



Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee Meeting  
Monday, October 5, 2021  
6:00 PM to 7:45pm  
Zoom Virtual Meeting

---

### Attendees

**RSMPOC Members:** Valeda Britton, Dorothea Jones, Steven Godfrey, Nefertiti Lawrence, Marisa Luse, Charlotte Nelson, Frederick Fairfield, Susan Sullivan, True-See Allah, Frank Williams

**Not in Attendance:** Catherine Hardaway, City Councilor Kim Janey (Ex-Officio), Rep. Liz Miranda (Ex-Officio), Rep. Jon Santiago (Ex-Officio), Rep. Chynah Tyler (Ex-officio), State Senator Sonia Chang-Diaz (Ex-Officio)

**BPDA Staff:** Kelly Sherman, Muge Undemir, Ocean Luo, and Naoise McDonnell

**City Staff:** Representatives from Councilor Mejia's office.

**Link to PowerPoint:** <http://www.bostonplans.org/getattachment/5c86d8c4-9794-4730-acd5-03ac2f5a3b0e>

### Opening

On October 5, 2021 Co-Chair Norman Stembridge of the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. Kelly Sherman, BPDA Planner, welcomed all and made initial announcements of meeting recording and Zoom and interpretation channel instructions. The Spanish interpreter gave their introduction and initial instructions, the Haitian Creole interpreter followed. Kelly continued with zoom etiquette instructions and an overview of the meeting agenda, to include PRC (Project Review Committee) remarks regarding their recommendation for Crescent Parcel, a vote by the RSMPOC on whether or not to accept the PRC recommendation for Crescent Parcel, and an overview of the language changes made to the P3 RFP since the RSMPOC vote at the previous meeting in September. Norman then continued with greetings and introductions of the rest of the RSMPOC members, gave a brief overview of the RSMPOC and its responsibilities and remaining schedule for the year.

### Planning Update

Kelly Sherman, BPDA Planner, introduced the members of the PRC. Steven Godfrey, Co-Chair of the RSMPOC, and member of this PRC provided the remarks regarding their decision for the Crescent Parcel. Steven provided a brief overview of the PLAN: Nubian process and how it helped shape the Crescent Parcel RFP. The RFP was released in January 2021, and all responses were received by April 2021. There were 3 responses total. The PRC met 6 times between June and August to review proposals, and Steven

provided a high level summary of each proposal. Ultimately the PRC decided to recommend the Drexel Village proposal, some of the reasons included: it has the highest number of proposed residential units out of all the proposals, it also has the highest number of 2, 3, and 4 bedroom residential units, and it also controls and integrates the adjacent St. Katherine Drexel church site into their proposed project resulting in the most open space of all proposals as well.

### **RSMPOC and Community Questions and Comments**

- An RSMPOC member asked if the other two project teams had been debriefed as to why they were not chosen.
  - Muge Undemir, BPDA Planner, responded that it is in the plans to debrief the other teams, but it has not happened yet.
- A community member asked about the proposed programming of the recommended Drexel Village proposal.
  - Muge responded that through the article 80 process there is more room for community input on the specific programming and opportunity to shape the project even more.
- A RSMPOC member commented: it is important to debrief and provide feedback for developers so that they can improve their future proposals even more.
  - Muge agreed, good feedback leads to a better and more diverse set of future proposals. It is also good to review the specifics of evaluation criteria
- A RSMPOC member asked will the IAG (Impact Advisory Group) detail continued monitoring of the project? Also what are the additional community benefits?
  - Muge replied yes, the IAG will continue to meet to review the project and report back to the RSMPOC on progress, which includes monitoring of construction workers and hiring; POUA can speak to additional community benefits.
  - Bill Grogan of POUA, stated that benefits will revolve around asset building and local job training totaling nearly \$250k, also approximately another \$150K for commercial space and activating additional open space, and committed to ongoing compliance.
- A RSMPOC member asked what is the status of the continued partnership with the onsite ABCD program?
  - Bill Grogan of POUA replied that they are expecting to renew their lease and redesign space to meet their needs.
- A community member asked what is the particular address of the site?
  - Muge replied there is no technical address at this time, but the site is located at the corner of Melnea Cass Boulevard and Tremont Street.
- A representative of the Onyx group development team asked if POUA hired a lobbyist during the review of the project proposals.
  - Bill Grogan of POUA replied that a lobbyist has not been hired for this project specifically.
- A community member asked about the discrepancy in parking between the various proposed projects, and cited a difference of about 100 spaces if underground parking cannot be used.
  - Muge replied that the City takes a holistic approach to parking in the area, through parking studies continued through article 80 process, and so the final number may

change as other parking space in the neighborhood comes online, such as the proposed parking garage at Blair Lot.

- J. Garland Enterprises representative also emphasized tree roots as a reason for not going further underground with parking as well as the increased cost associated with more parking.
- A community member asked what does the project offer residents, employees, and visitors, other than parking spaces?
  - POUA representative emphasized the proximity to transit as well as alternatives being examined.
- A RSMPOC member asked if development will be completed in phases?
  - POUA representative responded that the intention is to complete development within one phase of construction.
- A community member asked how will traffic be managed during construction?
  - Muge replied that a traffic study during the Article 80 process will include mitigation efforts, also there are currently ongoing traffic studies in the area being conducted by BTM. More of this info can also be shared with the community as the project continues through the Article 80 process.
- A community member asked about the opportunity to rent space for zipcar?
  - J. Garland developers stated they are open to the idea, but must find out if it is possible to give space within private development, but exploring the option.
- Kelly moved to begin the RSMPOC vote on accepting the recommendation of the PRC for Crescent Parcel.
  - The RSMPOC unanimously voted yes to accept the PRC recommendation.
  - The project will go to the BPDA board later in October for approval.

### **P3 RFP Language Updates**

Muge began explaining the process of the P3 RFP to date and reminded all that at the last RSMPOC meeting in September, a vote was taken to approve the release of the RFP to the public, provided that changes are made to specific aspects of the language. Muge provided an overview of the specific comments received regarding the language and how we responded to them.

- Changes made to the RFP language
  - Included context on the history of site and surrounding neighborhood pg. 6-7
  - Open space location on site should be flexible pg. 40
  - Existing Whittier Street housing should be considered as flexible to remain or be removed pg. 7
  - Green jobs, job training, and other economic development should be included before during and after construction
  - More details on potential partnership with local BPS
  - Details on the recommended 70 ft right of way width between buildings
    - Not all of that 70 ft is for cars, also for bikes, sidewalks, trees etc.
- Nominations to join the PRC to review proposals for P3 are now open
- BPDA Board will vote on RFP approval Oct. 14
- RFP will be released to the public tentatively on Oct. 27

- 2022 reviewing proposal responses to RFP
- A community member asked is it possible for developers to survey their potential partners and local residents on ideas for their proposal?
  - Muge replied that it is a good idea for developers to follow, it cannot be required within the RFP to conduct a survey, but it is a good idea as well as joining an upcoming pre-bidders conference where more ideas can be shared amongst developers.
- A community member asked what happens if the PRC does not recommend any of the proposals it receives?
  - Muge responded that we would review the shortcomings of the proposals with PRC and then decide if we want to make changes to the RFP or use the City to help in specific areas.
- A community member asked what does the evaluation of the evaluation criteria look like?
  - Muge replied that we did review and make some updates to the evaluation criteria, but we must be careful about the timing of any changes made to the RFP language.
- A community member asked what is the RFP response deadline?
  - Muge responded that the deadline is at least 90 days after the release of the RFP, but the deadline can also be extended if needed.
- A RSMPOC member reminded all to identify themselves before speaking, such as as a resident or representing any entities, etc. Then offered the floor to POUA/J. Garland Enterprises to give any closing remarks.
  - Development representatives reiterated their excitement and continued work together with the community throughout the remaining process.
- Norman thanked all for attending and closed out the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 7.45pm.