

MSLD Study Committee Notes #13

April 29, 2026, 6:30 pm

Zoom <https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1619762359>

Study Committee Attendees:

Ameeth Deenanath
Crystal Galvin
Jeffrey Gonyeau
Julie Hall
Nancy Johnsen (Chair)
Lindsey Mac-Jones
Linda Neshamkin

Staff:

Gabriela Amore
Elizabeth Sherva
Jennifer Gaugler

Members of the Public:

Johanna Hynes
John [last name]

Absent:

Kirsten Hoffman
Intiya Ambrogi Isaza
Senam Kumahia
Fadi Samaha
Ian Urquhart

Action/follow-up items for staff are highlighted in **yellow**.

I. REVIEW AND VOTE ON MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 8, 2026 PUBLIC MEETING

- A. **Linda** motions to approve meeting minutes, **Ameeth** seconds the motion. Meeting minutes approved unanimously.

II. PUBLIC FEEDBACK SINCE LAST MEETING

- A. Discuss feedback from community engagement event on April 15, 2026.
 1. **Jennifer** presented a [slide deck](#) with data compiled from the community engagement event.
 2. **Jeff** inquired about attendee count, **Gabriela** stated that staff estimated about 60-65 attendees.
 3. **Linda** encouraged having the next event in person as well.
 4. **Julie** felt that the opportunities for one-on-one conversations were helpful for dispelling misinformation. The Study Committee felt the activities were helpful, and thanked staff for their work.
 5. **Jeff** suggested that before the next public event it would be helpful for local resident members of the Study Committee think about whether they felt any particular segments of the population from Charlestown were missing from the event, and how to reach them better.
- B. BLC Staff to share any additional feedback received by BLC
 1. No additional feedback was reported.
- C. Study committee members to share any additional feedback received
 1. No additional feedback was reported.

III. REVIEW FUTURE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PLANS

- A. **Crystal** logged into the meeting [7:24pm].

- B. **Jennifer** suggested that the next community event could be in the fall – likely in September – following the completion of a working draft of the study report which could be shared with the public in advance of the event.
- C. **Julie** suggested exploring the use of Memorial Hall for the next event as it has a higher capacity.
 - 1. **Linda** supported this and noted that the building has recent accessibility improvements.
 - 2. **Jennifer** said that staff will reach out to the owners to inquire about hosting the event there.

IV. REVIEW PROPOSED DISTRICT & PROTECTION AREA BOUNDARY

- A. The Study Committee discussed the potential boundaries of the Landmark District and Protection Area, as well as current planning initiatives by the Planning Department in the Bunker Hill Mall area.
 - 1. **Jennifer** commented that the two areas in which the Study Committee has been considering expanding the Landmark District (Monument Avenue and the Training Field) have been specifically mentioned in public comments as areas that should be included in the Landmark District. The Study Committee seems comfortable with moving forward with the working boundary of the Landmark District as it is currently drawn.
 - 2. Regarding the Protection Area boundary, **Nancy** explained that there have been some concerns in the community about redevelopment of the Bunker Hill Mall area, particularly with regard to the height of new development.
 - a) Staff offers to do some analysis of the area around the southwest corner of the proposed Protection Area so that the Study Committee can discuss a potential expansion of that part of the Protection Area boundary at a later meeting.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

- A. **Johanna Hynes** asked what is the “Planning Department”? **Jennifer** provided a brief explanation that it is a department of the City of Boston municipal government that was established by Mayor Wu to take the place of the BPDA.
- B. **John** stated that he opposes any additional restrictions on property and therefore opposes the designation of the district.

VI. STAFF UPDATES

- A. **Jennifer** provided a brief update on a recent ruling by the Attorney General’s office that the study committee was found in violation of Open Meeting Law because it tried to host a hybrid meeting but the meeting was not sufficiently audible to online attendees. Once it became aware that the audio was a problem, the study committee immediately switched to holding only virtual or only in-person meetings, and the Attorney General considers the matter to be resolved.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: 8:10 PM

- A. **Jeff** motions to adjourn, **Julie** seconds. Unanimous vote to adjourn.