

## **Intervenors to Appeal McLean Decision**

The decision by the Land Court to uphold the rezoning of the McLean land presented the citizen intervenors with a thirty-day deadline to answer a difficult question: Should they proceed with an appeal? Their attorneys, McGregor & Associates, advised the intervenors that the court's decision provides numerous and significant legal reasons to mount an appeal. Although the judge upheld the rezoning, he acknowledged flaws in the agreement; one of the most serious being the possibility that the town could be denied all the promised benefits even as the rezoning went into effect.

Overall statistics on the results of appeals are not encouraging. On average, only one in five cases succeeds.

The board of the Belmont Citizens Forum reached an initial consensus that if the intervenors decided to proceed, it would support an appeal only if the money to fund it could be raised before the thirty-day deadline. The BCF board also agreed that no final decision would be made without first consulting past supporters of the effort to overturn the rezoning. The Belmont Citizens Forum then polled the more than 200 Belmont families who had paid the legal fees for the Land Court case.

Financial and emotional support exceeded all expectations. In less than two weeks, pledges surpassed \$25,000. Many contributors expressed a strong desire to see the legal effort proceed to a higher court. In addition, spurred by the release of third-party developers' plans for more than a million square feet of development, new supporters joined the effort. This has broadened the group of people who now support the fullest possible judicial review of the McLean agreement.

At a minimum, the case will proceed to the Massachusetts Court of Appeals. There is a chance, however, that the case will attract the immediate attention of the state's highest level of review, the Supreme Judicial Court. The appeal process is expected to take at least eight to twelve months.

*--Jim Graves*

## **BioTechnology Committee to Rewrite R&D Regulations**

*By Lynne Cook Polcari*

Belmont's new Biotechnology Advisory Committee, a subcommittee of the Board of Health, has been working hard since March to create new biotechnology regulations for the town. Belmont currently has only minimal regulations, and the Board of Health believes that immediate action is necessary to prepare for the Research and Development Park scheduled to be built on the McLean land. The board's goal is to have up-to-date regulations in place before industry moves into the new facilities.

Under the zoning passed in July 1999, a 150,000-square-foot Research and Development complex is to be built, by developer Belmont ValueRealty. In addition, McLean Hospital has retained the right to convert 200,000 square feet of its existing space into medical research and development facilities. If regulations are on the books before space is leased, companies will be told the town's standards and can then judge whether they are willing to comply with them.

The Biotechnology Committee is considering a broad adoption of the guidelines set down by the National Institute of Health (NIH). Standards will be tightened where necessary. The committee is also reviewing stricter regulations adopted by other towns, particularly Lexington. Even companies normally exempt from NIH regulations must meet Lexington's standards, which are independent of federal guidelines.

One topic the group has discussed at length is the levels of biotechnology research that should be permitted in Belmont. The National Institute of Health currently classifies research as Biosafety levels 1, 2, 3, and 4. Levels 1 and 2 are considered safe and pose few safety concerns to the surrounding community if properly regulated and executed. Level 3 may have adverse effects, because it can permit work on airborne pathogens such as tuberculosis and influenza. Biosafety Level 4 work involves research on such extremely dangerous pathogens as Ebola, research that is generally considered inappropriate in a densely populated community like Belmont.

The group believes that Level 4 probably should be banned outright, but it is debating whether to allow Level 3 research, through a special permit process. Some members feel that instances of Level 3 research could be beneficial. For example, a lab that has made an important breakthrough and needs to do Level 3 work to continue its research could remain in Belmont if it received a special permit.

Other members of the committee are concerned that a special permit process may create a loophole that the town will constantly have to examine and assess. One member noted that the town would always be defending itself against industry lawyers trying to justify their clients' research. An outright ban of Level 3 would close the loophole and free the town from the expensive and time-consuming evaluation of the merits of different types of research.

Enforcement of the new regulations is another area of concern. One member pointed out that the NIH guidelines are only guidelines, and that it is up to each community to enforce the regulations. Technically, scientists can do whatever they want in their labs, unless they agree to the public spirit of the regulations. Without a mechanism for oversight and enforcement, there is no guarantee that the regulations will be followed. One remedy is to require that all companies have an Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) to oversee recombinant DNA research, with a focus on biological safety. Belmont could require that the IBC have at least two members who are not affiliated with the institution but who represent the community-at-large and have background in science or public health. This will give the community direct knowledge of the research being conducted at the institution.

At the invitation of the Board of Health, McLean Hospital made a presentation to the Biotechnology Committee of its current facilities. Pete Paskevich, Vice-President/Director of Research

## *People Are Asking*

### **Will the Kendall Center ever be rebuilt?**

It's been fifteen months since the April 9, 1999, fire that destroyed the Kendall Center for the Arts. The arts center is now homeless, evicted from its interim location in Watertown to make way for an assisted-living complex and so far unable to find another spot for its education programs. The studio artists have scattered.

Meanwhile, Belmont's senior citizens are still looking for a location for a permanent senior center. The town recently decided to spend \$25,000 to install air conditioning in the rented senior center at Our Lady of Mercy parish hall, despite the seniors' complaints about the limitations placed on their use of the building: a four o'clock closing time, restrictive stipulations in the lease, and no elevator to take them to the different levels of the center.

Both the seniors and those in the arts program hope to move to a permanent home, a new building on the site of the former Kendall School. The Center for the Arts had occupied the original one since 1982, when the town closed the former elementary school because of declining enrollment.

Now they'll have to wait at least until late September to learn more about their fates. The selectmen awarded a contract, at the end of May, to Bargmann, Hendrie & Archetype, Inc., a Boston architecture and planning firm, for a \$50,000 feasibility study of two possible uses of a new building: a multipurpose community center or a school. The firm is also to consider the feasibility of erecting a building for one use but convertible to the other.

Since the School Committee has announced that it doesn't want a new school building--at least not a duplicate of the old one--any consideration of a school is obviously linked to the insurance coverage. The town's fire insurance on the Kendall gave Belmont two options under which it could collect. If it chooses not to replace the building, it would receive the actual cash value of the original. Unfortunately, the actual cash value of the 85-year-old building was not great--about \$2 million.

If, however, the town chooses to replace the building with one of like kind and quality, it would collect full replacement value--potentially \$6 million or more. Exactly what "like kind and quality" means is one of the many issues in question. Does it mean a school?

"Most government buildings look like school buildings anyhow," said one knowledgeable observer. "Schools are the most expensive buildings to build [because they need cafeterias and double-height gyms]. That's why building a school is the smartest thing to do, even if we built it as a school for the short term."

Would the town collect \$6 million if it built a multipurpose community center? That's one of the key questions. Selectman Will Brownsberger says he favors a community center, "which would include both a senior center that seniors could call their own, space for the Youth Commission, for the arts, possibly the Waverley library, and possibly other uses." (The Waverley library is now located in the Waverley fire station, whose sale has been proposed.)

The other selectmen could not be reached for comment, but Selectman William P. Monahan has stated publicly that he'd prefer a school, because that would bring the most money.

Brownsberger believes that the choice between a school and a community center will have no material impact on the amount of the insurance reimbursement. "I think we should be deciding as a town what it is that we want to do on that site," he says.

Another critical issue is the timing. The insurance policy requires that the destroyed building be replaced within two years. Town officials keep hoping to find wiggle room in the definition of “replacement.” But some authorities say “replacement” means a building that has been completed and has been granted an occupancy permit. With only nine months left before the two years are up, it’s unlikely that such a building will appear on time.

The town has asked for--but so far has not received--an extension. Experts say extensions are sometimes granted, though not often. Brownsberger remains optimistic. “I expect that we’ll be able to gain a full insurance settlement,” he said.

– *Sue Bass*

## **The McLean Case: The Land Court Decision**

*By Nelson E. Bolen*

On May 26, 2000, Judge Mark Green of the Massachusetts Land Court issued his decision in the lawsuit concerning the rezoning of the McLean Hospital land. The headline in the *Belmont Citizen-Herald* the following week proclaimed “Land Court OKs McLean rezoning.” However, it is important to understand what was and what was not decided.

More than half of Judge Green’s 25-page decision reviewed the factual history of the McLean rezoning. Both sides in the lawsuit had previously agreed that no material facts were in dispute and that the case could be decided on the basis of law without a trial.

The heart of the decision is the seven pages that Judge Green devoted to the central issue – the allegation of illegal contract zoning. (The remaining four pages were devoted to various procedural issues raised by the intervenors.) The judge clearly gave great weight to the fact that the rezoning had been approved by the town:

... it is not the role of the courts to set aside the collective judgment of a two-thirds majority of the town meeting and the general electorate at the behest of a few individuals who suggest that a different approach might be better.

Judge Green acknowledged that this case constitutes contract zoning:

If the presence of a contract between a private landowner and a municipality, arising incident to the rezoning of the landowner’s property, constitutes illegal contract zoning, then the actions of Belmont and McLean in the instant case constitute such contract zoning. However, despite the analytic simplicity implied by the ‘contract zoning’ label, whether there has been an illegal contract zoning depends not on the mere presence of a contract, but on the relationship of the contract to the subject matter of the rezoning and the legislative process by which the municipality approved the rezoning.

With respect to the legislative process, Judge Green noted that more than two-thirds of the town meeting members and more than two-thirds of the voters in the referendum approved the rezoning. He went on to observe: “The summary judgment record provides ample evidence to support that decision, though it is possible a contrary conclusion by the voters could also have been considered reasonable.”

In other words, the question of whether the rezoning was in the best interests of the town is debatable.

There were two previous court cases in Massachusetts that addressed contract zoning and thereby establish precedents – *Sylvania Electric Products Inc. vs. Newton* (“Sylvania”), and *Rando vs. Town of North Attleborough* (“Rando”). A key element of the *Rando* case, in which the challenged rezoning was upheld, was that the “ancillary agreements” were placed in escrow pending the vote on the proposed rezoning. As the Belmont intervenors pointed out, that was

not done in the McLean case. Judge Green dismissed that argument: "... I do not read Sylvania or Rando to impose such a procedural 'escrow' requirement."

One of the key issues raised by the intervenors was the integral relationship between the McLean rezoning amendment and the Memorandum of Agreement. The intervenors argued that the Memorandum of Agreement – the "sweetener" in the McLean deal – contained provisions that were contrary to the public interest and in violation of various laws. Judge Green observed:

By the very nature of the arrangements approved by the town meeting and Belmont voters, the possibility exists that all or some portion of the memorandum of agreement might be unenforceable, might be set aside (as in bankruptcy proceedings) or might not be realized for any one of a number of other possible reasons; the rezoning amendment stands independent of all such contingencies. Whatever concerns might exist regarding the prudence of such an approach do not derogate from the validity of the rezoning if it serves a public purpose.

In other words, there is no guarantee that the town will get what it thought it was to get.

Judge Green did not deal with the Memorandum of Agreement at all in this decision:

The enforceability of the memorandum of agreement is not presented in this action, and I do not consider it. Similarly, I need not address the criticisms intervenors direct to the wisdom or propriety of various provisions of the memorandum of agreement, as they do not bear on the validity of the rezoning amendment.

Thus, Judge Green did not address the intervenors' claims that such a provision as the one exempting all roads in the McLean District from the requirements of the Board of Survey bargained away the town's police powers, a reason that contract zoning is held to be illegal.

What does this all mean? A number of issues raised by the intervenors were not addressed in Judge Green's decision, and the judge's interpretation of previous case law is debatable. The intervenors had 30 days from the date of the judgment to appeal the decision. This appeal would have to be on the grounds that the judge erred in interpreting and applying the law, since the facts were not at issue.

*Nelson Bolen, a retired engineer, has lived in Belmont for thirty-three years and is the treasurer of the Belmont Citizens Forum*

**Summary:** *Judge Green decided that the overriding consideration is the fact that the town approved the McLean rezoning amendment, regardless of whether the rezoning is good or bad.*

## **McLean Applications Ruled Incomplete**

The Planning Board has ruled unanimously that the site plan applications submitted in late May by the three developers for the McLean land did not contain all the required information. That ruling does not mean that the applications have been rejected. Since the McLean land was exempted from the town's master planning requirement, the board does not have the right to reject the developments outright but only to require changes within the zoning law. However, unless the developers provide the missing data promptly, there may be a delay in the public hearing process, which was to begin in September. Construction is not expected to start before next spring at the earliest.

The board sent each of the three developers a letter containing a long list of missing data. One element common to all three was a requirement for new traffic studies containing specific information on the impact on each street. The letters to the townhouse developer and the developer of the R&D complex noted that such a study would require further information about the occupants of the buildings. The board required Northland Residential Corporation, the townhouse developer, to conduct a market study to see how many of the townhouse buyers are likely to be empty-nesters and how many will be families with children. It required Belmont ValueRealty, developer of the R&D complex, to identify the potential users. Planning Board members remarked during the board's June 20 meeting that the complex could legally hold office space rather than R&D labs.

Another element missing from all three applications was the "coordinated planning document binding on all applicants within the McLean District." This was required by Dick Bett's letter of May 19, 1999, to McLean. Without these documents, it's impossible for the Planning Board to know whether there will be appropriate, safe connections among the zones' roads; water and sewer pipes; electric, telephone, and gas lines; and storm water drainage systems. Even the partial information that was provided left the board's consultant dissatisfied with the number of dead-end water pipes and similar connections.

The Planning Board's June 20 meeting was the last for Chairman Joseph Newberg, whose term expired on June 30 and who asked not to be reappointed. He said he can no longer put in the amount of time required by the Planning Board. The selectmen are expected to appoint a replacement on July 10. The Planning Board's remaining members are Joseph Barrell, a plumbing contractor who recently oversaw the renovation of Belmont's historic Town Hall; Joseph Noone, a lawyer; Karl Haglund, a planner who works for the Metropolitan District Commission; and Andrew McClurg, a traffic consultant.

– Sue Bass

Administration at McLean Hospital, and Andrew Braun, Research and Biosafety Officer from Massachusetts General Hospital, met with the committee on May 31.

McLean Hospital currently conducts Biosafety Levels 1 and 2 research on the Belmont campus in two research buildings containing over 50 labs. The hospital has a lab capable of handling Biosafety Level 3 work, but it is currently not in use. McLean reported that it follows the standards set by the NIH and inspects its own labs annually. The Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) that oversees McLean's recombinant DNA projects is in charge of all Harvard affiliate research, with the exception of that being done at Dana Farber. That committee visits the McLean campus approximately once every three years.

In addition, McLean reported that it has an animal lab currently containing 150 primates. The hospital provides annual reports to the NIH and to the U. S. Department of Agriculture and also conducts its own regular inspections of the primate center.

The Biotechnology Committee has agreed not to make decisions on the ethical issues connected with animal or biotechnology research; rather, it will limit its focus to the health and safety of the community. It is possible that when animal research is conducted, the Board of Health could be responsible for ensuring the appropriate treatment of the animals, and the Town would bear at least some of the cost of this enforcement. The Board of Health is addressing this issue separately.

The board's charge to the Biotechnology Committee does not include industries other than biotechnology. The new McLean by-law, however, puts no restrictions on the type of research that can be conducted in the new Research and Development complex. It explicitly permits research in biology, chemistry, electronics, engineering, geology, medicine, pharmaceuticals, physics, and computer research and technology. Each of these poses some risk to citizen health and safety. The Biotechnology Committee and the Board of Health recognize the need for appropriate regulations, but feel it is important to stay focused on first creating biotechnology regulations. Once this is done, it is hoped that this group of citizens will agree to have its charge broadened and consider updating Belmont's hazardous material regulations.

The Board of Health is fortunate to have many talented and experienced citizens to work on the Biotechnology Advisory Committee. Co-chairpersons are Linda B. Wolfe and Michael S. Baram. Ms. Wolfe is the director of Environmental Health and Safety at the Whitehead Institute and has been involved with similar citizens' efforts in Randolph and Cambridge. Mr. Baram is an attorney and professor of law and the director of the Center of Law and Technology at Boston University School of Law. He is also a professor of health law at Boston University.

Other committee members are Christine Blazynski, director of Science Content at Webivore Knowledge Systems, LLC; Stephen P. Hale, a scientist at Phylos, Inc., in Lexington; Mariana Nacht, a molecular biologist at Genzyme Corporation; and James MacIsaac, a Belmont police officer who previously worked in the biotech field.

*Lynne Polcari is a stockbroker and a Town Meeting Member from Precinct 8.*

**Summary:** *Spurred by the new research and development activity on the McLean land, Belmont's Board of Health is updating safety regulations designed to prevent industrial accidents.*



## **Open Space and Recreation Plan Nears Completion**

*By Dick Madden*

To be eligible for state and federal grant money to purchase and maintain open land in Belmont, the town must have an up-to-date Open Space and Recreation Plan. This 80-plus-page document, in the works since 1996, describes in detail all the open land in town, including playgrounds and ballparks. The plan, which will replace the outdated report of 1979, is undergoing a final draft by a consultant dealing with issues of accessibility for the handicapped. Once it is finished, the plan will go to the Board of Selectmen for approval and then to the state for final acceptance.

The plan is a rich source of information about our town. Here are some excerpts:

Extensive wildlife habitat is found at Little Pond and the wetlands and marshes of the Metropolitan District Commission's 115-acre Alewife Reservation, a natural local treasure shared with Cambridge and Arlington. The Alewife wetland habitats help support great blue heron, a variety of waterfowl species, muskrats, painted turtles, and herring. These wetlands serve a vital function of helping to attenuate flood flows which impact on the low-lying areas of the Little Pond and Winn Brook section of town. Officials and neighborhood groups of the communities of Arlington, Belmont, and Cambridge hope to preserve and expand the wetlands resources of the Alewife Reservation.

The plan also states:

The existence of a regional greenway in the northwest section of Belmont is a significant factor in sustaining the town's wildlife population. This greenway consists of over 500 acres of contiguous open space, 300 acres of which are in Belmont. The greenway includes the Metropolitan District Commission's Beaver Brook Reservation, Massachusetts Audubon Society's Habitat Education Center and Wildlife Sanctuary, Belmont's Rock Meadow, McLean Hospital, and the site of the former Metropolitan State Hospital. In an otherwise densely developed region, the greenway provides critical habitat that hosts an impressive array of wildlife species. Natural areas in metropolitan Boston are becoming increasingly fragmented by development, leading to a loss of bio-diversity. Belmont's regional greenway helps protect its wildlife population from disease and genetic isolation and its preservation is essential to the ecological integrity of the area.

The plan was undertaken when the selectmen, in 1996, approved the formation of a working committee of approximately 25 people. The committee included representatives of various town boards and commissions as well as interested citizens of the town. Four subcommittees formed: open space and recreation inventory, community setting, environmental analysis, and community process. Members worked tirelessly to produce a first draft report dated September 1996. The final version should be completed by the end of June 2000.

All those who worked to prepare this comprehensive report are to be commended. It is hoped that their efforts lead to the preservation of open space throughout the town.

*Dick Madden is a Town Meeting Member from Precinct 3 and a student counselor at Waltham High School.*

## **Walking: Alternative Transportation**

*By Rosemary Burke*

In our auto-dependent culture, it's easy to forget that streets are not just for cars. They're for people too.

They're for children who'd like to walk or bike to school. They're for senior citizens who'd like to stroll to the store for a quart of milk and meet friends along the way. They're for people who'd like to walk for exercise, or walk to work, or simply get out and enjoy the sunshine on a beautiful summer day.

In some parts of Belmont, people can walk safely to reap the benefits of exercise, chat with friends and neighbors, enjoy their neighborhoods, *and* help to preserve the environment. In other parts of town, however, where sidewalks are nonexistent or poorly designed, citizens walk at their peril.

Across the state and across the country, the right to take a safe and pleasant walk in one's community is becoming a priority. As suburban sprawl increases the traffic passing through neighborhoods, communities are acknowledging a need to balance the priorities of the drivers who use their roads and the priorities of the people who live on those roads.

Streets, for too long viewed as the domain of the automobile, were designed to move the greatest number of cars at the greatest speed: "design speed." And as the volume of traffic has grown, engineers have sought to "improve" roads by making them wider, straighter, and flatter. But planners, engineers, and communities now recognize that this approach, successful in increasing the speed and flow of traffic, has also increased the rate of fatal accidents and hampered those who cannot or do not drive to their destination. Community planners at last realize that roads serve many essential transportation, social, and economic functions and that successful traffic management must take into consideration all different modes of transportation. Safe places for pedestrians and bicyclists are integral to the transportation management plan of a livable community.

Like many New England towns, Belmont was a farm community that, starting in the 1930s, was broken up and sold to developers. A developer would build houses on his plots, along with roads that usually did not include sidewalks. Sometimes, after the developer had sold the houses, he would give the roads to the town before they had been paved. In other cases, private neighborhoods would ask the town to accept their road and thereby be responsible for its maintenance. The last time this occurred in Belmont was in the early 1980s.

Early in the 1900s, the town recognized that the roads had to be improved to meet appropriate standards. Generally these called for roads that were 26 feet wide with 7 feet on either side, making a right-of-way of 40 feet. In each 7-foot right-of-way, the town tried to install a 4-foot-wide sidewalk and a 3-foot tree lawn. The tree lawn was to accommodate trees and, later, utility poles and fire hydrants. These lawns continue to serve the important function of absorbing some surface water runoff and helping to prevent floods on the streets.

Historically, if the selectmen determined that sidewalks were necessary for safety, the town would take financial responsibility for laying these sidewalks. This mostly concerned the areas around churches, schools, and commercial centers. Traditionally

however, if residents wanted sidewalks in their neighborhoods, the selectmen would pay a third of the cost, and the residents on both sides of the street would each pay a third.

Roads and sidewalks do, of course, need to be repaired. Usually, repairs are made on roads that have been the recipient of federal and state funding. The Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21), signed in 1998, is based on the significant changes in federal transportation policy resulting from the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991, or ISTEA (pronounced "ice tea"). These two federal laws now make bicycle and sidewalk projects eligible for funding, as they were not earlier. States continue to control project selection but look favorably on communities attempting to incorporate into their transportation plans the federal mandate to include pedestrian and bicycle access.

In Belmont, the Bikeway Planning Committee, which has worked hard to plan for a bikeway, has been temporarily stalled by the financial drain of the Big Dig. However, the Belmont Bikeway is the kind of initiative that TEA-21 and ISTEA were designed for, and we should support the Bikeway Committee's efforts in this worthwhile project.

The responsibility for Belmont sidewalk repair belongs to the Highway Department. Although most sidewalk problems have been caused by trees and their root growth, Highway Superintendent Peter Castanino confirms the town's commitment to installing and maintaining trees. Trees not only enhance the appearance of a street, but provide environmental benefits as well. The Highway Department works closely with the Shade Tree Committee in choosing and planting appropriate trees.

According to Mr. Castanino, the department currently has a list of 700 requests for sidewalk repairs and a FY 2001 budget of \$84,470. Of that amount, \$10 to \$15 thousand will go for materials, of which concrete is now the major choice. This has been true since the 1920s, when residents preferred the look of concrete even though asphalt was cheaper. Brick, used in some nearby communities, is not considered a good choice by Mr. Castanino because it is slippery when wet and requires more maintenance. Asphalt, used to make some sidewalk repairs up until the 1980s, is no longer a standard choice. (Belmont residents who are concerned that asphalt was laid too close to healthy trees may have this asphalt removed by calling the Highway Department at 489-8210.)

When a resident requests sidewalk repair, a highway supervisor assess the problem and assign a rating (1, 2, or 3, with 1 being the worst). He will then determine whether the Highway Department can do the repairs or an outside contractor should be called. Repairs that cost more than \$10 thousand must be sent out to contractors to bid on. Mr. Castanino acknowledges that his allotted budget is insufficient to address all the requests for sidewalk repairs assigned to his department.

Belmont is in the process of drafting policies about the curbing on the edge of a road, and what plants can be installed in the tree lawn by residents. Which streets will get curbing and of what kind has been a hotly debated topic. While it's believed that granite curbing adds another protection for pedestrians on busy streets by keeping cars and service trucks from driving up and blocking sidewalks, it costs \$18 a foot. Asphalt curbing installed at the standard five-inch height costs \$2 a foot. Each situation is judged individually, and decisions are based on street conditions and the amount of money available.

Communities all around the state are studying ways to manage increased traffic flows. Making a community more accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists is one factor in

this management. But adding sidewalks is not enough. We also need speed enforcement (including local residents committed to driving within posted speed limits), walk signals that respond quickly so that pedestrians are willing to obey them, and crosswalks at frequent intervals, with signs to warn drivers of the state law mandating them to stop for pedestrians. Residents deserve the choice of how to reach their destination, and any way they choose should be as safe and pleasant.

Many organizations that support pedestrian safety and accessibility have made their knowledge available on the Web. One such advocacy group, Walking in Arlington, recently had a display at the Robbins Library. You may ask to see these materials at the Robbins reference desk. You can also visit the following Web sites for suggestions on how to encourage walking in your neighborhood:

*PEDS (Pedestrians Educating Drivers on Safety)* <http://www.peds.org/links/index.htm>

*Walking in Arlington* <http://www.walkboston.org>

*TEA-21 and ISTEA information* <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/index.htm>

*Transportation for Livable Communities* <http://www.tlcnetwork.org> (*On Line Resources*)