



Meeting Notes
April 3, 2006
6:00pm-7:45 PM
Boston Public Library
65 Warren Street

RSMPOC Members Present: Darnell Williams, Daniel Richardson, Barbara Barrow-Murray, John Barros, Joe Cefalo, Reginald Jackson, Michael Miles, Charlotte Nelson, Donovan Walker, Senator Dianne Wilkerson, Councilor Charles Turner, Marilyn Lynch Excused, Public-20 plus

Welcome: Darnell Williams (OC Chair) called the meeting to order and introduced the agenda.

Review of Minutes: The minutes for the 3/6/06 RSMPOC meeting were unanimously approved.

Bartlett Yard Timeline and RFP Discussion: John Dalzell (BRA) presented a proposed timeline outlining the Bartlett Yard RFP process. In addition, the Use and Design guidelines developed during the community workshops have been posted online. The BRA will do electronic and traditional mail outreach, as well as make all documents relevant to the Bartlett process available in hard copy at Roxbury Libraries, per the suggestion of Dan Richardson (OC). The BRA will also develop a summary document on the community meetings.

-John (BRA) went on to describe how the OC meetings can be used as workshops for finalizing the Bartlett RFP, utilizing the Use and Design guidelines. The BRA will also provide OC members with a draft RFP two weeks prior to the May meeting.

-Darnell (OC) asked each OC member to carefully look through the timeline before any further discussion. John (BRA) read through the timeline and objectives.

-Barbara Barrow-Murray (OC) stated that this feels like a very tight timeline.

-Joe Cefalo (OC) stated that when the OC receives the first draft copy of the Bartlett RFP that it should be made public immediately. He recalled some issues with this during the P-3 process in integrating the OC work with public comments.

-Darnell (OC) stated that the OC needs to remember all it learned during the P-3 process and that in terms of public review, the sooner the better.

Michael Miles (OC) asked when the Bartlett draft RFP would be going out. John (BRA) stated that it would be in mid-April, ahead of the next OC meeting and it would be distributed to the OC, meeting attendees, the Roxbury libraries, and posted on the BRA website.

-Darnell (OC) suggested using local media to get info on the process out, for example utilizing the BNN bulletin board. John (BRA) commented that this would be another way to get info out about the May OC meeting.

-John (BRA) stated that he felt it important to not let the dialogue become too drawn out, keeping discussions fresh and current. Also, by mid-May a second draft would be ready to be reviewed for the June OC meeting. If there are not significant changes that need to be made, then maybe an official 28 day period for public commentary would begin after the June meeting.

-Barbara (OC) reminded everyone about summer vacation issues and that there will be no August meeting. Also, why wait till June to talk about the RFP? John (OC) responded that the public will be involved from the first draft of the RFP, and then in June, when close to finished, we can announce a formal commentary period. This is all predicated upon June approval of the RFP by the OC.

-Joe (OC) suggested that this is a two-tiered process. The first is extensive public comment starting now and throughout the RFP drafting process. The second could begin in June with another announcement stating that this document exists, kicking off a 28-day comment period that would hopefully generate new public discussion.

-John (BRA) stated that this is a proposed plan based on a smooth RFP process. It can easily be slowed down if needed.

-Barbara (OC) stated that as currently set up; the earlier comments carry more weight. Michael (OC) asked about maintaining dialogue while editing. John (BRA) responded that the BRA would hope to use the OC meetings to capture this dialogue and facilitate public commentary.

-Michael (OC) asked that all public comments offered be brought to the May meeting and Barbara (OC) reiterated this request to make sure all requests are addressed and not ignored.

-Joe (OC) this was done for P-3. All the comments were acknowledged and some were incorporated. This showed that that OC was listening to concerns. Barbara (OC) would like a comments status report.

-Darnell (OC) between mid-April until July, there are 90 days allowing for public comment.

-Senator Diane Wilkerson (OC) asked for a clarification on the number of OC meetings during this time period. John (BRA) responded that ideally, there would be a new version of the draft at each of the May, June and July meetings.

-Charlotte Nelson (OC) stated that May is the first time that the OC will discuss the RFP.

-Timeline: Draft emailed in April, two weeks previous to the May OC meeting. Similarly, after comments and revision, the next draft will be presented two weeks ahead to the June Meeting. Extensive discussion and public discourse will be encouraged at the May and June OC meetings.

-Darnell (OC) stated that this plan seems to be one that will allow a very thorough process that makes sure everyone can have input. He stressed that there will be no rush to complete it at the expense of participation.

-Barbara (OC) asked if there was a way to lengthen each time period by a week to ensure all public comments are examined.

-Michael (OC) stated that thus far, this process has worked hard to incorporate public comments. Let's wait and see how the feedback comes in. He felt that this timeline as a template was acceptable. Charlotte (OC) agreed.

-John Barros (OC) appreciated the timeline but asked what happens between meetings. When does the OC get the necessary info? He would like to see all feedback delivered to the OC two weeks before each OC meeting.

- Sen. Wilkerson (OC) requested that the OC be presented with the big picture of Roxbury and Dudley Square development. This big picture view is important when considering the future development of Bartlett Yard. Darnell (OC) agreed and asked for a list of Roxbury development from the BRA.

-Dan Richardson (OC) commented that the OC needs the info in plenty of time to prepare for meetings. Also, OC members need to be present at these meetings.

-Charlotte (OC) brought up including abutter comments at workshops around the big picture, Dudley to Eggleston. Also mentioned the Dudley Main Streets presentation.

-Darnell (OC) would like to see a comprehensive Roxbury development list before the May OC meeting. Also, the template should be revised to show the 2-week info gap. It should be noted that public commentary is requested throughout the entire process. Pat Courtney (Aud.) suggested any possible DND projects be included as well.

-Audience Question: After looking at possible density scenarios presented by the BRA, will the RFP address density? Darnell responded that this is an issue that the OC will be sure to work on.

-Rodney Singleton (Aud) asked about FAR density possibilities.

-Sen. Wilkerson (OC) density is an important issue, but it is also necessary to remember that in order to develop Dudley Square, there is a need to increase traffic and density in the area.

-John (BRA) stated that so far, the range of density and size has been consistent.

-Darnell (OC) stated that the OC is aware of the density issue and will be addressing it. Michael (OC) followed that this type of discussion should be encouraged, a good example of future dialogue.

Revised P-3 Timeline and RFP Discussion: Hugues Monestime (BRA) introduced a new timeline for the P-3 RFP process. The deadline for respondents has been pushed to May 22, 2006 at the request of the BRA Secretary.

- Donovan Walker (OC) asked if the timeline would be extended again. The OC needs to know.

-Dan (OC) suggested the OC write a letter to the BRA Secretary's Office asking to be informed of all further decisions of this nature. The OC should be owed this courtesy.

-Barbara (OC) asked why it was pushed back and who asked for the extension. This looks bad and it should not have been extended for one developer.

-Michael (OC) stated that this warrants an investigation into the circumstances. The OC should know more.

-John B (OC) echoed this statement and this decision was disrespectful to the process and the RSMP. He asked for a letter from the BRA saying that this will not happen again.

-Charlotte (OC) asked what explanation was given to the abutters.

-Reginald Jackson (OC) asked what the legality of this is. Will a team that does not win the project be able to question the process?

-Hugues (BRA) will send out a full list of the RFP respondents again.

-Sen. Wilkerson (OC) felt that this issue speaks to the need to define the OC and BRA roles in this process. Who makes decisions on different issues? Also, the OC needs to make sure that the PRC is fully loaded for P-3

-The BRA is working on this with the assistance of the OC.