

## **Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting April 5, 2018**

### Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Rachel Weil, Ann Camara, Michele Hansen, Tori Antonino, Ben Baldwin, Ben Bradlow, Erik Neu, Bill Cavellini, Mike Firestone, Jacob Kramer, Afruza Akther

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Simon Hill, Peter Insley, Andy Greenspon, Wig Zamore, Father Richard Curran, Joe Beckman, Bill ?, Gary Trujillo, Jessica Eschleman

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil, Bill Cavellini

### Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
  - o Bill facilitated the meeting and welcomed the group.
  - o Agenda differs somewhat from what was sent out to the membership.
  - o Bill asked for concise comments during tonight's meeting
2. Approval of minutes from 3/29/2018
  - o Simon- Add mention of executive session earlier in the minutes
    - i. Transparency re: executive session. Mentioned that BOA had introduced language that the board should be open and transparent if it is to be recognized
      1. Rachel- This was US2 language, not BOA language
      2. Bill- to correct the minutes, there needs to be a majority vote of the board
      3. Simon- Doesn't matter whether it's correct or not, just that I said it
    - ii. Ben Bradlow- move to temporarily pass the minutes and issues be submitted to Ben Baldwin for review
      1. Seconded
      2. Vote- unanimous "ayes"
3. Review of prepared questions for George Proakis & Sarah White for 4/12 meeting
  - o Tori- It is not prepared yet, BEC needs to review it over the weekend.
  - o Bill- How can we review it as a board?
    - i. Tori- Online?
  - o Mike Firestone- Is it worth using the time allotted to discuss potential questions?
    - i. Bill - Let's entertain the idea. Is the board ok with it?
  - o Andy- Next week will be an opportunity for anyone to ask what they want, there won't be a dearth of questions. The BEC will have an

easy time generating questions, they just haven't been formally taken from the minutes yet.

- Ben Bradlow- Want to make sure these questions are circulated in a timely manner. The idea is that George be prepared to answer the questions. We will look bad if not presenting that materials in time to George.
- Tori- I intend to submit questions to George on Monday or Tuesday
  - i. Ben Bradlow- Tuesday is a little late.
- Jacob- I move that we bump this item to the end of the meeting. If we have enough time and energy we can come up with questions.
  - i. Michele- Second
  - ii. Vote: unanimous "ayes"
- 4. Update on BOA formal recognition of USNC, decision on how to respond to US2 meeting offer
  - Rachel- The board has hopefully seen the email from Paul Scappicchio offering to meet this week or next. Want to open up for discussion to see how to go about doing this.
  - Bill- Before we do that, we should get an update from the BOA meeting, where US2 reps were present
  - Erik Neu- The BOA rejected the US2 proposal, agreeing with our concerns that they were material changes. The last part that stated US2 be "credited" dollar for dollar was discussed. They kept language that was submitted by USNC to the BOA. They will create a stub CBO that will...
    - i. They told US2 that if they
  - Bill- do we know the timetable? CBO ordinance has been in the works for 8 months.
    - i. Erik- That's going nowhere any time soon.
  - Mike Firestone- We were successfully able to remind the board, that the city, board and USNC had all agreed on the language. US2 came in and tried to substantively change the language. At this point the BOA is behind us. There is a possibility of getting US2 to agree to the language that the city and BOA proposed. There is no answer at the moment to how long it would take to create a stub CBO but there is a commitment to pursue one.
  - Bill- Do we need any more background to determine whether and who should meet with US2?
    - i. Joe Beckman- Ongoing dialogue w BOA to create a CBA with Tufts regarding payment in lieu of taxes. They are using the same vocabulary. Keep that in mind.
      - 1. Erik- Off topic, but good to keep in mind.
    - ii. Rachel-When was the last time the CBO was brought up in either legislative matters or the whole board of aldermen?
      - 1. Jacob- over the summer they thought it was too complicated and tabled it. I think JT Scott(ward 2) is

taking recognition language from our submission. Anything to do with money can be determined later. They may be able to move quickly on this. If that money were to arrive without a CBO it wouldn't disappear, it would go into escrow.

iii. []

5. Discussion of whether the Council should engage with US2 about their development plans and the requirements under the CDSP prior to the start of negotiations on the CBA
  - o Bill- Tori submitted this discussion online and it has come up a few times. We need to address this.
  - o Tori- I feel this needs robust discussion and don't know if we'll conclude tonight. Question is about our strategy. We are not only a board to negotiate a CBA. We are a liaison btw community and US2. We haven't engaged them. We haven't been able to talk about any designs. They may be violating zoning ordinances. This needs to happen in some form.
  - o Ben Bradlow- Materials that Tori has submitted are extensive. A lot of hard work has gone into it. I'm also confused about this discussion: the scope of the CBA as enumerated in the covenant btw city and US2 includes many of the issues raised around the CDSP. A number of commitments made in CDSP will shape the types of things we negotiate for in a CBA. I see these two as synergistic, not as separate things.
  - o Erik- They are synergistic, but we want to get information from US2 to inform what we want in a CBA. Any changes in CDSP to the point of negotiations will be unknown to us prior to negotiations. We need to get that information.
  - o Jacob- One thing we should be clear about is that this is about their plans, not what is going to happen. This is our position until we have an agreement with them that we support their plans.
  - o Simon- Special permit was passed last year. There are things in there that do not fit with the model. Problems are in the first 6 paragraphs: open space, high quality civic space, park. They are still short 1.9 acres of high quality civic space. Their model is not in compliance with CDSP. This needs to be brought up with planning board.
  - o Michele- If they're not in compliance then the whole thing can start over again.
  - o Andy- US2 is going to have neighborhood meetings as part of their process. Design review, planning board. Planning board has all the power- they can approve the design review with or without CBA. If we aren't engaging US2 to affect those plans, we may not get a chance later.

- Jacob- I think we should make it clear that it would be in their best interest to begin CBA negotiations before they have neighborhood meetings. If they are going to present plans in a public way and have failed to respect the body that represents the community, they are going to have trouble in their public meetings.
- Erik- there are members of the community interested in engaging with the USNC concerning US2's plans. These people engage in the BEC and don't show up at USNC open meetings. **Motion that this body authorize the BEC to meet with Drew Leff with the intention to gain information on their current plans and not in a decision making capacity**
  - i. Michele- Seconded
  - ii. Discussion:
  - iii. Ben Bradlow: I am swayed by the justification, but I don't think it appropriate to designate a committee to represent the council. Don't want a siloed discussion. Need to integrate these discussions into main body of council.
  - iv. Erik- Last time we had this discussion, we decided the full USNC didn't have time to fully dedicate to this.
  - v. Jacob- **amendment: A committee of the whole to have this discussion.**
    - 1. Erik- accepted.
  - vi. Ben Bradlow- This meeting will be open to the public. What is envisioned for structure?
    - 1. Erik- CAC engaged by presentations, questions from the core group, public comment, and someone inevitably screaming at US2.
  - vii. Jacob- Procedural question- If we approve this, is it contingent on success or failure of discussion in agenda item 4?
  - viii. Bill- Who calls the meeting and sets the agenda? I don't know enough about the motion to vote on this.
  - ix. Ben Bradlow- I won't vote on this until we understand the response to the meeting on the covenant amendment. I support it in principle but don't want to cross contaminate meetings.
    - 1. Erik Agreed that timing is favorable to have agenda item 4 meeting first (hopefully next week). **The CDSP meeting proposed here should be a USNC meeting, not a US2 meeting.**
    - 2. Ben- **This will not be communicated to US2 until we understand results of first meeting. Offer of meeting should come after results of our first meeting**
    - 3. Erik - Accepted

- x. Erik Neu- We can wait to publish these minutes until
  - xi. Vote: 9 “ayes”, 1 abstention
6. Questions & decisions on Traffic & Parking priorities from CBA report
- o Bill- Many of these topics are covered in CDSP and zoning. I want to get some agreement among the board on which pieces of the priorities are already present in other agreements/documents.
    - i. Zoning has clear language on district-wide parking plan
    - ii. CDSP has language on bike share stations
    - iii. Commuter shuttles are in the CDSP condition 51, but limited to hotels only.
    - iv. Erik Neu- Bill is correct about the items mentioned. Also: Traffic management association (miniature CBA unto itself) How was this negotiated for Mystic View Task Force? I ask that there be a traffic management association to measure the plan and determine when things are triggered.
      - 1. Jacob- clear need and desire for this
  - o Michele- Nothing in here about Uber stops.
    - i. Erik- As self-driving cars and Uber increases, garages should be built with an eye to being convertible in the future into some other kind of space.
      - 1. Ben Bradlow- Is this specific enough to bring to the negotiation.
      - 2. Erik- This is a question for Phil Parsons or Wig
  - o Jacob- Small addition: Fire Dept is worried about priority on traffic signals getting through the square during construction. Currently no way to get priority through multiple traffic signals in US.
  - o Bill- Ask of the committee was to get one big idea and several small ideas. Can we move to that part of the discussion?
  - o Tori- Could we negotiate for fewer parking spaces? Zoning meeting with Dan Bartman- If we don't build as much parking we will end up with fewer cars.
    - i. Bill- this is in the report. What does zoning call for? Something along the lines of 1500 or 1200 but they need to present evidence that they need to go to 1500. We could ask for a lower number of parking spaces and require significant proof that they need more.
    - ii. Erik- We can request that all spaces be paid for so that you don't automatically get one as an employee or resident. Prohibit certain addresses from getting on-street permits
      - 1. Bill- CDSP covers this. Unsure of exact language
      - 2. Andy Greenspon- We should ensure that new residents have a place to park. If there is no space in the newly built lots, they should be allowed on street permits.
    - iii. Ben Bradlow- I'm in favor of parking limitations.

- iv. Michele- My inlaws live on Beacon St. and can no longer park on their street. Eliminating parking affects people.
        - 1. Andy- These are going to be new residents
    - o Erik-Motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes.
      - i. Michele- second
      - ii. unanimous “aye”
    - o Jacob- Motion that someone, self-nominated, formalize the reconciliation of our CBA report with CDSP and zoning, and say that there is a strong preference in this group for fewer parking spaces, paid for separately from apartments, and a parking enforceability agreement to make sure this is adhered to. These could be combined into one “big” parking agreement ask.
      - i. Smaller item: convertible garages.
      - ii. Bill- There was a strong rec from USMS that there be a parking garage on D7. We need to address it.
      - iii. Jacob- That’s fine.
      - iv. Jessica- Transit oriented development is bringing us many good things, but we want to preserve the character as it is now. The station will be how people come and go. Having the ability to park in the center of the district will off-set an imbalanced Union Sq. If parking is only considered close to the Green Line stop, and not considered in a way that increases traffic through the square, other parts of the square may wither away. A parking facility in D7 would serve the businesses there. I want to strongly consider parking go into D7, of whatever size and shape feels right.
      - v. Bill- US Neighbors wants a neighborhood park there. These are competing asks. This calls for more discussion.
      - vi. Jacob- In light of this known conflict, would USMS be able to consider other locations for parking?
        - 1. Jessica- I want to give a reason for pedestrians to make it further down the block.
        - 2. Bill- What about underground parking under a park?
      - vii. Ben Bradlow- Jacobs motion is that there be a summary of this discussion. It would be problematic if it doesn’t deal with the D7 parking discussion. Three options:
        - 1. Parking lot in D7
        - 2. Park in D7
        - 3. Study for underground parking with a park above ground
          - a. Bill- Also an option that the park be on D1
      - viii. Tori- I would like to hold off on this discussion until others can be made aware of it.
7. Discussion on whether to expand outreach about nominations for CBA Negotiating Committee

- Andy- How many applications have been submitted?
  - i. Ben Baldwin- 1
- Jessica- What is the ability of the board to extend the deadline?
- Michele- Motion to extend deadline by 1 week
  - i. Erik- Seconded
  - ii. Discussion:
  - iii. Ben Bradlow: Propose amendment to motion: If there are fewer than 10 applications by the deadline it should trigger automatic extension of deadline
    - 1. Michele- reject amendment.
  - iv. Tori- We haven't done much outreach. I agree we should extend by 1 week
  - v. O&C committee meeting will meet on Saturday and flyer on 4/10 and 4/14
  - vi. Vote: unanimous "ayes"
- 8. Public comment
- 9. Next meeting date and time
  - George Proakis and Sarah White will be attending our meeting for 30 minutes to answer questions we have submitted to them.
  - We will have a discussion of traffic priorities