

On 09/11/2023 4:06 PM EDT Lorraine Iovanni <l.iovanni@comcast.net> wrote:

ATTN: MBTA Task Force

Cc: PB and TA

(Ms Hunter, please distribute this email to all Task Force Members and all PB Members, and post to the MBTA website, thank you.)

Good Afternoon,

I would like to offer the following concerns, suggestions, and observations regarding the last MBTA Task Force Meeting on Sept 7, 2023.

1. Communications Plan: As usual, excellent job by Tiffany Marletta on the communications plan. However, we have not seen much progress regarding base line data and will need to catch up readily to plug into the Communications Plan. The Q and A is a start, as is the Assessor data.

At the November 14, 2022 STM, our zoning map with a change to incorporate "single family" in the legend was approved. Why was this map unknown/unavailable to the TF?

I recommended, as below, a crib sheet to pin down accurate data. I have seen 39 acres on the state website and 37 acres on our website. I have heard folks mention 34 acres. (Please correct me if I am not factual.) I asked that we verify some baseline data, as in the below email.

MIT students: recommend that we use our MIT students to begin the process of developing a crib sheet for the TF and the residents. We need **concurrence** on basic data. And yes, we need a snapshot of the **entire Town**, not just the downtown area. **The Elephant in the room is WHERE will the balance of acreage be located outside the 40 per cent downtown? Does it even exist? Additionally, the MIT Students should report to the TF, not the Town Administrator, obviously.**

2. Need for a Facilitator: The Task Force appears to be struggling with a starting point on the process of trying to identify what the current *barriers* are both in terms of technical questions on what to count, existing zoning and other topography and environmental issues. *I would highly recommend a trained facilitator (Ms Beckman?) to assist the TF in*

brainstorming for a couple of sessions. I am not convinced that your decision to appoint a subgroup to the TF, which is the subgroup to the PB, is necessary; we will waste precious time. *All folks on the TF were selected to this TF to lend expertise, diversity, creativity, and openness to this process.* The TF should work as a cohesive group and team, reporting to the PB.

Related to the above is that there should NOT be a heavy reliance on consultants in framing the direction of MBTA zoning. You folks know our Town...lessons learned with Mark Brobrowski. I want to commend Richard Smith for his clear, concise, and confident remarks...we are NOT close to complying with the State guidelines (see Para 9 c. of the Guidelines) To what extent in a realistic way, can we come close to what the State expects....as I said below the State is looking for a "*reasonable*" standard of effort, not a miracle. We need to keep this in mind.

Along with a Crib Sheet of basic AGREED-TO DATA for the meeting, the current zoning map on display at each meeting, and a list of all current zoning provisions that makes it difficult to achieve density and where (like the # of parking spaces), the TF should adopt---as our SB has done effectively--- an effective *project manager approach*. Right now, it is not evident that we have clarity on what needs to be done, who will do it, and a time frame. As Mr Smith stated, we should be really concerned about our progress...time is of the essence. Perhaps, Ms Bilotta may assist the TF with setting up an effective project management approach, as on the SB.

3. Open questions posed to EOHLC: Ms Ware has indicated that she needs answers from the State EOHLC on (1) whether to count certain existing units once the zoning is overlayed, and (2) whether filled tidal land may be subtracted from the equation? I hope that we have these responses before Ms Ware leaves us? If not, we should do our best to speed this along.

4. Affordability Component in the Guidelines: Ref Para 4 b. I recommend that in the interest of housing diversity and housing affordability that we incorporate in our final plan no less than 10 per cent AH units, as permitted. Our land mass is finite; and, quite frankly, if the Town is interested in diverse housing, we should use this opportunity to incorporate this goal. The EOHLC will most likely look positively on this matter should the voters go forward.

5. Use of a Consultant: As a resident, **this is my major concern.** The TF should be driving the direction for the Consultant, NOT the other way around. While Ms Ware is not familiar with the State Compliance Model Tool, as she stated, who in the Town or on the Task Force is qualified to use the Tool at this Time. Is it a matter of plugging in AGREED-TO DATA to get the end result for compliance as a clear GOAL? We should start the ball rolling on this one.

I would also ask that Ms Ware present to the TF **with the actual scope of this CONTRACTOR and the NAME of the VENDOR.** We cannot afford to wait for a contractor to make a recommendation (and impact) to the TF for a reaction at the eleventh hour. Lessons learned on zoning.

6. New Town Planner: I am hopeful that just as Ms Ware has demonstrated high expertise in her profession and has been effective interfacing with our Boards, that any new Town Planner will also have the same distinction and credentials. I am hopeful that some members of the PB were permitted to review recent candidates, input, and even serve on an interview panel.

I offer this commentary in the interest of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the TF, on a very complicated and challenging effort. I hope that these comments are constructive.

Regards,

Lorraine

Lorraine Iovanni
20 A Pine Street