      - 1. Andy Greenspon- Zoning overhaul has very few actual changes to what is already there. It is zoned as mixed use, not commercial
    - iv. Jacob- Propose that we engage with this developer in some way.
      - 1. Tori- Seconded
      - 2. Vote- 7 aye, 1 abstention, 0 nay
    - v. Andy Greenspon- Erik Neu requested that they provided more information. Needs to be more of a discussion. Possibly a small group can talk to them to get more info.
      - 1. Ben Bradlow- We can ask the developer to make a proper presentation. As far as we know there are not more details than exist in their communications with us.
      - 2. Joanne Berry- I prefer a proper presentation. From there we can make decisions on it.
      - 3. Jacob - We should come up with a framework for how we interact with developers like this. I side more on the public open process rather than Erik's suggestion of a small private group discussion.

4. Andy Greenspon- Before we create a general framework we should move forward viewing a presentation by the developer
  5. Tori- Is there value in having some face to face conversation with them before a presentation?
  6. Ben Bradlow- Considering Tori's comments, I move that we invite the developer to make a presentation to a USNC meeting
  7. Gary Trujillo- Is it appropriate or advantageous to understanding the sentiment among abutters before scheduling a presentation?
  8. Bill Cavellini- I strongly support Erik's proposal that a small group meet with the developer first, along with *immediate* abutters. This development is not imminent- we should not sacrifice our other duties. I worry that if we line up a lot of developers we won't have time to focus on US2.
  9. Andy Greenspon- This is very early in the process. If we request a presentation they may have nothing to present except a couple of buzz words.
  10. Ben Bradlow- I withdraw my motion
  11. Bill- Do we ask Erik to make contact with the developer? Plus anyone else that wants to be involved. As well as talking to all immediate abutters. Ask the abutters if they've been contacted by the developers.
  12. Volunteers- Jacob, Joanne, Tori (maybe), Erik Neu (in absentia). Joanne will initiate the conversation with all volunteers.
- vi. Joanne- In the future we need to ask what type of affordable housing is included in a development.
8. Discussion on whether to change Article 16 of the Interim Bylaws to clarify intent
    - o Andy Greenspon- Article 16 outlines how a CBA is conducted with the broader membership.
      - i. IF a CBA does not receive  $\frac{2}{3}$  community support, deliberations continue until "a majority" support can be reached.
      - ii. This refers back to  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority.
      - iii. Suggested amendment would make this  $\frac{2}{3}$  explicit
    - o Ben Bradlow- Main concern is the simplest procedural mechanism to clarify the issue. If we have a clearly minuted comment on the change and that there was no objection, it could serve as a sufficient clarification.

- i. Jacob- Agreement with this notion. In bylaw writing it was agreed that anything important requires  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority.
  - o Bill Cavellini- This  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote is for when we come back from negotiations with the developer. The concern is that the community should be very much on board, otherwise an interest group could cram in a few extra people to reach a simple majority. However, it is possible that a small group of  $\frac{1}{3}+1$  could stick to their guns and make unreasonable demands of the negotiation process, never agree and thus hold up the whole process. Other parts of the bylaws are explicit about  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority. The item in question here doesn't seem to be an accident.
    - i. Joanne- it is our job to make sure needs and concerns are met. If we don't get the  $\frac{2}{3}$  its because we don't deserve them.
    - ii. Gary Trujillo- Agreement with Joanne.
    - iii. Ann Camara- Agreement-  $\frac{2}{3}$  the whole way.
    - iv. Andy Greenspon- There will always be certain people that are unhappy but they will probably drop out of the process if they don't get their way.
    - v. Jacob Kramer- allowing a simple majority removes incentive to push for a second round of negotiations.
    - vi. Bill- I am convinced. not worth a process for amending bylaws
    - vii. Vote for  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority for final decision. "majority" in last line of article 16 refers to the  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority in the previous sentence
      - 1. Unanimous "ayes"
- 9. Communications and Outreach Committee Report (15m)
  - o Ben Baldwin- Continued deliberation on web site change
  - o SCATV- Michelle is working on a Union Square neighborhood video
  - o Peter Levine USNC biweekly update
    - i. Bill- We need more details on date and time to coordinate board member availability.
      - 1. People can coordinate a time with Peter Levine
    - ii. Tori- Could be a board member and a council member
    - iii. Ben Bradlow- whoever is responsible on a given week can arrange it with Peter
    - iv. Ben Baldwin: Proposal we move alphabetically by first name
      - 1. Afruza
      - 2. Andrea
      - 3. Ann Camara
      - 4. Ben Baldwin
      - 5. Ben Bradlow
      - 6. Bill
      - 7. Ganesh

- 8. Jacob
  - 9. Joanne
  - 10. Michele
  - 11. Mike Firestone
  - 12. Rachel
  - 13. Tori
  - Andrea Lizama will be coordinating a walk out for gun control
    - i. Jacob- Proposal that we formally address the issue and endorse the high school walk out
      - 1. Rachel - seconded
      - 2. Bill Cavellini- This is the first time we would be taking a position on something outside of Union square. Opens the door for other issues.
      - 3. Andy Greenspon- we won't be able to take positions on every thing that every individual in the council is doing. It also wasn't on the agenda so we shouldn't vote until next meeting.
      - 4. Ben Bradlow- This particular issue is not directly related to our work.
      - 5. Gary Trujillo- we risk unnecessarily alienating some people.
      - 6. Jacob- our endorsement would be based on our guiding principles in the bylaws. We are trying to reach a base of support among high schoolers, which is why we made the age floor 16 instead of 18. I reached out to the board today to put this on the agenda, so it has been proposed publicly.
      - 7. Bill- We can't take a vote now without 48 hours advance notice on the agenda.
    - ii. Jacob- modified motion: I will work with Andrea to craft a letter that members of the board and council at large are welcome to sign on to and we can circulate.
      - 1. Andy Greenspon- we can all sign as individuals. We can seek endorsement afterwards.
10. Public Comment (25m)
- Bill Cavellini- we should be noting the things we want to change about interim bylaws in order to set in place permanent bylaws.
11. Next meeting time and place
- Bill- we don't have the Argenziano cafeteria next Thursday. Propose that we meet on Wednesday instead.
    - i. Jacob- PARENTING Journey may be able to host us Thursday.
    - ii. Bill- is the general will of the group that we keep the Thursday shedule? Yes
12. Adjourn

