

Joint Select Board and Arlington Redevelopment Board
Monday January 13, 2020, 7:00 p.m.
Central School, Main Floor
Meeting Minutes

This meeting was recorded by ACMi.

SELECT BOARD PRESENT: Diane Mahon (Chair), Joseph A. Curro, Jr, Stephen DeCoursey, Daniel Dunn, John V. Hurd
ARLINGTON REDEVELOPMENT BOARD PRESENT: Andrew Bunnell (Chair), David Watson, Eugene Benson, Kin Lau, Rachel Zsembery
STAFF: Adam Chapdelaine, Town Manager, Jennifer Raitt, Director, Planning and Community Development, Doug Heim, Town Counsel, Erin Zwirko, Assistant Director, Planning and Community Development

Mr. Bunnell opened the Redevelopment Board meeting.

Mrs. Mahon called to order the Select Board meeting. Mr. Hurd moved to open the Select Board meeting. Mr. Curro seconded the motion. It was unanimously voted by members of the Select Board.

After introductions of the members present, Mr. Chapdelaine began the joint meeting of the Select Board and the Redevelopment Board as facilitator. He noted that it may be the first meeting in the long time where the two boards met jointly.

Housing in Arlington: Overview and Highlights

Mr. Chapdelaine asked Ms. Raitt to provide an overview of community plans that are currently in progress. Ms. Raitt noted that she had provided a memo with an overview of those plans in progress to the Redevelopment Board in December 2019. The memo also provided information on whether these planning processes would result in future zoning amendments.

The first item reviewed by Ms. Raitt is the Sustainable Transportation Plan, which just had a kick off meeting. It will be instrumental in thinking about current and future mobility options in Arlington. The Master Plan includes a Transportation Element, but it only went so far. It did not consider newer technologies and sustainable transportation options that are here now and we know that more are coming in the future. The Sustainable Transportation Plan will position the town to best implement newer policies in the future and be responsive to transportation-related concerns in town and regionally including cross-cutting elements such as housing and economic development. There will be community forums and other ways to engage in the process, including mobile workshops, walkshops, and other avenues.

The Net Zero Plan is also ongoing and is also cross-cutting. The Net Zero Plan is accounting for current greenhouse gas emissions and what they are projected to be in the future related to transportation, built environment, and other emissions that are created in Arlington. This plan will help the town to think about the controls in the town and private development. The plan will create a pathway to achieving net zero by 2050.

Another important planning process to be aware of is the Economic Analysis of Industrial Districts. The town has hired a consultant, RKG Associates, to help the staff and the Zoning Bylaw Working Group evaluate the economics of the industrial districts in town, which is a small percentage of the town in land area and actual industrial uses. We are trying to understand where there is the potential to attract more industrial uses in the future as well as innovate in the future through creativity and flexibility in the Zoning Bylaw.

The final item that Ms. Raitt mentioned is the Residential Design Guidelines. A study completed in 2019, which emerged from the Residential Study Group over a couple of years, that looked at the type of development and replacement homes

that are being constructed in the R0-R2 districts. The study reviewed, in response to a Town Meeting article, what the impacts of this new construction and the relationship to quality of life changes. The Department of Planning and Community Development delivered the report to the Select Board in July 2019. The town hired a consultant to develop residential design review guidelines and a review process related to new development.

All of these planning processes may result in Town Bylaw amendments and/or Zoning Bylaw amendments. These projects are happening over the course of 2020, so we would be looking at a future Town Meeting in 2021 to consider any amendments. There will be many products and deliverables to share with the community over the year through the public process. These are the four most important items that Ms. Raitt wanted to share with the town Boards, and noted that her memo is posted through NovusAgenda. Ms. Raitt noted that there is an intersection in many of these projects due to how development, and particularly housing development, is discussed in the community.

Mr. Chapdelaine asked if the Board members have any questions for Ms. Raitt. Mrs. Mahon asked who was hired to complete the Residential Design Guidelines. Ms. Raitt noted that Harriman was hired to prepare residential design guidelines and recommend a design review process.

Mr. Chapdelaine noted that he and Ms. Raitt made a presentation to both Boards on an overview of housing issues locally and regionally. Mr. Chapdelaine thought that there was a consensus that there is an affordability crisis in Arlington and in the region. He also noted that based on comments from both Boards and those made at Town Meeting that there is a general consensus that more affordable housing is needed. Where there seems to be disagreement is how to create more affordable housing. Mr. Chapdelaine asked if there are any questions or comments about this topic from the Board members present.

Mrs. Mahon noted that Mr. Chapdelaine touched on what she heard. Mrs. Mahon noted that in addition there were questions about implementing a process that is unlike what has been done in the past, in particular requiring perpetuity for the length of affordability.

Mr. Dunn noted that when he first ran for Select Board, he was worried about the budget. In particular, the budget busters he was worried about included the cost of health insurance. Five years later, health insurance is less of a problem, but the growth in the schools is what is driving conversations now. Mr. Dunn noted that those big issues evolve over time. He is worried about housing and housing cost at this point in time. He does not believe it is a tenable situation, and if nothing is done, Arlington will have more expensive homes, will be more homogenous, and less mixed. Mr. Dunn notes that this will have a significant impact on race and equality in Arlington. Mr. Dunn noted that change is harder than what he thought it might be. By working together, Mr. Dunn believes changes can be made.

Mr. Curro noted that he agrees with Mr. Dunn that conversations are evolving. For example, when Mr. Curro meets with the Council on Aging, he hears about the overall cost of housing for seniors. Looking at root causes with a socio-economic perspective is incredibly important. Mr. Curro asked Ms. Raitt to expand on her statement that the Sustainable Transportation Plan being cross cutting. Ms. Raitt explained that in the existing conditions analysis is to have a good understanding on how people move around town and where the demand is for where people want to get to, which is also known as the first mile/last mile challenges, and how that might potentially drive and change residential growth in the future. Looking at these data critically might inform transportation policy which has an impact on housing policy and climate policy. Mr. Curro noted that it could also inform how the town can assist people to age in place.

Mr. Watson raised a few items for consideration that have been part of the conversation at Redevelopment Board meetings. The Redevelopment Board draws a distinction between affordable housing as the term is legally defined and affordability in general. When we talk about affordability we are talking about it in both ways. We are sensitive to the needs of the mid-market housing market, which is not the legally defined term, but impacts Arlington. Mr. Watson also noted that the Redevelopment Board has talked about keeping in mind the need for commercial development when talking about housing. Mr. Watson noted that we should be careful to not miss opportunities to encourage commercial growth in the future or precluding future commercial growth.

Proposed Board Review of Future Warrant Articles

Mr. Chapdelaine explained that this agenda item responds to how the Select Board might have weighed in on the numerous zoning articles before the 2019 Annual Town Meeting. Historically the Select Board has not weighed in on zoning amendment articles that are not under their jurisdiction, and similarly for the Redevelopment Board. However, there is a willingness to discuss a review by the Select Board with the Redevelopment Board and vice versa. Mr. Chapdelaine asked the members to think about a process that both Boards be comfortable with. Ms. Raitt provided a memo as a starting point as part of the evening's agenda packet. Mr. Chapdelaine summarized Ms. Raitt's memo as having a meeting after the warrant closes in January with the chairs of each Board, Ms. Raitt, and himself. At that meeting, the group would collectively make decisions about which articles might warrant review by the other Board that is not traditionally on its docket, which would then be presented to the rest of the Boards' membership for discussion. Mr. Chapdelaine asked if there are any reactions.

Mrs. Mahon noted that she hopes to achieve more collective discussion rather than having either Board feeling like they are out there on their own. Mrs. Mahon noted that what would help her is to understand the process/protocol that would help the community and Boards understand the important issues, but also allow the Select Board to join with Redevelopment Board to have complete conversations on the bigger issues. She thought that the Town Manager and Planning Director have outlined a good process. She asks the members to think about the process and how to best effectuate it for the future.

Mr. Bunnell is in favor of this idea. He does not believe that every item needs to be reviewed, but the Redevelopment Board should be asking for input from the Select Board and take recommendations and comments.

Mr. Benson draws some distinction between citizen petitions or articles that come from other Town entities. The process makes sense when warrant articles are coming to the Boards. But when the Redevelopment Board develops proposals, there should be a way to get input from the Select Board early in the process to refine the proposal prior to filing the article.

Mr. Curro agreed with Mr. Benson. The goal is to send a signal to Town Meeting that both Boards have considered collectively all of the warrant articles. He notes that there are three pathways: provide input early in the development of a proposal; provide advice if a proposal is not fully baked; and if the proposal is finalized, concurrence or support on a recommendation to Town Meeting. Each scenario could plan out.

Mr. Chapdelaine responded to Mr. Benson's comment by stating that this year might be too far along, but for future years, it would be important to start much earlier in the process. In response to Mr. Curro, this is a good start to what should each Board be doing: review and comments, recommendations, motions (but not conflicting motions), how do we time it, etc. We could take this Town Meeting season to work through these questions. In response to Mrs. Mahon's comments, he agrees that each item does not need to be reviewed, but we should have a dialogue to get to a consensus on what should be reviewed.

Mr. Hurd asked what the preference is: the Select Board wait to hear from the Redevelopment Board, or allow the chairs to discuss and propose something to the membership. Mr. Chapdelaine noted that he is hearing two different suggestions. For this cycle, the chairs, the Town Manager, and the Planning Director should meet and consider. For future Town Meetings, start the conversations between the two Boards earlier as needed.

Mr. Lau noted that when the Redevelopment Board makes recommendations on amendments, there is a reason to address a particular issue, for example addressing affordable housing. He suggested that the Redevelopment Board would welcome the help earlier in the development of how to address those issues, but not necessarily the technical changes. Mr. Bunnell expanded on this by stating it would be helpful to have policies, goals, and priorities in harmony with each other, and how that would inform the process to develop amendments. Mr. Benson provided an example about housing

and affordability across demographics. It is an area where the two Boards need to have a robust discussion on how to address, and what could change with zoning or town policies to do that. It would be a helpful discussion before the Redevelopment Board gets too far in development zoning amendments.

Mr. DeCoursey noted that it makes sense that each Board receives feedback early enough in the development process and in line with the public process, which likely pushes the schedule out from Town Meeting. In the short term, it makes sense to meet after the warrant closes, but in the long term, the two Boards should meet in the fall to ensure that the conversations happen early enough. We do have to be mindful that the recommendation on zoning articles comes from the Redevelopment Board regardless of how the Select Board members feel about a proposal, and similarly with Town Bylaw changes. We have to be careful about not overdoing it.

Mr. Watson noted that on the larger issues that the Redevelopment Board deals with, and housing is a good example, we realize that there is a holistic approach that goes beyond zoning and beyond the purview of the Redevelopment Board. He stated that it is ok if at different points in time we move forward with zoning or policy changes that may be within the purview of the Select Board, but we need to have a holistic understanding of how all these pieces fit together and making sure that we are not trying to solve a problem without all of the pieces to the puzzle. He thinks this is where the collaboration is most important.

Mr. Dunn compared this to the Town's finance process that we might learn from. We do this on the finance side with regularity. Through a combination of dialogue and iterations, and also independent Board actions, we might get to a point where Town Meeting and/or voters can decide. There are independent authorities, such as the School Committee or the Retirement Board, that need to take votes even if there isn't consensus. The downside is that there is not a direct flow chart, but it could be instructive.

Mr. Chapdelaine noted that it sounds like more meetings between the boards with a goal setting process could achieve a more holistic vision. Ms. Raitt asked when the Select Board has its goal setting meeting. It is held in July, so Ms. Raitt suggested that it might make sense to have a July joint meeting. She also noted that her attendance at some Select Board meetings might further this holistic approach.

Mr. Hurd wanted to make sure that the process still leaves zoning changes in the Redevelopment Board's purview to develop the actual amendments. He suggested that the Select Board and Redevelopment Board decide on a path, the Redevelopment Board creates the amendment, then the two Boards come back together to discuss and review.

Mrs. Mahon likes Ms. Raitt's suggestion regarding attendance at the Select Board meetings, but it may not be an efficient use of time. We should identify specific points in time when the Planning Director might attend Select Board meetings to have discussions as an ambassador for the Redevelopment Board, or vice versa for the Town Manager.

Mr. Chapdelaine stated that he hears consensus with some details to work out. He heard strongly that the two chairs, Mr. Raitt, and himself start a dialogue after the warrant closes this year. For the next year, work out a process.

Briefing on Potential Articles for Annual Town Meeting

Ms. Raitt noted that the agenda packet included a draft of a Municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund bylaw that was developed by staff and the Housing Plan Implementation Committee (HPIC). The Housing Production Plan identified the creation of a Trust Fund as a way to hold and administer funding for affordable housing. The HPIC will meet on January 17th to discuss further.

Mr. Curro asked about the interplay of Community Preservation Act (CPA) funds and a Municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Mr. Heim noted that CPA funds can fund a Municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund. When it funds a trust fund, the community needs to make sure that the expenditures meet the requirements of the CPA. Ms. Raitt expanded on this that the trust fund could request funding from the CPA Committee, which follows that CPA's recommendation process. If the

CPA Committee funds the trust fund, the money is deposited into the trust fund. Mr. Heim also noted that a trust fund can act throughout the year whereas the CPA Committee is on the Town Meeting cycle of acting once a year.

Mrs. Mahon asked for clarification of who oversees the trust fund: would it be the Collector/Treasurer and an independent auditor? Ms. Raitt indicated that both would oversee the fund, and the independent auditor could review the trust fund during the regular audit that the Town undertakes with Powers and Sullivan.

Mr. DeCoursey asked if a Municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund is the only recipient for a real estate transfer fee. Ms. Raitt indicated that if the town adopted a resolution for a real estate transfer fee and if the town filed a home rule petition to be allowed to establish a real estate transfer fee, then yes, the only account those funds could be deposited into is a Municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Mr. DeCoursey also indicated that the Municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund is Action Item 14 in the Housing Production Plan, so it would be helpful to include a baseline and better understanding of what has been accomplished from the Housing Production Plan.

Ms. Mahon clarified that one source of revenue that could be deposited into the Municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund is a real estate transfer fee, but there are other sources of funding that could be deposited into the fund. She noted that there has been no decisions on a real estate transfer fee at the state level. Ms. Raitt noted that Ms. Mahon is correct, and explained that there are a number of bills in the legislature that address a real estate transfer fee: one that is statewide and other municipalities' home rule petitions with various thresholds. There are many ways that Arlington could establish a real estate transfer fee, and a quick study of sales over a million dollars in Arlington showed that there were 152 transactions in 2019 that would have netted \$104,320 if a real estate transfer fee was set at 0.05%. A trust fund could also accept gifts of land and money, grants, payments in lieu, CPA funds, etc.

Mr. Watson noted that the flexibility is important in setting a threshold. An unintended consequence of a fee might increase the unaffordability of mid-market housing. He recommended setting the threshold thoughtfully.

Ms. Raitt closed by stating that she wanted to make the Boards aware of two items that are forthcoming that she is aware of for this year. Mr. Chapdelaine noted that these are two good examples of articles that would go to the Select Board for the main motion, but which the Redevelopment Board might have a strong interest in discussing as well.

Draft Community Outreach Strategy

Ms. Raitt noted that the community outreach strategy is draft and open for discussion. She noted that the staff would like to set forth a transparent process and create a feedback loop over the next year and engage as many people as possible. The first phase is to bring awareness starting with the meeting tonight. The next phase sets a number of options for people to participate in the next few months of 2020, which includes the Town Survey and potentially other surveys, community workshops, and open houses. Through this process, we would develop the broader engagement strategy on the most important topics. The latter portion of the engagement period, specifically June through November, would be spent on policy development. Ms. Raitt noted that it would be important to consider a 2021 special Town Meeting to give enough time for this strategy to play out. Toward the end of 2020, we would move into the formal Town Meeting process, which would include public hearings, having the boards work together, and neighborhood meetings, among other ideas.

Mr. Hurd noted that the first step should include educating the community about the affordable housing crisis and not jump into solutions. He recommended having a public forum early in the process where a presentation could be made and allow for comments. Ms. Raitt noted that a large public forum could happen in the first half of 2020 along with other broader discussions with various groups in the community.

Ms. Mahon added that conversations around housing for seniors, veterans, and adults aged 22 or older who transition out of supportive residential programs. There is a need for housing for these distinct populations and there is funding available. These populations would not tax the school system or the transportation network. Ms. Mahon suggested working with the Veterans' Service Officer, Council on Aging, and the Disability Commission to identify sources of funding

that could support housing for these populations. Ms. Raitt acknowledged that all types of housing would be part of the conversation.

Mr. Benson noted that there are two pieces to consider: making Arlington a more welcoming place for new housing development through zoning and policy; and finding the developers that do this work, inviting them in and working with them. He recommended outreach to developers as part of the engagement strategy.

Ms. Zsembery noted that there should also be an investigation in the needs of Arlington's commercial infrastructure that supports development in the community.

Mr. Watson noted that he is supportive of having at least 6 months to focus on education and receiving community input before formulating policy proposals. He noted that this is a plan and is not set in stone. As this work progresses, Mr. Watson noted that we need to be conscious of giving even more time to that phase depending on where the community engagement takes the Boards.

Public Comment

Mr. Chapdelaine opened public comment and requested that comments are limited to 3 minutes.

John Worden, 27 Jason Street, noted two items. He agreed that affordability is the most important housing issue in town, and creating that kind of housing town should be the only kind of housing being promoted in Arlington at this time. The outreach program is very important, and he is glad that it is a prolonged process as it takes time. Any outreach should not be controlled by a specific agenda with limited public comment. It is important that the public be given a real opportunity to present thoughts, feelings, beliefs, and facts. Mr. Worden mentioned that there is concern about mansionization, rock removal, escalating taxes, and loss of commercial development. He does not believe that Arlington can afford to bring in more people. Mr. Worden noted that the Economic Analysis of Industrial Zoning Districts is very important.

Alex Bagnall, 10 Wyman Street, believes that the Zoning Bylaw is working as designed by encouraging single and two family construction by right while discouraging multifamily construction due to lot size, density restrictions, parking requirements, and a special permit approval process making it that only high end projects are economically feasible, with the Housing Corporation of Arlington's projects excepted. This unequal treatment has perpetuated race and class segregation in Arlington. Mr. Bagnall noted that maintaining the existing Zoning Bylaw maintains the status quo of Arlington's housing stock and maintains inequality. He noted that Arlington voted resoundingly to preserve 40B in 2010. Mr. Bagnall noted that a structural problem needs a structural solution.

Steve Revilak, 111 Sunnyside Avenue, provided some data about the purchase of his home. The former owner purchased it for \$151,000 in 1999. Mr. Revilak purchased it for \$359,000 in 2007. Today, the home is assessed at \$501,000. He noted that housing costs are escalating and there is a cumulative impact on the households moving into Arlington. Mr. Revilak provided some information from the 2019 Town Survey and noted that the population is affluent and highly educated to match the cost of housing that they live in. After 20 years of gentrification, there have been benefits to the community, but it comes at a cost by creating an economic barrier to live in Arlington. Mr. Revilak sees this as a crisis and would like the community to do something about it. He sees two issues: affordability and the imbalance between supply and demand.

Don Seltzer, 104 Irving Street, noted that the outreach strategy. Last year, the town limited the scope of outreach including not discussing the impact on the schools. Mr. Seltzer noted that the same question will come up again, and he is troubled by how town officials are preparing. He indicated that the cost per student needs to include school costs that are outside of the school budget and within other budgets. Mr. Seltzer indicated that the school budget does not include OPEB costs, health care, or capital costs, which are in the town budget. He noted that additional students have overloaded classroom capacity and schools have been expanded with debt incurred. Mr. Seltzer noted that the Capital Planning Committee and the Finance Committee need to be included in the discussions.

Mark Rosenthal, 62 Walnut Street, thanked the Board member who noted it is important to make it possible for people to stay in their homes. It is an important piece of diversity and he draws the linkage between that and commercial development. He noted that the elderly are not taking advantage of programs available through the town because they are unacceptable. The Finance Committee chair Al Tosti noted that new housing costs more in town services than it provides in revenue. He notes that there is a low percentage of tax revenue that comes from commercial space. The cost of new buildings falls to the homeowners. Mr. Rosenthal noted that Arlington should be taking about new types of commercial development including start-up incubators.

Patricia Worden, 27 Jason Street, noted that she is grateful for the comments from the ARB members. She asked whether there are plans to help residents being evicted or displaced and where there are plans for more schools if the density articles are proposed at Town Meeting. Mr. Chapdelaine noted that these are important issues to be discussed during the outreach.

Roderick Holland, 88 Grafton Street, noted that if a special Town Meeting is the mechanism for substantive zoning amendments, it would be important to schedule it many months in advance to ensure that Town Meeting Members can be in attendance since it's hard to predict when one might be scheduled. Additionally, he noted that outreach during 2019 was impressive, but there were a lot of "what if" questions which could not be answered. The Town would benefit from internal capability for modeling and simulations in order to answer these questions as the technology is available.

Anne Thompson, 14 Cottage Street, has been considering a large database of parcels within the 5 counties in the greater Boston area. Arlington does not have a commercial tax base. The other communities in the Metro Mayor's Coalition have larger commercial tax bases and differential taxes, and therefore less of a problem funding school costs. Additionally, Ms. Thompson noted that the average square foot size of an affordable unit in Cambridge is 800 square feet. She noted that this is not a family-sized unit, so Arlington needs to decide who the affordable housing is for. Ms. Thompson noted that she is happy to participate in conversations, review documents created by consultants, and offered her ability in data analysis.

Jon Gersh, 24 Kipling Road, noted that this meeting seems like a model for public forums and cooperation. He is happy to hear about affordable housing and growing the commercial tax base. He noted that it still feels like Arlington is under pressure by the housing goals of the Metro Mayor's Coalition. He asked that Arlington's needs be put ahead of the regional needs. Mr. Gersh recommended thinking about affordable housing only and growing the commercial tax base.

Beth Melofchik, 20 Russell Street, indicated her preference to not use CHAPA and MAPC for future studies in the community. She reiterated statements made about addressing Arlington's problems, including growing the commercial tax base. Ms. Melofchik noted that Arlington does not have much in common with the Metro Mayor's Coalition communities. She would like to see industrial and commercial space preserved, and there should be more lab and development space. She likes the holistic viewpoint of Arlington as an entire community. Ms. Melofchik also discussed many elements of addressing climate change. She would like to see the tree canopy on Mass Ave saved and that the Veterans' Park should not be moved to behind the Police Station.

Carl Wagner, 30 Edgehill Road, noted that he appreciates this meeting. He noted that the Boards are volunteers doing their best for Arlington. He also noted that the 2019 articles to increase density did not come from the voters. These articles came from out of town or from unelected officials. Mr. Wagner noted that the people who live and work in Arlington are more important and that the elected officials need to work to make the cost of living, quality of life, and current density is preserved. The elected officials are in a sacred bond with the voters. Mr. Wagner asked that the Select Board work with the Town Manager, staff, and the Redevelopment Board to recognize that the voters are the most important stakeholders before anything new is undertaken.

Pam Hallett, 1 Gilboa Road, noted that affordable housing is clearly a crisis for many people in Arlington. Many of the tenants coming to the Housing Corporation of Arlington (HCA) are from Arlington already. HCA has a network of social

service agencies to help each case to identify housing and help meet the needs of these families and households. The real estate transfer fee is a wonderful concept as a way to help fund these efforts. Ms. Hallett noted that she will be presenting to the Legislature on the need for real estate transfer fees.

Susan Stamps, 39 Grafton Street, noted that she believes a working group needs to include other community representatives. She noted that the Tree Committee and others were brought in during 2019 after a lot of investment was made by the Redevelopment Board and had many concerns. She believes that many voices need to be in the conversation earlier in the process, such as the Tree Committee, Disability Commission, a representative from the housing community, Sustainable Arlington or the Clean Energy Future Committee, and builders. Ms. Stamps also indicated that there need to be better visuals.

Jo Anne Preston, 42 Mystic Lake Drive, noted that she attended all of the Redevelopment Board meetings last spring. She explained that none of the meetings included any of the Arlington residents that would be most impacted by the articles from the 2019 Town Meeting, such as those people who live in older apartment buildings in Arlington. She believes it is very important to include these residents. However, these households are difficult to reach and they need to be identified and reached. The methods last year did not reach them, so this should be priority.

Aram Hollman, 12 Whittemore Street, likes the real estate transfer tax but is concerned about the outreach plan. Mr. Hollman noted that the protracted schedule is a replay of the previous year. He indicated that Arlington should not convert commercial and industrial spaces to residential uses. He noted that very few affordable units have been created in Arlington with new housing over the last 20 years. Mr. Hollman does not believe that housing will help the Town's bottom line where as commercial and industrial space helps the bottom line. He urges the community to create jobs in the industrial and commercial areas and make Arlington a job center.

Karen Kelleher, 57 Beacon Street, asked those in attendance to think about this forum as a reset. There were unproductive conversations last year that didn't get to the real conversation about values and lifestyle. Ms. Kelleher noted that the problem is difficult to solve, and as such there will be difficult solutions. She is pleased to see Arlington turning to solutions and noted that she hears unanimity on the concern that the increasing affluence in Arlington is creating hardships. The proposals from the Housing Plan Implementation Committee on establishing an affordable housing trust fund and creating a revenue stream are productive. Ms. Kelleher explained that she works in affordable housing finance and creating affordable housing is expensive and increasingly difficult to subsidize. She urged Arlington to aggregate resources to solve the problems while balancing the objectives that are important to the community.

Len Diggins, 8 Windsor Street, noted that the transportation costs impact the cost of living. He recommended some focus on development policies to bring down the cost of living. He recommends similar actions for sustainable housing to reduce the cost of homeownership. Mr. Diggins also noted the comments about making Arlington first will not be productive if we do not continue to work with others in the region to address local and regional concerns. If we do this, Mr. Diggins noted that we can elevate Arlington and the region.

Future Meetings

Mr. Chapdelaine noted that he did not think a series of meeting dates need to be set this evening, but he did note that there is interest in a joint goal setting meeting in the summer. He will circulate some dates later this spring after the local elections.

Mr. Lau made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Mahon seconded. The motion was unanimous.