



Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee Meeting
Monday, October 3, 2022
6:00 PM to 7:10 pm
Zoom Virtual Meeting

Attendees

RSMPOC Members: Norm Stembridge, Valeda Britton, Charlotte Nelson, Dorethea Jones, Frank Williams, Frederick Fairfield, Lorraine Payne Wheeler, Marisa Luse, Nefertiti Lawrence, Steven Godfrey, Sue Sullivan, True-See Allah

BPDA Staff: Rebecca Hansen, Jonathan Short, Jamarhl Crawford, Yarisamar Cortez

Opening

On October, 2022, Co-Chair Norman Stembridge of the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee (RSMPOC) called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. Jonathan Short, BPDA Senior Real Estate Development Officer, welcomed all and made initial announcements of meeting recording and Zoom and interpretation channel instructions. The Spanish interpreter gave their introduction and initial instructions followed by the Haitian Creole interpreter and Capeverdan Creole interpreter. Jonathan continued with Zoom etiquette instructions and an overview of the meeting agenda. Jonathan explained that the chat box function was going to be closed momentarily during the short presentation but remain open for the rest of the meeting. Norman then continued with greetings and reviewed the calendar of upcoming RSMPOC meetings over the year, gave a brief overview of the RSMPOC and its responsibilities and encouraged people to get involved and remain engaged.

Before beginning the presentation, Co-Chair Norman Stembridge introduced elected officials that were present on the call: From State Senator's Liz Miranda Office, Rochelle, State Representative, Chynah Tyler, District 7 Councilor, Tania Fernandes Anderson.

Co-Chair Norman Stembridge handed the presentation over to P-3 PRC Member, Mary Anne to present on their designation recommendation on Parcel 3.

Presentation Notes

Presenter: Mary Anne Nelson, P-3 PRC Member

- Mary Anne introduced herself as a member of the Parcel 3 Project Review Committee (PRC) and a community resident.
- Parcel 3 is part of the PLAN:Nubian Square launched in 2016.
- Request For Proposal(RFP) process was guided by several community meetings, PLAN:Nubian Square (2016), and information gathering. RFP objectives: affordable housing, economic development, development without displacement, good job standards, diversity & inclusion, sustainability, and additional community benefits.
- BPDA released the P-3 Toolkit with information about the site, history, and planning process.
 - 13 public meetings in 2021 to develop RFP guidelines.
 - Survey to the development community

- Draft RFP was shared with community to solicit feedback
- Official RFP was released on October 27, 2021. Development responses were due March 16, 2022.
- Project Review Committee (PRC) Members were a combination of RSMPOC members, local residents, and business owners.
- The PRC first met on April 20, 2022 through September 2022 for a total of 8 meetings.
- The PRC evaluated the proposals against evaluation criteria, interviewed the development teams, and reviewed the comments.
- The BPDA received 2 proposals: 1) from HYM & My City at Peace and the 2) Ruggles Progressive Partnership & Tishman Speyer
- The majority of PRC members recommend the HYM & My City at Peace Proposal
- The members ranked the proposals against the evaluation criteria
- In the last PRC meeting, there was a 5-2 vote, in favor for the HYM & My City at Peace Proposal
 - 7 members did not vote
- My City at Peace & HYM Proposal Highlights
 - Housing, Life Sciences, Open Space
- Ruggles Progressive Partners & Tishman Speyer
- Strengths of each proposal
 - My City at Peace & HYM - 1) Development concept: consistent with area planning history and sizable number of income restricted homeownership units, Life Science usage to allow greater affordability in residential component; 2) Access circulation, connectivity and continuity, Street grid and open space network presented place making opportunities; 3) Diversity and Inclusion: joint venture with larger and multiple smaller firms.
 - Ruggles Progressive Partners & Tishman Speyer - 1) Urban Design: 64% of the site open space with community activation opportunities; 2) Sustainability: proposal commits to solar and solstice initiative to provide local community leadership opportunities, and lab/office space commits to LEED platinum standards; 3) Diversity & Inclusion: Tishman Speyer collaboration.
- Weaknesses of each proposal
 - My City at Peace & HYM - 1) Sustainability: Proposal does not include specifics on on-site renewable energy or renewable energy procurement; 2) Contextual Architectural Design: concerns around height and building character
 - Ruggles Progressive Partners & Tishman Speyer - 1) Concerns around demonstration of the ability to execute the Project as intended; 2) Massing, height and orientation concerns.
- After evaluating both proposals, the PRC recommends My City at Peace & HYM.
- Next Steps
 - The PRC has completed the first phase of its work.
 - But Community Process continues
 - RSMPOC will vote on the PRC recommendation.
 - BPDA Board must award tentative designation of the selected developer
 - RSMPOC will continue to monitor each project in the broader neighborhood context.
 - PRC will convert to a new role as an Impact Advisory Group (IAG) to work closely with city staff and the rest of community members.

Mary Anne (PRC) concludes the presentation to open to Question & Answer.

Jonathan (BPDA) instructs that the first Q&A portion (18m) is for RSMPOC members to have a discussion and ask questions to the P-3 PRC.

Norm puts forth to RSMPOC members to comment and ask questions.

RSMPOC Deliberation

- RSMPOC Member: Why did Tishman Speyer and Ruggles Progressive Partners recently withdraw from consideration?
 - (RSMPOC Co-Chair) Answer: Based on communication the reason for withdrawal was due to financial market conditions. When they originally submitted their proposal the financial market was much more stable. Tishman Speyer and Ruggles Progressive Partners team did reach out to the RSMPOC directly with their news. RSMPOC Co-Chair thanks teams for their participation in the process.

- RSMPOC Member: Question about building size of HYM and My City at Peace proposal. Did the Northeastern university building size have an impact on the height of the proposal? Will sustainability efforts be improved in the project? Comment: The RSMPOC should be involved in the development of the Community Benefits package since it falls under the purview of the Nubian square area.
 - Mary Anne (PRC) Answer: HYM/ My City at Peace proposed shorter buildings than the Northeastern dorms that are being built.

- RSMPOC Member: Northeastern has a tower across the street of the proposed site. Comment: Pressure should be put on Northeastern to scale back their buildings so Roxbury can be developed more fully.
 - Mary Anne (PRC) Answer: The height of the Northeastern buildings was not a factor of consideration in the evaluation of the proposals. As a resident of Mission Hill, not in support of height.
 - RSMPOC Co-Chair Answer: In terms of the sustainability piece, the PRC can work with the development team to improve the sustainability elements of the project.

- RSMPOC Member: How does the support of Life Sciences impact affordable housing? Who is Lab central? And how long will they be in a rent free lab training space? How is Lab Central engaging adults and kids in this effort?
 - Mary Anne (PRC) Answer: Revenue from the lab space will subsidize part of the housing costs. Was not too sure on the activities of Lab Central.
 - RSMPOC Member Answer: Train youth and members of the community in this line of work.
 - Mary Anne (PRC) Answer: There are lab jobs that do not require undergraduate or higher degrees.

- RSMPOC Member: Was lab safety considerations around housing considered in the review of these two proposals?
 - Mary Anne (PRC) Answer: The lab spaces proposed are Level 2 which are not hazardous. The lab spaces will also be separate from the residential development. Level 2 does not pose a threat to residents.

- BPDA Staff Answer: Clarification on Seaport Project Comparison. Jonathan nor Rebecca were involved in the Seaport project. In the Seaport Project the lab and residential areas were touching. In the P-3 Proposals these labs aren't touching the residential areas.

At 6:50 pm, Co-Chair Norm, wraps up the RSMPOC deliberation time and opens up the floor for the public for comments and questions for 15m.

Public Comments & Questions

- Community Member: He was not happy with the timing and process of the RFP. It was troubling for this individual to receive 2 responses to RFP. Community should participate in the process and future iterations of this development for the benefit of the community.
 - RSMPOC Co-Chair Answer: Since the beginning of the Master Planning process, the most has been 3, maybe, responses for the RFPs that have been released in the area. The RSMPOC will monitor this project going forward. The PRC still has a role moving forward.
 - Mary Ann (PRC) Answer: The city should look at other proposals to address equity issues city wide.
- Community Member: Asking for clarification on comparison between Seaport and this project.
 - BPDA Staff Member: The Seaport project, not related to P-3, the lab component was touching the residences which required further evaluation. Both P-3 proposal the lab and residential components were separate and not interacting.
- Community Member: Appreciation to everyone involved to get a designation to P-3. Proponent of retail condo ownership structure. Was the market retail condo ownership structure considered in the selection and if not can it be considered during future review?
 - RSMPOC Co-Chair: For HYM/My City at Peace retail condo ownership was considered. This is something that can be talked about in future conversations. It would be a community benefit for those in the community that would like to start a business and stay in it.
- PRC Member: This process required work in part of the committee to digest everything. Apple to apple criteria each section is discussed and argued. The system itself it's a great way to do it. The work of the PRC is far from over and the work of the RSMPOC "is just beginning." The community needs to be involved as well. This is the first major step but more work on part of various stakeholders will be required.
- Community Member: What was the PRC vote breakdown? And how many in the PRC did not participate?
 - BPDA Staff Answer: BPDA sent a survey to the PRC to facilitate conversation. BPDA received 10 survey responses. A meeting was held, 10 PRC members attended. 2 people from this group had not responded to the survey but attended that conversation so in total 12 different voices throughout the process. The total as of Wednesday morning was 6 - 3 in support of HYM/ My City at Peace.
 - Community Member: When was the announcement that Tishaman Speyer withdrew their application?
 - BPDA Staff Answer: Friday evening, after the PRC voted.

At 7:04 pm, Co-Chair Norm concludes the public comment period.

Jonathan (BPDA) explains that this will be a voice vote. He instructs RSMPOC members to take a vote by responding "Yay", "nay" or "obstein." Jonathan made a final call of attendance for RSMPOC member Katherine Hardway. Katherine Hardway was marked "Absent."

Jonathan (BPDA) called on RSMPOC members for their vote. Please refer to page 6 to see vote count.

The RSMPOC voice vote concluded and Jonathan counted all votes. The results were: 11 yays and 1 abstain.

At 7:08 pm, RSMPOC Co-Chair Norm announced that the vote had passed.

Jonathan announced that the BPDA would take this item to the BPDA Board for a vote for HYM/ My City at Peace to be the developer for the tentative designation for Parcel 3.

RSMPOC Member: Will the PRC become an IAG?

- BPDA Staff Answer: The IAG is a body that is established through the Article 80 process which doesn't happen until tentative designation is awarded.

RSMPOC Member: And will the same PRC members be part of the IAG?

- BPDA Staff: It is generally the same people from the PRC to be part of the IAG but that also depends on personal commitments that folks have.

At 7:10 pm, thanked the public for their comments, participation, and attendance. A motion to adjourn the meeting was called. Motion was seconded by RSMPOC Co-Chair Steven Godfrey.

	Name	Yea	Nay	Abstain
X	Catherine Hardaway			
✓	Charlotte Nelson	✓		
✓	Dorothea Jones	✓		
	Frank Williams	✓		
✓	Frederick Fairfield	✓		
✓	Lorraine Payne Wheeler			✓
✓	Marisa Luse	✓		
✓	Nefertiti Lawrence	✓		
✓	Norman Stembridge	✓		
✓	Steven Godfrey	✓		
✓	Sue Sullivan	✓		
✓	True-See Allah	✓		
✓	Valeda Britton	✓		
	TOTAL	11		