



Meeting Notes  
July 13, 2009  
6:00 PM – 7:45 PM  
Dudley Public Library  
65 Warren Street

**RSMPOC Members Present:** Darnell Williams (Chair), Beverly Adams, Norman Stembridge, Daniel Richardson, Marilyn Lynch, Joseph Cefalo, Frank Williams, Michael Miles, Donovan Walker, Virginia Davis; BRA: Monestime, Maria Faria, Jeong-Jun Ju, Ted Schwartzberg, Jacob Wiggins

Chairman Williams (OC) called the meeting to order at 6:07 PM. He then entertained a motion to accept the last meetings minutes and for any modifications, if needed. None were requested. Norman Stembridge (OC) moved to accept the minutes and Daniel Richardson (OC) seconded the motion. Notes were unanimously accepted.

#### Working Session Update

Norman Stembridge (OC) gave an update of the last working session meeting (June 29, 2009). The discussion revolved around P-3, Bartlett Yard, and economic development.

He noted that Barry Gaither (Elma Lewis) brought them up to date on P-3 and the BRA. They brought to light an issue with the Whittier Street Clinic location on the site because they are looking for additional space for the building.

In regards to Bartlett Yard he explained that the group was told that they were working out an extension with the MBTA. They received a \$4,000,000 appraisal last year that was cut to \$750k. The developer is looking to the T to extend out for a year. David Price noted they were hoping to start Article 80 process this fall and first construction in 2 years.

Norman Stembridge (OC) also noted that Brenda McKenzie talked to them about internal BRA structure for P-3 to make the process more cohesive.

Chairman Williams (OC) questioned the process and asked if that was now put to bed

Joe Cefalo (OC) said he feels that things are better now after the meeting; the group also discussed canceling their August 3rd meeting.

Joe Cefalo (OC) added that they discussed Donovan's question about Community Benefits from the previous RSMPOC meeting and that the group might not have been thorough in addressing it and would like a meeting in the future to discuss those issues.

#### Parcels 8, 9, and 10 and the Crescent Parcel Update

Monestime (BRA) gave an update on the status of each parcel. He noted the RFP for 9 and 10 has been vetted through by the community and the committee is exploring the possibility of folding Parcel 8 into the RFP for Parcels 9 & 10.

He also talked about a more generic RFP. The BRA will bring a draft RFP of the Crescent Parcel and will contemplate having the RFP's ready to go when the economy improves.

Chairman Williams (OC) asked do give a sequential update of each parcel.

Monestime (BRA) noted that the draft RFP for Parcels 9 and 10 was submitted to DCAM for feedback. DCAM is currently reviewing the RFP.

Chairman Williams (OC) said that he thought that DCAM was done reviewing the draft RFP for Parcels 9 and 10.

Monestime (BRA) said they were still discussing how to issue the RFP, either jointly or just the BRA.

He also said that the BRA has also begun to look at environmental issues regarding 8, 9 and 10 as well as the Crescent Parcel. They have discussed a tabletop analysis that will give a history of the use of those sites for potential contaminations. It should not cost too much money and BRA is checking with the state agencies to see how they also could help pay for the analysis.

We are holding back on appraisal and determine a lease term for the RFP parcels until we are ready to issue the RFP. We need to establish value and cost per square foot.

Donovan Walker (OC) doesn't believe anything generic should be applied to the Crescent Parcel and feels that they are holding back on Crescent until 9 & 10 are ready. He also noted that he felt they have the opportunity in that area to do things for the community and they seem to be doing the work but are waiting on someone else's schedule.

Chairman Williams (OC) stated the committee has articulated the generic RFP process and the committee feels it might expedite the process. He also noted that they requested the generic RFP process. They are also not going to try and do something due to the market conditions.

Norman Stenbridge (OC) said he thought they were looking at the status of all the parcels with all the agencies involved. If the ownership could not be resolved then we should move forward with legislation. Not exactly for development, but just so we can move forward. He liked the idea of 9 and 10 together, possibly with Parcel 8 and then the Crescent if it made sense. They will all be available to individual developers.

Joe Cefalo (OC) asked that since there would be no Phase 1, what is the timeframe for a developer to assess the site?

Monestime (BRA) said it was usually during the tentative designation period.

Joe Cefalo (OC) said he thinks that it must be specific for the developer.

Norman Stenbridge (OC) asked if a previous desktop assessment has been done before and if anything came about?

Monestime (BRA) said they have done some before and found some things that were taken care of. He also spoke about the Crescent Parcel process. He stated that there were four workshops for parcels 9 & 10 and they may not need as many workshops for this parcel. The generic RFP should come to the committee and hopefully take lesser time for the process. Hugues then introduced representatives from DCR to talk about their process.

Joe Orfant (DCR) introduced Patrice Kish (DCR) and Jim Comeau (DCR) to talk about their process.

Joe Orfant (DCR) said that Parcel 8 was acquired for the park master plan. When contacted by the BRA about the parcel, they were greatly interested. He said he would like to see the Nawn factory developed. The land is protected by Article 97 (use must be changed by a 2/3 majority in the leg.). The process is spelled out in the land disposition process.

Jim Comeau (DCR) noted that from time to time they have surplus properties. DCAM will ultimately transfer the property to the City. He then explained the process. He also noted that the goal for the Commonwealth was not to give away land. He believes they can achieve a no net loss of property by working with the City and must receive fair market value for the land. DCR would like to see legislation for any difference in value of the City property and the Commonwealth be put into a trust fund for the heritage state park.

Chairman Williams (OC) asked if it was a short window we're looking at for this process.

Jim Comeau (DCR) said it would not be many years but likely longer than 8 months.

Joe Orfant (DCR) noted that Jim will get a recommendation from the Commissioner. They do not have control over the MEPA process which could take time. Also don't have control over the legislative agenda to get the disposition on their docket.

Michael Miles (OC) asked what city agency has control of the piece of property DCR would like in return.

Jim Cameau (DCR) said he couldn't say for sure. It is near Stony Brook Reservation and would be a good conservation piece.

Norman Stembridge (OC) asked that if no matter what, do they still have to go through the legislature?

Joe Cefalo (OC) said that yes that is the case.

Donovan Walker (OC) thanked them for coming to the meeting and for providing their information.

Thatiana Gibson (DCAM) then gave information regarding her role in the process. She noted that her role is process orientated and DCAM wants to make sure their disposition process is included in the language of the RFP. The legislation Jim noted will direct DCAM as well as the Inspector General ("IG"), scope of work, appraisers, etc. When a deed is drawn they submit to the IG office and others. She noted that she has looked at the RFP and really isn't changing much in it, and that their process is noted in there.

Chairman Williams (OC) asked about the timeframe compared to DCR's

Thatiana Gibson (DCAM) said that in best case it could be 6-8 months, but could be longer depending on the IG and other factors.

Norman Stembridge (OC) asked if the DCAM and DCR processes run concurrent or after one another

Thatiana Gibson (DCAM) said they run together

Joe Cefalo (OC) noted that for DCR said 8 months may be unlikely for his department and that the committee needs to understand that

Michael Miles (OC) asked if the DCAM language is in the current RFP

Thatiana Gibson (DCAM) said she has reviewed and tweaked some of the language in the draft RFP

Michael Miles (OC) asked about the timeframe of getting her language back to the BRA

Thatiana Gibson (DCAM) noted it should be available by the next working session meeting

### Bartlett Yard Update

Michael Miles (OC) gave the committee an update as David could not make it. He noted that there really are no new updates to report from the last meeting. They have worked with the MBTA to get an extension on the PNS agreement that was due to expire. That will allow them to continue to work through some of the value changes of the property. Due to the drop in the value of the land, they are reworking their financial aspects. He said the group is working together with the MBTA on an extension to June 2010. Due to the legal language of the sale price being set upon, they have run into some trouble. They are working on phasing scenarios to combat financial issues.

Donovan Walker (OC) said he thought \$4,000,000 was required upfront to bid on the parcel. Doesn't understand how you can get a new appraisal. Not sure how they are now down to \$750,000. He was unsure how they paid that amount of money and are now stating they shouldn't pay it due to the revaluation

Joe Cefalo (OC) said that a bank did an appraisal and due to the change in the economic climate, the appraisal was much lower from the bank. The bank can't lend is a piece of land that is being sold for \$4,000,000 when they appraise it for \$750,000. The developers are asking for more time to work out this issue for the next year. We assume a new appraisal will happen at the end of the year. The MBTA is bound by statute to receive the \$4,000,000.

Leah Buckley (Citizen) said that she had seen that Bartlett was on the agenda. She noted that she has recently relocated to the area and feels that Bartlett St. was an ideal location for an all girls school or an all black law school. She stated that if the bid goes down to \$750,000 then she would like to see others have the opportunity to rebid on the project.

Michael Miles (OC) said they now have a year to come up with \$4,000,000. They have an extension till June 30, 2010 to work that out. The MBTA is working with them to phase the project to meet the obligations with the price remaining at 4mill. They may proceed with more viable pieces first, and then pieces that rely on that

A citizen asked if that cannot be done; will it go out for a rebid?

Michael Miles (OC) said that it will go out for a re-bid. The MBTA will no longer be obligated to that developer.

A citizen asked that in six months down the line, will this group take a stand or have the authority to do something?

Chairman Williams (OC) said he felt that their responsibilities will not allow them to do such.

Michael Miles (OC) said they will stay committed to the developer. If in six months we will try to find a way to help them or ask them to be honest and explain, then go to MBTA.

### Ruggles Place Update

Maria Faria (BRA) gave an update on Ruggles Place. On April 28, the BRA gave an extension on P-3 for 18 months. She then read the standards within said agreement. Specifically it notes Elma Lewis must submit a monthly report. That was submitted on schedule, as was this month's. The BRA also met with Elma Lewis to go over the process. They have 90 days to do a subdivision of land with Whittier Street. That 90 day window is up this month.

Chairman Williams (OC) asked if the 90 days window is coming up

Maria Faria (BRA) confirmed that it is coming up this month.

Donovan Walker (OC) requested a copy of the board memo that outlines the 18 month process.

Joe Cefalo (OC) asked about their new partner, DRI, who was noted at the working session.

Maria Faria (BRA) said that in the packet there was information regarding the Elma Lewis' financial situation and its requirements.

Joe Cefalo (OC) asked if the BRA has looked at the DRI proposals

Maria Faria (BRA) said that they will be the project managers for the projects and K-2 consultants will work with them

Chairman Williams (OC) asked if there were project managers for P's 8,9,10.

Maria Faria (BRA) said not yet, but there will be

Michael Miles (OC) asked for clarification the 90 days requirement

Maria Faria (BRA) said if they cannot reach the 90 day agreement the BRA will step in; the deadline is the 28<sup>th</sup> of July as is the third monthly update.

Barry Gaither (Elma Lewis) said their two priorities are for moving forward with DRI, the legal team, and their architects. She stated that for Whittier Street, they received a list of what they want in regards to lot size, massing, parking, etc. He said Elma Lewis

offered 12,000 sq ft. of building space and 35,000 sq ft of parking. They also have an option of increasing their space of to 15,000 sq ft. He noted they could also add an extra story if zoning allows for it. Also would like to increase total square footage from 60,000 sq ft to 78,000 sq ft. He stated they asked to change the entrance from Tremont St. to Whittier St which is un-agreeable, due to enormous traffic issues. It would be too much traffic on Whittier St.

Carol Murray (Citizen) – what does “step in” mean at the end of 90 days.

Maria Faria (BRA) read the exact text of the resolution. The BRA will step in and likely work with both groups to come to a resolution.

Chairman Williams (OC) said the BRA will make the determination if necessary

Norman Stembridge (OC) said they “retain the right to” and that doesn’t mean they have to exercise it.

Mr. Bickerstaff (Citizen) – said the BRA would step in as an arbiter at the end?

Maria Faria (BRA) confirmed that after the 90 days, if no resolution is reached, they may.

#### Staff Update

Ted Schwartzberg (BRA) informed the group that four neighborhood newspapers have closed. He noted that the staff will continue to email the community and post the meetings on the BRA calendar. He said that staff will begin to do paper mailings to notify the community and advertise in the South End News. The BRA will also advertise on the City online calendar and work with the ONS to reach citizens in the community.

Leah Buckley (Citizen) – noted that the paper has been suspended according to the editor.

Berry Gaither (Elma Lewis) recommended the BRA could take use of the BNN.

#### Community Input

Bruce Bickerstaff (Citizen) asked if there was an official position of elected officials in regards to P-8. If so, can the community hear what this is so that they can understand their positions?

Chairman Williams (OC) said he was unsure of a definitive answer and noted that a lot of the discussion on this evening was in regards to P-8

Norman Stembridge (OC) said Rep. Rushing would do all in his power to help. He also said that Rep. Fox would help and with DCR and DCAM coming to the table it appears we will keep this process going.

Bruce Bickerstaff (Citizen) said he would like to stay updated on the elected official's stance and asked about the when the process will be complete of revisions.

Thatiana Gibson (DCAM) said that Article 97 gave specific provisions for that and that DCAM has provisions about notifications to Historical commissions which could take some time.

Bruce Bickerstaff (Citizen) asked if P-8 is becomes park or historical site, will there be a continued relationship between DCR and the development partner?

Chairman Williams (OC) feels that DCR will surplus the land, DCAM will work with disposition, go through legislature, then come to BRA and we will set up a PRC.

Bruce Bickerstaff (Citizen) asked that if the site is a park, would DCR support that monetarily or otherwise? Would it be public or private?

Chairman Williams (OC) noted the question and said it was one they could not answer tonight, but it is a topic to follow up on.

Chairman Williams (OC) entertained motion to adjourn the meeting. Daniel Richardson made such motion, which was unanimously approved.

With that, there was nothing more and the meeting was adjourned at 7:41pm.