

Approved by
the Select Board on:

6/9/2021

SELECT BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, MAY 24, 2021

REMOTE MEETING

7:00 PM

RECEIVED
TOWN CLERK
BELMONT, MA

DATE: September 2, 2021

TIME: 2:15 PM

CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Select Board was called to order at 7:00 pm by Chair Adam Dash. Vice Chair Roy Epstein and Select Board member Mark Paolillo were present, along with Town Administrator Patrice Garvin, Assistant Town Administrator Jon Marshall, Director of Community Glenn Clancy, Director of the DPW Jay Marcotte and Director of the COA Nava Niv-Vogel

COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Community Forum on Hate Incidents at Belmont Public Schools sponsored by Community Organized for Solidarity on May 27th at 7:30 on Zoom.
- Committee applicants wanted for 2021 annual committee appointment process. Apply online at Town portal. Application due by June 11, 2021.
- Memorial Day Observation will be held at 11 am at Belmont Cemetery on Grove St. on May 31, 2021. Attendance will be limited at cemetery and parade will not be held.
- Meet and Greet with new Fire Chief David DeStefano on June 4th at 10am at Beech St. Center (in-person event). Register at 617-993-2976.
- Talk with Doc: Presentation on Dementia a Virtual Health Education Talk will be held on June 8th from 11 am - 12 pm. Contact Dana Bickelman at 617-993-2977
- Breakfast with Presentation Rehabilitation Skilled Care Center on June 2nd at 9:30 am (in-person event). Register at 617-993-2976.
- New Transportation Options for Belmont Residents. Seniors can book a ride through Alternative Transportation at 857-364-6570.

COMMENTS FROM TOWN RESIDENTS

- Harry Hoffman asked if there was another format available for Select Board viewing. Dash said this is the only format available.
- Sharon Clarke is concerned about Concord Ave. restriping. Dash said they will be discussing that item later on in the meeting.

ACTION BY CONSENT

Presentation of the Age Friendly Action Plan by the Age Friendly Advisory Council

- Nava Niv-Vogel, Director of the Belmont COA, listed the members of the council and thanked them for the work that went into this project. The five-year action plan was formed to look at how Belmont can improve aging for residents. The plan was informed by the previous Age Friendly Report in 2018. The project meetings on the plan were started shortly before the pandemic and the council was able to complete the plan by April 2021. The national AARP

review team approved the plan and re-certified Belmont as an age friendly community until May 2024.

- The Action Plan does not require money from the Town, except for indirect support from Town staff.
- The plan sets goals in four key areas: Housing, Transportation, Outdoor Spaces, and Communication. Goals were classified with short- and long-term action plans and divided into two time periods: 2022-23 and 2023-24:
 - Housing improvements: assess community interest in aging-in-place through resident surveys and focus groups, develop a guide to home modification processes aimed at safety, locate grants to distribute guide, and support zoning changes for ADUs in Belmont.
 - Transportation improvements: continued evaluation of the existing pilot parking permit program, enhancement of safe bikeway and pathway use, exploration of more ride sharing options.
 - Outdoor space improvements: work with other Town departments and committees to advocate and apply for grants for Age Friendly features in any new projects.
 - Communication improvements: enhance visibility by revamping current website to increase communications across all sectors of community, establish the Age Friendly Action Committee as a hub for age friendly communications, create long term clearing house for volunteer program.
- An Age Friendly Action Committee will be established to help implement the plan.
- Epstein noted that the next big step will be developing a charge for the committee.

Motion made to adopt the Age Friendly Action Plan as produced by the Belmont Age Friendly Council. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

Discussion and possible vote on the request to co-sponsor the 2nd Belmont Pride Parade on Saturday, June 12, 2021 at 1:00 PM.

- Fran Yuan said they will follow same route as last year. Co-sponsors are: Belmont Human Rights Commission, Belmont against Racism, Belmont LGBTQ Alliance, Black and Brown in Belmont, and Unitarian Church in Belmont. She is asking the Select Board to endorse the parade. The parade will begin at the Unitarian Church in Belmont.
- Garvin said no police detail would be needed, but if necessary, police will be available.

Motion was made to co-sponsor the 2nd Belmont Pride Parade on Sat. June 12 at 1 pm starting at the Unitarian Church. Motion approved by a vote of 3-0.

Discussion and possible vote on positions for articles and amendments for Annual Town Meeting, Segment B

Presentations on a few articles will be made tonight by petitioners.

Standard Articles 13, 15, 17, 18, and 20 need to be voted. These articles have already been discussed at previous Select Board meetings.

Article 13 – FY21 Transfer Water Retained Earnings.

This item was already been voted at September Town Meeting. The Department of Revenue is asking for re-vote.

Motion was made for Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 13. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0

Article 15 – Salaries of Elected Officials.

Motion was made for Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 15. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0

Article 17 – Establish Expenditure Limitation for Revolving Funds.

Motion was made for Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 17. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

Article 18 – Appropriation of Transportation grant (Uber tax).

Motion was made for Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 18. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

Article 20 – Appropriation to OPEB Stabilization Fund.

Motion was made for Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 20. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

Article 21 – Transfer to General Stabilization Fund

The article will be dismissed due to unsuccessful override.

COMMENTS ON ABOVE ARTICLES:

Harry Hoffman is concerned that three people control the voice of the people. He thinks there should be more participation from the Town in general. He wondered what effect the non-binding suggestions make?

Dash said the Warrant Articles have been on the website for awhile and there have been a number of public forums and processes about the articles. The Select Board makes non-binding recommendations on the Town Meeting articles, and these votes do not bind Town Meeting.

Paolillo said the only appropriative body is Town Meeting and they are the only body that can vote the appropriation for the budget.

Dash reminded the public that the Town committee appointment process is currently open for people who want to get involved.

Article 11 – Resolution for Fossil Free New Construction

This article has already been approved by a vote of 3-0 at an earlier Select Board meeting.

Article 7 – The BRAVE Act.

Aaron Pikcilingis, the petitioner, has revisions to Article 7 and wants to share research done since last discussion.

- The amendment asks that the Select Board provide a report to the Town Meeting members during the first five years of enforcement. Dash said he thinks that other departments would be better fit to issue this report because of confidentiality. Pikcilingus said the Town Clerk thought that an annual report should go to the Select Board to make sure costs are viable.
- Dash suggested holding off voting on the amendment for the June 2nd Select Board meeting. He's not sure that the Select Board is the right body to be reviewing this report and he would like to hear from Town Attorney George Hall first. Dash said the Town Moderator will direct the votes for each section separately at Town Meeting.
- Dash asked if there would be means testing to make sure applicants are eligible. Pikcilingus said he has been working with the Warrant Committee and George Hall on this issue and they have said that means testing may not reflect the spirit of the law. The vote at Town Meeting would allow the Select Board to design the program.
- Epstein feels there are significant financial implications and there is no financial modeling to review. He doesn't understand what can be means tested. He thinks the Town would be better served if we raised these items in the Fall Town Meeting instead.
- Paolillo says a number of communities have adopted the same article and sometimes cost is not as important as the support we can provide for veterans. If we think further analysis is needed, we can do that later. He is fully prepared to support this article.
- Bob Reardon, Chair of Board of Assessors, commented that it would be better to have a clearer estimation of costs. He said that we don't know how many people would be taking advantage of this. We only have gross numbers right now and a means test may not be possible.
- Paolillo commented that unless the proponent wants to withdraw it, we have to vote on it.
- Dash said we don't have all the data yet. We can't vote on the amendment tonight because George Hall is not here. We could wait until June 2nd to vote the amendment.
- Pikcilingis said the only remaining ambiguity on costs is around employee pay, and that impact has been estimated to be between \$18K and 72K per year with an average of \$25.6K. A number of simulations have been made using a computer model. Dash said it might make sense to share that analysis with Epstein so the Select Board can have more information.
- Dash said the most costly item is the overlap of Town employee and Veteran's pay. He thinks that is the only provision that should be delayed until the Fall Town Meeting. Pikcilingis said he will supply more analyses to Epstein before the June 3rd Town Meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS on ARTICLE 7:

Lisa Pargoli wondered why we have to make Veterans work for their money. She thinks Article 7 should be passed without further scrutiny.

Timothy Flood said he hasn't heard anything from Bob Upton. Pikcilingus said Upton cannot have a position because he's not a policy making member of the town, but he has talked to him about the issue.

Joe Bernard thinks that calculating the impact of the pay provision is not important. There are not an infinite number of variables. The differential is the cost between town and military pay. Dash reminded him that the provision also impacts pension and OPEB benefits.

Elizabeth Dionne (Warrant Committee member) expressed her appreciation to Select Board members for monitoring the costs related to this amendment. She said that there is a cost involved because the article will put further burden on Town employees.

Article 12 – Community Preservation Committee (CPC) FY22 budget

Dash said the Select Board voted favorable action on Article 12 separately on March 1, 2021, but that was before Paolillo joined the Board. Paolillo asked if there was a fair amount that wasn't appropriated. Dionne said the CPC only responds to the proposed projects. Elizabeth Dionne said there are big costs coming up, including the design of Phase II of the Community Path. Also, we have funded studies to expand the publicly owned community affordable housing. We are going to need grants for these projects. She is glad that there are some reserves. Four projects were submitted and the CPC approved all of them.

Dash said there were presentations from each proponent of the Article 12 budget before Paolillo joined the Select Board. Paolillo said he does not need to hear from the proponents again. Epstein said the article does not propose to pay for easements, it's for appraisal work.

PUBLIC COMMENTS on ARTICLE 12:

Russ Leino (Chair of Community Path Committee) corroborated that the funding for the request is for the preliminary steps for securing right of way for the Community Path. Mass DOT has a specific process. This request is for the work preceding the legal work. We anticipate the need for a future request for CPC to fund compensation for possible impacts.

Judith Feinleib said residents have been told we don't have to pay for the Community Path. Dash said that the Town has to pay for design and takings for the project, but we don't pay for construction, the federal government pays for that. She queried whether we should be doing the Community Path under the current budget restrictions.

Elizabeth Dionne, (Chair of CPC) said that the challenge is that the Town approved that amount on Community Housing, Historic Preservation or Open Space/Recreation. Belmont gets state matching funds on these appropriations, and if we violate the provisions of the act then we have to pay back fines. These are not fungible funds. If we wanted to spend funds elsewhere, we would have to reject the Community Preservation Fund and forgo the State matching funds.

Lisa Pargoli questioned why we are not using the \$200K study that was approved for the South side for Community Path design? Dash said there was a public process. We originally had voted for the South side but it didn't work out.

Paul Roberts would like to move ahead on the Community Path. He thinks it is vital infrastructure and will be a huge boost to businesses.

Adam Zilcoski (teacher at Belmont High) supports the Community Path. He bikes from Boston and he uses the path around Cambridge that connects to Belmont.

Harry Hoffman is in favor of the path. He asked how does the path relate to the restriping project on Concord Ave.? Dash said the Community Path goes to Alewife where people can take T and the restriping involves another path to Boston.

Epstein said that when the Community Path on the North route was proposed, the assumption was that the route was secured. Epstein doesn't see how an appraisal can be done if we don't know how much more land is needed on the French and Mahoney property. He said an appraisal could be based on the cost per sq. foot of land for a small area, however, if an easement involves a large fraction of the parcel the appraisal might require the value of the business. He thinks appraisals should not be done until the easement areas are identified.

Russ Leino said that the process of 25% design will be analyzed in the right-of-way package. The appraisal won't happen until that work is done. It's allowing us to continue with the work of getting the path designed and securing the right-of-way. He said these are good questions, and those areas will be affected, but we need to move forward with the rest of the design over the next year.

- Epstein said there is philosophical issue. The original proposal that was presented said that permanent takings won't be necessary, now we are finding it may be necessary to have a permanent taking. But if it's a taking that may put a business out of business, he will not support that. Russ said he doesn't think this statement is correct. Leino said he thinks this is spreading confusion and not rooted in the work of the consultant. Leino said we don't know full appraisal needs, but to jump to the assumption that the business will be put out of business is misleading.
- Paolillo said we have made a commitment that we will meet with residents. We are going to work with those issues with the residents.
- Leino said they expect submission of the 25% design project by late Summer/early Fall. A public hearing about acceptance of formal design will come later.
- Dionne appreciates Epstein's questions. She wants to focus on the \$200k. As Chair she is sensitive to our funding process. She said we have up to 30 months to spend Community Preservation Act funds and we have made significant investments in the Community Path so funding is available when necessary.
- The Select Board had voted unanimously on all four projects in the Community Preservation Committee budget in a previous meeting. Paolillo said he doesn't need to vote. He is in favor of all four sections. Epstein said when they voted about 40 Brighton St. the full information about the required easement was not available. Dash said that it was evident that there may be some properties that would need easements when we voted on March 1 when Mr. French and Mr. Catarino spoke on this issue.
- Paolillo said all permanent takings have to be approved by the Select Board. He doesn't support permanent takings but we don't know that yet and we have to keep moving forward on the design plan.

Motion #1 was made that the Select Board recommend favorable action on the motion within Article 12 that the town reserve for appropriation the following amounts from FY22 estimated receipts of \$1,300,000 as recommended by the Community Preservation Committee:

1) \$130,000 for open space/recreation

2) \$130,000 for historical preservation

3) \$130,000 for community housing

4) \$855,000 for the budgeted reserve

5) \$80,000 for administrative expenses.

Motion #1 was approved by vote of 3-0.

Motion #2 was made that the Select Board recommend favorable action for \$35K to be appropriated from the undesignated fund balance of the Community Preservation Fund for Payson Park consulting services. Motion approved by vote of 3-0.

Motion #3 was made that the Select Board recommend favorable action for \$200k to be appropriated from the undesignated fund balance of the Community Preservation Fund for Preparation for Community Path Right of Way Acquisition. Motion approved by vote of 2-1. Epstein opposed.

Motion #4 was made that the Select Board recommend favorable action for \$250K to be appropriated from the undesignated fund balance of the Community Preservation Fund for Transfer to the Belmont Housing Trust. Motion approved by vote of 3-0.

Motion #5 was made to recommend favorable action for \$190K to be appropriated from the undesignated fund balance of the Community Preservation Fund for Tennis Court Expansion at Winn Brook. Motion was passed by vote of 3-0.

ARTICLE 14 – FOSTER CHILDREN TRANSPORTATION REIMBURSEMENT FROM STATE

Tony DiCologero summarized Article 14. The school districts are required to provide transportation to students placed in foster care. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) has partnered with two state agencies for districts to receive partial reimbursement. In order to participate in the program, Belmont needs to sign a DESE Memo of Understanding (MOU). Town Meeting has to authorize the signature of MOU. The expenses are reimbursed at rate of 20% and the money goes to Town, not schools.

DiCologero reported that in FY19, we spent under \$14,000, in FY20, \$33,000. We get back 20% of that amount.

Motion was made for the Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 14. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

ARTICLE 16—ENTERPRISE FUNDS FOR WATER SEWER AND STORM WATER SERVICES and

ARTICLE 19 – APPROPRIATION OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Paolillo asked if this was the article where we draw down additional funds for fuel tanks?

Ann Marie Mahoney answered that last year \$540k was approved to replace fuel tanks at the DPW. When Jay Marcotte started to get a firm bid from Northeast Petroleum it was learned that the \$540K estimate was increased to 1 million. After working with Town Administration, Belmont Light and DPW it

was decided that the extra \$500K would come from water and sewer enterprise (\$150K each) and Belmont Light (\$200K).

Paolillo is concerned about spending another half million from budgets. He is concerned about draining the reserves and feels that in the years to come electric vehicles may reduce need for fossil fuel. He wants to support Capital Budget expenditures, but not the additional \$500K and wondered if we could look at additional reductions on tank replacement. Mahoney said that in 2016, Capital Budget changed to a bottom line budget and Paolillo has to vote based on that bottom line amount.

Jay Marcotte, Director of DPW, said they are currently looking at replacing smaller police and fire vehicles with electrified vehicles, but no electrified options are currently available for fire apparatus, dump trucks and diesel vehicles. Paolillo asked if we could go to (2) 4000 gallon diesel tanks instead of 6000 gallon tanks? Marcotte said with smaller tanks, there would be more frequent gas delivery and redesign costs might negate the savings gained.

PUBLIC COMMENTS on ARTICLE 16 and 19:

Bill Anderson asked why does anything need to be moved out of Enterprise Funds? It's all taxpayer money and it should be used to stabilize the rates and not be transferred to other projects. He knows the tanks have been uninsured, but he wants to understand the documentation about requests for insurance.

Patrice Garvin said this is not taxpayer money, it's rate payer money. This is considered a capital asset and will be used on the Belmont Light financial sheets. It will benefit Belmont Light and the Enterprise Fund. Marcotte said that there has been a problem with the underground storage tank insurance since 2012. Marcotte is waiting to hear from Crum and Forster regarding insurance for pollution liability. If we have a leak then we have to pay the whole amount of the project.

Bill Anderson asked to see specific letters of denial. Anderson says this needs to be laid out clearly at Town Meeting for Town to debate.

Judith Ananian Sarno (Town Meeting member) claims that this project has not been on the Capital Budget list and Town Meeting members need to approve capital expenditures.

Ann Marie Mahoney said the Capital Budget Report was emailed to each Town Meeting member.

Garvin explained that this capital expense is no longer part of Article 19 because the fuel tank cost is being taken up by the Light Board and it's not being appropriated by the Capital Budget. Fuel tank expenses are being debated in Article 16.

Bill Trabilcy asked if the contingencies for remediation added costs? Marcotte explained that he received several varying quotes for replacing tanks since 2018. Wesson and Sampson were hired in 2019 as environmental consultants, and public hearings were held on the subject. Town Meeting approved the original estimate of \$540K for project on February 9, 2020. Northeast Petroleum gave a firm quote of \$530K in March 2020, for hardware, piping and installation. We have e-mails from them that indicated their portion would be ~ \$200K to \$250K and removal costs were estimated at ~\$150K to \$300K. Marcotte said they tried to be conservative and estimated the total cost at \$540,000. Marcotte said that since then the cost of steel has sky rocketed. He feels that the soil is in good condition.

Judith Feinleib (Town Meeting member) asked if she doesn't want to vote the additional \$500k if she has to vote against Article 16? Mahoney said she would have to reject the total \$300k from Water and Sewer enterprise.

Dawn MacKerron, (Town Meeting member) asked why does Belmont have to vote on this if the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has approved the tanks for continued usage? The money could be used for other critical capital needs. Marcotte answered that he is afraid that we will have to spend \$5M to clean up the site if we don't get new tanks.

Timothy Flood said that every time an item is presented at Town Meeting, we are asked to pay more money the next year. Based on how estimates work, you can build in 20%, but building in 100% is not tenable. He asked if we could send out to bid again? Marcotte said we got a bad estimate from the State bid installer. There was a year and half between estimates and it was exacerbated by COVID.

Epstein said no one wants to spend a million dollars for oil tanks but if the old ones are not insurable, we don't have a choice. The crux is whether the tanks are truly uninsurable and we need more definitive information on that. Marcotte said if the article was defeated and new tanks are necessary we lose the opportunity to replace tanks this year. Dash said we have to get rid of the single-walled tanks, because of the environmental liability.

Deb Talanian has done surveys on above and underground tanks. She called three companies and she agrees it's time to replace the tanks. Even with insurance, we don't want these to pollute the water supply. But she thinks Belmont could save money by looking at other companies.

Marie Warner wants to see a breakdown of the costs. Marcotte said that Northeast Petroleum is on the list of State bidders. Underground tanks are cheaper, but the groundwork is more involved so the costs are about the same.

Motion was made for the Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 16 ENTERPRISE FUNDS FOR WATER SEWER AND STORM WATER SERVICES. Motion was approved by vote of 2-1. Paolillo voted against. [For the record Epstein said his vote is predicated on the assumption that existing tanks are uninsurable.]

Motion was made for the Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 19 CAPITAL BUDGET. Motion was approved by vote of 3-0.

Article 22 – FY22 BUDGET

Update on the FY22 budget was given by Tom Caputo from the Financial Task Force 2 about the American Rescue Act. His update involved two items: 1) Understanding the nature of the lost revenue calculation; 2) Review of the process of utilizing funding. The American Rescue Act grants funding of \$7.6M (Coronavirus Local Stability Fund) and \$1M for Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief Fund III (ESSER III). The US Treasury offered guidance on fund use on May 7th and now Belmont has to determine how it can be utilized.

The funding is broken down into five different sections. There are two areas that Belmont could take advantage of:

- 1) Leveraging costs borne by COVID.

2) Replace of lost public sector revenue.

- The funding comes in two tranches in 2021 and 2022. It can't be used for recurring expenses. Lost Revenue guidelines come from the Federal government, there are no State guidelines yet.
- The Financial Task Force worked with Town Administration and they are now working with the State to get more guidance. The funding amounts are affected by the Town growth rate. Once we have determined the growth rate, then we can do calculation to determine lost revenue and determine how much of the \$7.6M can be claimed. At this point in time, we think there are a few million of lost revenue that can be used for the operating budget.
- Potential approach for using funds from 2021-23.:
 - FY21: Identify COVID related expenses since March 3, 2021 and use funding to reimburse those expenses.
 - FY22: Identify COVID related expenses in FY22 Operating Budget and utilize federal funds to cover those expenses (this will reduce free cash requirements).
 - FY23: Identify one-time COVID related expenses and utilize federal funds in FY23 Operating Budget.
- It was confirmed that none of these funds will be included in Article 22. Caputo said that the first tranche of funding comes in automatically.
- Garvin reached out to the State today and they said they are still developing guidelines. The losses are claimed by calendar year starting in FY22. ESSER money is allocated separately.
- Paolillo said it is unclear if we can spend without appropriation. We won't have time to do an amended article for June 9th Town Meeting but there could be expenses we could incur especially for health-related needs.
- Garvin said the only change in FY22 budget was the addition of the Systems Manager position and that was discussed at last meeting.

Motion was made for the Select Board to recommend favorable action on Article 22. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

[It was decided that the Select Board will wait to vote on Article 7 -- Brave Act at the June 2 meeting.]

Possible vote to amend engineering services contract with Langdon Engineering in the amount of \$202,245.00 for further environmental monitoring and evaluation at the former incinerator site, 1130 Concord Avenue

- Glenn Clancy said he is trying to find out from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) if we have to mitigate wetlands. We are trying to gather data to argue our case. The estimated cost is \$1.2M for mitigation and that is on top of the capping costs. Our consultants outline potential costs to cap site on a regular basis. Once we get this last environmental analysis, this is last piece of cleanup. We have to report any deficiencies to DEP so they can tell us what needs to be addressed.
- Epstein asked what would remain in the landfill stabilization fund. Clancy answered that the current balance in the landfill stabilization fund is ~\$2.8M. The most recent estimate by consultants on the cost of the cap was \$3.6M. Clancy thinks we are a couple of years out from trying to design the cap project.

Motion was made to approve the amendment to the existing engineering services agreement for environmental monitoring and analysis at the former incinerator site at 1130 Concord Ave. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

Discussion and possible vote on recommendation from the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) for restriping on Concord Ave

Dana Miller summarized the history of the project:

- Concord Ave. is the busiest street in Belmont and is the site of the new Middle/High School. The High School Traffic Working Group designed a bike lane to allow students and residents to travel safely. The Concord Ave. bike corridor connects to Boston, Harvard Sq. and Brighton. Similar bike protected bike lanes are common in other towns. Belmont has heavy cut-through traffic and high school students park on the street. The Concord Ave. striping plan would reduce speed and parking of students in neighborhood. The first two years of the Middle/High School will not include student parking. The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) was asked to review the proposal and they had a public engagement hearing on April 1, 2021. In response to concerns raised, the plan was revised to increase on-street parking, and assure emergency vehicle access. On May 13th TAC had another meeting and due to concerns about the loss of the four parking spaces, TAC voted to recommend the project with the exception of the block with four spaces. The striping project on Concord Ave. was delayed to address the concerns. There is a high degree of public support of the proposal, but there are residents who oppose the plan, as well.
- Dash announced that the plan can be accessed on the Select Board website.
- Glenn Clancy said that two factors arose since the TAC meetings: 1) Possible reconsideration by school committee of off-street parking west of Harris Field. 2) Potential need for parking in the final two years of High School project. The roadway will be repaved this summer within the limits of the high school project. Clancy thinks that the prudent thing to do is to reevaluate this plan.
- Dash said we will not be voting this tonight due to concerns.
- Clancy said that a revised proposal from TAC will come at later date. The Select Board makes the final decision on this. This would go back to TAC and they will do a better job of publicizing the meetings so that abutters can be heard.

PUBLIC COMMENTS on restriping plan:

Jeff Held appreciates the deferral. He lives on Concord Ave. He doesn't think all the views are on the table. The protected bike lane could be less safe than what have now. He feels that better options are available.

Harry Hoffman wants to know what kind of adjustments can be made to open up traffic?

Tigran Airapetian commented that patients from the dental clinic on Concord Ave. have no place to park. He thinks we should put bike path on the sidewalk and feels the current bike lane design is not safe.

Seth Clarke lives on Concord Ave. and says Belmont is a cut-through town. We can't constrict a major artery without problems. He thinks a more careful study is required.

Sharon Clarke lives on Concord Ave. and said the TAC did not include her in their communication about their meetings. She is happy to hear that the process will be improved. The proposal impacts the number of MBTA bus stops in the area as well.

Clancy replied that post cards were mailed out to a list of abutters. In the future, he will put out posters about upcoming hearings. He said what we are proposing in the plan in relation to bus stops was approved by the MBTA. The bus stop issues will be mitigated by improving the signage.

Brenda Morris is a cyclist and her kids cycle to school on Concord Ave. She says we need to make Concord Ave. safer for bicyclists.

Petru Sofio is a high school student who bikes to school. He says he was almost hit by a pickup truck on Concord Ave. last year. He would like to see Belmont adopt this plan. Many other towns have had similar plans. He suggests flex posts between lanes.

Hannah Liberty asked what is the timeline for deferral? Clancy said he originally wanted to consolidate the repaving work associated with High School/ Middle School, but now he is not able to do that. He said it probably won't happen before the Fall. Hannah Liberty suggested that TAC should reach out to High School parents as well.

Catherine Bowen supports the bike lane. She is concerned that the Select Board would pause on the implementation of this proposal. Belmont has ignored the needs for managing on-street parking. Other towns have restrictions on parking. It's time to make the roadway safer for all users. She encourages the Board to reconsider this issue, sooner than later.

Reddien family said their whole family commutes by bicycle. She strongly supports proposal. Drivers veer into the bicycle lane. An off-grade cycle track would be a good solution. She wants to know if the Town will defer permanent thermoplastic striping?

Clancy said that most of area being repaved is near the high school intersection. There is only a small section that includes parking that is being repaved. Re-striping will be related to signals, not biking.

Jeffrey Roth lives near Concord Ave. and he thinks the plan and the guidance is about the safety of Town residents. He thinks the plan is a safety feature that suits the needs of Belmont. He knows the road is an important artery, but we can't have fast traffic, and no urbanization. We need something now to improve safety.

Dash said it is prudent to look at the issue closer and the TAC will be taking this up again and more people will be notified for any public discussion.

Discussion and possible vote on a future cardboard event

Deferred to June 2.

Discussion and possible vote on remote participation in meetings

Deferred to June 2.

Approve new Business License for Belmont Consignment Furniture, 697 Belmont Street 8/H 9:30 PM

Motion made to approve new business license for Belmont Consignment Furniture at 697 Belmont Street. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

Executive Session: To conduct strategy sessions in preparation for negotiations with nonunion personnel or to conduct collective bargaining sessions or contract negotiations with nonunion personnel; To discuss strategy with respect to collective bargaining or litigation if an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the bargaining or litigating position of the public body and the chair so declares; Belmont Patrolman's Association.

Deferred to June 2.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 12, 2021 – Regular Meeting

Motion was made to approve the amended meeting notes from May 12, 2021. Motion was approved by a vote of 3-0.

COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS:

Epstein received an e-mail as liaison to MBTA Advisory Board about projects for MBTA Improvement Funding. We have until June 2nd to offer a 500-word statement. The Select Board decided not to offer a statement due to the short deadline.

Motion to adjourn was approved by vote of 3-0.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 2, 2021 at 5:30 PM

Respectfully Submitted,



PATRICE GARVIN, Town Administrator

