

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting June 20, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Michèle Hansen, Ben Baldwin, Bill Cavellini, Ann Camara, Rachel Weil, Joanne Berry

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Van Hardy, Gary Trujillo, Father Richard Curran, Joe Beckman, René Mardones, Wig Zamore, Ann

Co-Facilitators: Bill Cavellini

Agenda

1. Welcome
 - a. Quorum not achieved. Bill led off introductions
2. Approve minutes from 6/6
3. Public Comment
 - a. Joe Beckman- Has there been any followup from the YMCA?
 - i. Ann- I am going to ask the library, arts council, YMCA to come to a meeting next week
 - ii. Father Richard – I met with Bill Murphy, YMCA director, recently
4. Recap on Monday meeting
 - a. Bill reviewed the discussion between USNC members and Board of Aldermen from Monday 6/18 on USNC recognition as CBA negotiators with US2
 - b. There is a meeting prior to the Legislative Matters Committee, proposed by Mark Niedergang, to jumpstart the CBO ordinance process to get it in shape for a vote
 - c. Joe Beckman- Is there any discussion of rental vs. condos? This could be important for the real estate transfer fee.
5. MEPA Updates
 - a. Joanne- Imperative that we stop bringing MEPA up in discussions since we have leverage on it. These are regulations that are required and shouldn't be discussed by the negotiating committee or CBA. We know a waiver request is coming and they cannot be allowed to get that waiver. In order to ensure they are not granted a waiver, we need to get the community involved. The project has many components that trigger environmental reviews
 - i. Bill- I have said that MEPA is a leverage point, but I have never meant to imply that it could be sacrificed for something else.
 - ii. Joanne- Good, then it should not be discussed in a way that
 - iii. ___ - I want to get as much attention focused on the BOA passing the CBO as possible at the pre-meeting and Legislative Matters meeting. USNC needs support at each of these meetings. Need to bring attention to importance of a formal agreement. What is the ideal scenario for tomorrow?
 1. Joanne- Summary of what we have asked for in the May letter to the BOA with our asks sent to membership
 2. Rachel- Pre-meeting is at 5pm. Not sure of the extent to which the Legislative Matters meeting will be relevant to

our purposes.

3. ___ - Who will be in attendance tomorrow? The point is to show our investment.
 - a. Ann will be there at 5. Michèle may be able to go in the beginning.
 - iv. Joanne- I propose that I send out an email guiding people on how to comment on submissions from US2
 1. Michèle- I think you are already empowered to do this
 - v. René- I suggest USNC see if they can get some legal assistance during hte MEPA process
 - b. Ann Camara- We need to send an email. Show up tomorrow, write letters
 - c. Wig- second largest project at assembly sq sent CDs today. There's 30 days. There needs to be a brainstorm within 7 days. There is only 1 site visit. Need a broad number of citizens to participate. Helps to show that you understand the MEPA process, understand what is in and out of jurisdiction. If they want a MEPA waiver on D2, once its done its done for 50 years. Typically >1000 pages.
 - i. USNC will send instructions on how to sign up for MEPA notifications
6. Design Review Committee meeting - updates
 - a. Rachel- There aren't any updates. DRC doesn't have a quorum, so there is no meeting planned.
7. Oversight discussion
 - a. Ben Baldwin gave a brief review of what was talked about in the last meeting. There were no firm decisions made on oversight.
 - b. Bill- I would make a suggestion that the board be fully informed on everything discussed in negotiations with developer.
 - i. Also- the board should share as much as possible with membership at regular meetings. That would include what topics were discussed within negotiations in a given week. However, I would exclude almost all strategic and tactical decisions that the negotiating team went through in coming up with priorities
 - c. Ben Baldwin- Issue is that we don't have a mechanism of reporting back. Who is the point person?
 - i. Bill- Can we do that at USNC open meetings?
 - ii. Ann- Can we have a secretary at negotiations?
 1. Bill- that idea was recommended by the expert from NJ
 2. Rachel- That subject should come up at the next training session
8. Public Comment
 - a. Joe Beckman- What partner agencies are going to be involved in negotiations?
 - i. Bill- They won't be present in negotiation sessions. They are present in training sessions. Many organizations are represented
 - b. Wig- Board membership will have to approve any agreement
 - i. Bill- Bylaws call for a $\frac{2}{3}$ majority to approve agreements
 - ii. Wig- Based on form of Assembly Square, they had many experts on different topics. We did not reveal much from negotiations. We only brought lawyers in at the last second to check language. \$50mil was on the balance.

- c. René- Thanks to the USNC board for the time spent on this process. SCC spent a long time negotiating with Clarendon Hill. They might be a good resource on negotiations.
- d. Gary Trujillo- I appreciate the need to withhold certain information from the general membership concerning negotiations, for the reasons stated by Bill. However, I feel it is important that the negotiations represent the needs and priorities of the full membership, and that there should be some mechanism devised to ensure that members can provide information about those needs and any recommendations they may have for obtaining them in CBA as they may care to express. I am particularly concerned about advocacy for specific citizen desires regarding the community center, and do not feel confident that the planned "training sessions" for negotiators will be adequate for that purpose..
 - i. Bill- I'd encourage you to speak with the people representing the community center at the training session, and invite you to write your thoughts on the subject, expressing whatever you may be able to collect from others who have strong feelings on that subject.
 - ii. Gary- I will do so on condition that what I write be read out during the community center portion of the training session on the community center.
 - iii. Bill- agreed
 - iv. Gary- Tim Talun had been invited to participate in the training session. It seems not accidental that you haven't heard from him.
 - v. Bill- We wrote to Tim but never heard from him. (Bill went into some detail concerning the way the invitation to Tim was made and what was done subsequently to cover the topics that Tim would have covered had he accepted the invitation, and said that Tim's thoughts would likely be incorporated anyway into what would be said by those who will be handling that portion of the training session.)
 - vi. Gary- Have you considered the possibility that Tim's non-reply might be related to the fact that questions he has raised, such as the one concerning the composition of the CBA negotiating team qualifications, have also been ignored? I feel it would be good to have people such as Tim and Rob.... (at this point Bill, cut off Gary with a re-statement of what he had said previously about how Tim had not responded to the invitation, to which Gary objected, on grounds that he was not permitted to finish his sentence, which he said was intended to express the general idea that having people participating generally in USNC activities, not only the training session just mentioned, who would be representing the Union Square Neighbors, would enable the USNC to be more credible and effective and to be more likely to gain support from the segment of the neighborhood represented by that entity).

9. Next Meeting

- a. No meeting scheduled.

10. Executive Session

- a. Bill: Motion to go into executive session because of personnel and strategy matters of negotiating team, as long as there's a brief recess

- i. Ben seconded
- ii. No quorum- could not vote

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting June 6, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Michèle Hansen, Ben Baldwin, Bill Cavellini, Erik Neu, Ann Camara, Tori Antonino, Erik Neu, Ben Bradlow, Pennie Taylor

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Van Hardy, Tom, Jessica Eshleman, Simon Hill, Gary Trujillo, Matt Taylor, Nia Lambert

Co-Facilitators: Bill Cavellini

Agenda

1. Welcome
 - a. Bill welcomed the group and led off introductions
2. Approve minutes from 5/30
 - a. No quorum at start so vote postponed
 - b. Vote: 7 yes, 1 abstention
3. Public Comment
 - a. Gary- Tim Talun had a question concerning the make-up of the negotiating committee
 - i. Tom- Can we restate the question
 - ii. Erik Neu- Recites question
 - iii. Ben Bradlow- Can we discuss this under agenda item 6?
 - iv. Simon- Within the rules the USNC elected a negotiating committee
 1. Bill- Yes the bylaws are explicit on this
 - v. Michèle- I think we can say exactly what happened. Nothing about the way the committee members were chosen makes me uneasy.
 - b. Simon- I'd like to speak against the public comment period as it is. I think the group is small enough to allow free comments.
 - i. Tori- Any 10 members of the USNC can bring an agenda item that must be addressed within something like ten days
4. Further discussion of "Good Food for All" program
 - a. Jessica- June 23-30th, the Union Square community is raising awareness and funds for the SNAP match at the farmers market. SNAP is formerly known as food stamps.
 - b. Erik- What is the request for support from the neighborhood council?
 - i. Jessica- Request is to consider coming to participating businesses and encourage network to do the same. Contributions are also accepted- we are a 501(c)(3)
 - c. Ben Bradlow- We have a general mandate to support our community. Including a notice about this is included in this.
 - d. Ann- Is there a flyer?
 - i. Jessica- Yes. We will also have social media but we are trying to reach those who we are not yet reaching.
 - ii. Jessica- I can share what I'm working on with the O&C Committee
 - e. Vote in favor of publicizing Good Food for All: 6 yes, 0 abstain 0 opposed
5. Discussion & decision on USNC hosting a meeting with the Board of Alderman June 18th on US2's Phase 1 plan and delay in transferring additional land to US2

- a. Simon- Let's do the meeting.
 - b. Ben Baldwin- Can we informally agree here and email the rest of the board to get the 1 vote we need to make it happen
 - i. Michèle- Can we skype someone in?
 - c. Ben Bradlow- I've expressed to the alderman already that I'm concerned that there could be meetings about this issue, and then the mayor will come to the BOA with a demand to transfer the land asap. There hasn't been the sense of urgency in taking up our issues, while another party can get that sense of urgency. I think we should have the meeting, but I want to emphasize the need to put pressure on our allies on the BOA to move our process along. Mark Neidergang's response to our letter suggests that it may not be possible to get our recognition until after summer recess. Delaying our recognition until August.
 - i. Erik Neu- This time of year, budget and financial topics take precedence at the BOA. The idea is to convince the BOA and US2 that their land transfer has to wait.
 - d. Tori- Do we need to wait for the BOA to recognize to start negotiations? As long as US2 recognizes us.
 - i. Michèle- I think so
 - ii. Bill- Waht is the status of Erik Mike and Rachel's attempt to make contact with US2?
 - 1. Erik- Received response today. We haven't discussed or responded. Proposed the 14th at 9am.
 - iii. Simon- US2 seems to have already kind of recognized USNC. We can bring up our issues and priorities at the meeting.
 - e. Van Hardy- What is the purpose of the meeting?
 - i. Discuss letter, our problems with D2 and why we're asking for a delay. BOA don't have meetings Mondays.
 - f. Tori- I reject Mark Neidergang's claim that our request needs to wait. We should schedule the meeting and push for our priorities.
 - g. Vote in favor of hosting a meeting with the BOA Monday June 18 place and time TBA:
 - i. yes- 5
 - ii. no 0
 - iii. abstain 0
6. Discussion of timetable for start & duration of training program, start of negotiations, and USNC Board meetings as training proceeds
- a. Bill hands out proposed training schedule. First session proposed for Monday, 6/11 7-9 at the Public Safety Building. All USNC Board Members encouraged to attend. Content of training sessions have not been distributed publicly.
 - b. Erik- I don't see a strategic value in hiding the topics of the negotiating training sessions. There are no curve balls, although I did find one item that was missing.
 - c. Bill- Should details of training be discussed in open session?
 - i. Ben Bradlow- If I had not attended exec sessions I would be confused right now. People should be assured that there is a clear mechanism for reporting back issues discussed in executive session.
 - ii. Bill- So we should discuss item 7 first?
 - iii. Ben- yes

1. Michèle- Seconded
 - d. Return to topic:
 - e. Bill- What does the group think for approximate start of negotiations with US2?
 - i. Michèle- I can't make the 16th, will there be written information?
 1. Bill- unclear
 - ii. Bill- General outline of training sessions
 - iii. Bill- Some flexibility on 6/16. Given responses from resource people, could be 16th or 17th. Any preference?
 1. None stated
 - f. Pennie- Motion to approve the timetable
 - i. Michèle- seconded
 1. 6 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention
 - g. Bill- We can determine start of negotiations when trainings are done. Soon after
 - i. General agreement
 - h. Bill- Absence of architects who have agreed to participate. There is still time until session for in July.
 - i. Tori- I can help flesh out the training sessions.
 - i. Pennie, Ann can also help
 - j. Erik- Omission in trainings- finance and business of real estate. Understanding the flip side of our negotiating position.
 - i. Bill- Would it be ok to be part of session 2?
 - ii. Erik- Don't care
 - k. Bill- Should we schedule USNC meetings during training period (June 11- July 16)
 - i. Ann- I suggest we have meetings in the gap between training sessions
 - ii. Erik- We voted on a motion to require report back so there have to be meetings.
 - iii. Simon- Oversight in timeline- summer session in July and August, people are going to be away. Better to aim for September for negotiations. Also need to have board meetings to prepare for other things
 - iv. Bill- Should we have a board meeting next week?
 - l. Erik- Motion to skip the week of 13th, meet on week of 20th. Unless people submit urgent agenda items by the 9th
 - i. Seconded
 - ii. Vote: 7, opposed: 1
7. Discussion & decision on mechanism for oversight of the Board over Negotiating Team
- a. Ben Bradlow- In union negotiations there is periodic reporting about priorities, progress, etc.
 - i. Bill- When a union is sharing updates with members, they card at the door. Not exactly analogous.
 - ii. Ben- If we conduct all discussion in total darkness, when an agreement is proposed to the public it may be hard to get a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote.
 - iii. Michèle- The question is what is appropriate to put out to the whole council rather than just the board.

- b. Pennie- Our membership is close to 1000. We can make an effort to remind people what we're doing.
 - i. Ann- We're not going to have real answers every day.
- c. Erik- There are two pools of people to concern ourselves with; Those who have lost faith and those who never had it. In an effort to bridge trust, we can have someone report back.
- d. Tori- My concern with canvassing further is that issues may be skewed a certain way, angling for a certain benefit over another.
- e. Ben Bradlow- Mobilizing for support is not the primary issue on the table
- f. Ann- I want people to know what the process is but we won't know what to give them until negotiations begin.
- g. Michèle- Can we publicize some of the top things that we are fighting for?
- h. Bill- Strategy and tactics shared with board, but not with general membership. Report on progress made in negotiations, subject matter. It's important to keep people informed.
- i. Ben Bradlow- Michèle's idea sounds right. The CBA report outlines a lot of this.
- j. Erik- One early thing that will come out of this is that the negotiating committee come up with a list of specific priorities. Maybe this is voted on by the board with a role call vote and published to the membership. Motion to make this part of report-backs: Negotiating committee comes up with a list of SMART priorities, voted on by board in role call vote with the results of the role call vote published to the membership.
 - i. Bill- Seconded
 - ii. Discussion of how to deal with new things as they come up, that may not be in line with priorities
 - iii. Ben Bradlow- We can come out with a maximalist position with trade offs happening in the process of negotiating. Have to make it clear by publishing a public summary of our asks.
 - iv. Pennie- As a board we have already given approval of our CBA document as a maximalist position.
 - v. Erik- Amend the motion to SMART priorities
 - vi. Tori- It will not be the content published or the role call? If it is the content, I don't want it published.
 - vii. Ben Bradlow- Description of Negot. team members was technical. Prioritization, in my sense, was dealt with in the election. Delegation got a technical body brings us to questionable territory. One way to avoid this is to have the board participate in the training sessions.
 - viii. Pennie- I see two layers of decisions- priorities and smart goals within those priorities
 - 1. Bill- I suggest we cross that bridge when we come to it
 - ix. Tori- Is the motion that the negotiating team come up with the smart goals?
 - x. Ben Baldwin- Motion to close discussion
 - 1. Pennie- Seconded
 - 2. Vote: 8 in favor
 - xi. Vote- 4 in favor, 4 opposed. Does not pass
- k. Erik- I agree that it is the job of the board to decide on priorities. I am not able to attend the schedule as proposed. I made the motion to ensure that someone was working toward smart goals

- l. Ben Bradlow- We need substantive deliberation on smart goals/priorities. Substantive decisions rest with the board not the negotiating team.
 - m. Tori- Smart goals could come out of those who participate in negotiating training as described in the calendar.
 - n. Pennie- Remind everyone that this has been a democratic process. We have collected the asks for the community, so the democratically elected board can make decisions.
 - o. Erik- Motion + those of negotiating committee and present members of IUSNC Board at session discussing priorities present a list of Smart priorities with a role call vote distributed to the membership
 - i. Michèle- second
 - ii. Vote: 5, 0 opposed, 1 abstention
 - p. Bill- Discussion on Tim Talun's request
 - i. Ben Bradlow- Criteria were clear, list of applicants were publicized, USNC deliberated in executive session, and the results were publicized.
 - ii. Michèle- I move that the chair write a simple email with what Ben Bradlow just said and send it.
 - 1. Erik- I would add that the selection was a direct result of the pool of applicants
 - iii. Ben Bradlow- We can send a clarifying email. The process was transparent.
 - iv. Erik- We can provide a higher level explanation to alleviate concerns
8. Public Comment
- a. Gary- There is a lot of focus on procedure at these meetings, which can be used to obscure the substance of issues being discussed. I want to call attention to the fact that Tim's question was declared when I raised it at this meeting during the first comment period to be such that it could not be considered because Tim is not present at the meeting. I replied at that time that the question is my own as well as being Tim's, at which point several members of the board agreed that that fact makes the matter worthy of consideration. However, when the item came up for discussion by the board, no reference was made to that fact, and it was again being thought of as Tim Talun's question only, and I was not permitted to comment on what I felt to be statements about the matter during that discussion, in which only board members were allowed to participate, that were entirely beside the point. There was an assertion made by the chairman that amounted to a claim that since a clear procedure was followed and the composition of the negotiating committee was decided by the board (during executive session, which cannot be witnessed by non-board members, and the proceedings of which are not reported to the membership), no further accounting is necessary. No amount of citing history or procedure, however, is relevant to the question asked by Tim and myself as to a request concerning disclosure of the specific qualifications of members of the appointed negotiating committee relative to representation of the several matters for which it will be required to advocate during CBA negotiations, especially as regards obtaining concessions on "indoor civic space" (community center).

- b. Simon- USNC is the elected body to keep oversight over the negotiating committee.

9. Next Meeting

- a. Wednesday June 20 unless urgent agenda items come up by June 9

10. Executive Session

- a. Tori: Motion to go into executive session because of personnel and strategy matters of negotiating team, as long as there's a brief recess
 - i. Pennie- seconded
 - ii. Vote: 8 in favor

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting May 30, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Michèle Hansen, Ben Baldwin, Ben Bradlow, Bill Cavellini, Pennie Taylor, Joanne Berry, Rachel Weil, Erik Neu, Afruza Akther, Jacob Kramer

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Ann Ryan, Colleen Moore, Chris Allen, René Mardones, Peter Insley, Baby Bradlow, Jessica Eshleman

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil

Agenda

1. Welcome
 - a. Rachel led off introductions
2. Approve minutes from 5/23
 - a.
3. Public Comment
 - a.
4. Organizing for the Design Review Committee June meeting on US2's current D2 parcel plan discussing a new process for developing an alternative plan (BEC update)
 - a. *non quorum discussion*
 - b. DRC meeting in June, no date yet. Tend to be on Wednesdays.
 - c. USNC has sent a letter to city about the unresolved design issues but USNC has not received a response.
 - d. Discussion of strategic options:
 - e. Erik- US2 may be out of money for architectural costs. Financing will come triggered by, for example, start of construction.
 - i. What is the rough amount of money required?
 - ii. Original design maybe cost tens of thousands. Causes changes to financials.
 - iii. US2 indicated USAA as partner new on board, Alexandria Labs as a potential tenant. Alexandria has long history in Kendall Sq. and deep pockets.
 - f. Rachel- So how can we take this conversation to the DRC?
 - i. Joanne- pursue communication with US2 to figure out where they're at with designs
 1. Ben Bradlow- they have provided no mechanism for us to engage and what are the benefits we can hope for from this meeting?
 2. Background on development CBA for new attendees
 3. Erik- There is value in trying to get information
 - g. Ben Baldwin- Would a strong turnout have sway in the DRC? What would constitute good attendance?
 - i. Bill- Not known
 - h. Ann Ryan-Strategic to reach out to US2 while they are "stuck." Shows that we are organized. Possibly willing to help
 - i. General agreement among the group that USNC should try to generate turnout to June meeting and put discussion of meeting with US2 on next

agenda.

- j. *Afruzza arrives, quorum achieved*
- k. Erik Neu- Motion that Rachel, Mike, and Erik meet with US2
 - i. Ben Bradlow- Preferable to move toward having the negotiating committee be the primary body negotiating with US2.
 - ii. Erik- Continuation of previous conversation with Rachel, Mike, and Erik who could not make it
 - iii. Ben Bradlow- We have sent a letter to the BOA saying we will not support land transfer. We can meet with them to address covenant/ordinance issue and proceed on land transfer.
 - iv. Vote: In favor: 6, opposed: 2, abstention: 1
- l. Bill Cavellini- Motion to mobilize for the June CDR Committee meeting: Web site, Facebook, etc.
 - i. Ben Baldwin- Seconded
 - ii. Vote: 8 yes, 0 oppose, 0 abstention
- 5. Discuss vote on draft position paper on Bow St. Development (Erik Neu's draft)
 - a. Parking requirement in proposal due to community input and issues with lack of parking
 - b. 5 stories, 3 by right. Seeking approval from abutters to gain the height.
 - c. Bill- Move that we accept the report as presented online
 - i. Erik- I don't support that. There are edits to be made
 - ii. Bill: Can be made during discussion
 - iii. Pennie: Seconded
 - iv. Discussion:
 - v. Bill: 3 trees with 9 inch diameter. Where has this been called for before? I would like us to not be the first to ask for that.
 - vi. Michèle- General practice to plant a younger tree, more healthy.
 - vii. Colleen- As long as it's consistent with what's there.
 - 1. Michèle- Need to ensure that they actually do it and take care of it.
 - viii. Pennie- Historic Preservation Commission- is there an action item about incorporating advice?
 - 1. Erik- They have to go to HPC due to demolition review ordinance
 - ix. Bill- Is denial of parking permits normal?
 - 1. New in Somerville, has been done in Cambridge
 - 2. Bill- some talk of that in US2 buildings.
 - x. Michèle- Can you review the unit sizes?
 - 1. Erik- Based on SMART goals, specific numbers about unit size. Just came up with ratio in report.
 - xi. Colleen- Along with historical piece, will this force a setback?
 - 1. Erik- They can move their plan.
 - 2. Colleen- My concern is the building blocking light.
 - xii. Vote for acceptance of motion with comments: 10 yes, 0 no, 0 abstention
 - xiii. Post vote discussion: Erik: setting up a meeting among neighbors end of June
- 6. Discussion of timetable for narrowing down CBA priorities; start & duration of training program, and start of negotiations
 - a. Postponed due to late start

7. MEPA update and discussion on findings, meeting and suggestions for Special Review Procedure
 - a. Joanne- Seeks to meet with MEPA people and Somerville Redevelopment Authority. Half of D2 lot is completely contaminated
 - b. Bill- Move to authorize Joanne to represent USNC in front of these groups.
 - i. Erik Neu- Seconded
 - ii. Discussion: Joanne I will send an email to follow up, will need at least 4 to come to meetings. US2 cannot get a waiver on this property
 - iii. Vote: in favor: 9, against: 0
8. Public Comment on tonight's agenda
 - a. Jessica: Asking to be on next week's agenda with this update: Initiative being planned for last week in June throughout US. Good Food For All: SNAP is accepted at farmers markets. Since 2005 USMS has been matching SNAP dollar for dollar. Funding is currently not meeting demand, so we are trying to start a community campaign: Local SNAP Match. USMS does promotion encouraging visits to local businesses which will have special deals with money going toward the program.
 - i. Ben Baldwin- Send information and will include it in upcoming communications
9. Executive Session
 - a. Bill: Motion to go into executive session because of personnel matters of negotiating team
 - i. Pennie- Second
 - ii. Vote: 8 in favor

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting May 23, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Ann Camara, Michèle Hansen, Ben Baldwin, Ben Bradlow, Bill Cavellini, Tori Antonino, Pennie Taylor, Joanne Berry, Jacob Kramer

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Simon Hill, Gary Trujillo, René Mardones, Andy Greenspon, Greg Hill, Debbie Musnikow, Wig Zamore, Jessica Eshleman

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil (arrived shortly before executive session segment)

Agenda

1. Welcome and intros
 - a. Bill started off the meeting with introductions. Agenda will be different than the one posted- Erik Neu is not here to discuss his item.
 - b. Public comment has been split in two, separated to the beginning and the end. As an experiment, only board members will be allowed to comment on items in between the comment periods.
2. Approval of minutes of 5/16/2018 meeting
 - a. Michèle- Motion to accept
 - i. Ben Bradlow- Seconded
 - ii. Vote: 6 yes, 1 abstention
3. Public Comment on tonight's agenda
 - a. René- Good idea to limit the discussion just to board members to keep meetings shorter. Perhaps tonight the board will vote the final list of the negotiation team. This is a concern not just for me but Union United. There are no people of color and only one woman. When we came together with Union United, the big goal was to have those voices represented.
 - b. Gary- I respectfully disagree with some of what René said. The co-chairs have been reasonable in calling upon people. I don't think there has been any systematic discrimination. *(Post-meeting note from Gary: I may have misunderstood what René was saying, which may not have been about participation in meetings, as I had thought. Given what is recorded above regarding René's statement, I would agree with him, and go a bit further – not only is it important for women and minorities to be represented on the CBA negotiating team, we also need those who are passionate about what is important to other segments of the local population who would, for example, advocate for a design of integrated indoor civic space ("community center"), as I said at a previous meeting. If all these values are not well represented in the negotiating team, we may have reason to question how good a job was done of getting the word out about nominations for this position.)*
 - i. I'm disappointed that participation of non-board members will not be allowed during the main discussion in tonight's meeting, particularly that involving the letter to the Board of Aldermen. USNC wants to claim to represent the community, but if people don't have a chance to participate fully it's hard to say we're representing anybody but board members.

- ii. I have circulated an alternate draft of the letter, so if I'm prohibited from taking part in the discussion I would have to say everything I want to at the present time:
 - iii. We need to be diplomatic in the way we express ourselves, even to US2. We are at their mercy to some extent, and we're imploring the BoA to help us get US2 to agree to the City's amendment. Propose that given that the meeting of the Design Review Committee that was supposed to happen tomorrow has been postponed, we may have more time to work on the letter.
 - c. Simon- In agreement with Gary. We don't need specific percentages of people. We just don't get that many people volunteering so we have to take what we can get. I don't like the limited public comment period.
 - i. I'd prefer a strongly-worded letter, and see the present one as rather "wimpy."
 - ii. About the letter to the Design Review Committee. Description of D2 parcel, framed with buildings. That was the by-right concept, not part of CBA. The community center would have gone into that 15.5 acres. The mayor never would have supported it because he wouldn't have been able to get money out of US2 or tax from the building, even though it would have been better for the community.
 - d. Greg Hill- Does neighborhood council have an outreach committee? I haven't received any communication on that.
 - e. Joanne- Apologies for my absence the last few weeks. I've been dealing with family emergencies.
 - i. I spent time at MEPA today. There has not been a filing for this project from US2. However, doing some ground work to determine what needs to be done once that comes through. There is quite a bit of contamination along GLX and Boynton Yards. From what I've read, there has not been any cleanup so I will be continuing to investigate that matter.
4. Review of letter to the Board of Aldermen asking for delay in transferring part of D2 land to US2 until they accept Covenant change language that the city proposed
- a. Bill- I separated these letters and if I misinterpreted it then I apologize. We may want to consider separating letters to BOA and DRC.
 - b. Ben Bradlow- I was not a lead author of this letter. Full correspondence on this letter is available on the Board Google Group. In what I've seen, I haven't heard any major substantive inputs into the design related issues. I've made inputs as to the tone of the letter, with additional inputs from Erik and Mike Firestone. All this to say- I haven't heard anything that leads me to think we are in great need of delaying this letter. Many members of the community have been asking to get the ball rolling on this for a long time and I wish to respect those wishes by sending a single letter soon.
 - c. Jacob Kramer- The part dealing with the transfer of land to US2 is not going to be relevant to the DRC. We can take out that part. It makes sense to register with the BOA our aesthetic problems so they have a sense of how mature the process is, there will be a delay on design side.
 - i. Bill - So it's appropriate to have two letters?
 - ii. Jacob- Yes but take out land transfer

- d. Bill- Can we have some discussion on the two or one letter issue and whether we can tolerate a delay?
 - i. Pennie- Good to keep BoA apprised of critiques. Good to remove land transfer section for DRC. Sooner the better to get this out
- e. Ben Bradlow- If we end up with two slightly different letters I can live with it, but I'd prefer a single letter. Key authorities on these issues begin to see the interrelatedness.
- f. Ann Camara- Same as what Ben said.
- g. Jacob- I am persuaded that we can keep it holistic in agreement with what Ben said.
- h. Pennie- Motion that we write one letter that addresses the concerns, sent to both BOA and DRC
 - i. Michèle- Seconded
 - ii. Discussion:
 - iii. Ben Bradlow- Process of finalizing the letter. Want to address stylistic issues
 - 1. Bill- Let's vote on one letter or not first, then discuss drafting.
 - iv. Vote- 7 in favor of one letter, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions
- i. Bill- I'll entertain a motion for how this letter gets finalized. Basic draft is out there. Input from Gary Trujillo, Erik Neu and Mike Firestone should be considered before letter is finalized
 - i. Jacob- I incorporated Mike Firestone's feedback into the letter that has been circulated. I have not incorporated Erik or Gary's edits.
- j. Ben Bradlow- We should set a deadline for when revised draft is circulated. Are people amenable to approval via email? If not, it has to be addressed in meeting next week. Some issues are more sensitive than others.
 - i. Jacob- This seems consistent with spirit of process thus far. No edits have substantially changed the content.
 - ii. Michèle- Gary, is your letter more of wordsmithing or is there content change?
 - 1. Gary- Mostly changing tone. I found original draft some unnecessary aggressive tone. *(Post-meeting comment from Gary: I also added language in various places to make more clear our intent and desire.)*
 - 2. Jacob- President Ballantine was clear to me that they like to see concise communications
- k. Jacob- Motion to give preliminary approval to this letter, pending a draft revision, which will be circulated via email 5/24 (tomorrow). People will have 24 hours to review. Approvals of that will be accepted via email. A majority of board members approving will be sufficient to send it. One of the board co-chairs will send to both DRC and BoA. We can discuss who else we want to CC.
 - i. Michèle- Second
 - ii. Tori- Circulation- public or just board members?
 - 1. Jacob- CC entire list, unless there is disagreement
 - 2. Tori- want the public to be able to see the new draft and make comments to be accepted by the board.
 - 3. Jacob- I don't accept that amendment. Motion is to review

comments we've received so far by Erik and Gary.

4. Tori- I do not wish to make this an amendment to the original motion.
 - iii. Vote on the motion- 8 yes, 1 abstention
5. Approval of draft letter to the Design Review Committee for June meeting asking for rejection of US2's current D2 parcel plan and a new process for an alternative; and organizing for the meeting
 - a. Addressed in item 5
6. Public Comment
 - a. Simon Hill- *USNC-public* and board mailing lists are both open formats, it's just trickier to get to the board for folks who don't know how to do it. Things that are put directly into public are steps less.
 - i. I circulated email from George about DRC having limited ability to consider things that are already on the table. If you put things into the letter for design review it might confuse them, so to speak
 - ii. Bill Cavellini- My understanding is they have a limited purview
 - b. Wig- I don't have a prejudice between 1 or 2. You could make a blanket statement that different bodies in the city have different decision making responsibilities but you want them to understand the full context.
 - i. I was at the Assembly Square meeting for a large project. May be some occasions that don't require a lot of deliberations but can be a big help.
 - ii. Assembly has very little open space in plan. Can be reworked to have more open space, but could help the public greatly.
 - iii. Jacob- That is something the USNC public list is great for. Second step is request for secretary to send in Tiny Letter.
 - c. René- I am reading Gary's letter. This is an alternative correct? It seems that the last few paragraphs lay out a strategy for how the BoA can recognize the USNC. This is the same strategy used in the past. It took a long time for US2 to come up with a counter proposal. For me, it's weird to see that the board is trying to use the same strategy again, knowing that US2 might take this opportunity to delay the approval process. Requires more discussion about strategy to get recognition from BoA. Should look into legal advice before moving forward with this letter.
 - i. Gary- Second what René said. We need to do this right. The need we have here is to have some high level discussions about strategy. It's important to have as many people from the community involved as possible. Asserting our right to be recognized is not a winning strategy unless accompanied by evidence that we are representing the community.
 - ii. Gary- I'd be willing to work and help Jacob edit the letter, to make it shorter if that's what we all want.
 - iii. Joanne- Only concern with legal counsel is legal bills. We are fortunate to have an attorney working with us guiding the tone in a way that is appropriate. We have tried to bring in experienced members of the community. Many are not willing to come to these meetings (**Mike Firestone**, the attorney being spoken of here, arrived immediately after Joanne made this statement.)

- d. Michèle- Where does DRC intersect with MEPA? Not at all. Who is the major party that we should direct our protest toward?
 - i. Wig- Individulas on DRC have the authority. Can copy to whoever else you want. DRC does make decisions on building designs. Not the same kind of decision framework that MEPA uses.
- e. Simon Hill- BoA is going to recognize this board – it's not debatable. I would chase them to get on the covenant process
- f. Jessica- Some questions from people in the community.
 - i. Process of distilling CBA report into items brought to the negotiating table?
 - ii. Will there be an election cycle next December?

7. Next meeting date and time

- a. Wednesday 7pm at Public Safety Building

8. Executive Session for the Board

- a. Jacob- Motion to enter executive session for matters of strategies, procedure and personnel
 - i. Pennie- seconded
 - ii. Vote: 8 yes, 1 abstention

16 May 2018, 7pm,

Present: Rachel W., Bill C., Michele H., Erik N., Tori A., Father Richard C., Pennie T. (taking minutes), Ann C., Simon H., Jacob K., Wig Z., Joe B., Gary T., Afruza A.

YMCA Director meeting:

One possible location: Park area leading to train tracks at Charlestown and Linden. Second building of residential with higher proportion affordable, and park area. In conceptual beginning stages- Simon. Not on US2 spot but adjacent, private property. Per Ann, Stephanie is in prelim talks and is preparing something to share for us. They have financing for whole lot and maintenance. Some interest in keeping community center in D1, especially since the timeline for D2 is fairly stringent - Gary. There is no urgency for Y to move from Highland (speculated to have face value of ~3.5 million). Tori & Erik remind: still need to hold US2 accountable for public/open space- CDSP/requirement. Rachel raises issue of where SROs (single room occupancy), that are used widely, are needed and unlikely on D2. Joe: with loss of Ruby Rogers there is need for these services...will Y fill that need? Can US2 fill gaps? Jacob summarizes: people liked the conversation, Y might be doing own thing, we won't come to any plan now at this stage, we await updated information and continuing conversation.

D2 block: Tori

Going to design review on 5/24. Permit could be issued in next month. Tori's main concern: private recreational space on parking garage luxury space overlooking Allen St. Thoughts to share feedback with US2, mayor? Jacob proposes honing our position on specific space, bring to design review board. BoA has opinion that rooftop should be open space, programming developed in collaboration with USNC, other neighborhood groups. Jacob motions to make a clear position that we can similarly submit; seconded. Residents adjacent on Allen St. need to be engaged, given alternative, or need process to prioritize Somerville residents. How do to so? Simple property swap (Wig), we'll canvass them via BEC (meeting this Sat/canvass this Sun); Bill connected with Allen St. residents and thinks many will be open to connecting with us. Forms they're suggesting are not adequate and do not meet needs of neighborhood. What is our counterproposal? Positions: 1. Public space. 2. Critique of proposal in broad strokes. 14400 people on affordable housing wait list- it's closed. Bill has seen examples in 3 cities to maximize residents getting affordable housing; no evidence in Somerville. Bill: This should not be interpreted as an endorsement for overall plan, which we find falls abysmally short of creating vital urban space that people will remember they've been and want to return to, because of content and shape, beauty, way it's arranged. It's a shame if we can't do this here. Wig, Rob's proposals on visuals are all way better than what US2 proposes. If we make a statement on open space, we need to preface it. Erik: include language to hold design committee accountable!

JK: write a letter to design review that will serve as testimony to present: 1. Strenuously advocating for any open space to be fully public, with community process to program. 2. Bill's point. Pennie will bottom line drafting letter using these notes.

Wig: need to research affordable housing process- general knowledge - Joe B. volunteers, and informs about Council on Aging- deals with financing, restructuring, renovations, limited equity

ownership etc. Overlaps with discussions on transfer fee-- these are the other pieces folding into place here.

Re: meeting with mayor: Tori wants Joe C. on board; parking garage (D2) can't be the anchor for his Somervision. His buy-in could be worthwhile. Michele confirms that Design Review and Planning make decisions outside of BoA- so we have to get in front of them, and reaching BoA might not have impact..

Use letter as simultaneous request for

1. Inadequacy in general
2. Public space

Erik: ship sailed on BoA with Union Sq. zoning. Point raised that several planning board members have expired terms, one has been lame duck for years. Design Review committee doesn't usually take comments. 2012 SCC got grant and planning event that involved residents of Allen St.; a document emerged with neighbor's wishes; do those same ideas apply 6 years on, can we reach the same people ? Something to start from. Gary has contacts of people that did 2012 workshop (*Actually, the workshop I attended, where emails were collected was in May, 2015 - gst*) . 8-10 parcels impacted. We want to canvass residents to get them on board, inform them. Per Bill, ~3 households have Portuguese as first language, BEC will bottomline canvassing- Tori and Wig volunteer. We've never seen massing on whole façade- don't just want ivy up and pretend it's not there. Want to see image of massing on backside.

Meeting update: 65 Bow St. Erik- zoning is a bit slow, map last thing they'll work on. Erik sent out document with 5-6 specific questions. BoA not making much progress on zoning, budget season is upon us. Bill- very good to see abutters at meeting, main concern was that abutters should be contacted, and make sure developers had had contact. Developers are asking for changed zoning, pulling 5-story variance up a lot. An agreement to purchase with contingency that they get upzoning. First salvo- if you let us build more units, you automatically get more affordable housing. JT and Ben said they need to work it out with abutters and USNC, can't do spot zoning via petition, don't want special permit or variance- want to change zoning, not prove hardship, etc. Big issue = parking. Don't build too many, but address inadequate on-street parking. Force to build some ratio of spots to units. Any spots created are not tied to deeds. Residents wouldn't be allowed to pay for city parking permits? There's precedent in Cambridge. Erik made abutter map. Creative ideas for green space? 2 trees in plan, nothing else suggested, idea of rooftop garden not popular. Could they buy a nearby property to be a pocket park? Anything else missing? Documentation of automotive business history of Somerville... Jacob raises idea of adding another affordable unit over required. Concern raised about affordable housing taking precedence over green space. Eversource substation behind it, next to business stretch, may not be site for green space. Joe raises idea of building in preventing condo conversion. Calendar: Erik wants to have proposal written by end of May/early June, to not get lost in summer slow-down during July and Aug.

Gary asks for Outreach and Communication and CBA committee to send updated info for website. There are not presently descriptions on the web site for either the CBA or the O & C committees, so information is requested from the chairpersons of those committees to put onto the landing pages for each of those committees. Who are point people for those updates/uploads? - please step up.

DLJ looking to purchase Star Market – open space being discussed- luxury housing, with open space. Not configured to fit soccer field, which is what community needs...one community meeting happened, more to come.

Motion to move into executive session for personnel reasons approved.

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting May 9, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Rachel Weil, Ann Camara, Michèle Hansen, Ben Baldwin, Ben Bradlow, Erik Neu, Ganesh Uprety

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Joe Beckman, Peter Insley, René Mardones, Gary Trujillo, Bill Murphy (YMCA), Tom Bent (YMCA), Simon Hill, Kazumo?, Jessica Eshleman

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil

Agenda

1. Welcome and intros
 - a. Rachel started off the meeting with introductions
2. Discussion with YMCA director (1 hr)
 - a. Rachel- to Bill Murphy: Please start us off with a little bit about your future plans for the YMCA in Somerville
 - i. Bill- Somerville YMCA has a \$2.5 million operating budget, and 70 employees. Affiliated nationally but independent. Highland Ave building was built in 1904. There are four child care programs, with 220 kids in licensed care. Many high school students use the Y, as do younger kids. Many youth employees serve as lifeguards (40 during summer, paid \$15/hr). There are 300 kids at camp every summer. 1200 adult & 800 youth members. There is also a pre-school center operated in a house next door to the main building, which is one of several adjacent to one another owned by the Y. Swimming pool was added to building in 1930s. Bill grew up in Somerville and has been with the Somerville Y for over fifty years. He has served as its director for thirty years. National affiliation provides an opportunity for expansion, new building, etc. The current building is owned free and clear, and operations run a small surplus. It is even able to offer swimming lessons to its (youth?) members at no extra charge. Much thought has been put into looking for a new home for the Y in the city, with Union Square being one of several sites under consideration.
 - ii. A new YMCA would ideally be 50,000 sq ft. and would require many parking spots. 350-400 visitors daily.
 - iii. Simon Hill- Has a structural engineer recommended leaving your current building?
 - iv. Bill- No it is still in pretty good shape. Renovating would be expensive and require shutting down program for years.
 - b. Ben Bradlow- Thanks for coming tonight. We've held two summits where we brought together over 150 people in the community to talk about goals for the neighborhood on many topics. There are lots of ideas for a community center. My first question is what you would like to see new or different if you were to move to a site in Union Square, distinct from current operations? What would be the scope of your interest in a neighborhood driven YMCA/community center proposal?
 - i. Bill- My biggest concern would be how much we would change. I don't want to lose the great things we are doing now. For example, new Y's don't have dormitories. Affordable housing is a gigantic issue in this city. We also have all kinds of space that's not laid out the way we use it or want to use it. The Y isn't really a gym and swim place, it's a social service agency. The fitness

- component for kids is important for me, and with a new building we can design the space around our program.
- ii. Tom Bent- There are newer Ys that are built into office buildings taking up a couple of floors. Partners with community health centers. National affiliated organization has helped to design some amazing new spaces. Most YMCAs aren't transit oriented
- c. Simon Hill- Did you get a property tax assessment on Highland Ave?
 - i. We don't get taxed since we're a nonprofit, The city assessed it at 3.5 million.
 - ii. Simon- My sense is that the city said there will need to be community organizational partnerships in order to get a community center.
 - iii. Bill – our plan would be to raise money, get bonds and tax credits. A new Y costs \$20 million.
 - iv. Simon- Do you think you can get the funding together to construct a new YMCA facility?
 - v. Bill- Certainly. The Y is interested in this opportunity
 - d. Joe Beckman-Are you committed to a single new building? My concern is multiple sites. This is a \$2 billion project. The city could push the MBTA to release some extra money to go toward facilities. I'm interested in the partnerships you've crafted. If there were support, there could be different programs at different sites.
 - i. Bill- We would be open to that. We need to figure out where the main location is going to be.
 - e. Erik- You know the D parcels pretty well, Tom. Where would you put a new Y/community center?
 - i. Tom- The reality is we need time to raise funds etc. The present site of the police station would probably be one of the key spots. Good location. Reality is, the timeline for D2 is too short; we'd love to have it happen sooner than would be possible there. US2 has been interested in talking to us. We had a meeting (with Greg Karczewski, et. al.) 6-8 months ago.
 - ii. Ann Camara- We had heard that US2 would want a private YMCA for their buildings.
 1. Tom- I asked Greg about that, I think it was a miscommunication
 2. Bill- The YMCA always makes its facilities open to the general public.
 - f. Peter Insley- You mentioned that US2 wouldn't permit you to put dormitories in a new Y [actually, Bill only said that he thinks that US2 has housing covered, so there wouldn't be a need for the sort of accommodation that's provided by the Y on Highland Avenue]
 - i. Bill- I don't know of a new Y that does dorms. Plus US2 is doing housing there, so I can assume they're handling that instead of a duplication of services.
 - ii. Peter- The current tenants may not have the same opportunities in US2's affordable housing.
 - iii. Peter- How much more space would you need to make a move worth it?
 1. Bill- 50,000 square feet is our ideal size. We have 35,000 right now, including two floors of dormitories
 - g. Michèle Hansen- My brother in law lived in the current Y building before he married my sister, while he was making a personal transition. I think it's important to the neighborhood. We can't get enough affordable housing, so it wouldn't be duplication.
 - i. Tom- It's a difficult mix, with the dorm clientele mixed in with the kids. Especially today a lot of the tenants have issues.
 - ii. Bill- Our housing is 43 single room occupancies. There are no services and I am the resident director.
 - h. Ann Camara- The reason I called Bill is because the Y has everything a community needs. We have been trying to figure out what we want in a community center
 - i. Bill- Visit the Y. Arlington doesn't have a Y, but they do have a Boys and Girls club. Most Ys are in a square, eg Cambridge. Cambridge has built and runs

several top notch community centers. Somerville has relied on the Y to do all that. You could make the point that Somerville needs to invest more in this kind of thing. There hasn't been a capital campaign for new community centers in over 100 years.

- i. Gary Trujillo- I'm glad to hear you'd be interested in a partner like CHA. Union Square doesn't presently have one (since the one in the building where SCC has its offices was closed a couple years back). The Built Environment Committee has been looking at what we want in a community center. One consideration is that there are advantages to having all these facilities located in close proximity to one another, principally with respect to the synergistic effects relative to the community-building capacity, though not all in our group place emphasis on that idea. In addition to athletic facilities, we've looked at meeting space, performing arts, branch library, and SCATV. At some point, maybe we could bring you that into the conversation.
 - i. Bill- Yes.
- j. Erik- Do you have 2-3 examples of a Y making a big capital project shift in a hot real estate market.
 - i. Bill- I can ask the Y about this.
 - ii. Erik- And partnering with a big development. Cost-sharing, being creative, etc.
 - iii. Bill- Got it.
- k. Joe Beckman- Curious about partnerships with the city in some empty schools, or the less active churches. It's harder to imagine a single site anymore.
 - i. Bill- We use St. Catherines on occasion. Used to run a program out of the Cummings School. We have looked at other sites. Generally, older schools, I think the city has plans to redevelop.
 - ii. Michèle- St. Anthony's would be good for that.
 - iii. Bill- It's an interesting site, I wonder what they use the school for.
 - iv. Gary- Though the school itself is vacant, there are young people living on the top floor – young people serving in something like Vista or Peace Corps.
 - v. Michèle is a thriving parish, serving the local Brazilian community
- l. Peter Insley- You serve Arlington as well
 - i. Bill- Yes, a lot of Boston area Ys are independent. It's different in other parts of the country
 - ii. Peter- Where do people live?
 - iii. Bill- About 75% are still from Somerville. Some have moved out but continue to be members.
- m. Simon- How much parking did you ask US2 for?
 - i. Bill- We asked for a lot. At least 200
 - ii. Tom- We have 400 daily users now and only 40 spaces, and it works.
 - iii. Simon- The problem is there isn't space for what you're asking for.
 - iv. Bill- We know we're not going to get all the parking we want.
 - v. Tom- The attraction of Union Square is that you can walk, bike, transit, etc. This is a huge amenity for hte people living and working here.
- n. Ann Camara- Would St Anthony's allow you to do everything you want?
 - i. Bill- We haven't really explored it yet
 - ii. Tom- Greentown Labs is using a lot of their parking lot.
 - iii. Ann- What about hte police station itself?
 - 1. Bill- I don't think it will work. It's in pretty bad shape.
- o. Bill- Lynn is bulding a \$27million development next to their current building. Grants, fundraising, tax credits.
- p. René- This neighborhood council will soon enter a negotiation with US2. Any thought you have about what this group should bring to that conversation? They want to advocate for a community center.

- i. Bill- Make sure you have your priorities set. Make sure everybody is on the same page.
 - q. Erik- It's a two pronged strategy. It's built into their special permit to have this conversation.
 - i. Bill- The city needs to be involved too.
 - ii. Erik- The Y could be a rallying point.
 - iii. Tom- The mayor is on board
 - r. Erik- It would be great to use that extra MBTA \$50 million for this purpose
 - i. Tom- There are a lot of attachments. But it is committed to Somerville and Cambridge.
 - s. Bill- Half the YMCAs being built right now are partnered with a healthcare agency.
 - i. Tom- we have had discussions with them. [CHA?]
 - t. Rachel- I think this has been a fruitful conversation. Is there another way for folks to reach out?
 - i. Bill- Yes please come visit.
 - ii. Tom- If we get some information together, we will send it to you.
- 3. Board of Aldermen meeting on transfer fee
 - a. Peter Insley- I got the sense that there was support among the aldermen. The bill has been amended to exempt as many people as possible. It did not defang the opposition and they were very vocal.
 - b. Ben Bradlow- There could be one or two votes against it, or it could be unanimous. Then it has to go to the state house
 - c. Joe Beckman- It doesn't project its impact, so I fear it will be bounced out of the state house fast.
- 4. Next meeting:
 - a. Rachel- I think we have been moving meetings too much. Can we decide on a day?
 - i. Do Wednesdays work for people?
 - ii. Yes
 - iii. Next meeting set for Wednesday, May 16
- 5. Continued negotiating team selection discussion (in executive session – 1 hour)

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting May 1, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Rachel Weil, Ann Camara, Michèle Hansen, Ben Baldwin, Ben Bradlow, Mike Firestone, Jacob Kramer, Erik Neu, Tori Antonino, Afruza Akther, Ganesh Uprety (via phone)

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Jessica Eshleman, René Mardones, Gary Trujillo

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil

Agenda

1. Welcome and intros
 - a. Rachel started off the meeting with introductions
2. Party time - great success!! (5 m)
 - a. Thank you to the organizers of the party
 - b. The event made over \$400
 - c. Mike Firestone- We have everything we need to open a bank account. At this point we are incorporated and can go through the process of applying for 501c3 status.
 - i. Ben Baldwin- To open a bank account, must have Treasurer plus two officers present.
 - ii. Ben Bradlow- It would be worth opening an account at a local bank. eg Winter Hill, East Boston, Cambridge Savings
3. Beacon St. tree support- letter (5 m)
 - a. Rachel- Letter re: Beacon St tree removal has been through a few iterations.
 - i. Gary- I thought that was being sent in on Friday
 - ii. Rachel- Another version was generated
 - b. Michèle- The original letter called out Newport Construction. Why was that removed?
 - i. Rachel- I felt that the sentiment was better f
 1. This brings up how the board can configure addressing issues that are not immediately relevant to our mission. Don't want to open this up at the moment.
 - ii. Jacob- As writer of original letter I am happy with the revisions. I move to accept the letter as edited by Rachel
 1. Erik Neu seconded
 2. Vote: 7 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention
 - iii. Rachel- Last week at the end of the meeting, many of us were not caught up with what was happening. We may need to have another discussion about what further support would mean for these kinds of issues.
 1. Gary- Deadline is tomorrow, by official protocol, for submission of comments. It's important to decide whether we want to have that level of influence. It's part of open space/built environment
 - iv. Jacob- My understanding was that our strategy for Beacon St

trees would be to send a letter. The ask for the trees on Somerville Ave was to set up a hearing. We should encourage our membership to attend that hearing.

1. Gary-There is a law that refers to the city's right to remove trees. If one or more objections are received before or on the day of the hearing, the only authority authorized to issue an order to cut is the aldermen or the mayor.
 2. Rachel- At the hearing tomorrow we can object.
 3. Mike Firestone- There is a hearing for this. That is a formal opportunity. Verbal comments are identical to written comments. If there are people going tomorrow to express concerns then we are covered. I think we're putting ourselves on record about a group of trees.
 - a. Gary- There will be no scribe at this hearing to record these comments, so a written comment has more value.
 - b. Rachel- I would encourage those that aren't able to attend to write a letter.
 - c. Jacob- This is a capital project- something that has been bonded by the city for public good and infrastructure.
 - d. Rachel- We have not had time to do a full legal analysis so we can only offer our opinions. Please attend the hearing tomorrow if you are able.
4. Discussion with directors of YMCA, Boys & Girls club, other nonprofits (set dates) (10 m)
- a. Rachel- These are nonprofits that may be fruitful partners in negotiating for a community center. We can talk about this today to see what we would like to get out of these discussions.
 - b. Ann Camara- Bill Murphy at the Y, Glen Ferdinand at the library...
 - c. Mike Firestone- This is a really important idea. We are having a conversation about having a negotiating committee and indoor civic space is one of the most active discussions. The success of an indoor civic space proposal is going to depend on an operational partner or partners. Asking for a rep from the Y to come to our next meeting to hearing about their hopes would be extremely positive.
 - d. Ben Bradlow- What has been the interaction with YMCA in these discussions up to this point. George Proakis mentioned it.
 - i. Ann Camara- I called these directors myself. I had heard from US2 that the Y wasn't interested but when I spoke to him he expressed interest. They are interested in selling their building and moving to Union Square.
 - ii. Michèle- There has been talk for years about the Y moving to Union Square.
 - iii. Erik Neu- Is this the YMCA on Highland Ave? They are interested in selling and then moving? That could make the whole thing a reality.
 - iv. Ann Camara- The library is interested in a new youth center area.
 - v. Tori Antoninio- Greg from US2 said he met with people at the Y who weren't interested
 1. Ben Bradlow- When?

2. Tori- Last six months or so.
3. Ann Camara- The Y was possibly going to open a private gym area for US2 residents. I called corporate and apparently that is something that they do.
- vi. Gary Trujillo- Tom Bent, on board of the Y, wants something on the "main line" rather than the green line spur.
- vii. Tori- in the CDSP it says that US2 will engage with neighborhood council in locating a spot, finding a tenant. If we start to engage in a process, we can reach out.

Mike Firestone- This is all good- we should set up a meeting to talk about their plans for the future and talk a little. Should we invite the director to come to the next meeting?

- Rachel- Should we try to prepare a list of questions?
- Ben Bradlow- The way I'm thinking about this meeting, and I suspect the Y isn't the only stakeholder we may meet with, is that we're trying to hold focused engagements to prepare us for the negotiation. It's not bad to have an open ended conversation. Difficult to imagine focused parameters of what's possible since we don't have all information. We can circulate questions on the email before hand.
 - Erik Neu- Nobody here understands the Y's business model. We need to get that information.
 - Tori- Is this just an invite to the Y or to others?
 - Ann- They asked me to attend a USNC meeting.
 - Jacob- We should be clear that we don't have a particular direction we're going in. Another part of this is looking at funding sources
- Michelle- Ann, did you reach out to the Boys and Girls Club?
 - Ann- no. I can reach out.
 - Michèle- Would be good to get them involved, too.
- Erik- Library was interested in an annex branch. It could be something that is an adjunct to the YMCA. It could be easy to get YMCA involved and then supplement with library after.
- Tori Antonino- USMS offered to work together with us on this. To be part of this community center discussion. To offer space for meetings and resources.
 - Jessica Eshleman- This is a matter that is important to our board. Figuring out what our support looks like, as a 2 person team.
- Jessica- One other group brought up is the Somerville Media Center
- Ben Bradlow- We are agreeing, that a. we are going to invite directors of the Y to a meeting ASAP. b. and Boys and Girls Club.
 - Mike Firestone- B&G club operates several in Boston and 1 in Chelsea. They don't have one in Somerville. I think in terms of engaging with existing Somerville partners, there is a benefit to having a conversation with the Y first.
 - Michèle- the B&G club left Somerville not by choice. It was a big loss so bringing them back would be good.
 - Ben Bradlow- I have met with a neighborhood group in Lincoln Park where the B&G club also came up. I just want to underscore that this is something that is coming up elsewhere.
 - Erik- Where did people end up when the B&G club moved out of Somerville?
 - Michèle- Charlestown. I can find people and make contact.
- Rachel- Do we need a vote?
 - General consensus- No

- Rachel- We are meeting on a Tuesday this week. When should we schedule our next meeting? I can send out a Doodle Poll
- Ben Baldwin- We could check the availability of the Y and base our meeting on that.
 - Rachel- Ann, can you check the availability of the Y and we can move from there?
 - Ann- yes.

5. By-laws review (10 m)

- a. Rachel- This is a broad discussion, but we should have a plan to discuss.
- b. Erik- We need to Renew our bylaws, or, the interim bylaws continue for another year. We would be considered a “continuing interim board.” This language would need to be amended. It makes sense to aim for a timeline a month in advance of what we did last year. When was final successful vote last year?
 - i. Michèle- October
 - ii. Erik- Let’s aim for September to begin these discussions. We’ll need a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote and people won’t be on vacation anymore. I nominate myself and Andy Greenspon to do a first pass at reading the bylaws and note what needs to be changed or at least debated.
 - iii. Ben Bradlow- One possibility is to create a bylaws committee. It sounds to me like you and Andy could do that. We don’t want all board meetings to be taken up with things that can be done in committee.
 1. Group- Its a lot of work.
 2. Erik- And we need group consensus on so many things. The hard part will be discussing, agreeing, and closing these items out. I’m ok with calling it a committee.
 3. Jacob- I’d be inclined to support the committee idea. I think what hung up the working group was inability to come to and stick to a decision. I don’t think that’s as much of a problem since we already have a board structure.
 4. Michèle- It will be easier if we can pinpoint the things that need to be changed.
 5. Ben Bradlow- The way to go about this is to create the committee. They can advise when there should be a convening of the whole. It would give us flexibility to not have a board meeting for every discussion.
 6. Ann Camara- Why did I hear that we had 6 months to revise them?
 - a. Erik- That’s why I looked it up
 7. Mike Firestone- I think there is something about the timeframe, but for what it’s worth, if we’re in violation of the bylaws, there is not a large punishment. We can stick to the timeline that Erik presented. I am happy to be helpful. What we ultimately want is a set of written recommendations from the bylaws committee.
- c. Rachel- Do we have a motion?
- d. Ben Bradlow- I move to create a bylaws committee
 - i. Miek Firestone- seconded
 - ii. Discussion- Ben Bradlow- Let the record show that Erik Neu has

volunteered himself.

iii. Vote- 9 yes, 0 opposed.

6. Public comment (20 m)

- a. Gary Trujillo- If we change the venue of the meeting, we should put signs on the doors.
- b. Rachel- Do people like conference room 104?
 - i. René- We have the white board it's great, but what if a lot of people turn out?
 - ii. Tori- I can't stand the high pitched ringing sound.
- c. Gary- Maybe something for a future agenda. Now that the web site has been changed, there is a conversation about how to do things better. I want to encourage critique and suggestions.
 - i. Rachel- Is this something for the O&C Committee?
 - ii. Gary- Yes but we haven't had a meeting in a while.
 - iii. Ben- There is a lot of discussion online, but it's true we need to schedule another O&C meeting.
 - iv. Tori- I can't read the bylaws online.
 1. Gary- I will take a look to make sure it works on phones.
 - v. Rachel- If people have web site issues, can they send them to you?
 1. Gary- Yes.
- d. Gary- I want to make sure that the Tiny Letter reflects important announcements from the front page of the web site.
 - i. Ben Baldwin- I can check the web site before sending newsletters.
- e. Tori Antonino- Union United is talking about our recognition and I think we need to be involved in these conversations.
 - i. René- I don't think UU is doing any legal research on behalf of the USNC. We have members of UU and USNC seeking legal council. Right now we have UU members participating in USNC and they . You know that Bill, Ganesh, Afruza, etc are involved with UU. Some of them are not able to get legal advice on these issues. UU has a commitment to give them the support they need to participate in these discussions.
 - ii. Michèle- Union United was having a discussion within their own ranks. UU, USMS, US neighbors as constituencies of our board. If they want to scrutinize us they can. We have made a decision to be private.
 - iii. Ben Bradlow- It should be clear that what appears to be happening with UU, that we are all members of other groups, and we talk to people, get advice etc. If other groups want to weigh in on what we're doing they are welcome and encouraged to do so.
 - iv. Mike Firestone- I draw a distinction in what the fact patterns are. If I send a letter to the group about an important issue, but don't disclose that it was actually written about someone else. That's not ok and does not conform to the transparency we are trying to achieve. But if Phil Parsons sends a letter about our organization to the Board of Aldermen, then he can do that. We want to be cognizant if this org is speaking for itself or if someone else is doing so.
 1. Tori- There hasn't been any report back to us on their findings. If they're doing work to help us then just give us a

heads up.

2. Michèle- I don't think they have to do that. They are allowed to scrutinize us.
 3. Mike Firestone- If someone is writing about the USNC, they should be encouraged to come to the council. But they don't have to.
 - a. Afruza- We are here, also. We also count on the legal advice at UU.
 - b. Tori- After you have done some work, I hope that you will come and share what you have found.
 - f. Jacob Kramer- There was a hearing last night on affordable housing and whether or not it is a crisis. I encourage people to look into this meeting. It's on the Somerville meeting portal.
 - g. Rachel- Public hearing tomorrow for tree removal 5:30pm at the Public Safety Building. Thursday is meeting of the planning board for Boynton Yards 6pm VNA on Lowell St.
 - h. René- To clarify this legal question at Union United. The research we're doing will have implications for how USNC negotiates with US2. It will be good for this group to have that discussion. We will be willing to share what we have found, but it is sensitive information right now.
 - i. Ben Bradlow- We need to figure out a way to engage on this. Given our necessities around transparency, the request would be: If there is info UU wants to share with the board, is it going to be in writing, a meeting, etc?
 - ii. René- We are still gathering all the facts.
7. CBA negotiation committee (exec session) - 60 m

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting April 12, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Rachel Weil, Ann Camara, Michele Hansen, Pennie Taylor, Afruza Akther, Ben Baldwin, Ben Bradlow, Mike Firestone, Tori Antonino, Jacob Kramer

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: 11, Barbara- Mystic View Task Force, Wig Zamore, Sam, Gary Trujillo, Jessica Eshleman

City of Somerville OSPCD: George Proakis, Sarah White

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - o Rachel led of introductions and started the meeting.
2. Approval of minutes from 4/5/2018
 - o Mike Firestone- I compliment the taker of the minutes
 - o Ben Bradlow- Motion to approve minutes
 - i. Mike Firestone- Second
 - ii. Vote: 9 aye, 0 nay
3. Update on CBA Negotiation Committee nominations
 - o Ben Baldwin- There are currently 4 applicants to the negotiating committee. 3 board members and 1 non-board member
 - o Ben Bradlow- And the deadline for submission is midnight April 15
 - o Barbara- We should reach out to people who ran for the board but didn't get elected. Many strong community members there
 - o Pennie- I'd like to take up a conversation on Boynton Yards if it's relevant to the CBA negotiating committee
 - i. Ben Bradlow- My proposal is to deal with US2 now and Boynton Yards separately since they are different developments
 - o Resident- Is there a minimum size for the committee?
 - i. Rachel- 5-7 people
 - o Mike Firestone- We could do a special email to the candidates of the board to notify them of the negotiating committee
 - i. Ben Baldwin- I will send a special email
 - o Jacob Kramer- Reiterate what Bill said- I expect them to come in quickly over the weekend
 - o Tori- I dont want to be on the committee but I'd like to have an advisory role on zoning and permitting. I want to make sure that committee members read through the relevant material. I want to make sure that the negotiation is made up of asks that havent already come up in design review an CDSP process. We could support by doing homework that the committee may not have time

for.

- i. Ben Bradlow- Point well taken. The section of the CBA report, and in some of the discussions leading up to it, it was envisioned that the negotiating team would be reporting to the board at meetings. Not sure we need an extra advisory group. In a way the whole board serves that function.
 1. It will be good to have a list of docs that the committee should be familiar with
 2. Make sure there is regular reporting by the negotiating team to the regular meetings
- ii. Tori- I may apply to be on the committee, maybe that's the answer.
- iii. Ann Camara- I feel similarly and thought about applying. It may be good to have separate meetings with the negotiating committee to update the board.
 1. Michele- You mean executive session
 2. Ann- It can be open, but just designated time to meet on this topic
 3. Michele- Anything we deliberate on for the negotiating will be in exec session anyway
 4. Mike Firestone- HAVe to think about how the negotiating committee can ... it can definitely report back to the board in a closed door session. There is no mechanism for the negotiating committee to have a closed meeting with the entire membership. A listening session or something. N.C. has a lot of freedom to schedule sessions on open space for example.
- iv. Barbara- We had a negotiating committee at Harvard and we always met back with the leadership. Open discussion is one thing, but being advised on specifics is important. If you had some knowledge backbone on the team that could serve that function.
- v. Michele- I will go back to my idea of having people there as advisors, not necessarily participating in the negotiation.
- vi. Ben- We already have a proposed committee of 5-7. 2 or 3 of those people could be serving purely expertise purposes
 1. Tori- It is time sensitive, so we need to make a decision now. Is applying to the committee with the intention of being a pure expert and nonparticipant an option?
 2. Ben Bradlow- There are some general recommendations in terms of the application. My view is that if someone applies and proposes to be selected for criteria other than those explicitly laid out, then the board should consider those criteria in

making a selection.

4. Update on US2 discussion

- Rachel- Mike and I were at the meeting. Erik was not able to attend. It happened just this afternoon. It was generally a good discussion. They were forthright about their priorities, made them very clear. We made our position clear that we were not looking for substantive changes to the amendment when we submitted ours. And that this is not the vehicle with which they should be proposing these substantial monetary terms. They were unwilling to budge from the covenant should accept their amendment.
- Mike Firestone- Greg ___ and Paul Scapiccio met with us. They had submitted an amendment with a few unimportant things, plus one major change: make explicit that any monetary payments negotiated in CBA negotiations (ex if they created a \$500,000 revolving loan fund), they would get a dollar for dollar credit for their other required contributions in non-CBA processes. They also wanted dollar for dollar credit for non-monetary contributions.
 - i. They suggested that the “nonmonetary” part of the amendment be struck from the proposal
 - ii. They were insistent on the idea that, if they are doing direct payment to funds, ie a small biz support fund, arts fund, relocation etc, these are the kinds of things that we shouldn’t be doing that. That has “always been” their position and want it to be reflected in the covenant.
 - iii. The choice for the USNC is 3:
 - 1. We aren’t interested in negotiating with any new conditions built in. They can have that position, but it must be in the negotiations, not the covenant. This is where we currently are as an organization
 - 2. Middle position-We could consider because: If we can reach agreement it’ll move the process forward more quickly. We don’t agree that they get a \$ for \$ contribution credit, but we agree that you’ll be seeking one from the city.
 - 3. Accept their amendment.
 - 4. Ben Bradlow- possible 4th option. This was a take it or leave it amendment from US2. The BOA is able to create a stub CBO such that the covenant doesn’t need to be amended. It seems to me that anything that would weaken the covenant isn’t worth considering
 - a. JAcob- We made it clear internally that we are an independent org. If there is official language saying that they intend to ask the city for a credit, that we could get entangled in with city funds and then be subject to different

regulations.

b. Tori- Looking for clarification

i. Mike F- Right now in covenant they are committed to: Community Benefits contributions \$1.60 per sq ft up to something like \$3.8million over 30 years. ACcount overseen by the BOA. US2 is saying that we could prioritize some of these dollars to our own projects rather than going to the BOA first. There is a possibility that there is some value to getting money now to go toward priority projects identified by this organization rather than money over the next few years doled out in grants to local organizations.

1. If we set this aside and tell US2 that their prior dollars to the city have nothing to do with the CBA. I think this is the position we can take. May be flexible at the actual negotiating table. Otherwise we're starting with less at the negotiating table.

2. Tori- I don't think we should put burden on taxpayers by telling them to seek credits with the city. If they want that \$ for \$ amount we could do this

3. Sam- Were they clear that if we went for the \$ for \$ option that they would provide the money upfront? That is the main benefit of this course.

a. Mike Firestone- They're not saying anything up front, but I think that's how its been envisioned. Also: I think Ben Bradlow is right. We can just say that we don't want it in the covenant.

iv. Michele- I make a motion that we stick to our original language and stick with what is in the covenant now. Perhaps work with the BOA to move the CBO ordinance along faster.

1. Ben Bradlow- Ive been watching the legislative matters committee and its clear that these issues aren't going to be off their agenda in the near future. Want to raise issue of timing. I don't know when the CBO will be taken up by the BOA. I don't see this being a single session issue. This could easily delay us by a couple of months.
 - a. Jacob- They are already in motion on this stub CBO. In the meeting when they rejected US2's amendment, they made a motion that they would work on a stub CBO and move forward with that way of recognizing the council.
2. Mike Firestone- We said we would take this back to the USNC. Made it clear that we thought it was a positive move to remove reference to non-monetary contributions. Two things: We should not vote a decision right now. We should say "our discussion indicates that the board is interested in continuing to work with the BOA on pursuing this" but we'll keep the dialogue going with US2 in the hopes that the stub CBO process will give us more progress.
 - a. Ben Bradlow- Do we have to say anything right now, are we expecting them to come back to us with something?
 - i. No they basically left it at the same place as us. They need to bring things back to their people to look into their concessions.
 - b. Wig- Is there a presumption that US2 is going to be the developer of all these sites and if not, what is the transfer process for their payments due to the city? Normally required at permit stage
 - i. Mike Firestone- We'd have to look into the covenant. All linkage fees would be identical. Any revenue stream based on sq ft permitting would be common across all linkage fees.
 - ii. Wig- Inheritability goes to us rather than the city
 1. Mike F- Something to consider
 2. City Rep- We would probably amend the ...
 - iii. Tori- There is information about this in the covenant. it has 26 items which may include Wig's question.

- 1. Wig- But USNC is not written in.
 - iv. Mike F- Is there an issue for the city in capturing their \$1.60 revenue?
 - 1. Wig- Could be a legal threat from developer or the city
 - 2. Mike- Because we're not a party to the covenant, a commitment of this nature would be a deal between the city and US2 that they're voluntarily scoping a space for the neighborhood council. Be mindful of that language, but the back end language establishing how payments are maintained, even if another developer takes over, that's not something we'll be negotiating around.
 - v. Tori-Item 25 in covenant says: this covenant and contributions ... are intended to be applied fairly to all projs in development plan area so that they are all contributing similarly...
 - vi. Ben Bradlow- This also came up in CBA summits
- 5. US2 D2 Planning Meeting - Thurs April 19 6-8pm @ Public Safety Building
 - o Postponed due to lack of time
- 6. Discussion with George Proakis
 - o Rachel- Thank yhou for coming and offering to answer some questions. We have several prepared but feel free to start it off:
 - o George- Sarah Lewis is the individual responsible for large scale process permitting. Really exciting work. She incorporates everything we can into the process and has been key in the US process. I just came from talking about marijuana for the last hour and a half.
 - i. I don't quite have all the answers at this moment but we can do our best to get them to the USNC.
 - ii. Starting with prepared questions.
 - o Mike F- Anything you wanna say to
 - o Sarah- April 19th at the police station is their first required neighborhood meeting prior to the submission of design and site plan.
 - i. George- We are the first city that requires such a meeting before even applying for the permit.
 - o George- I've been here 8.5 years and when I came in it was the middle of the Somervision plan. The plan(2012) has goals and

action steps: One was to dive into neighborhoods and do neighborhood planning. T stations were first. BOA did a US revitalization plan. At the time the T was saying acquiring land was the biggest risk factor to staying on time. They put a committee together to look at different developers, and in the end of the day SRA chose US2. They brought in their own planning team and “We” moved onto Davis Sq. They had some asks, so we did the neighborhood plan for Union Sq to figure it out. Throughout that process, there was a significant conversation- more and more policy issues about affordable housing and protecting local biz. Making sure we can meet our regional housing needs while not displacing the people who make US great. When the US plan was done, it had ~50 pages of policy recommendations before the report even started.

- i. We now have neighborhood plans for- Gilman Sq, Lowell St, Winter Hill, Union Sq, About to release Davis Sq and then moving on to Brickbottom.
- ii. Plan for US includes Boynton Yards, Target, all the way to McGrath Highway.
- iii. Zoning- we are also doing citywide zoning overhaul. Decided to do US first for a bunch of reasons. Also allow us to test ideas from zoning overhaul in a particular neighborhood. Did a plan for an overlay of just what US2 is doing. BOA passed a district to do this process with US2. We are bringing these processes to the rest of Somerville.
- iv. Substantial step for US2 to be able to build was the CDSP: it says “here’s how over the next 10-30 years, US2 will build out over a series of lots.” Had to meet thresholds in zoning, public space etc. Approved in Dec 2017. Next step is to come back with design plans, have to be applied for for every thoroughfare, civic space, and every building. D2 site consists of several of these. That will reach planning board in beginning of August based on existing schedule.
 1. Tori- Can you explain the steps?
 2. George- Neighborhood meeting, 2 weeks, meeting of design review committee, couple weeks, 2nd neighborhood meeting, and then you can submit an application
 - a. Sarah- 1st neighborhood meeting is conceptual and, then design review committee does schematic development (more detail), then when it comes back for 2nd neighborhood meeting it should be at a design/development level. Can talk about materials and preferred schemes.
 - b. Mike F- If concerned local residents want to contribute productively at that meeting, what

kinds of questions would you ask?

- i. George- Reports and decisions page on Somerville planning & zoning. Where we post staff decisions and plans going back to 2011. Find CDSP- look at what was approved and what decision was filed by the planning board, and get an idea of what recommendations/demands they made. 94 conditions.
- ii. Real issues are from quantity to quality- some basic things are set in the CDSP process. How it operates or interacts- Imagine walking out of the T station. Is there something missing? Trees? circulation? elevation changes?
- iii. Tori- My concern is whether US2 will listen to us. So far they have showed us some designs, but not followed up to our feedback. Have there been any changes based on that? How do we get them to listen?
- iv. George- There was some evolution of their plans. The board brought up community input and asked for responses. Biggest open space discussion was left open for more discussion. I'm happy to take feedback from community into design review meeting to keep them focused on neighborhood concerns.
 1. Staff report for planning board- make recommendations for conditions that haven't been met yet. Planning board itself tacks on a bunch of things.
 2. Tori- So if US2 is not as responsive, we can champion the planning folks to do some of that work.
 3. George- there is no question right now that there is significant profit to be made by developers in Somerville. Particularly housing. To some extent, planning office role is to make sure the

community shares back some of that. I would take back as much as we can until we get to the minimum point they are willing to accept. The loudest voices to date have been about affordable housing in the development project. Those numbers are fixed. No surprises. Trying to do that for infrastructure or green line contributions. We're starting out with building permit fee, IZ, 10\$ sq ft linkage, jobs linkage, \$2ish green line, infrastructure, and then CBA program we have before us here. We are also demanding that they build some open space. Add that up, and we're asking more than suburban communities around us. So far development has continued. At some point we will hit a point with trade offs and I don't want to be the one deciding which thing is more important.

- Jacob- Let's move into prepared questions. My big question is about a desire for civic space, "community center." People seem to want an entire building with many types of spaces for different ages. Can you comment on degree to which that is imagined in CDSP, where is the gap, and how would funding for that flow
 - i. George- They need to be having conversations about this topic with USNC.
 - ii. Sarah- There has been progress in defining what that thing is. The more we can get to a point that we can articulate what this civic space needs to be. They won't improve on the concept without knowing what we're demanding.
 - iii. Ann Camara- Can we come up with measurements, too?
 - 1. George- Certainly helps. How much space is this civic space?
 - iv. Mike Firestone- This is a group with mixed background in this field. Planning department has more expertise. There's a lot of aspiration toward indoor civic space. I'd love for us to have a fully formed proposal to serve up. Knowing what you do about this process, do you have recommendations for how we can work more productively with the city to advance these ideas about civic space?

1. George- Talk to library director at the city- interested in US branch library. It could serve as an anchor for other things. Invite him to a meeting.
 - a. YMCA is limited in Highland Ave building. Y leadership has been talking about this for years
 - b. Bring a partner (e.g. library director. also brings some state funds, etc) to the table in your ask to the developer. Will work better than just making demands.
 - c. Boys and Girls club sold their building in US.
 - d. We can put you in touch with all entities that have come up in these discussions
 - e. SCATV- Moving them out of the little fire house could allow a space to move in that utilizes the space right in the middle of the Square
2. George- I lean toward D1 building for civic space. Makes more sense from city perspective. Also a park on the site, could integrate indoor and outdoor civic space.
3. Gary Trujillo- At CDSP hearing Alderman Rossetti, [suggested](#) that city could own the space. Is that idea a practical possibility?
 - a. George- Won't take anything off the table. A lot is going into the changes in the D1 site. Parking there supports other uses around the square. If we can gel around what our expectations are we can answer questions like that.
4. Resident- Somerville Planning staff- My family has been here 100 years. We want to see Boynton Yard to be a cash cow for the city. That way we can better fund the schools.
 - a. George- Yes, additional tax money goes toward schools, open space.
 - b. George- Boynton Yards- 3 landowners with valuable developable land. Challenge with it is that the majority of it sits on one persons land. Need to find a way to equitably address this. Owners are interested in redevelopment.
 - c. Tori- The reason this is one of our questions is that under zoning overhaul, there is a Boynton overlay section. Prescribed civic space has one map of piecemeal places. I am hoping we will be allowed to have this conversation again.
 - i. George- Discussing BY overlay in zoning is a whole discussion I'm happy

to have at some point

- Jessica Eshleman- We're talking about \$3.something million dollars. List of potential asks is far greater than that. How is this investment going to leverage the greatest return. In your knowledge of other communities, has the ask been concentrated to one large initiative or is it sprinkled among different topics?
 - i. Sarah- Huge variation
 - ii. George- Many projects, city ahs asked for money for many purposes. Assembly development paid to fix parks all across the city. I don't have as much experience with communities talking about CBAs.
 - iii. Sarah- It's hard work- This group is the community leader. The community can decide that indoor community space is the highest priority.
 - iv. George- If there is something we can provide that will help, we will do it
 - 1. _____ - CBAs in similar areas with similar projects tend to contribute to either affordable housing or a particular nonprofit. This is unique since there are so many components. Demand specific things in the negotiation.
- Jacob- Can you describe process of how we could get to 2 parks (from CDSP proposal). Some has to do with permitting but does the council have a role?
 - i. George- Civic space term as defined in ordinance is a quality public open space- park, playground, plaza defined by trees benches etc.
 - ii. George- One must be substantially sized- D7 or D1 site. Developer doesn't care which. Expanding D7 space may be the way through this process that gets more than we had. Route to that is: Goodyear site height limit going from 4 to 5 stories would allow US2 to free up space elsewhere and expand the park. If board passes this, US2 would make a change to CDSP to put this all together. If you think this concept makes sense, we can probably do this.
- Pennie- 5702 sq feet that US2 needs to provide in open space
 - i. Sarah- They are only 2000 sq ft short, that they can pay in lieu(?)
 - ii. Tori- Maybe they can add more to the neighborhood park. D3 parcel is tiny and I would rather see that sliver go to a higher quality civic space.
- Wig- Seems like there is a time issue. Critical path for developer and community have to be on the same page. I would suggest that somebody breadboarding critical path on the asks. US2 is going to be going thru the conversations with the community in a month. Not a long time from conceptual to design development.

- i. Sarah- Yes, it's an aggressive timeline. I'm going to push them for as much information as we can get early in the process.
 - 1. Pennie- what types of information?
 - a. Sarah- When doing conceptual design you don't really cover materials. Because US is an existing community, things like that we need to start to get them to think about early in the process. Sustainability issues is a big one. Mobility management issues don't usually get addressed until building is built. Many things that usually happen later in the process.
 - i. George- two biggest things: 1. we want answers to questions on sustainability. (not due til June). 2: mobility and transportation. We are trying to drive the parking space number down lower than normal. Will only work if they are well positioned to have people walking/biking to work. To do that successfully is a robust transportation management system and schedule. Bike racks, showers. Especially on the commercial side. Ways to cut down on parking spaces for commercial employees.
 - ii. Wig- another example- gap between vision of developers and community activists in area. Activists had their numbers down 3 years before it was resolved. There's a lot of conceptual development on the community side and how it works for the city and developers to resolve that amicably.
 - o Jacob- Question about meeting next week. Is it a public meeting
 - i. Sarah- Yes
 - ii. Jacob- and all questions will be recorded? Like a public meeting, even though hosted by US2?
 - iii. Sarah- It will be done as an open house because we had difficulty with it last time. What we've recommended to them is that each topic area has note takers at each station on big flip charts so that everybody can see what everybody else is commenting on. Rather than a big question and answer time, this way we can get more people through and level of detail that you can't get in a big meeting with these specific topic areas.
 - iv. Ann- What happened to information from last open house?
 - 1. George-It exists
 - 2. Sarah- But not posted online
 - 3. Tori- Could this be violating anything?

- v. Ann- What about Walnut St proposed Rec Dept building?
 - 1. If we have an idea for what should be done there we should submit it.
 - o Tori- Will you collaborate with us? You have information and knowledge that we don't necessarily have. If you can't meet regularly, I hope you will be a resource for us if we want to submit more questions.
 - i. George- Issue with our staff having 2-3 night meetings per week
 - ii. Sarah- When I was in the private sector, we did a lot of design workshops and charrettes. As we get into the open space, I can help facilitate and go through that process. There's enough talent here that we can find a way to organize that.
 - o George- 2 buildings in Boynton Yards: 1 and 2 Earl St. in front of the board for review. Commercial space. Scheduled on the 19th. Planning board will not likely vote on them until May 3.
 - o Rachel- Thank you for coming.
- 7. Public comment
 - o Pennie- Boynton Yards update- JT Scott put me in contact with John Fenton (developer) and they had a presentation last week. Presented as community benefits. Not a lot of smart goals. Timeline is fast. Anyone who can meet with them in the next week would be suggested.
 - o All commercial office or startup space. Moving faster than US2 but totally different model.
 - o Wig- Designed two BY buildings to work with street design. Unclear if it's set in the current state of BY or reconfigured.
 - o Wig- First building is 10 story startup building- could contribute greatly to startup culture in US. Both are sophisticated, interesting design. Lacking: landscape, ground plane design.
 - i. Pennie- also quality of green space
- 8. Next meeting date and time
 - o

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

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting March 29, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Rachel Weil, Jacob Kramer, Pennie Taylor, Michele Hansen, Tori Antonino, Ben Baldwin, Ben Bradlow, Erik Neu, Bill Cavellini, Joanne Berry

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Simon Hill, Peter Insley, Gary Trujillo, Van Hardy, Sal, Andy Greenspon, Wig Zamore

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil, Bill Cavellini

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - o Rachel welcomed the group and started off introductions
2. Recommendations from CBA Committee on next steps
 - o Postponed until Jacob Kramer arrives
 - o Do we need pre-prioritization before the negotiations committee is formed?
 - i. CBA committee felt that we want more of a process: 2 meetings to address 7 subject areas in CBA report. Goal: Whoever wants to come can go through report and pick out ideas that would be final recommendations from CBA Committee. Meetings to be scheduled.
 - ii. Will develop document of larger and smaller priorities
 - o Call for nominations has been sent out. None have been received.
 - i. How will the decision be made? This is something the board will have to deal with
 - o Put together package, sent to city, about our candidacy as designated negotiating body. Mike Firestone took this work on.
 - o Bill- Move to approve 2 subject meetings proposed by CBA Committee
 - i. Ben Bradlow- seconded
 - ii. Erik- board level or committee level?
 1. Jacob- facilitated by committee, but all are welcome to attend.
 - iii. Bill- I would word it differently- subject matter that has surfaced must be worked on more if we're going to make specific asks of the developer. We don't have specific enough asks.
 1. Also, we should be talking about overall strategy of how to approach the developer with these asks.
 - iv. Tori- This is the most important work on the CBA so far- we have done the outreach and now we have to prioritize and advocate. We should make a big deal out of these meetings.

- v. Ben Bradlow- Do we think it's realistic to get through all of these issues in 2 meetings?
 - 1. We should also have a discussion on strategy. There is some discussion in the report, but useful to have more.
 - 2. We could have regular council meetings, dedicated just to these issues. Pushing these discussions out to committee works for some issues but I think these should be done in plenary.
 - a. Jacob- We should go through topic by topic as a board. Doing so as a board will allow us to make decisions. Let's take up one thing in our next meeting and see how it goes
 - i. Michele- This isn't going to work given time limitations
 - b. Committee of the hall- could have multiple meetings per week
 - c. Erik- Jacob and Ben are right. These are important decisions and anything discussed in small group will have to get rediscussed in a big group.
- vi. Jacob- Propose that we place a significant amount of time on the next agenda to discuss a section of the CBA report
 - 1. Ben Bradlow- I suggest we try this out with a less controversial topic- things that have relatively little monetary impact. Traffic is very important, but I don't think it will cause a lot of fights.
 - 2. Next agenda will include discussion of traffic section of CBA Report on the agenda. Goal is to come out of this with concrete asks.
 - a. Ben Bradlow- Can Jacob send a small brief on what we will be discussing?
- o Negotiations Committee selection-
 - i. Joanne- Might be beneficial for the group to discuss a more detailed proposal
 - ii. Jacob- Most of the CBA Committee: Want a broad number of nominations from a variety of perspectives and expertises. Ultimate process should be done in executive session as outlined in bylaws.
 - 1. One committee member expressed concern that executive session would lead to a law suit.
 - iii. Gary - I would like to see a published list of criteria for the qualifications for members of the negotiating team
 - 1. Jacob- List of qualifications has gone out

2. Gary- We need something to keep the board accountable to membership to satisfy the needs represented in the report. We need Negotiating committee members to represent certain interests such as the community center.
 - a. Joanne- Sometimes the best representative of certain interests isn't the best candidate for the job.
 - b. Ben Bradlow- In any hiring process, criteria are made public. The board can be judged if they have used those criteria in their selection process.
3. Simon- Executive session bylaws violate open meeting law, this isn't so serious that it can't be done in a transparent way.
 - a. Michele- There are personal reasons why a candidate wouldn't want the process to be public. Deliberations may be limited if comments will be made public.
 - b. Executive session minutes eventually become public
 - c. Andy Greenspon-This has been made political. Votes would have to be recorded and anything discussed would eventually be found out. Executive session invites pushback from community.
 - d. Peter- Is board actually required to release minutes?
 - i. Yes
 - e. Michele- US2 won't be making their conversations public
4. Bill- Motion that the board initiate the selection process in executive session, Interviews of candidates take place in executive session, and final decision be made in executive session and reported back to USNC.
 - a. Pennie- seconded
 - b. Tori- I am curious how absent members of the council feel. If members of the board are nominated, will they be required to leave for those discussions?
 - i. Yes
 - c. Andy- point of clarification. Will applications and CVs be public?
 - i. Bill- I don't see why they shouldn't be

- d. Erik- will there be interviews?
 - i. Jacob- depends on applicant pool. Informational interviews could be done in open session.
 - ii. Bill- In terms of my motion- I do not accept that interviews be done in open session
- e. Simon- Article 2 Section 3 of bylaws are violated by going into executive session
 - i. Ben Bradlow- Is it possible to discuss interviews in open session? Or at least like to hear why against it?
 - 1. Bill- Have to plan on there being enough candidates that this would take too much time at a board meeting. All selection processes involve a winnowing down without interviews. My motion does not remove that possibility.
 - 2. Pennie- More clarification on this would help
- f. Tori- I would like candidates to be able to speak in public about why they're qualified, etc. Maybe not an interview but some space to advocate for themselves
 - i. Joanne- Public CVs and letters of intent may be the best form to do this in. This would resolve tension in terms of allowing applicants to see the experience of their competitors.
- g. Michele- People don't necessarily have the skillset of zoning etc and may not be able to answer public questions.
- h. Erik- The proposal of overall executive session would give us less tolerance for executive session in the negotiations process. We need to be judicious about when we use executive session
 - i. Ben- What are the alternatives to Bill's motion? Is there a better proposal?
 - ii. Erik- Don't have an alternate proposal
- i. Andy Greenspon- If interviews are chosen to be public, taking up time should not be an issue. We just have to advertise the meetings.

- j. Pennie- objective of selecting negotiating committee is to get the best team to represent all of us. This should be the most exciting thing- we need everybody's enthusiasm. I don't like beginning from a point of doubt and undermining the negotiating committee.
- k. Bill- I call a vote on the question of original motion.
 - i. Tori- clarification- does this prevent a public presentation of candidates, opportunity to advocate for themselves
 - ii. Simon- Role call vote?
 - iii. In executive session it has to be recorded who voted which way.
 - 1. Tori- Motion that the vote we are about to take be taken by role call vote
 - a. Bill- no problem with amendment
 - b. Erik- seconded

I. Role Call Vote:

- i. Pennie : yes
- ii. Michele : yes
- iii. Bill : yes
- iv. Jacob : yes
- v. Ben Bradlow aye
- vi. Ben Baldwin: yes
- vii. Joanne: no
- viii. Erik Neu: no
- ix. Tori: no
- x. Rachel: yes
- xi. Results: 7 yes, 3 no

3. Zoning and Affordability, a proposal

- o Jacob- Hearing next week (4/3). There may be some things we can support as a board:
 - i. Fred Berman will add the following to zoning: Much talk about neighborhoods being downzoned. Amendment says: existing 3 unit building, if demolished, could be rebuilt as 3 unit building. 2 unit building with a V-shaped roof would give option to square the roof and add additional unit if it is affordable. Incentivizes new affordable units. Can the USNC support this?
 - ii. Rachel- Do you suggest we show up to support this language?

- vi. Simon- I saw an assessment on linkage that was going to cost US2 \$8million. That credit is a lot different from \$1million.
- vii. Pennie- US2 is saying that adhering to law is a contribution to the CBA
- viii. Ben Bradlow- Second Erik's suggestion. We should be as straight-forward as possible in response. We look forward to finding the most expeditious way to negotiate.
- ix. Andy Greenspon- I interpret this action by US2 - CBO would distribute funds to various communities. There had been a discussion...???

5. Built Environment Committee Update

- o BEC met on Sunday, 1pm at Fortissimo. Topics
- o CDSP- What is timely for us to determine if US2 has negotiated their payment in lieu of civic space. That number has to be figured out before they're granted a special permit review.
- o Upcoming D2 design- maybe coming out in 4-5 weeks
 - i. Configuration of civic space is not well-formed right now (in the middle of a busy road)
 - ii. Feeling of the committee is a desire to combine
 - iii. Community should have an iterative process for civic space
- o Neighborhood parks location need to be decided 1 year from CDSP approval. We need to engage and get the community in on this
- o George Proakis and Sara White would like to attend a meeting on April 12 to answer questions on development. Tori asked a few questions and George said he wouldn't know the answer, but US2 would. Sara White is the main contact at the city for US2.
- o Current zoning admin process- Tori: I want to push for a follow up to the open house style process. That there be a subsequent meeting to address issues and concerns. US2 may be required to do this based on some things that they have missed.
 - i. Joanne- At what point do we reach out to people on civic space? USMS may have some ideas and insight. Best to reach out to people who are already working on this rather than adding more tasks for ourselves
- o We should begin paying attention to the Boynton Yards district overlay- requires certain amount of civic space, affordable housing, residential, commercial
 - i. Erik- Is it a real overlay or is it the changes in the zoning to the Boynton Yards area?
 - 1. Andy- It's an overlay
 - 2. Erik- Will there be a review process?
 - 3. Wig- 2 big Boynton Yards buildings are going up faster than US2 buildings

- a. Startup buildings and lab buildings. From NY and have more capital- able to move faster than most developers in this area
 - b. They're going to zoning board and planning board next week
 - c. Rachel- Can someone with the information send it out to the group?
 - d. Pennie- JT Scott is checking in on this. If you have questions send them to me and I can ask Alderman Scott.
 - e. Wig- Assembly Sq proposal will also be at that planning board meeting. Hotel and residential is blowing the height limit by over 100 ft. This has been unplanned- better to have a planning process.
- o Outreach to US2 and city of Somerville
- o Documentation of questions on development
 - i. Tori is creating a Google Doc to compile questions for George Proakis and Sara White on the 12th
 - ii. Also a document to compile questions for Dan Bartman
- o Rachel- How do people feel about this proposed meeting with the planning office on 4/12?
 - i. Rachel- We should get a list of questions out in advance about a week to George.
 - ii. Bill- I was hoping to have Dan Bartman instead of George and Sara.
 - 1. Tori- I want to dialogue with George on progress with US2
 - 2. Bill- There are some controversial things coming up critical to our position of influence on the US development. specifically: US2's suggestion for how to change the covenant. This could take some time in upcoming meetings. I don't want to set aside an hour for the planning office if we're unclear whether they will have answers. Keep that section of the agenda to 30-40 minutes.
 - iii. Erik- What are the relevant questions? We should have them together by the 5th, Dan Bartman is an expert at zoning but may not know about US2 progress.
 - iv. Ben Bradlow- We basically have a week to develop these questions, while we don't know who is best to answer our questions. Identify next week who is best to answer our questions and then set up a meeting with them either at the 12th or later.

1. Tori- Getting George and Sara together is tough so the 12th is key.
 - v. Pennie- This meeting could be a built environment committee meeting, especially given flexibility of schedules.
 1. Ben Bradlow- The committee should be bringing these issues to the whole board.
 2. Andy Greenspon- same. We suggested that before and the board was against it.
 3. Michele- This could be a situation of necessity where we don't get another opportunity.
 - vi. Joanne- Having Dan Bartman come the week after April 12th will give us a chance to ask questions that wouldn't be on George and Sara's radar
 - vii. Bill Cavellini- Move to have George and Sara visit the board for 30 minutes
 1. Rachel- seconded
 2. Vote: unanimous "ayes"
6. Outreach committee update
- o Gary- Replacing web site process. Site is ready to go. Need to make a decision about whether to continue using domain name.
 - o Bill- How many voted in the poll?, Recommendation of O&C committee was SomervilleUSNC.org
 - i. Pennie- no real recommendation to change the name
 - ii. Bill- I am convinced that we can change the name
 - iii. Ben - Propose that we vote whether or not to change the name
 - iv. Erik- Does changing name have impact on ability to launch web site?
 1. Gary- Yes
 - v. Tori- If we're not able to give keywords to improve searchability, is that because of platform we're using? You can modify search words to get the right hits.
 1. Gary- If we don't change the name we will not be able to use current search engine results. We're using different technology for the replacement site which doesn't follow the same structure. Changing name will allow us to map old search results to the new site.
 - vi. Pennie- seconded
 - vii. Vote: all in favor of keeping the name and not registering a new one:
 1. 4 ayes, 2 nays, 2 abstentions
 2. Domain name will remain
unionsquareneighborhoodcouncil.org
7. Next meeting
- o To be determined via email in the next 24 hours

8. Public Comment

- Sal- Trees along somerville Ave are slated to be removed for drainage project. Asking that the USNC advocate for retaining them. There are no trees to replace them until 2020. This, paired with construction and drainage projects, will leave and ugly streetscape.
- Gary- Arborist will announce another hearing. Amount of time for public comment was insufficient. I'll make an announcement when I get more information.
- Tori- I've been attending PILOT meetings. Will be engaging Tufts with a laundry list of asks. Can create a document for people to

Minutes for 3-22-18

Board members in attendance: Afruza, Ann, Bill, Michelle, Jacob, Tori, Erik, Ganesh, Rachel, Mike, Joanne.

Bill: I want to congratulate Afruza for being chosen for the Hazel Hughes award for community activism by the Somerville Community Corporation. The award will be given next Wednesday night at the annual meeting of the SCC at the Armory.

Minutes from the last meeting were unanimously approved.

A summary of the Dan-Bartman-led site visit from the previous Saturday ensued:

Tori: Lovely tour of the D blocks. 20 people showed up. A nice walk and then Dan fielded questions regarding zoning. Dan addressed the Union Square zoning overlay: how could this be effective? How could the zoning overhaul affect overlay?

Andy: The overhaul is currently not expected to affect overlay. Once a CDSP is issued for US2, if zoning is changed, US2 doesn't have to follow it if they don't change the permit. Except for certain things such as inclusionary, environmental, certain sustainability things. However, if US2 has to get a change to the CDSP which has to get revoted on, they will have to follow any new zoning. Dan Bartman did mention that their D1 plans are not consistent with the current zoning, so if they want to build there according to plan they'll have to apply to change the CDSP. In zoning there's midrise, highrise, also block. If they want to make a building next to D block, having a whole lot instead of two separate buildings, then I believe they have to change the permit. Otherwise they can change their plans and make a lot line through, but would be very inefficient for them.

Erik: Did Dan say what the implications are of a CDSP that doesn't conform to the zoning that has been approved?

Andy: Dan said this doesn't have to be consistent with zoning until the site plan. Might want to get confirmation from Dan.

Jacob: Did preferences for what should be on which lot come up during the site visit?

General: People don't like the idea of skyscrapers going up.

Simon: There was actually. When you go up Prospect Street, at Prospect and Webster...

Discussion of what to call this. People begin calling it the "triangle space."

Tori: I think it's buildable. I mean, we can build something there. I think they're currently seeing it as a welcome to Union Square kind of installation.

Bill: Everyone is aware that Dan is the go-to guy for zoning in the city?

Ann: I met with him for four hours (had a meeting with him afterwards). Seems very genuine. The other thing they mentioned were elevators, two big buildings, people were very concerned about steps on the prospect side.

Michelle: Meaning escalators?

Bill: Coming out of the station to the square?

Tori: People from the community near the triangle were concerned about getting from the neighborhood to the T station. I think you'll be able to access it from that side of the street. I think there'll be an alleyway – Dan seemed to give assurance on this.

Simon: The biggest disruption in center of Union Square will be sewer work (obviously there will be some interaction between US2 and sewer work). Going to get kind of noisy down there. There was a meeting a week ago last Tuesday, when the next one comes up, worth going. Interesting to see what they're up to. Going to be six days a week worth of work.

Tori: I'd propose that we get a meeting with Dan on a weekday, or have him come to USNC, so he can field our questions. Can I do that? Reach out to him?

Bill: Sure.

Erik: I had cup of coffee with a couple of people from US2 over last weekend. The MBTA is agreeing to give back to Somerville the 50 million dollars at the end of the project, once that's close (2025; once we get to the end of the line). Assuming 75 left over, 25 to Cambridge, 50 to Somerville, or some kind of pro rata. US2 has agreed to let the city keep its GLX contribution (so they will not try to get their contribution back). Things like [blank] over at Prospect and Webster left out. Certain things like [blank] currently left out, as more and more things come back (bells and whistles into the station plans), this will come out of future things that might be funded with this money. I just want to make sure that people realize this. This has nothing to do with US2, it's contingent only on MBTA's total project coming in below budget.

Joanne: When would we like to meet with Dan?

Tori: Would encourage a group of us to go during a weekday.

Jacob: Let's generate a bunch of questions beforehand to see if he can answer in writing, maybe easier for him.

Erik: For him, a lot less-time consuming to explain it in person, because it's so complicated.

Joanne: The sooner we can get him here the better for us, especially with the zoning not official.

Michelle: Went to a meeting with Ben Ewen-Campen. Seemed Dan really was happy to meet in person.

Tori: Also very amenable to having people go to city hall. Agree we shouldn't waste his time although he seems to be willing to talk.

Joanne: I propose we create a list of questions by next week, send an invitation to Dan Bartman by the following meeting, where he can come and answer the questions, so we don't ask the questions over again when he comes. If someone has a follow-up question or something, then we're all available.

Bill and Michelle seconded. No opposition.

Joanne agrees to make the list of questions. Everyone to send her questions about zoning and followup and anything else that was discussed, and she'll put it on the forum [?].

Simon: Find out where the generated interest will go from the \$50 million.

Bill: CBA report has been revised. Jacob, if you could summarize the changes that have been made from the draft that was presented last week.

There followed a discussion of and vote on the revised CBA report.

Jacob: We submitted a draft last week for approval. Mike Firestone had suggested we open it up for comment on Tuesday evening, comment would be closed for a little while, we sent it out for this meeting, the board would have the opportunity to provide feedback... I got a bunch of feedback which I compiled in a document for my own use. I didn't send out the compilation of feedback. But much of the feedback went out via public list. Some of the feedback is in the form of specifics, can you change this sentence, some was extra contributions (from Green and Open Somerville, from Fossil Free Somerville). Erik also helpfully gave a full edit of the draft at the sentence level. A fair amount of feedback about the Community Center part. People felt that talking about the degree to which people disagreed about what they wanted to see in the Community Center was not really the right interpretation of the variety of ideas presented, so this was rewritten to reflect the overall vision: **people want a multi-modal community center**. People really want to see a lot of community space. We rearranged the order, alphabetizing the sections. Some parts people took exception to, certain contrasts of different positions, we tried to take out the objectionable parts. We added an appendix that Erik contributed: what are the public benefits that US2 has agreed to, and what are their obligations under zoning. Those are the main changes. There are also more hyperlinks in the document.

The idea of this report is to give a history of what has happened in the past and what happened in our meeting, what is available to take into account for the rest of the CBA process. It's a summary, so we did try to avoid recommendations or prioritizations. We did put an emphasis where it seemed a lot of people got behind a particular idea; not meant as a prioritization.

Jess: How many dots are there in general? Could you give a total, to provide context?

Jacob: We didn't always go into detail in each category, what is the number of dots, that level of granularity will not necessarily give extra information. Sometimes information came from a process without dots. But I think that giving a sense of general interest between categories is a good thing to include.

Father Richard: I was away until last Friday, but I did read the first version. I thought a lot of work went into this and it was a good summary of the history. I did have a followup about the dots – I was here for the summit, and others were as well. Obviously everyone wants to lobby, I did submit my own thing about 9 items which I considered for a CBA. We're really talking in the first version about jobs and affordable housing. We wouldn't want to give the impression that the people at those summits represent all the people in the community. I'm happy to see that [blank] is now covered, important to me. Wouldn't want it to seem like there had been a vote on these issues, based on attendance at the summits.

Jacob: I'd like to close this section, as a description of what has happened, and move onto the next thing, of which a lot may fall to the CBA committee, either driving recommendations, organizing negotiation training sessions, proposals on negotiating committee selection. Those proposals can come from anyone but I imagine the CBA committee will definitely be involved. This report is intended to put a pin in what we already have and hopefully we can move on from there.

Tori: I sent out another list of edits in the most recently sent version, some of my concerns were addressed but some were not. I can tell you what page they are and the suggestions.

Bill: how many concerns would you say you have?

Tori: Five or six.

Joanne: I will abstain from any vote because I haven't had a chance to read the report (either version).

Tori: Page 1, brief history of redevelopment. Where it talks about the selection of the developer. At the end it says how The SRA chose Chicago-based developers. I want to add that both the city and the public were disappointed in the result. From what I understand the city was actually really upset. To clarify, the mayor was upset with the selection. I was skeptical of this, but George said the mayor was yelling.

Bill: How essential is this change? If we leave it out, is it really not an accurate description of the history?

Rene: We need to be careful how we frame it because I haven't seen any formal document from the administration showing disappointment.

Jacob: We did our best to always cite evidence of what we said.

Erik: I highlighted things that were speculative and should be removed; this about the mayor would certainly fall under that.

Tori: I withdraw the amendment.

Tori: Next one, page 2. Engagement process. Union United, Locus Process; I felt they were weighted a little differently, Union United was described as an ongoing community coalition, Locus was established by the city, organized as a consultancy, etc. This section leaves out that the reason LOCUS was formed was to help empower communities to make CBAs. Leaving this out makes it sound like it was a city decision with the developer. Also, the section says LOCUS appointed 30 local strategy leaders. Say the city appointed them instead. Say out of 50 applicants. These 50 represented a very large cross-section, everybody, different activist groups, people from school system, architects, parents. I felt that Union United got more weight here for being more of a community process.

Peter: We cite LOCUS continually throughout the report. As a kind of foundational opinion. I don't think anyone reading the whole report would think we didn't give weight to LOCUS.

Simon: LOCUS: a lot of people continued over into working group, and into this group.

Jacob: I would object to the sentence "LOCUS was created to empower communities". We don't know why LOCUS was created. So far as I know they're not really about CBAs, more about public benefits.

Bill: I think it's understandable why Union United might have more weight since their main ask was a CBA. I'm not sure I object to any wording that suggests it's more effort to get a broad-based community input.

Erik: The main thrust of Union United was a CBA. The main thrust of LOCUS was creating this very group.

Jacob: What I've heard from people who were involved is that people did not feel empowered through LOCUS.

There was a brief discussion here in which Jacob suggested adding city staff to the list of LOCUS members. The group determined that there were city staff members (Irma Flores) on LOCUS, and to include them in the report.

Jacob: I would move to accept Tori's edits here without the sentence about the Locus empowering communities.

Michelle seconds.

Michelle clarifies: Just cut the line from the edits about LOCUS and the CBA, leave the rest.

Tori opposed. Two abstentions, Ann and Rachel. Thus 7 in favor, 1 opposed.

Erik: Some people have not had a chance to read the reports. Before voting to accept the report, we should drop some of the partial details about the path forward to negotiations. We need time to actually process this, rather than one piece of it at a time at a line-item level.

Bill: If it's OK with the group, I'd like to continue going through the changes Tori has surfaced and then see where we are. Any objections?

No objections to this.

Tori: Thanks everyone. Next point: the report says that LOCUS focused on an overall strategy for Union Square as opposed to specific asks for CBA negotiations. LOCUS focused on a strategy for tax incentive program and other worker rights. Some of what was considered strategy could be considered for CBA benefits.

Peter: Tax incentives cannot be in a CBA; these are legislative matters.

Tori: But worker rights and others could be in a CBA.

Jacob: People writing this report did their best to go through the LOCUS report and really extract what was specific to a CBA, as opposed to things that meant working with the city etc. When I went through this I saw a lot of great things that were not necessarily relevant to this particular process. Some people going through this will not find something specific that was in LOCUS. That is not to say that people in LOCUS did not worry about worker's rights.

Bill: Does anyone else want to speak to this? Motion?

A brief discussion of whether this is a comment or a suggested change.

Tori: No suggested change... the change was for the previous version of the report.

Tori: Next, on top of page 5, the formation of Union Square Neighborhood Council and CBA summits. Where it says beginning of July 2016 working group began meeting and generating proposals. I want to add that it was a LOCUS working group.

No one objects to adding this change.

Tori: Where it says parking garage... [blank] A recommendation is missing here from this section.

Jacob: Not necessarily a CBA idea... between the city and whoever builds a parking garage to negotiate. Well, CBA could say if you want to build a parking garage it has to be between us and the city.

Bill: That could be an ask. I don't see any problem there.

Richard: Can add ... [blank]

Michelle: Let's add it.

No objection. The amendment is added.

Bill: We will have to move on at some point.

Tori: There are three more lines.

Bill: Let's hear it.

Tori: A Community Center ask. This ask is acknowledged on page 20 in the middle, under Community Center. Ask for a rooftop [cafe?] on the Community Center.

No objection. The amendment is added.

Tori: Page 21, under arts. Second summit, under small businesses. Encouraging or obligating businesses to display works of art in their office spaces in Union Square, art gala, sharing space in the lobby. [blank]

No objection. The amendment is added.

Tori: About the negotiating team and representation. The report talks about the importance of representation across a variety of dimensions. It says we should include a mix of homeowners, businesses, workers, etc., like we did for the board members. That did not result in getting a mix of stakeholders. So I'm moving that the negotiating team represent the active stakeholder groups in the community, or that if we have dimensions, those dimensions represent people who have represented active interest groups who have worked on this, not just how we have divided up ourselves. I would be very sad if the negotiating team turned out to have the same result as how the board is comprised.

Erik: I'd motion to table this since it's part of a larger conversation.

Rachel seconds. Passes without objection.

Bill: Right.

Bill: Do we have enough to vote on this report? If we're going to move forward, we have to move forward. A vote on this report is an acknowledgment that it is a fair approximation of everything that has come before around Union square and leading up to negotiations with the developer. Not a report that recommends any one thing over another thing, just trying to get as close as possible to what has happened up to this point. And then the next steps have to be taken.

Erik: I have one concern with voting on this, that is, it defines a timeline which is driven by undefined processes. What we want on the negotiating team, how we're going to set the negotiating team, etc. I've generally been supportive of aggressive timelines, but for instance in last week's meeting someone said we already set the timelines so we have to stick with

them, so my level of comfort with these kinds of deadlines has been reduced... if we're looking to get the history etc., let's strip out for the time being the last section.

Erik moves to table section 6 until later. Seconded.

Discussion:

Jacob: We should keep that section, try to keep the timeline in it, knowing there may be things that interfere with our ability to hold to that timeline. Nothing on that timeline is unknown. It just requires our coming to a decision. The only thing truly out of our control is when the city amends the Covenant, beyond that it's up to us.

Mike: Erik, I don't want to have unrealistic timelines, but this group has a responsibility to put timetables forward to allow others to react to them. That's how we get in the mix. If we don't put something on paper, even if not entirely achievable (off by a week or two or three), who else is going to drive this forward. What we're saying is that we would love it if in two months we were in a position to be able to negotiate with US2. I'm in support of keeping this section.

Andy: What keeping this section entails is that within two weeks everyone has to apply, we have to send this out immediately and everyone has to apply. Assume everyone has two weeks with Easter Holiday. Then one meeting to decide, who knows if with 10, 40, 3 people submitting. We still haven't agreed on how the voting or the selection will go. Does it have to be at a public meeting? Is there a mechanism to do this otherwise? There has to be some sort of mechanism which is not so rigid so we have to stay here 5-10 hours some night to sort this all out. Also, what does it mean to vote on this timeline but then say it's not binding?

Erik: I agreed with everything Mike said. I'm willing to withdraw what I was saying, just use it in the future to acknowledge the need to be flexible in the future if people are being too focused on adhering to these dates in the face of unbending reality. A number of details may come up that are not being considered, we may have to work through these things.

Simon: Only possible start date for them is the fall. To put a timeline on us in a microcosm, when there is all this time available, would be bad.

Michelle: Mike is right, in order to be part of this we need to be in the mix. However, Erik is right as well. In the meetings, if someone says we need another week, we should be able to get another week, or two.

Tori: April 8th or 9th would be the deadline for nominations. If this is going to be inclusive, there has to be a lot of notice. This is an ambitious timeline especially after a holiday. Either we give a range of deadlines, or we move... I want to acknowledge that this is not a hard deadline. April 15th for the negotiating team.

Afruz: This is not about the date, but it says the negotiating team should be ideally homeowners, renters, workers. Why not other people who care about this community? Other

people who have the time, and prior experience? Working here and coming here every time without money...

Bill: What was meant by naming some groups was "at least these."

Bill: I'm closing the discussion. Is there a strong feeling that the wording there in Section 6 should be tabled?

Tori: The motion is to hold off on approving everything but the last section.

Michelle: There's no motion.

Erik: There's no motion.

Jacob: On the table is my motion to approve the report with what we approved of Tori's edits, not striking section 6. If people are in favor of that, support the motion.

Jessica: I've been concerned with when to offer my one suggestion on one particular section... is this the time? I want to offer before the report in its entirety is approved.

Bill: I think we should move on. I'm sorry, but there comes a point when you have to move on, and what we're voting on is the report as it currently stands.

Discussion of process for Jessica's suggestion. It is agreed that she can still contribute her suggestion.

Jessica: Last sentence on second six, third paragraph section 6. Where it talks about interest-based versus adversarial, saying we will move to adversarial if necessary.

Jessica quotes the sentence.

Mike motions to remove the sentence. Tori seconds. Unanimous to remove.

Tori: Point of clarification. If we approve this document, are we setting those timelines in stone?

Erik: I'm offering an amendment to Jacob's motion. It says "The deadline will be April 8th" so that the negotiating committee shall be appointed by April 15th. This is the strongest time wording in the document. Soften this to should.

Mike: Add "unless the board determines otherwise"

Jacob agrees.

The board votes on accepting the report with the above amendments.

Two abstentions: Erik, Joanne. All else in favor.

A discussion of the website launch ensued.

Bill: Let's skip the website section, I don't think we can proceed without Ben Baldwin here.

Gary: That means that the site will not have to be launched on Monday?

Bill: Yes. We'll put it off until the next meeting.

An update on the formal recognition process ensued.

Mike: Mixed news on the Board of Aldermen. I got a tonally apologetic email from Mark Niedergang saying sorry we can't do [it] this Thursday, followed by a commitment to do it next Thursday. Nothing new from city or law department regarding conversations with US2. We should get our language or hearing date by the 29th. Best thing is just to push for a hearing, public hearing, early in the month of April. We can take one proactive step towards accomplishing this, compile the documents that need to be provided to the city now and send them in. Say we're still waiting on you guys for the meeting on the 29th. In the meantime, here's everything you need from us. So let's make sure to get all those materials to the city and the members of the board by 5 o'clock on Tuesday.

Erik: Regarding covenant (from my run-in with US2 at Bloc 11), they said their lawyers had been addressing it and the hold up was that removing the CBO removes the mechanism by which US2 can give money to the city. So they're dealing with the logistics of transferring funds. They're expected to give the city updated language by end of this week.

Mike: Good to hear. I do think this is consistent with what we've been hearing. I do think we've been falling victim with slipping from Thursday to Thursday to Thursday.

Michelle: I think Mike's suggestion is a good one, but how many Thursdays are we going to let slip?

Mike: We don't have much of a response, they're not behind by that much. If they get really far behind, then we need to go to the board and say it's time for you to say you are committed to a robust, neighborhood process behind a community benefits agreement. You set out reasonable timelines and those are being frustrated by the developer. Mark Niedergang has said this is on the agenda for the 29th, we're going to set the language at the hearing then, etc.

Jacob: We don't really need US2 to be a signatory to a revised covenant. The Board of aldermen could set the date, this group has all the materials in line. Let's make sure we have gone through all the hoops. We should pressure them to set that date.

Mike: Our contingency, just in case, is that we just set the date and go ahead with the public hearing regardless of what US2 does.

Mike: I do need help putting together our materials. A map of the area, current bylaws, a few other things.

Bill: Do we need some statement of where we are on the road to incorporation, to presenting this by Tuesday 5 o'clock?

Mike: I'd like to remind everyone that right now we're functioning as an unincorporated organization. Pursuing incorporation by 501-3c process, that will take some time.

Michelle proposes that if US2 does not agree to the change in the covenant, USNC will ask the Board of Aldermen to have a hearing anyway. Mike seconds. This passes unanimously.

There ensued a discussion on the selection of the negotiating committee.

Bill: We won't have time for all of this tonight.

Jacob: I want to send an email just giving a description of what the idea is, if people are interested, are they prepared to throw their hat in the ring. It will give maximal lead time if we can do this right after the meeting.

Erik: I already made this motion last meeting. A two step process, we announce our intentions, then send follow-up information subsequently. It was voted down at the last meeting, I don't remember why.

A motion is made to put in the tiny newsletter that nominations are open for the negotiating team. (Erik and Jacob propose the motion together.)

Unanimously approved.

Andy: By approving the report, unless the board subsequently votes otherwise, April 8th is the application deadline. That means you have to advertise immediately. Does anyone know how many people are on the tiny letter? The discussion needs to happen about how we do the outreach now, or certain stakeholders will get upset.

Mike: There are 530 subscribers to the letter.

Simon: You should vote to modify the date based on what Andy said.

Jacob: It's the 22nd now. Our goal is April 8th. If we move this to April 12th, that's 3 full weeks. That seems like plenty of time. In terms of reviewing the applications, we could review on a weekly basis what is submitted, without necessarily voting on it, just to make sure we're up to speed. Then, a week after the 12th, we'd be ready to select a committee by the 19th.

Joanne: Rolling review can get a little fuddled. [People reviewed early may get precedence over people reviewed late?] Something I suggest is that people being nominated have line of work or experience listed as well as groups, etc. That gives us control because we know what

generalized group of experience we need, and what we should include in the committee. Then we can break these down so we're not reviewing all at once.

Jacob: We can do this in a week, if the board takes the process seriously, we can do an intense period of review.

Joanne: However, the MEPA report is coming out in April. This will be a substantial time conflict.

Jacob: The CBA committee could take on this part of the board's duties here. It can deal with all the submissions and provide summaries, similar to the style of report of we just voted on, so the board is equipped to deal with this stuff when the deadline is closed, so the board can look at it all at once. Then the board could come up with a decision in a week.

Michelle: I'm not comfortable with that idea. I think it's an important decision that should be made by all of us, all board members should look at all applications. A lot of interpretation is involved, and I'm not comfortable with it.

Joanne: I'm also not comfortable with this. I'd expect two to three weeks. We should set a number, we could do ten applications per week and go for as long as it takes.

Bill: I thought the experience with the election was very informative. There were 11 people who submitted names at the deadline, when we extended by 3 days, 44 more people applied. This suggests you have to stick to a deadline.

Andy: I don't think the question was rolling the deadline. If we see more, you'll take just longer to review them.

Erik: There's a fundamental question of the order in which we do things. We have to determine the size of the negotiating team, their skills, representation, etc. This can be done before the final solicitation of applications, can be done after solicitation but before review, or after applications in light of the applications we've received. Going into the application process before we decide on this structure is an invitation to trouble.

Bill: You're not arguing for delaying putting this into the Tiny Newsletter?

Erik: No, my point was that somebody might need time to put in a resume.

Michelle: There are a tremendous number of people who are not represented currently who feel that they will need to be represented. Are we going to have 5? 7? 8? Once we've figured out what the response in the applications was, then we figure it out.

Jessica: Aside from two week training period, is there any way to gauge the time commitment that will be involved?

Bill: There probably is, and we should figure that out, but we don't have time right now.

Simon: What electoral process exists without a fixed number of slots.

Michelle: It's not an election.

Bill: Let's narrow this down next week.

(The time was 9:04).

There ensued a discussion of the next meeting place and time:

Bill: Next Thursday?

Mike: I'll be at the board of aldermen.

Jacob said Pennie will not be available on Thursday. Michelle may not be here. GLX was rescheduled to Wednesday. Afruza is at the armory on Wednesday. Jacob can't be there on Tuesday. Bill decides to schedule the meeting for next Thursday, given the absence of large support for any other day.

Andy: Are applications going to be publicly viewable? I don't know that there's anything in the bylaws about this. I can't be at the next meeting so I want to make sure it's discussed.

Bill: We'll put it on the agenda for next week.

Meeting scheduled for next Thursday at Argenziano.

Meeting adjourned.

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting March 15, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Rachel Weil, Jacob Kramer, Pennie Taylor, Michele Hansen, Tori Antonino, Ben Baldwin, Ann Camara, Mike Firestone, Ben Bradlow, Andrea Lizama, Ganesh Uprety, Erik Neu, Afruza Akther, Mike Firestone

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Andy Greenspon, Simon Hill, Jessica Eshleman, Peter Insley, Gary Trujillo

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - Rachel welcomed the group and started off introductions
2. CBA Report (20m)
 - Ben Bradlow- Report was released last night (3/14) so not everybody had a chance to read it. No decision will be made tonight
 - Report available here:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1keW-7dP9P2PjBNMQRO51dGFrPuZDq38BA1vahK2Ze5c/edit>
 - Overall- the report is a summary of its inputs, not a value-laden proposal
 - Fifth section is a summary of inputs from the CBA summits and prior processes (LOCUS and Union United processes)
 - Sixth section maps out next steps to negotiations
 - i. Timeline is a reproduction of the one agreed to on 3/1 USNC meeting
 - ii. Selecting negotiating team- Board will have a call for nominations. Proposed nomination deadline- April 8. Selection of negotiating team April 15.
 - There is a spreadsheet with all of the data collected from the CBA summits- this is available for those who want to dig deeper
 - There is a folder with the documents referenced in the report
 - Jacob- I would like to discuss approval of the timeline for the negotiations committee timeline
 - i. Jessica- We may want a backup plan in case the BOA decision on USNC recognition gets held up
 1. Ben Bradlow-Amendment to the covenant that would allow the BOA to designate USNC for negotiation with US2 is going ahead. It doesn't seem like this will hold us up.
 - ii. Pennie- I think negotiation nominees should be required to submit a CV

- iii. Michele- Is the size of the negotiation committee in line with typical CBA negotiations? Should there be observer or team of observers?
- iv. Pennie- what is the timeline for acceptance of the report
 - 1. Ben Bradlow- In theory, it could be accepted at the next meeting
 - a. Tori- The board should have a couple of weeks to review the report.
- v. Andy Greenspon- Composition of the negotiating team is where the USNC is at risk of fracturing the community consensus. Currently it's unclear how the vote for the negotiating team will be conducted.
- vi. Andrea- How many people have access to the report and will it be translated into other languages?
 - 1. Pennie- Agreed. Do we have the capacity to translate?
- vii. Pennie- Can we put out a call for nominations before approval of the report?
 - 1. Jacob-That would help us hold to the timeline.
- viii. Ben Bradlow- I am wary of opening the call for negotiation committee nominations immediately. There have been concerns about things not getting circulated well enough in advance. We don't need to approve all criteria before issuing the call for nominations.
 - 1. Peter- We can approve the criteria for selections prior to issuing the call.
 - 2. Erik Neu- When you put out a request for qualifications you can develop a more specific RFP later. We can immediately put out a heads up for negotiating committee nominations and then get more specific later.
- ix. Michele- Can we get a committee chosen within a week of nomination submission?
 - 1. Yes
- x. Gary- Can we send out a preliminary announcement to get people interested in the negotiating committee
- xi. Pennie- One thing that is ill-defined is what the commitment is for a member of the neg. committee.
- xii. Pennie- Negotiating skills is one qualification that should be included in the description
- xiii. Jacob- I don't hear any major objections to saying that we will be looking for negotiation committee members
- xiv. Andrea- We can scale the timeline depending on how many submissions we get

- xv. Ben Bradlow- There is some danger to having people submit applications already. If people start submitting, then the board could be accused of developing criteria in part based on the qualifications of those nominated. An initial proposal informing the public about the negotiations committee may create additional unnecessary confusion.
1. Ben Baldwin- Could just get people in touch with e.g. Ben Bradlow who could keep a master list of people interested in being nominated
- xvi. Jacob- I withdraw my proposal. Folks should take all the time they need this week and submit feedback to Ben Bradlow. Then we can fully dive in at the next USNC meeting and issue a call for neg.committee nominations at the end of next week's meeting.
1. Tori- I think people need more than a week to review the document.
 - a. Michele- If we were deciding what the final asks to US2 will be we would need more than a week but htis is just a summary of inputs. We should be able to stick to the week of review.
 2. Ann- Are we still having workshops
 - a. Yes, about CBAs in general but not about this document
- xvii. Jacob- Pending approval of the report, we will open nominations for the negotiating committee.
- xviii. Erik- Where does the step of further refining what we want for the negotiating team fit into the timeline?
1. Jacob- That will be incorporated into the final draft of the document. If folks have more edits send them to the CBA Committee.
 2. Andy Greenspon- There is limited time to be able to submit edits in time for them to be incorporated and disseminated to the board before next meeting.
- xix. Mike Firestone- Process for negotiations will not be 3 hours in a room 1 time and then a CBA presented to the USNC. It will be an iterative process. This report is important for setting the table and is a strong draft. Their primary concern is that we not delay ourselves knowing how long it will take. We should make a good faith effort to get comments in by next week and if people think we are in good shape we can approve it. Or vote to make further changes.
- xx. Ben- The process of approving this report is merely to perform the due diligence of presenting what we have heard.
- xxi. Rachel- 1 week to review the report no matter when the next USNC meeting is.

- xxii. Ben Bradlow- Request that the secretary issue tonight an email via TinyLetter and USNC Public requesting any comments on this report be submitted by Tuesday
 - 1. Mike Firestone- and come to the meeting on Thursday to participate in the discussion where we finalize it.
 - 2. Tori- I prefer a week
- 3. Discussion of USNC Incorporation as non-profit (30m)
 - o Mike Firestone- This is the incorporation meeting as required in the bylaws.
 - o Mike- I propose we incorporate as a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization
 - i. We are not for profit and not a government entity
 - ii. A 501(c)(3) means that we are fundamentally charitable in nature
 - 1. We are already envisioned this way in our own bylaws. "Shall operate exclusively in furtherance of charitable purposes"
 - 2. The revised covenant also envisions us this way
 - 3. Pennie- Comparable orgs are 501c3, similar in scope and political activity
 - 4. Our mission is charitable in nature
 - iii. Mike- Something that might come up- What about a 501c4?
 - 1. There is no clear line between which is which. These are tax distinctions.
 - 2. Are we more like a public benefitting org or more like a homeowners association? HOA is often a 501c4 because the only ones getting benefits are people in the HOA. This org envisions itself benefitting all of the public in the public community.
 - 3. Pennie- Lobbying- 501c3s are limited in the amount of lobbying they can do (engaging w/ elected officials). only 20% of their time. Zoning and planning boards do not count. Lobbying applies to changing laws(legislature, board of aldermen, congress, etc)
 - iv. Pennie- Must apply to attorney generals office
 - v. Benefits of 501c3
 - 1. Donations are tax exempt
 - 2. opens up opportunities for grants
 - vi. Issues with 501c3
 - 1. Cannot endorse individual political candidates
 - o Tori- why is zoning not included in lobbying?
 - i. Examining proposals and writing letters is not lobbying. Spending time meeting with members of the board of aldermen to change zoning, however, would be.

- Erik Neu- CBA ordinance advocating for where funding should be allocated is not lobbying
 - Michele- We may do something like support tenant right of first refusal
 - i. Mike- I am making the legal recommendation that we go for 501c3 while being mindful of constraints. Only a small portion of what we do could be considered lobbying.
 - Jacob- Is it allowed to have a politician attend or speak at our events.
 - i. Mike-They can come speak about their priorities and learn from us
 - Ben Bradlow- Many great similar examples of why 501c3 can work. How long will it take to incorporate?
 - i. Mike Firestone- By tomorrow we should have an incorporation ID number. Need to open a bank account, register with the IRS and the attorney generals office
 - ii. Pennie- Once we get this together I will need two people to help open the bank account.
 - Ann- Did we have to submit bylaws to the secretary of states office for purposes of incorporation?
 - i. Pennie- We referenced the bylaws to describe the structure of the committees.
 - ii. Ann- Ok, so not the whole bylaws?
 - iii. Pennie- No
 - Pennie- Can we endorse Our Revolution, who endorses candidates?
 - i. Mike- We shouldn't endorse OR, we should support particular mission campaigns such as funding for public transport.
 - Michele Motion to accept the proposal to incorporate as a 501c3
 - i. Mike Firestone- Seconded
 - ii. Vote: 12 ayes, 0 nays
4. Union Sq site visit March 17, 10am at Bloc11 followed by Zoning discussion with Dan Bartman(10 m)
- Tori- BEC will provide printed copies of maps from US zoning overhaul and CDSP, orient people and give expectations of how things are going to look. We will inform the group on phasing for the development.
 - Dan Bartman will be available from 12-2pm to answer questions on zoning.
 - Tori- We will work on sending an announcement tomorrow.
5. New Web Site Launch (5m)
- Propose SomervilleUSNC.org-existing web site will be allowed to expire this summer. The old site will have a warning about the change before redirecting to the new site

- i. Gary- Actually, whether or not we register a new domain name, the existing site will cease to exist when the new one is launched. Even if we get a new domain name, people can use the old one, since auto-forwarding will be in effect. However, those using the old name would get a warning about the change and advised to update their bookmarks
 - ii. Tori- I recommend keeping the original URL. Will make it easier to google and facilitate people searching for it. I think we should take a vote on it.
 - iii. Pennie- Since it's not an urgent matter, we can launch the new site with the existing address and postpone URL discussion to a future meeting.
 - iv. Gary- Compromise position- Existing domain expires this summer. We could renew it as a forwarding mechanism. People will use whatever name we give them. The committee has agreed that SomervilleUSNC.org is a good URL.
 - o Launch will be Monday, 3/19
 - o Chairpersons of committees are invited to maintain and update their own pages- Just need to create login credentials but Gary and the O&C Committee are available to assist
 - o Only cost is a \$10/year fee to keep the domain name
 - o Tori- Want to keep the old URL
 - i. Ben- We will have to table this discussion until next meeting when we have more time. Launch to be postponed until 3/26
6. Built Environment Committee Invitation to City and US2 (10 m)
 - o Rachel- Two letters were sent to the Board today- One to the city/George Proakis
 - o Tori- We invite the city to come in and update us on development in Union Square. The same letter was drafted to be sent to US2
 - o Rachel read the letter aloud to the group
 - o Jacob- Are we trying to get the same update from the city and US2?
 - i. Tori- Want to hold the city accountable for providing feedback from the open house, as well as US2
 - ii. Michele- Hard to say no to a specific ask
 - iii. Andy- Concern with being too specific- could provide them with an easy out.
 - o Ben Bradlow- I can understand engaging the city but I don't understand why would we engage US2 in this way. We are already engaged in a clear process to negotiate with US2.
 - i. Andy- We should be able to bring the broader community in to ask questions to US2 about the development. Otherwise just the 5 person negotiating team will be the only people interacting with US2.

- ii. Gary- A broader meeting will better inform the negotiating committee
 - iii. Ganesh- If we send the letter to US2, they may not talk with us if we are not officially recognized
 - 1. Tori- The covenant says that US2 will negotiate “in good faith” which should encourage them to come. Just to give an update and answer questions.
 - iv. Michele- What would be the harm of meeting with US2? It’s more information for the public, not just the board.
 - 1. Erik Neu- What, if anything, has changed with the open house? What’s up with MEPA timeline? What is the general timeline?
- o Jacob- We have two pending communications with US2. Letter Mike Firestone prepared and they were CC’ed on and the recognition of us as the negotiating party for the CBA.
 - i. Simon- The city and US2 know the context of the USNC discussions, we do not know their context.
 - ii. Andy- Those letters were cc’ed to US2 and they were not directly addressed. This board has not truly reached out to US2.
 - 1. Mike Firestone- The ball is in their court, they are due to respond to the letters they were cc’ed on. We also need to do another public meeting- wth Board of Aldermen to complete our designation process. We can do both of those things before we schedule a meeting with US2. We would want to pack this place for this meeting.
- o Pennie- Outside of dates and numbers, tone of the meeting might not be beneficial for our negotiating position. Has potential to be a contentious conversation. Can we get this information in other ways? Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)?
 - i. Ann- Agreed.
 - ii. Andy- I don’t think there would be much that we can FOIA. I don’t think there is anything a community member could ask that would screw up negotiations.
- o Michele- I think there is no harm in bringing US2 in. Community can ask pointed questions and we can judge whether they give honest answers.
- o Ben Bradlow- The question is timing and purpose. Very strongly underscore the timing issues presented by Mike Firestone. Once we are designated negotiating body, we are in a better position to coordinate a community meeting with US2. We could pursue this after the Aldermen designate USNC.
 - i. Mike Firestone- Update on our recognition process. City has notified Mike that it will not happen today- Given how modest

our proposed language changes are, we want it by next Thursday (3/22). Anything longer than 3 weeks would be indicative of intention to delay the process. We can't have our hearing until after the language has been approved.

- ii. Mike Firestone- Proposal to let Mike send an email to the BOA
 - 1. Ben Bradlow seconded
 - 2. vote: 12 aye, 0 nay
- o Rachel- Proposal to postpone further discussion of letters until after our recognition by the BOA
 - i. Andy Greenspon- If the aldermen vote to recognize us, would the board be willing to have them give an update? And, would the board allow them to give an update during the negotiations process?
 - 1. Also George Proakis is independent of this recognition process.
- 7. Zoning discussion (continued)
 - o Public hearing postponed to 4/3
 - o Discussion- postponed until next meeting
- 8. O&C Committee Social Event Planning (5m)
 - o The purpose of the event is to allow USNC members to spend time together informally, relax, and enjoy some entertainment
 - o We are hoping to bring out up to 60 people
 - o Saturday, April 28 7pm at the Greek American Social Club
 - o Musical entertainment- Ben Baldwin's band the Cellar Doors and more to come.
 - o Next O&C Meeting Tuesday evening 3/20 at 7pm Somerville Public Safety Building
- 9. Next meeting time and place (5m)
 - o Thursday, 3/22 7pm at the Argenziano Cafeteria
- 10. Public Comment (25 m)
 - o Due to discussion running over time, no public comment was presented
- 11. Adjourn

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting March 6, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Rachel Weil, Jacob Kramer, Pennie Taylor, Michele Hansen, Tori Antonino, Ben Baldwin, Ann Camara, Bill Cavellini, Joanne Berry, Mike Firestone

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Andy Greenspon, Simon, Jessica Eschleman, Gary Trujillo, Peter Insley, Wig Zamore

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil, Bill Cavellini

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - o Bill chaired and started off introductions
 - o Joanne passed out copies of a Boston Globe article about a new development proposed by DLJ Real Estate Capital Partners at Boynton Yards.
2. Approval of minutes from 3/1/18 meeting (5 m)
 - o Mike: motion to approve minutes
 - i. Joanne: second
 - ii. Vote: unanimous "aye" 10
3. Collection of Conflict of Interest Disclosure Forms
 - o 11 forms have been submitted
4. Report back from Thursday Board of Aldermen Legislative Matters Committee meeting (10m)
 - o Mike: Last Thursday, the BOA LM committee discussed proposed language to amend covenant btw city and US2 to allow USNC to negotiate a CBA with US2. We had provided language to the city. City tweaked it a little and presented it to the board. The city's language met in all respects the process that we had proposed so we agreed to it. Mike was asked to voice support for the BOA for their support of the USNC through our formation process. Expect that by this coming Thursday, to have heard back favorably that there is consensus on the language and the amendment can be adopted. Then we can schedule a hearing.
 - i. If it doesn't happen by this Thurs then we should ask that it not be postponed beyond next Thurs.
 - o Jacob- is anything contingent on formal incorporation? How does that timeline fit in
 - i. Mike- we are receiving our designation as a nonprofit organization, so we have a little work to do, which we should commence immediately, to actually incorporate.
 1. Register with Secretary of the Commonwealth Corporations Division

- 2. Apply for 501(c)(3) and get TaxID from federal govt
 - 3. Open bank account
 - ii. Mike-With board's approval I am happy to begin the application process.
 - 1. Bill- I believe orgs seeking a status from the state that has no assets does not have to go through 501(c)(3) and it's a shorter process
 - 2. Pennie- Started a financial report, including donations received. Proposal for incorporation presented at a public meeting.
 - a. Mike- I propose we put this on the agenda for the next meeting- discussion of incorporation. and Between Pennie and I we can produce a proposal to the membership
 - iii. Andy Greenspon- Are we sure we want to be a 501(c)(3) as opposed to other 501(c)s?
 - 1. Bill- Due to our lobbying we may need to be a ©(4). We will have to go through another, more official officer election at an annual meeting.
 - o Mike: Motion to have a public meeting on incorporation at the next meeting
 - i. Pennie - Seconded
 - ii. This, along with CBA report discussion
 - iii. Vote: unanimous "ayes" 10
 - iv. We should send out a notice to membership that these discussions will happen ASAP
5. Plan presentation of US2 site plan and March 17 site visit (10 m)
 - o Tori: Built Envi Committee is planning: Meeting up, quick presentation and review, walk around the parcels.
 - o Tori- 10am to noon
 - o Materials to include: relevant pages from CDSP
 - o Outreach- Sending notice out to USNC public Google Group, listserves, Tynyletter, Facebook
 - i. Mike- Are we asking someone from the city to come?
 - 1. Unlikely that anyone would be able to make a Saturday morning.
 - ii. Jacob- Evite and Facebook event will help us get an attendance estimate
6. Built Environment Committee Report (15 m)
 - o Status of planning for March 17th site visit and possible presentation of US2 site plan
 - o Draft of George Proakis letter
 - i. Tori is drafting the letter to US2 as well as one to the city. Things we might ask:
 - 1. Ask US2 to give an update

- 2. Ask the city to give an update
 - 3. Thoughts on CDSP?
 - ii. We want to make sure we aren't tipping our hand to US2
 - 1. Built Environment will work this out in committee
- Wig passed out a public information release form the city upon their acceptance of Somervision as the comprehensive plan for the city. BOA voted their support for it and planning board adopted it in a formal vote. US neighborhood plan was incorporated into it. For every 100,000sq ft of development requires 1 acre of open space.
 - i. Open space goals are almost nowhere. Percentage provided by US2 is a tiny fraction of requirements. This needs to be resolved in current zoning discussion or it will never happen.
 - ii. Somerville has 1/3 of the open space requirement for health.
 - iii. Letter that was approved at the last meeting needs to be revised and re-voted.
 - 1. Numbers were inaccurate, remove ceding statement, insert a demand that they stick to the original plan.
 - iv. Jacob- Because our purview is Union Square, I want to see contributions for Union Square.
 - v. Mike- The only letter to the city so far was the introductory letter- extensively circulated for feedback. We should note that htis hasnt received the same attention.
 - 1. Andy- This was included in the Tiny Letter and discussed at last week's meeting
- Michele- Motion that we retract the letter and bring it back for another vote after work in committee
 - i. Joanne- Seconded
 - ii. Discussion:
 - iii. Ann- I'm not sure who should be writing this letter or if we should write it.
 - iv. Joanne- We have already started the process of editing the original letter. Wig will have input, people will have oppportunity for further input when it is presented to the board.
 - v. Bill- Is this letter meant to influence the amount of open space US2 is providing in a transformational development area? Or is it meant to influence the zoning overhaul.
 - 1. Both
 - 2. Bill- So timing is critical.
 - vi. Wig- Comprehensive plan process involved 3 years of planning. All goals should be achievable. There should be a strategic committee to determine financial and space strategy to determine how to get open space.
 - vii. Vote: unanimous "aye" 10

- Next BEC meeting is at 9am on Saturday at the Public Safety Building. City may come and answer questions that the committee may have on zoning.
 - Joanne will be sending an email to those interested in the MEPA review. Review is coming up in the near future.
 - i. Wig- The process is nowhere near on track to the available timeline
 - ii. Research/pharmaceutical building needs special certifications so these will be additional considerations through the MEPA process. US2 is requesting a waiver on this which we cannot let happen.
 - iii. The lab development company is one of the largest. They also signed a large contract with the pentagon.
 - iv. Requesting help on the MEPA report if people are interested in reviewing it, potentially also taking action against a possible review waiver.
 - v. Bill- I do not want to see us support the waiver. Either neutral or adamantly oppose it. There is no way that a development of this size should receive such a waiver.
 - 1. Joanne- considering traffic and types of buildings, I strongly support the granting of any waiver.
 - 2. Michele- we could use the waiver to get something we want out of them if we are in CBA negotiations at that point.
7. Other committee reports (20 m)
- Jacob- CBA Committee- Making progress on reports. Received all input from outside groups that we expect to receive. Sample section exists for review.
 - i. Locus document- in section about CBA, most of it is not really relevant. Focused on city demands or something a neighborhood organization could organize around.
 - 1. Bill- Locus identifies identities of who may be involved in implementation, where money may come from
 - ii. Rachel- Can you get more specific
 - 1. Jacob- e.g. Work with the city to create a traffic commission. Many other requests to the city.
 - iii. Erik Neu is convening a group on Friday with the Bow St development
 - O&C Committee-
 - i. SCATV report happening Monday with Afruza
 - ii. Social event planning for mid-late April
 - iii. Next meeting 3/10
8. Citywide Zoning Overhaul Discussion (20m)

- Jacob- Alderman Scott hosted a zoning meeting over the weekend. It became clear that there are changes that will happen through zoning. The USNC board should take a position on this.
 - i. Neighborhood residents (1-2family homes)- Downzoning- Over time, some areas will become less dense
 - ii. How can zoning be used to encourage affordable housing?
- Pennie- The proposed zoning is smoother than neighborhoods are in reality. Aldermen can go through unit by unit and suggest changes, so it doesn't have to be quite that smooth.
 - i. Differentiate between "neighborhood residents" and "urban residents." New zoning allows for fewer triple deckers and "urban" style buildings.
 - 1. Andy- weird incentive to prevent developers from tearing down triple deckers, since they can only build two stories under the proposed zoning.
- Andy Greenspon- People who want to discuss this in more detail can come to the next Built Environment Committee meeting.
 - i. We don't have capacity to do lot by lot analysis. We should push people to get involved and contact their aldermen.
- Ann- plan removes parking from businesses along Beacon St.
- Peter Insley- Plans are a large step in the direction of lower population density
- Bill- zoning doesn't tear any buildings down or automatically take value away from property. One way to get affordability is to offer zoning relief
- Joanne- We should specify what we mean by affordable housing. CDSP includes 50-80-110% of median income. Inclusionary housing, section 8 housing, section 8 vouchers, sliding scale housing.
- Wig- 40R Smart Growth will include more affordability and put Somerville in the front of the line for state grants
- Jacob- Downzoning to prevent displacement is ok but there are other ways to do so.
- Simon- Transfer fee money - for low interest mortgages for people to go from renting to owning.
- Andy Greenspon- When zoning definitions were converted from old form to proposed forms, it mapped to the old forms which is why it looks haphazardly drawn. Special districts have their separate overlay development plans.
- Pennie- Nonconforming building section is the most illuminating.
- Wig- anybody except mayor and staff can propose zoning at any time
- Bill- We should keep this on the agenda for the next few meetings. Or should we refer it to BEC.
 - i. Joanne- good to discuss as a whole council, a

- ii. Bill- on agenda, along with CBA report, incorporation research

9. Next meeting time and place (10m)

- o Zoning public meeting is Tuesday 3/13. Wednesday 3/14 if Union Square infrastructure meeting. Board of Aldermen legislative matters meeting is on 3/15.
 - i. Our participation in the legislative matters meeting is limited. Mike Firestone could leave early to attend LM meeting
- o Continue with plan to meet 3/15 at Argezniano School 7pm.

10. Public Comment (25 m)

- o Jacob- 3/7 SHS students are walking out at 8:17am. They are meeting up with Cambridge high school students in Union Square.
- o Simon- GLX meeting 3/7 has been canceled.
- o Jessica Eschleman- 3/17 tour information is already going out to USMS but please forward materials
- o Wig- difference in this zoning from prior zoning. Our staff are national experts on form-based coding. Must specify shape of building but not necessarily use.
- o Wig- There are a lot of people working on open space outside of USNC. Simple desire is for city form a special committee to deal with it.

11. Adjourn

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting March 1, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Rachel Weil, Ben Bradlow, Jacob Kramer, Afruza Akther, Ganesh Uprety, Erik Neu, Pennie Taylor, Michele Hansen, Tori Antonino, Ben Baldwin

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: Andy Greenspon, Jessica Eschleman, Aaron Weber, Peter Insley

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - Rachel chaired and started off introductions
2. Approval of minutes from 2/15/18 and 2/22/18 meeting (5 m)
 - Andy Greenspon- Proposal for $\frac{2}{3}$ for article 16, should outline the votes on
 - i. The word majority in the last sentence of article 16 of the bylaws refers to the $\frac{2}{3}$ majority in the prior sentence.
 - Erik Neu- attendance for 2/15 minutes should include everyone but Ben Baldwin
 - Vote on amendments to minutes: Unanimous “ayes”
 - Collection of Conflict of Interest Disclosure Forms
3. Next meeting time and place (10m)
 - Rachel: Proposal: Full board/membership meet on Thursdays every odd week, committees meet at same Thursday time every even week
 - i. Conflicts with Board of Aldermen, Union United
 - ii. Pennie: Thursday committee meetings would mean that people can only attend one committee meeting per week
 - iii. Jacob- Our maximum involvement with the BOA is in the next few months.
 - iv. Erik Neu- many other neighborhood groups have learned to avoid Thursday
 - v. Andy Greenspon- alternating days is possible if it's consistent
 - vi. Rachel- is there anyone for whom Thursday is the only day that works?
 - vii. Ganesh- We should base the decision on the Doodle Poll.
 1. Rachel will send out again
 - viii. Jacob- we could start a formal system of sending representatives to the BOA meetings

- Jacob- Do we need to meet every week? Can we alternate full board meetings with committee meetings?
 - i. Andy- There are some upcoming deadlines so we might want to continue meeting weekly
 - ii. Michele- We are still founding this board so we should continue meeting weekly. Or possibly every 10 days like the working group.
 - iii. Tori- We can meet every week with more attention given to committees
- Rachel- Let's just plan the next meeting with this discussion in mind. We should continue weekly meetings given upcoming zoning overhaul.
- Ben Baldwin- March 7 2nd
 - i. Michele seconds
 - ii. 4 people can't attend
 - iii. nevermind
- Tori- Motion: Tuesday March 6
 - i. Michele seconds
 - ii. Ganesh- clarification: this is not a fixed recurring date
 - iii. Vote: unanimous "aye" motion passes
- 4. CBA Committee Report (15 m)
 - Timeline proposal - Ben Bradlow (distributed via email)
 - i. Dates may change based on when the board meeting is
 - ii. Report should not focus on hard recommendations but just give a clear summary and basic assessment of what are issues that arose in the CBA summits
 - iii. Goal is by end of April to have more specific recommendations based on discussions of the board, then training for the negotiating team (two weeks)
 - iv. Jacob- I personally feel like this timeline takes too long. I would like to see the group ready to go by April 15. This is the result of years of preparation. Board members should dive in rather than taking their time.
 - 1. Andy Greenspon- Given the need to hold a public meeting before officially incorporating, I don't think we can move much faster than Ben Bradlow's proposal.
 - v. Erik- Professional advice for negotiating- who would that be?
 - a. Ben Bradlow- "interest based" negotiating strategy as opposed to adversarial. Advice includes probably legal advice, advice from specialized experienced negotiating strategists
 - 2. Has there been any discussion on whether the legal entity question has to be addressed prior to negotiations

- a. Pennie- bylaws require a public presentation of what we are pursuing. Mike Firestone is putting together a proposal for this to put on the agenda. Proposal-> public meeting-> official formation→ bank account
 - i. Erik- Where does negotiations fall in this process?
 - b. Ben Bradlow- We will need to deal with the question of our recognition. We should get advice from Mike Firestone at the next meeting
 - vi. Michele- Bill made an important point that our asks need to be specific. That will take time.
 - 1. Ben Bradlow- my timeline is a balance between a speedy process and the more prolonged version Erik Neu proposed
 - vii. Michele- We should be prepared regardless of where the city stands on our recognition and reopening the covenant.
 - viii. Andy Greenspon- Has discussion on how the negotiating team is determined occurred?
 - 1. Ben Bradlow- no.
 - ix. Jacob- Propose amendment to timeline- “broad recommendations” changed to “specific recommendations” for April 5.
 - 1. Ben Bradlow- The proposal is already a compromise
 - 2. Andy Greenspon- Shortening the timeline may lead to pushback from the community
 - x. Jacob- I can withdraw my recommendation.
 - xi. Rachel- Should we insert specific days or allow for flexibility in the timeline based on our meeting days?
 - 1. Let’s just stick with the meeting on the 15th
 - xii. Ben Bradlow- Motion to adopt the timeline as written
 - 1. Michele- With the provision that, other than the date of 3/15, the other days may be moved up or back based on availability of the board.
 - 2. Pennie- seconded
 - 3. Discussion- Andy: Between these deadlines there will be other meetings, time to take broad categories and refine them into specifics (based on Erik’s timeline).
 - a. We need a plan for determining negotiations team
 - i. The report will include a proposal for determining negotiating team, giving for weeks
 - 4. Vote: Unanimous “aye”
- Progress of additional inputs from organizations and individuals

- i. Somerville YIMBYS, Main Streets, some individuals, Welcome Project, Jobs for Somerville
 - 1. They are all in the CBA Committee Google Group
 - ii. Tori knows a group submitting input and looking for a 3-4 day extension
 - 1. Ben Bradlow- granted
- 5. Built Environment Committee Report (15 m)
 - Seeking approval of [Open Space Letter](#): Somervision Goal of 125 acres
 - i. Pennie: “Metric of open space” is an important point. Need to prevent, e.g. putting a park under route 93
 - ii. Jacob- What does the acreage in the letter translate into for the bounds of the USNC?
 - 1. Andy- The Somervision process just divided 125 acres among their development zones so it was not an exact science. I don’t think we can tell the city how much open space to put in Union Square.
 - 2. Andy- This is specifically in response to zoning, we should write another letter about the D block in US.
 - 3. Tori- 34% would be the total amount of green space in Union Square so we are really far off.
 - iii. Erik Neu- Neighborhood plan, built on Somervision, tries to get to these open space targets and states that the city will need to buy land and assemble parcels for a park. This absolutely requires a long-term plan.
 - iv. Tori- Seeking approval to send this out to the Board of Aldermen before March 13
 - 1. Jacob- The letter should come from the board, not BEC.
 - 2. Ben Bradlow- Motion to approve the letter with Jacob’s amendment.
 - a. Jacob- Seconded
 - b. Vote: 10 “ayes”, unanimous
 - Site Visit- March 17
 - Seeking approval of letter to US2/George Proakis re: next steps after open house
 - i. Tori Antonino- We want to open up a dialogue with the developers. Should we set up a meeting with George Proakis first? They haven’t reported back after the open house.
 - 1. Ben Bradlow- This issue is important. Issues around the built environment related to development blocks held by master development will be part of CBA negotiations. Engaging with the developer should happen through a CBA negotiation.

- a. Michele-To recap: we want to check in with George on what is going on with the built environment. I would be against the BEC going and speaking for themselves but we should get some update.
 - 2. Pennie- last week Alderman Ewen Campen got permission to meet with developers on “outparcels” (not D Blocks)- we could check in with them
 - 3. Jacob- We have reached out to US2 as a board. They have what we sent to the board of aldermen and did not reply.
 - a. Erik Neu- agree with Jacob.
 - b. Andy Greenspon- They did reach out to us, and we didn’t exactly respond. I would not be opposed to directly communicating with them- asking to engage in some way.
 - ii. Andy Greenspon- I don’t think the CBA will cover all design features demanded in the D blocks. Will we get architects to detail out what we are demanding from US2? There are several meetings and processes US2 has to go to so USNC may want to consider being involved.
 - iii. Ben Bradlow- Agreement that there needs to be follow up. Let’s consider a draft letter at the next meeting.
6. Discussion of Article 16 of the Interim Bylaws - Andy (10m)
 - o Andy - Past notes from working group: Article 16 as written in bylaws was approved in public meetings.
 - i. Bylaw committee of working group came up with amendments, all approved 25 to 3 by the group. One was not incorporated into bylaws: including voting on accepting negotiations being open 3 hours prior to the meeting. Can be structured as open hours just to vote after a presentation of the negotiated terms.
 - ii. Jacob- This can be a recommendation for the CBA report
7. Endorsement of SHS walk-out to protest gun violence - Andrea/Jacob (10 m)
 - o Rachel- The event occurred yesterday morning and will continue every Wednesday. Many have signed as individuals. There was a question of whether the board should endorse it.
 - o Jacob- They may want some resource support in addition to verbal support
 - o Andy Greenspon- We may run into the situation where groups around Somerville come to us for support. Not necessarily a bad thing.
 - i. Erik Neu- This is not directly related to our scope. We could send a more relevant letter to the principal advocating not

punishing students or something to the state government. Endorsing as individuals is fine but as a council could lead to unintended consequences.

ii. Michele- I think it's important to do what we can to support SHS walk out.

iii. Tori- These are our constituents and eventually this could affect the Argenziano.

o Michele- Groups can ask for our support in the future. We can say yes or we can say no.

o Jacob- Motion to adopt the letter as written and send it to the student group and principal from the chairs of the committee.

i. Ben Bradlow- seconds

ii. Vote: 8 "aye" 1 "nay"

8. Public Comment (25 m)

o Ben Baldwin- O&C committee meeting 3/10. Please join if you'd like to help plan a mid-late April social gathering.

o Ben Bradlow- David Tisel on Tenant Right of First Refusal legislation is hosting an event Monday 3/5 for info on the bill. 6:30pm at the Argenziano

o Andy Greenspon- Somerville Dems Caucus 11am Saturday 3/3 for governor candidates and others.

o Tori Antonino- Tufts Univ payment in lieu of taxes meeting- If people want to participate. Council may want to talk with them at some point about CBA process. March 24 10am to brainstorm what asks might be.

9. Adjourn

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

USNC Meeting 2/15/18

Board members in attendance:

Jacob
Rachel
Andrea
Ann
Bill
Ben Bradlow
Pennie
Afruza
Joanne
Erik Neu
Ganesh Uprety
Michele
Mike Firestone
Pennie Taylor

Item 1:

Approval of minutes from last meeting

Unanimously approved by board members

Item 2:

Built environment minutes stated letter from US2 was sent to board. board has not received this letter. Andy will correct.

Item 3:

(Tori arrived)

Conflict of interest forms need to be completed by board members. Only 3 have been received, 12 outstanding.

Item 4:

(Ganesh arrived)

CBA summits

~160 in attendance

Next steps

A report will summarize the inputs received in 2 meetings and issues that have arisen in previous processes

Ben Bradlow will bottomline report, would like help with it

Report will be presented to board for amendments and approval

That report will feed into more oriented process

Selection of negotiation team

Need to decide upon negotiating strategy

Recognition will have some bearing on that process

An additional stream of information will include direct concerns sent to board and group concerns sent to board. Written submissions were announced at summits
Will there be more public meetings?

Time consuming to plan but could be beneficial to host

Bill question: Ballpark of timeline for input and estimated timeline for report to be published. (ben) one week for submission deadline, report could be completed in 3 weeks from today. (erik) deadline for submission might not be adequate enough for group input, how is this going to be included in a report. (ben) 2 weeks is adequate (pennie) mar 1st good deadline (peter- public) group could start working on report now while submission is completed (tori) report completed and community will have ability to provide feedback (mike - public) should be consolidated, definitive, and pointed (michele) actual recommendations will take longer than 3 weeks to create general report (jacob) CBA committee should create something of value for the board to decide on (andy) report should be announced ahead of time of board meeting so community can provide input (ben) intentionally did not introduce proposal method to take note of what group considered. Seems like best move is to create a report of recommendations and publish well in advance for community review/feedback. Board can request amendments. (mike firestone arrived) (simon) would like more substantive issues to be included in discussions in meetings (erik) smart goals presentation is very good, where should these goals be involved - before report or should it be more like philosophical discussion (ann) we should visit community centers to see what they look like

(michele) should make a full report with all information, then CBA committee should come up with preliminary recommendations, publish recommendations, host large meeting for feedback, move forward with more concise report (peter - public to michele) people might not be as keen as coming back to review input that they put (mike - public to michele) more meetings hosted will be more divergent, editing process will be convergent, establish parameters for when the group will become convergent again and when the board will be making the decisions so people are aware (mike f) should identify topics then include other concepts that were discussed that were not discussed as much. Subsequent public discussions can be on the priority topics, provide process in report

(tori) ask people for a priority list based on categories mentioned (jacob) need to keep in mind how to use recommendations to the best of negotiation ability i.e. signatures from community, find right negotiating committee (andy - public) if you reach out to different groups based on categories, can ask them to submit report based on interests (jacob and pennie leave) (simon - public) multivariant process, need to provide more detail regarding development process (ben) re reaching out to groups: should decide tonight what is the deadline for written submissions, use like again to individually reach out to org like usnc did for summits. Board should deliberate what the topic areas will be included in recommended report. Participation for process: when an agreement is

determined by us2 and negotiating team, that negotiation needs to come back to board for public input. (bill) point of information: whatever negotiated needs to come back to well advertised meeting and $\frac{2}{3}$ of members need to approve. 2nd round needs simple majority. We should go in with majority input. (andy - public) by-laws are being interpreted inaccurately, was written as intent to get $\frac{2}{3}$ approval from usnc members (mike f) would like to have conversation regarding majority definition (erik) who on the board feels we need to have more discussion on current proposal (6 member voted yes) there will be a future meeting regarding that topic

(rachel) back to timeline: march 1st for submissions (unanimous yes)

(bill) make a motion: draft report submitted mar 15

(ben) report would be topics of discussion and summary of all input

(bill) LOCUS and summits came up with, make sure it is included in reports

(ben) host meeting for public mar 22

(peter - public) would like additional information of scope of project to be included in report

(simon - public) narrow categories and get parameters, then discuss, then make more precise. Have to be careful not being too precise right off the bat

(andy - public) move forward from topic, be succinct, don't reinvent the wheel

(erik) should be a timeline to vote on for the process, supporting bill's proposal

(bill) need to keep momentum outside of this usnc process in mind

Item 5:

BOA summary (mike f)

Alderman passed resolution in support of neighborhood council

How to move forward with process of creating CBO so USNC can lead CBA negotiations

Covenant between us2 and city to create CBO before USNC

Options:

Full passage of CBO

Skinny approval of USNC

perferred create covenant that states USNC was intended CBA negotiations body

Option 3 selected: draft passed out

Everyone in attendance given time to read proposed edits to consent

New literature is pulled from CBO language with conditional updates

(mike - public) related to vote the other day? (mike f) correct, former vote not related

(erik) CBO asked for full membership list (mike f) thought this was not feasible for our group to provide

(bill) proposed approval, second provided)

(andy) what does the 'shall' indicate in the language, does that mean they will vote or that they will hold a vote? (mike f) means that they will hold a vote

(tori) does the BOA have input in the covenant change since it is between the city, mayor, and US2. (mike f) if law department decides this matter is for mayor to decide rather than BOA, corrections will be made

(simon) open and transparent reaffirmed by BOA, articles 3 and 8 contradict each other. (mike f) not discussing this but executive meetings could be necessary for CBA negotiation if detrimental to public

(bill) make another motion mayor and US2 must agree on covenant, if they delay, USNC needs to have another plan (mike f) an edit to the covenant is not for legislative matters, it is for the lawyers of Somerville and US2.

(ganesh) documents means bylaws only or organizational documents, does this include legal entities like non-profit documentation or bank accounts, etc. (mike f) if we have it we can submit it and if we don't they understand we are in early phases

(afruza) should we go to US2 to ask them to negotiate the CBA with us before this covenant is changed (mike f) the day or week after the election of the USNC, the legal person contacted board members with a congratulations, therefore they are on record already as identifying us. Having recognition by BOA might be more beneficial than making a side deal with

(tori) who from the city is on board with us (mike f) mayor's office

(bill) vote to close discussion, unanimous yes

(bill) introduce motion for small group to meet with legislative matters committee to review the CBO complete process. (peter - public) worrisome that this might be postponed, makes sense to proceed in good faith with all parties (andy - public) point of clarification; meet individually with BOA, this initiative might fall more into the quick fix for the CBO (joanne) move forward with option approved by BOA, make a deadline, if not met, move forward with option 2 (mike f) include in language a deadline i.e. Mar 1st. Provide organizational documents to set hearing date for Mar 15th. Actively contributing to drafting of general CBO would be a good idea.

Need: approval for whole thing - (tori) bill do not remove motion, should work with CBO in tandem (michele) vote on the current option with the mentality that we have a back up option and long term goal assisting BOA with CBO (mike f) would like to go forward with referring to the letter requested. (all yes, tori abstained)

Moving discussion of response to Nu Market to next meeting. Ben circulated today

Item 6:

Built Environment - summit was success. Where is the built environment going right now? Zoning comment available until Mar 13th. Turn the neighborhood to Somervision as a guideline not an aspirational design. Main interest 125 acres of open space. Meet with city to see where their plans are to build 125 acres of

open space and if a task force will be formed. (bill) is somervision a legal document? (tori) all zoning referred to as somervision (bill) it is a comprehensive plan, a legal document, a city must be in compliance with the document (tori) best goal will be to keep it as a comprehensive plan (michele) george and city refer to it as a plan that can be edited and altered as needed (mike f) understanding is that plan is a guideline that developers should try to adhere to but if they do not it needs to be explained why inconsistency exists (andy - public) the alderman have to approve zoning so built environment should point out where the zoning misses and people should push for amendments. Send 1 page letter to BOA pointing out inconsistency with Somervision goals, potentially meet with aldermen, have some backup ideas to handle open space in Somerville. (michele) residential met, commercial halfway, open space not nearly met, should focus on this point (andy) wig will submit a draft to board to review next week

Item 7:

Outreach to business community and brick and mortar stores

Ben bradlow reached out to esther and lindsey to attend the meeting and they were unable to attend. Reiterated council's commitment to represent the interests of brick and mortar businesses in CBA meeting

(mike - public) direct outreach to other people who ran for board and possibly create specific sub committee for their interests

Item 8:

Doodle poll

Thursday is the best day so far for members

Next thursday 2/22/18 (unanimous) 7pm at Argenziano (unanimous)

Item 9:

(gary) introduced website concerns, can not take video anymore, would like public discussion to be first AND last

(andy) please send out contact tonight to notifying groups of deadline

(tori) allen street playground is being redone, would like to see kids have their own garden plot, would like Build Environment to get involved

Unanimous adjournment

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Meeting January 31, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Mike Firestone, Bill Cavellini, Ben Bradlow, Rachel Weil, Michele Hansen, Ann Camara, Pennie Taylor, Afruza Akther, Jacob Kramer, Tori Antonino, Ben Baldwin, Ganesh Uprety, Erik Neu, Joanne Berry

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: 8

Co-Facilitators: Bill Cavellini and Rachel Weil

Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
 - Bill welcomed the group and led introductions
2. Approval of minutes of 1/22/18 meeting (5 minutes)
 - Bill suggested an edit to item 2 in which he is quoted “don’t” and “Primary purpose”
 - i. change to “won’t” and “One of the primary purposes”
 - Ben Baldwin proposed to allow board members to edit minutes
 - i. Ben Bradlow disagrees
 - ii. Michele agrees with Ben Bradlow. Future meetings will be videotaped so we can confirm exactly what is said.
 - Bill made a motion to approve the minutes
 - i. Joanne seconds
 - ii. Vote: 11 “ayes” 1 abstention
3. Collection of Potential Conflict of Interest Disclosure forms
 - Not everyone received the form. Rachel Weil will scan and forward to the board.
4. CBA Committee report (35 minutes)
 - Discussion of preparations for CBA Summits – 2/7 and 2/10
 - i. 2 Canvasses on Saturday to spread the word.
 1. This is an attempt to reach people who may have voted or participated but aren’t linked in with email, TinyLetter, etc.
 - ii. There will be another canvass this Saturday.
 - iii. Membership sign up form is in use. So far over 60 residents have signed up.
 - Outline of presentation
 - i. Jacob Kramer outlined the structure of the meetings:
 1. Presentation
 - a. Erik Neu-Locus process
 - b. Van Hardy-Union United process
 2. Small group discussion

- a. Michele is coordinating facilitators and note-takers
 - 3. Report back - "dot"ocracy
 - 4. Affinity group discussion (focus on particular interests: ie affordable housing, economic development, public space)
- ii. CBA committee will draft a report with what was generated in the CBA summits and bring back to the board for approval
- Getting the word out – (with Comm. & Outreach Comm.)
 - i. Jacob is passing around a signup sheet for Saturday 2/3 canvassing
- Other
 - i. Erik Neu- What is going to be the outcome of this CBA process and how does it get translated into action.
 - 1. Jacob- This is something we should discuss
 - 2. Joanne- Reviewing the previous reports to determine key issues. Reviewing CDSP conditions - 90 stipulations before moving forward with development. US2 may already be required to do many of the things a CBA process may come up with.
 - 3. Erik Neu- The expectation for the LOCUS process was higher than what we got. We will need dollar estimates for asks- eg a civic center. We will need help prioritizing/determining trade offs all the needs coming from the process.
 - 4. Joanne- One condition of the CDSP is that a civic center can be created and US2 would work with a community representative such as the USNC.
 - ii. Ben Bradlow- In the bylaws, the board selects a negotiator but doesn't discuss how to do so. We should decide sooner rather than later, prior to CBA summits. How do we prioritize?
 - 1. Bill Cavellini- Many previously determined priorities are already in the zoning bylaws. We can at least eliminate these priorities as already in place.
 - iii. Mike Katz- One concern for Union Square Main Streets is that the dot-ocracy process has already been proven to leave out brick and mortar businesses. The need to lower the tax rate by getting more businesses in will be forgotten if people vote for their personal interests.
 - 1. Ben Bradlow- Would it be possible for USMS to make a written submission in addition to participation in summits?
 - 2. Peter Insley- addressing Mike Katz- what would you like to see in a CBA?

- a. A recognition that there is an issue with the way things played out and no carved out area for brick and mortar businesses. A written list of needs for businesses exists in one moment in time and is difficult to negotiate around as things change.
 - b. Revolving loan funds, benevolent landlord tax credits, technical assistance to small businesses, increased daytime traffic, access to parking, improved pedestrian access.
 - iv. Jessica Eschleman- Did any outreach happen for brick and mortar businesses?
 - 1. Joanne- Visiting businesses this week
 - 2. Ganesh- went canvassing around businesses last week. We should do more.
 - 3. USMS is trying to support the process. It's on USMS email blasts and Facebook.
 - 4. Jacob- CBA committee prioritized weekday outreach to businesses
 - v. Ann Camara- Focus of canvassing has been center of Union square- need to get Beacon St, Washington St, etc.
 - 1.
- 5. Communication and Outreach Committee Report - (15 minutes)
 - Method for getting more small business community input before Summits
 - i. Review of possible web site options
 - ii. Brainstorm for building local business buy-in
 - 1. Continuing conversation
 - Peter Levine from Somerville Media Center (SCAT) on one option for coverage
 - i. Two designated board members would create a script of topics covered in meetings and announcing upcoming events. SCATV could produce a biweekly show.
 - 1. Will it be reporting or editorializing?
 - 2. Goal is to keep it objective
 - ii. Jacob- O&C Committee is working on this and can continue generating scripts.
 - iii. Michele- Jessica suggested having longer form tours of the neighborhood, which could be a good way to loop in USMS and local businesses
 - Gary Trujillo- Propose that attempting to vote on a web site alternative at the next meeting is too much. Should form a task unit to make the decision.
 - i. Pennie- Maybe links to the site can be shared so folks have the ability to play with it on their own
 - ii. Erik- Let's write up the requirements of a web site

- iii. Michele- Proposal would be to have this discussion 2 weeks from now since next week will be taken up with CBA Summits.
 - iv. Pennie- Important that our web site be complete before these CBA summits. I move that this process move more quickly.
 - v. Gary- We have a web site that is working - Mike Gintz has been doing a good job.
 - Mike Firestone- Motion that the O&C committee be designated to transition to a new web site as soon as they can reach an appropriate agreement. The board can be notified as soon as a decision is made
 - i. Jacob - Seconded
 - ii. Bill- not sure we can enteratin a second motion
 - Michele- I think this needs to be done within 2 weeks. Can be left to the committee.
 - Vote to put it out to O&C Committee
 - i. 13 “ayes”
 - ii. Gary- wihtout sufficient discussion
6. Discussion and decision on whether to form a Funding/Finance Committee (15 minutes)
- Bill Cavellini- issues of costs for printing, renting space, web site hosting
 - Pennie- Proposes the founding of a finance committee. Steps to do so are pretty clearly laid out in bylaws.
 - i. Mike firestone- Seconded
 - ii. Discussion
 - 1. Mike Firestone- need to have some resources. Allow for small contributions to the USNC at the upcoming CBA summits.
 - 2. Andy Greenspon- will we need a bank account?
 - a. Pennie- Committee would be helpful in figuring this out
 - iii. Vote: unanimous “ayes”
7. Built Environment Committee Report (10 minutes)
- Joanne Berry- Motion to push this down the agenda because Tori is on her way
 - i. Michele seconds
 - ii. Vote: 13 “ayes”
 - Tori Antonino- Meeting Last Sunday at Canopy.
 - i. Seeking 10 minutes in CBA summit to describe the built environment committee
 - ii. Next meeting scheduled for this Sunday at 1pm
 - Joanne- We agreed to merge the MEPA working group with the Built Environment Committee.

- Andy Greenspon- Seeking to interface with US2 early in order to incorporate built environment demands. Seeking approval from board to reach out and meet with the city and developers to establish a positive dialogue.
 - i. Jacob- concerned that the built environment committee could independently meet with the developer.
 - ii. Michele- Ann, Joanne and I have participated in built environment committee. I am all for meeting with the city, but US2 should wait. I agree with Jacob's concern.
 - iii. Tori- I am not trying to undercut the committee. I want a better representative format. I don't think reaching out to businesses is equal to having a vote on the board. I don't anticipate meeting with the city or developers before the proposed membership meeting to address election issues and representation.
- 8. Discussion of BOA resolution about Neighborhood Council recognition (10 minutes)
 - Ben Bradlow- Board of Alderman took up a resolution in part responding to our letter, though it makes no mention of letter. This will be taken up in meeting held tomorrow.
 - Mike Firestone- Alderman Neidergang (chair of legislative committee) called with clarifying questions. Covenant is the only place where this USNC exists formally. Covenant predicted existence of a CBA ordinance by this point. Where does that leave USNC?
 - i. Extent of authority allowable for a neighborhood council without conflicting with the law- so far it looks good with respect to the goals of the council. Legal memo to the BOA relative to neighborhood councils appears consistent with the letter USNC submitted to aldermen.
 - Tori Antonino- Motion to have a discussion on the motion:
 - i. Mike Firestone seconds
 - ii. Vote - 14 "ayes"
 - Andy Greenspon-
 - i. Mike Firestone- there are many established neighborhood groups that have official opportunity to give feedback on development issues.
 - Tori Antonino- Propose a membership meeting for all candidates to discuss issues. Under bylaws, I am collecting signatures for a petition to discuss ___ at next legislative matters committee.
 - i. Mike Firestone- Nobody wants to derail the process of of the USNC getting recognized. If we have this meeting, would you be willing to allow the board of aldermen to take a vote to recognize the USNC tomorrow if we can have the proposed meeting?

- ii. Tori- I want to prevent recognition by the BOA until these issues have been addressed
- iii. Jacob Kramer- We have a position that we wrote, signed, and sent. It seems strange that we try to dictate what they are allowed to vote on. We should hold these meetings but not contravene our position
- iv. Michele- I agree that we should move forward while scheduling a forum to discuss the issues presented.
- v. Gary Trujillo- I agree with spirit of Mike and Jacob, but am persuaded that BOA should have their vote. How will the letter from USMS exec committee be dealt with?
- vi. Andy Greenspon- It is the BOA's right to vote on what they want. Letters from the community have been submitted and alderman will have their discussion with this in mind. Concern is - What is the legal force behind "recognition"
- vii. Pennie- Each member of the board is multifaceted and to imply that there is a group with monolithic interests is upsetting. The concept of "representation" means taking into account ideas that don't necessarily stem from one's own concerns.
- viii. Ben Bradlow- There's no decision before this board. USNC unanimously agreed to seek recognition. It would be impossible to hold this meeting before tomorrow's meeting before the BOA. We should have a meeting to address these issues, but it shouldn't affect aldermen decisions.
- ix. Mike Firestone- I can't agree to your proposal as is. Let's meet halfway: schedule a meeting, recognize that some people wanted to delay the vote, recognize that the board doesn't want to delay the vote but will have the meeting to address concerns. It would be a mistake to miss the momentum currently in the board of aldermen.
- x. Bill Cavellini- Provision in bylaws for some suggested discussion, provision 3.3.7 requires interim board to seek input from membership starting 6 months from day of election and start a process discussing membership. This also applies to the bylaws. The discussion we're having is contained in this provision. This is appropriately discussed in a bylaws committee. If 10 members of the council want to hold a meeting, co-charis must schedule it within 14 days.
- xi. Rachel Weil- We are interim, evolving as we go. To stop the momentum would be detrimental to the concept of the neighborhood council.
- xii. Andy Greenspon- Mike Firestone's compromise is good. Disagree with Bill- interim board has the significant role of negotiating the CBA, whether or not it is interim.

- xiii. Perception of issues with the election will continue to cause a split in the board and prevent proper work.
- xiv. Michele- There is a possibility for several people with diverse backgrounds to be on the negotiating committee. There is nothing preventing local businesses or unelected board candidates.
- xv. Pennie- This process relies on good faith of the developer. The board should be able to act in good faith for the neighborhood.
- xvi. Ben Bradlow- The board has made it clear that there is a commitment to reaching out to folks that don't feel represented. The election occurred according to the rules, nobody denies the legitimacy of the way the election was conducted. We must conduct ourselves as stewards of those who elected us.
- xvii. Erik Neu- The high point of community good faith in the process was the candidate forum. There is some need for catharsis and to regain the level of good faith we saw at the forum.
- xviii. The board could accept the suggestion of Philip's letter that the aldermen recognize the board with the understanding that it fix some issues in the next 6 months.
- xix. Joanne- This is an opportunity to fix errors. Those members of the board who are new to the process are "uncorrupted" by previous processes so can act as liaisons to those who feel left out.
- xx. Peter Insley- I object to the idea that something needs to be made right. The election happened and the board has made efforts to reach out to those who feel left out. If the USNC declines recognition of BOA there is no better representative of the Union Sq community to conduct negotiations with US2.

- Bill- is there a motion to extend the meetings?
 - i. Jacob- this seems to have served as a public comment period. Motion to strike the Public Comment agenda item from the agenda.
 - 1. Ben Baldwin - seconds
 - 2. Vote- unanimous "aye"

9. Date and time of next meeting after CBA Summits (5 minutes)

- Motion to extend the meeting to discuss more than scheduling the next meeting
 - i. Vote- 1 aye, 13 nay
- Rachel Weil- Fossil Free Somerville has Weds meetings. Doodle poll will be sent to membership to determine good days and times to conduct meetings. We have been operating under the meeting times of the working group but there may be a better time.

- i. Send to local business community
 - o Bill Cavellini- The date of the next meeting will be Wednesday
 - i. Many folks can't make it- change date
 - ii. Next meeting Thursday the 15th at 7pm
 - 1. Vote: 13 ayes, 1 nay
 - iii. Location: Jacob can schedule it at Argenziano Cafeteria unless it's not free, in which case it will be at the Public Safety Building.
- 10. Public Comment (25 minutes)
 - o Eliminated from agenda in item 8.

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Fifth Meeting January 22, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Mike Firestone, Bill Caveillini, Ben Bradlow, Rachel Weil, Michele Hanson, Ann Camara, Pennie Taylor, Afruza Akther, Jacob Kramer, Tori Antonino.

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: 7

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil, Peter Insley

Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
 - Rachel welcomed the board and led introductions
 - Special guest from the MA Attorney General's office: Jonathan Sklarzik
2. Open Meeting Law Presentation and Discussion (40m)
 - Mike Firestone introduced the presentation and rationale for the discussion
 - [Material Available Here](#), [Open Meeting Law FAQ](#)
 - Discussion:
 - Mike Gintz- Biggest issue is what can be done to facilitate this group online while adhering to public meeting law
 - i. Jonathan- Bill under consideration to open deliberation up to web sites
 - ii. As a non-public body we have an opportunity to experiment with innovating.
 - Tori Antonino- Physical posting- where does one post?
 - i. Must be posted by city clerk in the place where they post things.
 - ii. City can adopt its web site, which becomes legal posting method
 - Bill Cavellini- How much time does clerk need in order to post 48 hours in advance?
 - i. Give yourself at least an extra day. Get to know your clerk and what kind of time they need.
 - Jacob Kramer- Sums up what we're already doing in the spirit of this law
 - Bill Cavellini- One primary purpose of the board is negotiating with developers or designating a group to do so. There will be a need to strategize a negotiating position that we don't want known to developers.
 - i. Develop our own reasoning for going into executive session, possibly different from the official 10.
 - ii. There is rule in our bylaws to allow going into executive session for this purpose
 - Mike Gintz- Are there any other versions of open meeting laws?
 - i. Robert's Rules of order. Nongovernmental entities are not legally required to abide by it. They abide by their bylaws.
 - Bill Cavellini- There are times when we may be acting as an advisor to a public body
 - i. There are other neighborhood groups that are not public bodies but who do act in an advisory role similar to USNC and do not abide by open meeting laws. There have been court cases. Three

factors beyond the definition (must encompass all three to be considered): 1. Does govt establish, control, appoint members, etc? 2. Public Business. 3. Empowered to act collectively.

- Ben Bradlow- Important to have a recognized standard to promote transparency and accountability. All issues that we have needed to deal with were better dealt with in a meeting.
 - i. One issue impacted by open meeting law is drafting a document on Google Docs- technically deliberation
- FAQ sheet
- 3. Ethics Discussion (20m)
 - Mike Firestone passed out conflict of interest conversation worksheet for consideration.
 - The greatest ethical concern is that board members are acting with a conflict of interest, or have the appearance of a conflict.
 - Board to submit worksheet and chairs to review for conflicts of interest that require more than simple disclosure
 - Examples: Someone with a property interest very close to D2 eg Dunkin Donuts
 - i. Mostly financial conflicts. State law applies to immediate family members. Distant family may be “appearance of conflict”
 - ii. Conflict doesn’t bar membership on the board- just needs to be stated and particular issues may require recusal.
 - Disclosure doesn’t necessarily mean recusal. Recusal would mean disqualifying from discussion and decisionmaking.
 - Jacob- What is process for recusal?
 - i. Bill Cavellini- Proposal: Chair would pay attention but each board member to pay attention, too.
- 4. Other Business (25m)
 - Rachel Weil - Letter to the mayor, board of aldermen, US2 has been submitted. Will be discussed at next legislative matters meeting February 1 at 7pm. There will be a reportback from legal team of the city solicitor.
 - i. Response to letter will be forwarded to board
 - ii. Ben Bradlow - Letter requested a meeting, which we haven’t heard back about. May apply more to the mayor’s office.
 - Jacob Kramer gave a summary of the previous legislative matters meeting
 - i. Could this recognition be made without passing a CBA ordinance?
 - ii. Point of the letter was not recognized. Can the covenant be reopened to specify us as the nonprofit recipient of a CBA?
 - iii. There is a mechanism for recognizing a member of the public in those meetings
 - Tori Antonino- They haven’t decided which way to go. Seems like they are leaning toward having CBA funds go to the city. It’s not city money it’s community money
 - Mike Firestone- Official position is that we are independent nonprofit, designated as party to a CBA, based on a covenant that the city brokered with the developer, and that the CBA has a list of allowable topics. There’s a separate provision about a CBA fee assessed on a sq ft of development basis. City is interested in who is in charge of divvying up that money. We are interested in other things not necessarily related to these fees. We need to clarify our ask to the alderman.

- Alderman Scott issued a letter commending us for our election and establishment.
 - Scheduling further meetings:
 - i. CBA Summit: Argenziano Cafeteria (fee ~\$250 for both meetings), Police Station (free)
 - 1. Feb 7 and 10 have been proposed
 - 2. Argenziano Cafeteria is free on weeknights for community groups of less than 100
 - a. To host the 2/7 CBA summit
 - 3. Vote on using the Police Station for the Saturday meeting: 12 yes, 0 no
 - a. To host the 2/10 CBA summit
 - ii. Green room is open for free smaller meetings on Bow St.
 - iii. Bill Cavellini - Propose USNC Board meeting on 1/31
 - 1. Mike Firestone- Propose to put a finance or budget committee onto the agenda.
 - 2. Argenziano is not available on 31st, police station can be reserved
 - 3. Mike Firestone- Is it possible to invite people to come to meetings to represent for USMS or other small business perspective?
 - a. USMS is looking for a new director
 - Ben Bradlow - We need a line of communication with the small business community. Possibly a subcommittee. We don't have a mechanism for input on economic development.
 - i. We should put it on the agenda for 1/31
 - Peter Insley- vote to extend the meeting by 20 minutes
 - i. 12 yes, 0 no
5. Public Comment Period (20m)
- CBA Committee meeting at police station 1/23 7pm
 - Outreach & Communications meeting at police station Saturday 1/27 10am
 - Pennie Taylor- need a process for approving spending for reimbursement, specified in bylaws
 - Bill Cavellini - WBUR Open Source features Somerville USNC
 - Public attendance has been dropping off. Some issues with outreach to advertise meetings. Addressing aldermen as such to keep community informed on who we're talking about.
6. Adjourn

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Fourth Meeting January 17, 2018

1. Welcome and introductions 7:07pm start
 - a. Minutes have been posted on the website
 - b. Access to a discussion board was made available yesterday to the public by Ben Baldwin
 - c. Bill suggests changes to time allotment - would like longer agenda #3.
 - d. Bill introduces email from Brian from SCAT regarding more formality in SCAT meeting coverage (Bill would like to add to agenda 9) (Pennie states it will be touched in on 5a)
 - e. Jacob passed material around for 3a
 - f. Introductions (board members)
 - i. Bill Cavellini-cofacilitator
 - ii. Ben Bradlow
 - iii. Pennie Taylor
 - iv. Michele Hansen
 - v. Rachel Weil
 - vi. Ann Camara
 - vii. Joanne Berry
 - viii. Peter Insley - cofacilitator
 - ix. Ganesh Uprety
 - x. Jacob Kramer
 - xi. Tori Antonino
 - xii. Mike Firestone
2. Public comment
 - a. Bill Cavellini introduces communication guidelines to the public
 - b. Gary - announcement: SCAT not able to get camera to meeting. Would like a motion to create an institutional membership. Would like explanation for CBA public input and potential authorship.
 - c. Simon - on behalf of Andy would like a number of committees to meet together to get on the same page. Would like a motion to make this happen
 - d. Wig - would like CBA to be moved after agenda 4 and 5. (referring to the USNC flyer passed around) The graph refers to consolidated zoning. Somervision has to be before that to be legal. First comprehensive, then zoning, then consolidated. (referring to letter drafted by Mike Firestone) Very good tone in letter. 1st P - not all of Union Square represented. Above II - "Built Natural Environment". Affordability misleading, no affordability in commercial space in special permit. III - more than 15 acres is an option not an obligation for master developer. (general comment) Problem with accessibility with Canopy City. Open meeting law - conflict of interest is important
3. CBA Committee Report and decisions
 - i. Created membership database, flyer, delegated tasks to people to create these. First plan is to find people who voted, fill out membership form (for contact), invite to CBA meeting
 - ii. Have some volunteers to print materials and canvas
 - iii. Would like to discuss options for finding a location and different meeting dates if other locations are available
- b. Membership form

- i. Approval requested
 - ii. discussion : Ann asked if addresses are clarified as home or business (peter suggests home or business checkbox) (ben bradlow suggests an extra line for business name
 - iii. Vote to approve flyer: unanimous yes (11) no (0)).
 - iv. We need a non-member voting form (peter suggests different form) (jacob suggests same form, extra checkbox) (jessica asks if form will be available electronically, jacob confirms yes) (pennie introduces website and agrees all information will be merged into database) (bill suggests vote on form) (jessica would like to know what happens after form is submitted - discussion postponed to communication)
 - v. Vote: unanimous yes (11) no (0)
 - c. Planning and organizing for the community meeting
 - i. Approval of one page flyer for meetings on 1/31/18 and 2/3/18
 - 1. Flyer can be posted or handed to someone. Gives some intro and idea into meeting expectations.
 - 2. Conversations about location: police station secured on wednesday by ann and michele. Jacob has been asking several locations for saturday venue and has not had luck. (ann suggested st anthony's, is asking for additional dates at the police station). Flyer will be printed in multiple languages, date and location needs to be confirmed before canvassing. (Liz suggests reaching out to Esther on Union Square Main Streets, Ben Bradlow is meeting with Esther tomorrow). (Mike suggests an overview of what Union Square Development is, Jacob confirms that is next item) (Ben Bradlow suggests redefining acres, Mike points out that what is stated on the flyer is accurate, Ben rescinds)
 - 3. Vote on flyer: yes (10) no (0), tori did not vote
 - ii. Approval of presentation creation plan
 - 1. Presentation has background on development and impact on neighborhood, what has been proposed and mentioned, then open up to discussion and break out groups. This will lead to consensus to determine what comes up most and participants will be able to submit comments after
 - 2. Discussion: (Ann suggests the Human Scale which explains urban development and would like to add it as an additional event) (Jacob announces meeting scheduled for next Tuesday and would like to receive any comments or suggestions until then) (bill suggests adding graphics to presentation, joanne offers images readily available from her website) (Jacob would like to push meeting out at least one week to better prepare for large meetings. Keep wed and sat as dates on the week.)
4. Built environment check-in (moved from 5)
- a. Met on Monday at 7pm on 1/15, tori sent out invitation 3hours prior to meeting

- b. Focus needs to be brought to built committee because it will be long term input regarding all phases of development
 - c. Built environment will give feedback to builders on designs, keeping public informed, oversee follow through on feedback for presentations, communicate with planning board
 - d. Tori will look for document that was supposed to be submitted to design feedback
 - e. Would also like to be involved with rest of development going on in union square
 - f. Would like to get 10-15 min in CBA large meeting to get a pitch
 - g. (wig reports there was a good representation in meeting, zero feedback for US2 proposal which is bad, reiterated CBA is only 1-2% of proposal) (rachel replies asking what a successful engagement process would be) (wig responds engagement in the built environment is the essential part at this point) (joanne suggests contacting rebecca on planning board for primary point of contact) (bill, public, would like to suggest a role for the committee to quantitate data for advocacy points) (michele asks wig for actual success) (bill cavellini states not having bell and whistle presentations) (wig states you have to engage on primary data of developer) (ben bradlow reminds everyone committee discussions should happen in the committee, attendance and minutes should be recorded and shared, would like to suggest to make built a working group rather than committee) (peter closes agenda)
5. Outreach and communications check-in
- a. Report
 - i. Pennie - met last night and had 6 people in attendance. Website was discussed, currently challenging, Junwa(?) and Weebly(?) discussed. Mobile compatibility, calendars, eForms. Two different sites will be created and compared.
 - ii. 100-150 statement from committee's to post onto website.
 - iii. File of all minutes and important documents currently all held on a single link on the website that only Ben Baldwin can edit.
 - iv. Emails for committee's will be at the discretion for each committee.
 - v. Mission statement to use for different events as an intro. Glossary to post all acronyms, would like crowdsourcing.
 - vi. CBA committee asked to help with outreach so contact list was split up to help future outreach efforts.
 - vii. Will add what happens after form is submitted will be added on agenda for next week.
 - viii. SCATV meeting is going to be set up soon for videography and what videography will look like.
 - b. Outreach suggestions
 - i. Ann - videography (would like to have 5-15min from the meeting to put on SCATV). Received email from peter levine to post 3-5min on SCATV and two pages completed in summary of the meeting. Thought of fr richard's counsel who has prior experience with SCATV (michele has two volunteers who would like to help).
 - ii. Bring a neighbor! An easy way to bring people to the meetings and introduce and set up home visits.

- iii. Discussion: (pennie would like to go beyond the communications group to sort out what will help or what will not) (bill cavellini put motion forward to have meetings video recorded, would like to make this official so proper training can occur, brian would like an institutional membership, bill has made it clear to brian that USNC does not have money) (jacob suggests being strategic when asking people to show up and believes a summary is sufficient) (gary would like videotape for specific records) (dennis thinks bring a neighbor is a good idea until everything is sorted out) *ganesh leaves at 8:22pm
 - iv. Pennie reiterates setting up meeting with SCAT to determine feasibility and restrictions. Bill Cavellini would like to move with motion to make SCAT to be an institutional member so people can be trained on how to take video
 - v. Vote for SCAT to be institutional member: unanimous yes (11) no (0)
- 6. Letter to BOA
 - a. Changes
 - i. Needed to take more time to discuss ongoing outreach and was not completely inclusive, will adapt most of wig's comments.
 - b. Comments
 - i. pennie - 3rd page tope line, one of those is not like the other
 - ii. Simon - conflict in 1st P, USNC is voting membership of the neighborhood, inaudible, does not like affordability, does not like educating we are here to listen, preventing displacement for low income people in union square; how defined?
 - iii. Gary - sue thomas if recognized by city that would make USNC public (mike responds bylaws define this org to be independent, nonprofit org. Some people in the city suggests that could be jeopardized, we will keep an eye on it)
 - iv. Tori - 2nd page 1st P she would like to see public spaces separated from commercial
 - v. Peter - put affordable housing and affordability at even playing field by separating the two from each other
 - c. Litigation
 - i. Plan was to send after final approval tonight with tweaks. Would like to add "tentatively" before meeting dates and include locations "tbd" (pennie confirms BOA is in outreach for follow up)
 - ii. Requests for response in writing by Jan 29, suggests putting a final line in before sincerely including a contact (will include co-chair's emails)
 - d. Vote - all yes (11) no (0)
- 7. Planning for open meeting law meeting on Monday, 1/22/18
 - a. Mike has Jonathan Sklarzak making a presentation about an open meeting law and how he advises public bodies to engage and adhere to law. Can offer current topics in open meeting law. (ben would like to add ethics issues, mike states this could be a separate topic) (michele take ethics test, mike responds move this to open meeting law and ethics meeting and mike will add to it)
 - b. Date and time - canopy city at 7:00pm

8. Bylaw committee discussion - tabled to online discussion. Ann would like it to be translated to basic understanding. Unanimous to table yes (11) no (0)
9. Future meeting logistics - space, facilitators, etc (liz can volunteer the space for normal meetings with appropriate notice for free) (rachel will reach out on the public discussion) (jessica suggests retails) (dennis suggests a flyer as to why we need help)
10. Public comment - all in favor of extending period yes (11) no (0)
 - a. Liz - asked board to keep open mind in spirit of collaboration with developer, caution to not alienate groups underrepresented. Public space should not be completely disregarded for future meetings since these are not business specific
 - b. Dennis - membership form online with google form, the sooner this can happen the easier this can be - benefit is an automatic response (pennie responds and invites dennis to next communication meeting)
 - c. Van - Becoming a public issue could be troublesome and would like to help
11. Adjourned 9:06pm

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Third Meeting January 10, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Mike Firestone, Ben Bradlow, Joanne Berry, Michele Hanson, Andrea Lizama, Ann Camara, Pennie Taylor, Afruza Akther, Tori Antonino, Ganesh Uprety, Ann Camara

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: 14

Co-Facilitators: Peter Insley, Pennie Taylor

Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
 - Pennie announced the co-facilitators and welcomed the group
 - There is a portable microphone from SCATV to record the meeting
2. Public Comment (10m)
 - General discussion about ethics violations: Asked specifically at beginning of first meeting that bylaws be left alone and begin electing officers. Identifying self as a board officer in the press 11.2, ethics 13.a, 13.c. Personal agendas are getting in the way of transparency.
 - i. The board appreciates voicing concerns. Because it's a new committee there is a learning curve. We are as transparent as we can be but there has to be discussion on the board that's been created. There need to be meetings that don't include public discussion. Each parcel has a year timeline. Could you provide resolution to some of these issues?
 - ii. Tori Antonino- We haven't been doing enough to be transparent. We need to have an informed discussion on open meeting laws. I have participated in some of these pre-committee meetings. All discussions need to be on a public listserve.
 - iii. Listserves are not a good vehicle for doing the communication we want to do.
 - iv. Pennie Taylor: There is a lot of labor that goes into every step that we have done. There needs to be an order of operations for how things move through committee.
3. Committee Check-ins:
 - Built Space: Upcoming Union Sq permits, dev items, zoning (10m)
 - i. Tori Antonino- Meeting has yet to be convened on this, hoping to do so in the next week. Will there be a listserve for the Built Environment Committee?
 1. There will be an update in the Communications Committee Update
 2. We need to determine the best media to hold these discussions
 3. Ben Bradlow: Clarification on types of meetings that have been occurring: there are some informal issues that arise in new institutions. One particular issue is establishment of committees. It's inevitable that some informal encounters

occur to get to a formal establishment. Each committee has met informally to develop a formal proposal for the board. There has been no closed meeting of any committee. We are moving toward a transparent structure as laid out in the bylaws.

4. Wig: I'm a member of many state board and committee, it's hard to bootstrap. Transparency is a big issue. Elected bodies do it 100% at a larger scale so it can be done. It will only get more difficult.
 5. Ben Bradlow: Open Meeting Laws discussion have been tabled at the last two meetings.
 6. There are a lot of stakeholders that aren't here, and some who question the legitimacy of the election and do not feel represented. We need to all have empathy for each other
- ii. Tori Antonino- Plan is to meet with Ben to find out how communications with the committee will work.
- o CBA Committee updated report, outreach (10m)
 - i. Jacob: Reportback on Sunday meeting. Minutes of the meeting has been sent out to the board and posted publicly.
 1. Organizational outreach- How do we engage the community to learn about the CBA process?
 2. We created an evolving list of stakeholders to reach out to in the beginning stages of this process.
 3. Replicate the USNC Working Group outreach process.
 4. Need a membership form, physical and digital. Peter Insley to do so
 5. Review of previous processes around CBA (LOCUS, CAC, UNION UNITED, etc)
 6. Jacob volunteered to come up with a draft of a flyer with a brief statement about CBAs and what to expect from a meeting
 7. Translation- everything that we have done so far has been exclusively in English. We are committed to changing that:
 - a. Ben Bradlow-Portuguese
 - b. Peter Insley- Spanish
 - c. We do not yet have other language connections figured out
 8. Glossary- list of development terms, translated
 9. Budget- We have a treasurer but no bank account. Relying on in-kind donations for these first efforts
 10. Motion to decide a date for a bigger more publicised event, need at least 2-3 weeks notice. Propose Wednesday January 31 and Saturday Feb 3 with duplicated program. Some informational component and some participatory component.
 - a. Discussion: Joanne Berry- Is this initial event to be part of Communications or CBA committee?
 - i. Jacob- This is a way of building membership so committees should work together. CBA committee would be creating the materials and Communications

committee can coordinate bringing materials to wider public

- ii. Wig-Issue about boundaries of CBA:
 - Previous speakers at CBA events characterized them as 1% of the value of the development. Is the USNC regarding fiscal and built form as outside or inside of the CBA?
 1. Ben Bradlow- This may be covered in Mike's letter and how we are recognized. Should the CBA schedule tied to the progress of the letter?
 2. Mike Firestone- Process of establishing legitimacy of organization as a community voice, The scope of the CBA depends on that process. We should schedule the big meeting because it's an opportunity to make good on the commitment made by Bill that, whether or not people feel the elected board represents everybody, we need to have a mechanism to bring people in. There is some value to having just one day.
 3. Michele- We have always done 2 in the working group.
 - iii. Ann Camara- Last week we took votes on the committees and their outlines being accepted. Wasnt the CBA outline not accepted?
 1. Jacob- We tabled that and it is not on the agenda today.
 2. Ann - how do we go on planning events without an accepted CBA?
 3. Michele- The formation of the committee was accepted by the structure of the proposal was tabled.
- b. Pennie: Motion to vote on dates proposed
 - i. Ben Bradlow: Seconded
 - ii. Point of clarification- what happens on these days?
 1. Jacob: information about CBAs and presentation of previous proposals. Then an opportunity for people to make their own proposals.
 2. CBA committee will compile a report that will be brought to the board.
 - iii. Michele Hansen- If we are doing so much at each meeting it will be good to have two

- iv. Joanne Berry- Interested in checking in on what US2 is anticipating
 - 1. Wig- important for someone to understand full scope of the development and react to that
 - c. Vote: 11 ayes
 - o [Firestone Letter](#) Discussion (15m)
 - i. Peter Insley- Let's take a few minutes to read the letter
 - ii. Mike Firestone- "Firestone Letter" will not be the final name of the document
 - iii. Mike Firestone
 - 1. Introduction of neighborhood council and specifically the board
 - 2. Solicit formal recognition to of our role in negotiating a CBA
 - 3. Establish our position as a recognized body on significant developments in the neighborhood.
 - 4. Critiques of my own letter- a lot of history went into engagement. We would like to act as the voice of the community. I don't think just the fact that the election occurred is enough to establish that we are this voice. We should announce some intentions to bring everybody into what we are doing.
 - a. We just agreed to host two participatory meetings to bring the community in (CBA education events). Letter should discuss more about what Communications committee intends to do.
 - 5. Ben Bradlow- Fantastic letter especially with proposed additions. Would only add description of committees and working groups we've established
 - 6. Mike Gintz- Important to communicate that board is a process not an entity. When we talk about bodies that have complete transparency, they are part of a framework of existing government. Emphasize that actions to increase inclusion are being taken.
 - 7. Colleen- In the spirit of inclusion, we should consider implications of hosting meetings in a police station which excludes segments of the population
 - 8. Simon Hill- There's an ideological component which misrepresents. On the surface it looks like 700 voters is a good thing but its not representative of the 16-20,000 people in wards 2 and 3. Suggesting that the election was remarkable is a stretch.
 - 9. Dennis- Piece is inconsistent with own council legitimacy "we have begun a series of membership meetings" There is a board but no official membership
 - a. Section 3 first paragraph- change "Union Sq residents" to "Union Sq citizens"
 - b. Mike Firestone- The word "citizens" can be problematic. I tried to adhere to words already used by the council to describe itself. Confusing to people the difference between "board" and "council"

- c. Peter “residents, tenants and business owners”
10. Peter Insley - Reads as if we’re begging for recognition.
 11. Mike Firestone- how should we agree on what a final draft looks like? There is nothing consistent with open meeting laws that allows people to send comments to Mike Firestone. Perhaps if comments can be sent to Mike Firestone and Ben Baldwin to be publicly posted.
 - a. Joanne- would you suggest we take the week to make comments, then an updated draft would be posted for comments before a final draft?
 - i. Mike Firestone- We would need to live with some imperfection in that process. Substantive comments should be sent to both Mike and Ben Baldwin, with comments being accepted until Jan 15. We have to produce a final draft, discuss whether to send it or go into further discussion.
 - ii. Jacob Kramer- Seconds moving forward with that proposal
 - iii. Mike Firestone- We are agreeing that we will take comments for the next five days posted publicly. At that point a final draft of the letter will be discussed at 1/17 meeting of the board to determine if that version can be submitted or if it requires further discussion in which case it should be reopened to the public.
 1. Ben Bradlow- We have no mechanism for online voting.
 2. Mike Firestone- We can have a conference call
 3. Mike Gintz- as a person who is not on the board but is a member- the board is empowered to make these decisions, don’t have to act as a subcommittee.
 4. Jacob- The mechanism for this is the board only discussion board, which is publicly viewable.
 5. Simon- Why can’t the final draft be reviewed in a public meeting before submission.
 6. Gary- Agree with Mike Gintz about having empowered the board to make certain decisions. Elephant in the room regarding election- This could go on for a while once submitted to US2 and the city.
 12. Wig- This letter outlines 3 areas only 1 of which is the CBA. Still unclear how much of area will be developed.

Need to think about scope covering more than just US2 parcels (eg Post Office)

- a. Consider that appeal is to the city for legitimacy
- b. What form of organizations is Union Square associates?

13. Liz- Section 3 reads as a document for residents as opposed to businesses etc.

- Communications digital plan (10 m)
 - i. New web site: Need to find a platform, address cost issues, anchor that links to minutes, active Google Docs/ blog Pages for committees, Maps, calendar, existing docs from process, city, developers.
 - ii. Membership form: Peter Insley drafting.
 - iii. Mike Gintz updated: to remove link to the old discussion groups, to add links to the new discussion groups, and to note that new Committees will be forming and that folks should stay tuned.
 - iv. Amassing existing docs: Tori Antonino
 - v. **Discussions lists:** 2 new: usnc-board and usnc-public
 - vi. Both are 100% publicly readable.
 - vii. Board email list: Open viewable board conversations. Ben Baldwin is admin and will confirm all view requests. Only board members can post
 - viii. USNC Public: Anyone can post, though people must join the group first. The Public list will probably need to be moderated eventually, so we should discuss further about whose responsibility that will be and what rules/code of conduct they'll follow in doing it. Previous list will be present but not accepting new messages. Please use the same conduct as meetings.
 - ix. **Outreach materials to develop:**
 1. Glossary for commonly used acronyms and terms. Will be printed and available at meetings and on website. Start with model from Ben Baldwin, modify for Union Square specific language.
 2. FAQ about USNC
 3. Translations of FAQ, glossary
 4. Outreach Mission: look at models from other neighborhood councils, draft work in progress.
- 1. What does the web site need to include
 2. Currently the web site is on a Markdown web site on GitHub so if you don't know how to edit it is a problem. This is the reason for switching to a more easily updated web site.
 3. Working group discussions channel is open, and other groups are viewable but not open to discussion.
 4. We knew that email communication was not public enough but until now there was no digital way to communicate

1. Gary Proposal to hold a meeting soon
 2. Ben Baldwin proposes to host a meeting soon for the Communications committee
 - a. Jacob Kramer- Seconded
 - b. Ben Bradlow- ask that committee take up all communications issues brought up in this committee and report back to the board
4. Working group updates
- MEPA working grp update (10m)
 - i. Full text of update available
 - ii. First step- get in touch with US2 to determine their plan for submission and follow it to make sure it follows protocol.
 - iii. Wig- There must be a full environmental impact report
 1. The big question for developer is whether to do full blown impact report or to ask for a waiver on phase one and postpone the full report.
 2. If they do seek a waiver the board should determine whether or not to oppose it.
 - a. They tend to give waivers on big developments. Public comments should cover a variety of topics because duplicates get thrown away.
 - iv. Joanne- please contact Joanne or Michele to express interest in joining the working group.
 1. Mike Firestone- we should ask people that we know have expertise if they can join the working group
 2. Ann Camara- There are people who may not have expertise but they may want to learn more.
 - Pennie -Motion to table rest of discussion in order to address Open Meeting laws next on agenda
 - i. Ben Baldwin seconded
5. Open Meeting Laws (10m)
- Tori Antonino- This should be an entire meeting. Move to table this to an entire meeting with presentations. Need to know limitations and benefits.
 - i. Michele- we should take the opportunity now to at least talk about it. Consider that we don't have the capacity or resources to address every issue in depth.
 - ii. Joanne- Let's discuss what would need to be done in order to prepare for this longer open meeting laws meeting.
 - iii. Requirements are pretty straightforward in statute, but what needs more thought is why would we do it? Eg. Legal reasons or activities we want to engage in that impose that obligation. Or just as a good faith effort for the community. Are there realistic constraints in implementing open meeting laws? Are there solutions to those constraints?
 - iv. Ben Bradlow- Emphasize urgency of this matter. A meeting to address this topic needs to happen in the next week or two. We have had discussion about inclusion and openness. Open meeting laws are probably not perfect but are the most clearly accepted standard for inclusion that exists.
 - v. Question about interim between working out open meetings. Will publicizing meetings be open to the general public.

1. This will be on the web site, but committees haven't formed to enough of a degree to have streamlined this process.
2. Important that outreach be made to Union Square Main Streets
 - a. Web site could link to a google calendar that has all committee meetings on it.
- Michele- Motion to have a meeting on open meeting laws
 - i. Pennie- What type of meeting will this be? Require a vote or just informational?
 - ii. Ben Bradlow- there is a webinar each month with a training on open meeting laws. January 18 9:30-11am is the next one. We may want to schedule our meeting after that.
6. Meeting logistics (15m)
 - Spaces
 - i. Greentown labs would need to know more than a week in advance and have details on numbers.
 1. 1/11 there will be a public event at Greentown Labs, giving USNC a chance to check out the space
 - ii. Tori Antonino- We can reach out to Canopy at any time
 - Scheduling
 - i. Ben Bradlow- Propose general meeting Wednesday 1/17, excluding substantive open meeting discussion. 7pm.
 1. Tori to confirm location
 - ii. Open Meeting Laws mtg- Propose 1/22
 1. Tori to confirm location
 - Media Coverage
 - i. Gary- Tori and I will be trained on how to do recording.
 1. Weekly cable show on neighborhood news- Communications Committee should work out which portions of our video to be put on this show.
 - Inclusionary logistics
 - Facilitators
 - i. 1/17 Meeting: Proposal to assign someone for this meeting but send out a message to general public soliciting future facilitators
 1. Pennie- Motion to assign determination of facilitators to co-chairs
 - a. Ben Baldwin seconds
7. Bylaw committee (10m)
 - Tabled for 1/17 meeting agenda
 - i. Ann Camara and Joanne Berry to spearhead report.
8. Public Comment Period
 - This process will be as successful as how involved we get the rest of the community. Need advance notice of agenda and materials. List of membership- who does it represent?
 - It's important that we have an actual membership as stated in the bylaws. Great that it's coming together. Perception is that the "greater board" is not being included. Need to know who the membership is.
 - i. Peter- form is nearly done
 - Question about US2 and who they actually are- Landlord at Green City Growers. Out of Chicago
 - i. User friendly web interfaces- Squarespace and Weebly

- ii. Nondigital communications are important, not just through the internet
 - iii. Emphasize importance of finding a new location
- Meeting times: 7 is way better than 6:30. Weekends should also be explored for scheduling.
- Intersection between extending our outreach and the community benefits agreement. When negotiations come about US2 is going to say they've already been assessed for many regulations and "we have no more money." If there are no representatives that are businesspeople on the CBA committee they may be seen as ideological zealots.
 - i. This adds legitimacy and imparts negotiation wisdom to the committee.
- Tori Antonino-Bow St Marketplace will come before planning board tomorrow night.
- Michele Hansen- Voters in the election should have been used as list of membership
 - i. Ben Bradlow- There was a list of everyone who voted- where is it?
 - ii. Wig- 2 lists- one of voters and one of people interested in being contacted. Last person to hold them was Philip, Karen, and/or Fred. Someone should contact them.

9. Adjourn

Union Square Neighborhood Council - Second Meeting January 3, 2018

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Mike Firestone, Ben Bradlow, Rachel Weil, Joanne Berry, Michele Hanson, Andrea Lizama, Erik Neu, Bill Cavellini, Ann Camara, Pennie Taylor, Afruza Akther, Tori Antonino, Ganesh Uprety

-

Neighborhood Resident Members: 15

Co-Facilitators: Rachel Weil, Bill Cavellini

Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
 - o Agreement to participation read by Ann Camara
 - o Rachel welcomed the group and led introductions
2. Public Comment
 - o Parking in residential areas- US2 hasn't given a straight answer as to how parking will be configured. Hoping we can push them and the city for more clarity.
 - o Joanne- Motion to introduce an item to CBA. Maintenance and snow shoveling prior to and after development of land.
 1. DPW should take care of it- still city owned
 2. We need a map of who owns what- US2 will never own the majority of the parcels adjacent to sidewalk
 - o Defining area of interest- Will the neighborhood council's purview be narrowly defined around CBA or will it be more broadly defined to zoning.
 1. Will be determined in the committee structure
 2. Difference between isolated zoning issues and the full zoning code as it applies to union square.
 - o There should be a communications plan in place sooner rather than later
 1. Will be in the open meeting law discussion and communications committee report back
 - o Assembly Row zoning meeting postponed but we should keep an eye on it.
3. Upcoming Union Square Permits, Development Items
 - o Massachusetts Environmental Protection Agency – Bill Cavellini- Where is US2 in the process of filing? Is it possible they're filing for a waiver? They are likely already in the process of producing a report on the environmental impact of their development.
 1. This is the last regulatory step aside from design review that US2 must pass

2. Ben Bradlow- Motion to establish a working group to determine where US2 is in that process
 1. Michele Hanson seconds
 2. Mike Firestone this could be categorized under built environment committee
 3. Ben Bradlow- Establishing a working group will be more expedient
 4. Michele Hanson would like to participate in the working group. Joanne Berry would like to participate in the working group.
 5. MEPA process is split into factors that are state jurisdictional and non-state jurisdictional. This level of an issue requires all hands on deck. Expected to be filed this month. Should set up education settings to allow people to make environmental comments while embracing those in the community with particular expertise.
 6. Ben Bradlow - Motion to table discussion until after built environment committee discussion.
 1. Michele hanson seconds
 - o Community Development Special Permit – Ensure contingencies are fulfilled as development continues
4. Committee Description Drafting Report Back
 - o Built Environment Committee
 1. Presentation
 2. Discussion
 1. Tori-May make sense to split zoning into its own committee
 1. Ben Bradlow- It would be feasible to keep it in one committee. Zoning is passed, matter of monitoring if plans are consistent.
 2. Wig- zoning will almost certainly be changed
 2. Ben- Motion to form a working group to focus on the MEPA process
 1. Bill seconds
 2. Vote- unanimous “ayes”
 3. Resolution
 1. Joanne Berry, Michele Hanson to head MEPA working group
 - o Outreach & Communications Committee
 1. Presentation
 2. Discussion
 1. Erik Neu- Inbound alignment of releases from the city
 2. Joanne- Include current and future businesses (ie those moving into US2 development)

3. Mike Firestone- Authority of the USNC is tied up in engagement of the community. Particularly while we're new. We should determine a date to make a release updating folks on what we've done so far.
4. Important to determine how communications intersects with other committees- need to get people out for MEPA discussions
5. Civic media- MIT and Emerson looking for project ideas for the spring.
6. Pennie Taylor- What tools can we build to create community understanding of the process and serve as a role model for other neighborhood councils
7. Joanne Berry- can we develop a timeline for the creation of the committee including an education session on MEPA?
 1. Rachel- Allow the MEPA working group to meet and propose a way to incorporate the communications committee.

3. Resolution

1. Ben Bradlow – Moves that we form the committee
 1. Michele Hanson seconds
 2. Unanimous “ayes”
 3. What is the role of nonvoting members in the committees?
 1. Volunteer.
 4. Secretary to post on the web site that committee has been formed and that they should contact for inclusion
 1. Secretary should sit on or chair the committee
2. Need to create a membership form, Members will need to maintain
 1. Joanne volunteers to do so

o Community Benefits Agreement Committee

1. Presentation
2. Discussion
3. Resolution
 1. Mike Firestone- Suggest that feedback be reviewed and proposal presented.
 1. Move forward with the process described in the CBA Committee proposal on a volunteer basis without yet forming a defined committee.
 2. Ben Bradlow- move to table the proposal but to move forward creating the committee
 1. Bill seconds
 1. Vote - Unanimous “ayes”

- o Articles of Incorporation Committee
 1. Presentation
 2. Discussion
 1. Motion to approve Mike Firestone as primary drafter in consideration of the availability of these drafts to the public
 1. Does this mean draft will be available on the 7th, 72 hours prior to the meeting on the 10th
 2. We can put the item on the agenda, review the draft in meeting.
 2. Issue of form of liability- are board members individually liable or is there a corporate entity.
 3. Definition of “large-scale” and “developer” needs more detail
 1. Ben Bradlow- Move to table discussion until we have a draft letter for review
 1. Ann Camara seconded
 2. Unanimous “ayes”
 3. Resolution
 - o Expectation of Committees
 1. Committee to acquire materials, review, come up with a recommendation to the USNC for feedback, incorporate feedback, approve.
5. Meeting Logistics
- o Rachel Weil - Motion to limit discussion to time and space
 1. Joanne seconds
 - o Scheduling
 1. Jacob Kramer proposes January 10
 - o Spaces
 1. Canopy Space - Michele Hanson expressed approval of the space
 1. Tori Antonino to determine availability of the space on January 10
 - o Media Coverage
 1. SCATV is still working out logistics, Gary Trujillo will take responsibility for bringing a camera and recording USNC meetings.
 - o Inclusionary Logistics (Translation, child care)
6. Open meeting Laws
- o Tabled
7. Adjourn

Union Square Neighborhood Council - First Meeting December 19, 2017

Attendance

USNC Voting Members:

Mike Firestone, Rachel Weil, Michele Hanson, Andrea Lizama, Erik Neu, Bill Cavellini, Ann Camara, Pennie Taylor, Afruza Akther, Tori Antonino

- Via Skype: Joanne Berry, Ben Bradlow

Neighborhood Members:

29 Attendees

Motion to nominate a facilitator: Jacob nominates Bill Cavellini

Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
 - a. Bill Cavellini welcomed the group to the meeting and began introductions
 - b. Bill gave an overview of the agenda
2. Election of officers: co-chairs + secretary + treasurer
 - a. Mike Firestone nominates Bill Cavellini as co-chair
 - i. Michele seconds
 - b. Jacob Kramer nominates Rachel Weil as co-chair
 - i. Ben Bradlow seconds
 - c. Afruza nominates Pennie as co-chair
 - i. Jacob seconds
 - d. Pennie prefers to run as treasurer and withdraws her candidacy as co-chair
 - i. Result: Bill Cavellini and Rachel Weil are co-chairs
 - e. Pennie Taylor nominates herself as treasurer
 - i. Motion to institute Pennie as treasurer by acclamation
 1. Unanimous "ayes"
 - f. Ann Camara nominates Joanne Berry as secretary
 - i. Afruza seconds
 - g. Jacob Kramer nominates Ben Baldwin as secretary
 - i. Mike Firestone seconds
 - h. Ben Baldwin and Joanne Berry gave statements as candidates for Secretary
 - i. Board agrees to take vote by secret ballot
 - j. Tori Speaks in favor of Joanne based on note-taking skills
 - k. Erik praises Ben Baldwin's planning
 - l. Pennie speaks in favor of Ben Baldwin
 - m. Point of order from Andy Greenspon – the minutes state that all votes not otherwise specified must be done in public
 - n. Resolved to vote in public
 - i. Joanne: 7
 - ii. Ben Baldwin: 7
 - iii. Tied!
 - o. Rachel proposes Co-Secretaries
 - p. Ben Bradlow asserts that officers can be added as needed
 - q. Jacob suggests a second poll because the office of secretary is crucial
 - r. Andy greenspon suggests 2 6-month terms
 - s. Michele suggests a second ballot
 - i. Seconded by Andrea

- t. Joanne:3
- u. Ben:10
 - i. Result: Ben Baldwin is Secretary
- 3. Establishing committees:
 - a. Bill gave an overview of relevant bylaws
 - b. Recommendation of the following committees:
 - i. CBA negotiation committee
 - ii. Communications/outreach committee
 - iii. Built environment advisory committee
 - c. Ben Bradlow suggests to establish a delegation of members of the board to generate a proposal for the characteristics and skills required for each committee and bring proposal to the next meeting
 - i. Jacob- We should have an overview of what each committee does so that they aren't duplicating efforts, frequency of report-backs, protocol for actions of committees
 - ii. Mike Firestone- committee structures gives opportunity to neighbors who are not on the council to engage
 - iii. Tori- Gives potential committee-members the chance to align with a platform
 - iv. Erik- Point of clarification- if someone lives outside boundaries, are they only able to participate through working groups?
 - v. Bill – Are we appointing committees or soliciting volunteers?
 - 1. Jacob- Council board is given power to select a board for CBA negotiation
 - vi. Ben Bradlow- Committee to create committees will do nothing more than present the skills required of each committee at the next meeting
 - 1. Change the name of the “CBA negotiation committee” to the “CBA committee”
 - vii. Mike Firestone- Suggests a proposal to amend bylaws to clarify 7.1 that non-council members can serve on committees. Current language is unclear.
 - 1. Michele – Nonvoting members can participate on committees but not vote
 - viii. Ben Bradlow- Are there any other committees that we want to explore? Proposal to solicit a volunteer to present committees at next meeting
 - 1. Michele - Eventually we will need a bylaw committee
 - 2. Pennie- bylaws include code of conduct committees, membership committees
 - d. Mike Firestone seeks a volunteer for the Communications & Outreach Committee
 - i. Pennie Taylor nominates herself
 - 1. Erik Neu- point to point conversations can be had via email but board level discussions must be made public
 - 2. Resident- Communications committee should determine the procedures for communication
 - 3. Mike Firestone- short term solution can be between current web site coordinator (Mike Gintz) and current Secretary (Ben Baldwin)
 - a. Long term solution can be determined but C&O Committee

- 4. Mike Gintz - Official board announcements would have to go through secretary
 - a. In the interim- should we put emails on the web site?
 - b. Pennie Taylor- motion to make posting of contact info opt-in only.
 - ii. Michele- Clarification: We will make the Tiny mailbox the only official announcement source?
 - 1. Yes-Adopted by acclamation
 - e. Michele- What is the built environment committee
 - i. Erik Neu – Zoning, planning board, etc
 - ii. Bill Cavellini- All built environment related things will be held within this one committee for now.
 - f. Mike Firestone- seeks a volunteer to give an overview of the Built Environment Committee
 - i. Tori Antonino nominates herself
 - g. Ben Bradlow volunteers himself to draft a description of the CBA committee
 - h. Ben Bradlow suggests forming a bylaw committee
 - i. Jacob nominates Mike Firestone to draft a description
 - i. Results- Presentations at next meeting will be the following
 - i. Ben Bradlow on CBA committee, Ann Camara & Pennie Taylor on Communications & Outreach, Tori Antonino Built Environment, Michele Hanson and Mike Firestone- Approach to board of alderman for recognition
- 4. Recognition by Board of Aldermen
 - a. To be reviewed at next meeting by the Board of Alderman recognition committee (Mike Firestone)
- 5. Scheduling next meetings
 - a. Tori- need to contact business community regarding best meeting days and times
 - i. Bill - Get that input between now and next meeting for presentation
 - b. Ben Bradlow- Proposal to meet January 3 and January 10
 - i. Jacob seconds idea for two meetings but dates to be determined based on input from Tori and business community
 - ii. By Dec 27th Tori will provide input from Union Sq Main Streets to determine second date
 - iii. Pennie raises issue of scheduling too many meetings in quick succession given the stringency of the section 3.3.4 of the bylaws where 3 absences can cause removal from board.
 - 1. Mike Gintz- 3 absences does not necessitate removal it only allows for removal if it is necessary.
 - iv. Next meeting of the USNC will be Wednesday, January 3 at 6:30 in the public safety building
 - c. Tori- USNC has been invited to meet at Canopy – responding to concerns about meeting at the police station
 - i. Bill- Let's give folks the chance to see Canopy while agreeing to have next meeting at the Public Safety Building
 - ii. Tori makes a motion to have Matt Hoey from Canopy come make a presentation about his meeting space
 - iii. Jacob requests discussion on this.

1. Board agrees to check out space on own time
2. Resident requests vote wait until after the public comment period
- d. Ben Bradlow- Should the board vote to abide by public meeting law?
 - i. Mike Firestone- this is a serious discussion and the board should not agree to be held to open meeting law without more consideration.
 - ii. Vote tabled until next meeting
6. Review and approval of by-laws
 - a. Already approved in a referendum
7. Public Comment Period
 - a. Bill Cavellini- Future meetings should begin with a public comment period before business agenda. Motion to move public comment periods to beginning of agenda
 - i. Mike Firestone Co-chair gets to design meeting agenda
 - ii. Unanimous acclamation vote to move public comment to the front of the agendas
 - b. Resident- Showcasing cool spaces- Greentown Labs is willing to provide meeting space. Anyone who has a suitable facility should be eligible to host a meeting
 - c. Resident- SCATV is not here and they had agreed to cover all our meetings. Will check for next one
 - d. Resident- Public comment can include 1 or more times on the agenda
 - i. Best not to get bogged down in bylaws while US2 and the mayor fast track the development
 - e. Resident – Membership meetings should be scheduled “well in advance” so the next meeting probably can’t be considered as such
 - i. What is “reasonable advance notice” with regards to child-care?
 1. Pennie- agenda for next meeting can include how we respond to this concern
 - ii. Spaces- there will be a need for committee and working group spaces so we will be able to take advantage of many spaces
 - iii. Placing public comment at the beginning of agenda could lead to a lot of time taken away from main agenda
 - f. Resident- Express concerns about reaching out to business community during the holiday season and a request to extend time until next meeting
 - g. Resident- If approved by board at next meeting, Canopy can welcome the council to the third meeting
 - h. Resident- unclear if the USNC can get an agreement with the city if we are not abiding by open meeting regulations
 - i. US2 doesn’t operate under open meeting laws and the city is negotiating with them
 1. CBA expects to result in use of public money, which necessitates abiding by city-defined rules.
 - i. Resident- City doesn’t currently have a plan or requirement for where community benefits ordinance is directed (eg funds can be put toward a local nonprofit rather than USNC). Covenant states that US2 must enter good faith negotiations with USNC, solicitor moves to make negotiations between US2 and a local nonprofit. Under deliberation.
 - i. Distribute minutes from legislative committee to the board on this topic

- ii. Resident- good for the council to speak to other boards and committees in the city and planning offices.
 - iii. Resident- this is ambiguous. Get an opinion from state ethics commissioner
- 8. Determining co-facilitators for next meeting:
 - a. Board to email out to USNC to solicit co-facilitators
- 9. Bill: Motion to adjourn