

**Attn: Select Board, Planning Board, MBTA Zoning TF, Director of Planning and Development, DPW Director, BOH
Cc: TA, ConCom Members, and Climate Resiliency Committee.**

(Ms. Powers, please share with all members of ConCom, the Water Resources Task Force, and members of the Coastal and Climate Resiliency Committee. Thank you).

(Ms. Hunter, please share with all PB and MBTA TF members and post to the MBTA Zoning website. Thank you.)

Good Morning Ann,

Thank you for taking the time to respond. I appreciate your data and personal thoughts. I am compelled to respond in **BOLD** to some statements you wrote below. I will share with all stakeholders on my email because I have heard from some of them already and in terms of our project on Town Governance all stakeholders need the same data.

1. You state: "If that happens, Manchester residents will be asked to stop outdoor water use regardless of the state of Gravelly Pond." **This is unacceptable in terms of MBTS's ability to self-govern and in terms of resident expectations. The State is overreaching on many, many levels, which seems to be the MO. We need pushback on some matters and need to negotiate what is in our best interest, not the State's agenda for control. Rationing and control by the State when our water capacity is not at issue is objectionable on so many levels.**

2. You state with regard to the MBTA Zoning project that: "The real number of new units is only 335 in rough numbers, instead of 1500 new residents, we're looking at about 1,000 if every lot in every overlay district were built out to the maximum allowed." **While I appreciate the guesstimate on Ch40A, sec 3A that is still about 20 percent of our population and maybe more in number of larger families and multigenerational groups. It does not factor in the 40 B situation, which we may lose.**

3. Ref MBTA Zoning Impact: "...but it's kind of like measuring a jelly-fish. The changes will be piece-meal over a considerable amount of time." **As you know, I deal in data and I asked a question regarding data on April 16, 2024 at the SB Meeting. Impact studies on anything...whether 40 B, 40A/3A and the CST build out (water usage by the business and potential water usage for 115 units) needs analysis UPFRONT along with sewerage capacity, traffic management, public safety etc. We need this data to vote effectively. As both Mike Pratt and I requested at the last SB meeting on MBTA Zoning on April 16, 2024...this needs to happen by the consultants and before Nov**

STM. Should we lose the 40 B litigation and water/sewer is run to the LCD, there is a more than reasonable chance that this facility as well will want connection.

4. You state: "Actually, Hamilton gets most of its water from the Ipswich River basin, which is in very sad shape." **True, as well as a number of wells; and they are treating PFAS now, ahead of the game. At present population, water capacity in Hamilton is in good shape currently. Hamilton has recently sent out a RFQ to assess ANY new development and has selected UTILE to contract with for their impact studies. Water demand is obviously one factor among others with any development. This is my point.**

5. You state: *I doubt that there is one position of MBTS "governance" on anything more complicated than the time of day.* **This Town contracted at considerable expense to improve communication among boards and committees. Messaging needs to be strategic, clear, and concise. I appreciate brainstorming and independent thinking, but one voice is essential on MBTA Zoning and other matters. I know you can agree. Tiffany has worked very hard on this process, as well.**

6. You state: *"The zoning overlay proposal could be seen as a "lawn reduction act" because it puts more buildings on the same amount of land, meaning less lawn."* **Here's what I can say on this tricky issue. Residents are currently in debate with others and the Town over sharing of well water. That says something regarding the preciousness of the water supply and its use. Having said this, it would be a mistake to frame the issue of water reduction in terms of "lawn reduction act." Not everyone is onboard with this agenda and move to the suburbs such as pricey MBTS because of expectations and quality of life and just plain old fashion lawns for their kids to play on. Most responsible MBTS residents will conserve willfully and have done so in drought as you mention below.**

I am requesting again,

1. Strategically, what is the population **number** that the MBTS estimates with total combination of all activity: 40 B potential loss, MBTA Zoning to include 115 units of employee housing in the LCD (of which CST has made no secret and is on video record by our MBTA TF), MAHT goals for development? **Is it 1000 or 2000 or more? (This affects our SHI as well, as we fall behind.)**

2. Can we plug this number into the CREAT tool and publicize our water demand for the future based on this number (and in emergency for closing Lincoln St for PFAS or Gravelly Pond to recharge).

3. If our boards are not equipped to do these impact studies on increased population, I highly recommend using **UTILE** contractors for any development to assess impact of our goals for MBTA Zoning, development of the LCD by CST/loss of 40 B, and MAHT goals for development. All Towns do these impact studies. It should not be done "piecemeal" ...we need to know before we vote in November on STM to increase population significantly.

Respectfully,

Lorraine Iovanni
20 A Pine St