

Attn: MBTA TF, PB Members

Cc: TA, ConCom Members

(Ms. Hunter, please distribute to all TF and PB Members.)

(Ms. Powers, please distribute to all ConCom Members. Thank you.)

(Ms Marletta...speakers and acoustics were very clear this time. Please post my email to the MBTA Town website under correspondence. Thank you.)

Good Afternoon,

Best wishes for a healthy, happy, and prosperous New Year.

A few takeaways from the January 4th MBTA TF Meeting:

1. Process and Paperwork: I concur with Ms. Mellish. Any and all proposals, talking points, and event planning with the public should be funneled to the full MBTA TF for actual approval. I do not see this as micromanagement, but rather as point of authority. All MBTA subcommittees are authorized via the MBTA TF and the MBTA TF is authorized via the SB.

2. Harbor Point parking lot: My understanding is that the hired consultant has advised that this locus not be considered in the mix. However, Mr. Morse "**doth protest too much, methinks.**"

According to the Jan 4 record, the consultant does not cite Ch91 or the HOA residents as the reason; I heard " it's more trouble than it is worth." Regardless, I draw your attention once again to my email correspondence below. The EOHLC states: "**We encourage you to avoid overlap where it is possible to do so.**" *This applies to Ch 91 areas, filled tidal land.*

I would also contend that Mr. Garth's allusion to vacant malls without mixed housing throughout the US and lack of hindsight in the commercial real estate market, which is failing, has **NO** application to our Harbor area. I would also recommend that Mr. Garth's repeated promotion of smaller condos and apartments under 1000 sq ft be deleted from all discussion in the future. We are not Brookline as he mentioned; and clearly the State model is using a 1000 sq ft model (to include maintenance and

mechanicals). I see no value to the TF mission to continue to circle on this issue.

Also, Mr. Garth's comments that the HP area "cries out for more density" is in contravention to guiding principle you adopted to protect the resources in that area and the character of the downtown. It is crystal clear that the TF may avoid any zoning that does not protect the commercial area. The attached HOA docs are crystal clear...retail only.

It was clear from the Jan 4th meeting that some TF members were not in receipt of any and all paperwork to be discussed. This needs improvement.

3. Height of Design: I am unclear on this point, as was resident Ms. Sarah Pierce. Our considerations should not specify 4 stories or below solely to incorporate Newport Park expansion in the back out the street view. If and when, Newport Park is determined to be demolished and rebuilt, at that time, the developer may provide a design and ask for variances. If I am incorrect, Sarah, I welcome an explanation.

It is obvious that all volunteers and elected officials are working very hard in this matter. I appreciate Ms. Bodmer-Turner's probing questions, Ms. Mellish's push to conform to process, and Ms. Philbrick's emphasis on law. However, I hold that the TF must accomplish 2 things for **voters**:

1. Provide options to the State to comply that is in the "best interest of the Town."

AND,

2. Outline the impact of a rejection to "comply" with the State, in terms of loss of grant money.

Thank you for your work in this difficult matter.

Regards,

Lorraine

Lorraine Iovanni
20 A Pine St