## **Marina Lent**

From: Jim Malkin <jimmalkin@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2015 3:04 PM

**To:** Alison Burger; Dan Greenbaum; Billy Meegan; Steve Flanders; Janet Weidner; Jane Slater;

Ron Rappaport; Marina Lent

**Subject:** I received the following from a recipient of this letter and attachment

Attachments: Rossi - January 14 design parameter letter.pdf; att05800.htm

SquiCom - I am sending this to you for your information. I find it disappointing that Mr. Parker has firstly put himself and the FOS in the middle of what should be a conversation between the parties that own property effected by our recommendation (Orphanos/Jeffers, Weldon and the Farm Homeowners Association and has secondly submitted a lease proposal for Orphanos/Jeffers lot that would mirror the FOS initial proposal.

In reviewing the attached design proposal that Orphanos/Jeffers submitted to the BOS, I find that it retains the FOS parking design, the dune, the access location and the skiff launch; it eliminates our turnaround. While accepting the low causeway, they attempt to limit it to a specific number of feet, which is not backed up by the work done by our consultant.

I find this all rather disappointing on the part of the FOS.

JMM jimmalkin@gmail.com +1 917 3281987

**From:** Charles Parker [mailto:charles.f.parker@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2015 2:15 AM

To: Sue Regen; Rich Regen; David Stork; Nancy Stork; Virginia Dawson; David Dawson; Doug Liman;

Barbara Goldmuntz; zach lee; Robbie Lee; Callagy, John M **Cc:** Wendy Jeffers; Tony Orphanos; Peter D Weldon

Subject: Letter to Bill Rossi - Sent Today

Hi Everyone,

The Squibnocket Committee has completed its final report, the articles for Town Meeting have been written by the Selectmen, and Town meeting is set for early February. The FOS news is that the attached letter was sent today to Bill Rossi to kick-off the process for negotiating a final outcome.

We agree broadly with the recommendations of the Committee, however there are key differences. First, while the Committee is recommending that the Town purchase the properties, Tony and Wendy would prefer to lease their pond lot to the Town as a lease provides some control over the outcome (we do not know Peter Weldon's plans for his pond lot). Second, we have proposed a set of design details that differ from the Committee's recommendations but none are significant. For example, both parking solutions are in the same basic area, however our proposed parking area is laid-out differently and has been engineered. And, while we support the recommendations for the low causeway, much is left undefined. At this point, our objective

is to gain agreement on these basic design parameters before we move to a discussion of specific lease terms.

There are three basic steps in the process going forward from this point. The first is to work with the Town to get buy-in to a lease, as opposed to a sale (already underway). The second is to agree on the basic design parameters (discussed in the attached mail), and the third is to agree on a specific set of terms and move to closure (next step if we reach closure on the design). While there is a Town Meeting in early February, it is expected that the Town will vote to support the Committee's recommendations. Town Meeting shouldn't present an open question for us, unless there's a technical problem with one of the articles....

This memorandum has been sent to SFHA and Warren Spector has acknowledged receipt.

Anyway, we thought you would like to see the progress, such as it is!

Best,

Charlie