



Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee Meeting
Monday, January 7, 2019
6:00 PM to 7:45PM
Boston Water & Sewer Commission, 980 Harrison Ave, Roxbury

Attendees

RSMPOC Members: Charlotte Nelson, Dorothea Jones, Frank Williams, Frederick Fairfield, Norman Stembridge, Susan Sullivan, True-See Allah, Valeda Britton, Curtis Rollins (RNC Representative)

Not in Attendance: Beverly Adams, Felicia Jacques, Jorge Martinez, Tony Hernandez, 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: Dana Whiteside, Muge Udemir, Lillian Mensah, Victoria Phillips

Link to PowerPoint: <http://www.bostonplans.org/getattachment/b35ae987-cf98-4afc-9457-91486a134b10>

Opening

On January 9, 2019 Co-Chair Norman Stembridge of the Roxbury Strategic Master Plan Oversight Committee called the meeting to order. The meeting agenda, committee responsibilities, Master Plan's original goals were reviewed, and 2019 RSMPOC public meeting calendar were reviewed.

Planning Update

- Muge Udemir, BPDA Senior Planner, reviewed the timeline for the PLAN: Dudley Square RFP review stating the comment period for the PLAN: Dudley Square RFP responses is open and can be reviewed at: buildinghousing.boston.gov. The two developer presentations for the submitted RFP responses are scheduled for Saturday, February 23, 2019 for Dudley Commercial (135 Dudley Street) and 75-81 Dudley Street and Saturday, March 2, 2019 for 2147 Washington Street and 40-50 Warren Street.
- For more information please visit: bit.ly/PlanDudley

Development Project Update

DISCLAIMER: The Boston Planning and Development Agency provides these records "as is" and does not make any representation or warranty, express or implied, with respect to the content, quality, relevance, accuracy, completeness or adequacy of any information or materials contained herein. These records have been made available for informational purposes only, and do not constitute statements, endorsements, recommendations, acknowledgements, agreements or decisions by the Boston Planning and Development Agency, the City of Boston, its agencies, or any of their respective officers, employees, attorneys, representatives or agents.

Following Planning Update Dana Whiteside, BPDA Deputy Director for Community Economic Development, gave a high level description of the following development projects. Each development team was present to answer RSMPOC member questions and then audience questions.

Bartlett Place: <http://www.bostonplans.org/projects/development-projects/bartlett-station-lot-d>

- Bartlett is a multi-phased project proposed/managed by Nuestra CDC and Windale Development Company. There is not a designation for the project as the MBTA has a slightly different process where there is a direct purchase from the MBTA, by the designated developer, Nuestra CDC and Windale Development Company. The total development cost is \$84 million. It consists of commercial, residential, and office/commercial. There are a number of components divided by building type and is a multi-phased project. Building E, a homeownership development, was completed in November 2018. Building D, proposed senior housing development, is in process of Article 80 overview with a submission made on October 9 2018. There were two Article 80 meetings for Building D. There is a proposed public discussion on February 2, 2019 for the development team to speak about the project as a whole and the projects PDA. There will be ample time and public notice for this meeting. The other components of this project are under general review and the development team is working with the BPDA Planning and Design team for consideration.
- There is a desire from the RSMPOC to learn where the project is currently which is why there is a meeting proposed for February 2nd. There is also an effort to add members to the Bartlett project review committee (PRC). PRC nominations were accepts from the public not only for the PLAN: Dudley project but also the DND and Master Plan PRCs. The nominations will be vetted and selected in advance of the project discussion so the new members can get up to speed.

RSMPOC Comments

- A RSMPOC member asked, for Building E and its two affordable units, what is the price range. A Bartlett Place development team member responded, the affordable price is set at 80 and 100 percent AMI, it is approximate but the units are priced at \$265,000 and \$335,000 respectively. An update on the marketing of the two units. The lottery has been held but we have put in on hold because of the National Grid moratorium. If we selected now they would be in limbo. The moratorium is a settlement. If it was settled today there would be a waitlist and this building needs a 20 foot connection from the street. It would likely be months before the connection is made, although we are advocating for this and other Roxbury projects to be at the top of the list. We did not want to put the two affordable buyers in limbo so we are holding off before numbers are pulled.
- A RSMPOC member asked, Building B and Building E are pretty much finished, what is the timeframe and phasing for the rest of the site. A Bartlett Place development team member responded, we need to have a whole meeting about this because the development is 11 projects, 10 buildings and one public plaza. Two buildings nearing completion. The next building in line for permitting is Building D, proposed senior housing. That building still has to secure subsidies which POAH is leading which is a process which may take a year and a half before construction can begin but that is an estimate. We have three homeownership buildings we are trying to get into the Article 80 and approved this year. Two of those could start in fall of this year. The mixed income building needs to wait for subsidies so it will likely be a year and a half also before construction begins.

- A RSMPOC member asked, is the housing portion scheduled to open on time in 2019. A Bartlett Place development team member responded, yes they are scheduled to open in 2019. Originally we projected January or February but due to National Grid and not wanting to open in the winter, April 2019 is the likely opening.
- A RSMPOC member asked, there is a concern that we are not receiving all the jobs numbers. A RSMPOC member followed-up stating, at the November RSMPOC meeting we received some statistics on the employment. We have been meeting for about a year and a half now and we have never received the constructions trade's employment statistics. The number provided in this update mean very little because they are not backed-up by anything. For the past two years we have been talking about reestablishing the PRCs for this project and hope that by February there will be a definitive timeline for the PRC to be reestablished. Another issue which still have not been resolved is the grocery store. If we are going to be doing community process, the community deserves to be respected, have input, and know with certainty their needs are met. A Bartlett Place development team member responded, it is my understanding that the numbers we report here are based on the numbers reported to the City and all that data should be available to the committee. I will follow-up internally to ensure that happens if it is not already. For Building E we do have updated numbers here. For Building E, as of December 31, 2018, workers of color 87%, Boston workers 58%, women workers under 1%, MBE contracted 69%, WBE contracting under 1%. Those are the up to date numbers.
 - A BPDA staff member followed-up asking, at the next monitoring committee meeting, work to prepare any back-up numbers in addition to the numbers just presented. The monitoring committee is part of the Oversight Committee to ensure the labor components of the contract are being uphold by the guidelines articulated by this RSMPOC.
 - A RSMPOC member followed-up stating, there may be several sub-contractors that does not meet any of these standards and it is just one contractor comprising these numbers.

Community Comments

- A community member asked, is the PRC going to be scheduled sometime in February. A BPDA staff member responded, there will be project review discussion on February 6th and by that time the reconstituted PRC will in place and will have had an orientation.
 - The community member followed-up asking, if the PRC list has been posted anywhere. A BPDA staff member responded, not yet because the nominations have not been fully vetted yet but individuals have submitted their name for participation.
- A community member asked, are you scheduled for tomorrow's Civic Design Commission and if so, why. A BPDA staff member responded, the Boston Civic Design Commission (BCDC) is a body that looks at projects from the architecture and public realm perspective. Larger projects tend to be required to be reviewed by BCDC. Bartlett's project master plan was approved in 2013. The vote that was taken was that each component of the project had to have review because it is a multiple phased project. The Bartlett project will not be on the agenda tomorrow but the February agenda because the team still has work to do with the BPDA Urban Design team.

P-3 Tremont Crossing Project:

[http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org/projects/development-projects/tremont-crossing-\(p-3\)](http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org/projects/development-projects/tremont-crossing-(p-3))

- The project is a partnership between Feldco Development Corporation and the National Center for African-American Artists. It hosts the NCAAA museum as its cornerstone but also the

creation of upwards of 700 residential units and other commercial uses. The project has tentative designation which allows the development team to have the right to negotiate for aspects of the project and have a number of components and regulatory review to move from tentative to full designation. Tremont Crossing is approximately a \$300-500 million project (a member of the development team stating the \$300 million total development cost outlined on the presentation does not include one of the residential developments.)

- The tentative designation goes through the end of this month. The consideration of the site plan requires relocation of sewer line underneath the proposed parcel as well as considerations to the continuous activity this site will have relative to the Boston Public School (BPS) site right next door. The BPDA has to ensure the site plan with all the proposed components is appropriately reviewed and completed as part of the tentative designations as well as that the financing is in place and regulatory requirements, Article 80 and MEEPA are met. The development team has made significant progress in approvals with BWSC and BPS. The BPDA's position given the progress of the development team to allow for a further extension of the designation to allow the team to complete its work on the project's financing.
- There is a project review discussion proposed for January 31. It is a public meeting and will allow the development team to have a more extension conversation about the proposed site and programmatic considerations.

RSMPOC Comments

- A RSMPOC member asked, how long is the tentative designation being extended for. A BPDA team member responded, given the financing requirements and other components there will be a three-month extension.
- A RSMPOC member asked, what is the progress for the project's residential component? A development team representative responded, in regards to the relationship with Landmark Properties or joint venture partner for the project is coming along very well. A few months ago we had a representative from Landmarks to reintroduce them to the committee. They have been part of the project since 2016. We submitted an executed letter of intent to the BPDA at the end of October. Based on conversations with the BPDA, they wanted to see the relationship take shape in a more complete fashion so we are in the process of drafting a binding agreement with Landmarks and are preparing to submit drafts to the BPDA. Our goal is to have the agreement executed by the end of January.
- A RSMPOC member asked, remind the committee about the units for the Whittier residential component. A development team representative responded, in regards to the 9 townhomes is our collaboration with the Choice Neighborhoods Projects. Originally all the street front along Whittier Street was going to be small retail but then the Whittier Choice Street Project provided comments they would like the project to relate more harmoniously. To accomplish this all the ground floor along Whittier Street will be townhomes which will be Section 8 project based vouchers. We applied in a competitive RFP process and was awarded by HUD for all nine units.
- A RSMPOC member asked, what the next steps are for both the BPDA and the development team after the 90-day extension. A BPDA staff member responded, the expectation that within this three month extension the development team's agreement with Landmark is executed. The BPDA wants to have certainty on the relationship between the P-3 and Landmark because Landmark is looking to be a full development partner unlike in earlier iterations where Landmark would have a smaller interest. The next steps in coordination with the RSMPOC and PRC given

the financing component being complete, will be looking at executing a lease and looking to final designation.

- A RSMPOC member asked, with this joint venture agreement, is it a 50/50 investment and then put debt on top of it. A development team representative responded, the joint venture agreement is a construction joint venture. Under Massachusetts law you cannot create a commercial condominium before you have a certificate of occupancy. You cannot have two owners and two lenders trying to build a single building at the same time. We will go out and get a construction loan together and a consequence of this is as we get further in the cycle it is great to have a larger firm to secure a construction loan. Landmark is contributing equity for their residential tower, we are putting the equity in for the retail. Also based on the air rights value they are building on top of, they are bring \$53 million of equity to put the construction financing in place.
- A RSMPOC member asked, the timeline is at the end of this month the executed agreement will be given to the BPDA by the end of January. A development team representative responded, it will also depend on the BPDA's review but our goal is to have a fully executed agreement.
 - A RSMPOC member followed-up stating, this plays nicely into the designation extensions and by that time the RSMPOC needs to know where the project is going or else will need to look at alternative, as a personal opinions, so it is important to ensure the dates stay lined up.
- A RSMPOC member asked, because the Melnea Hotel is not going to be the Melnea Hotel, is there assurance that if this project comes to fruition that it will be the National Center for African American Artist or Elma Lewis. A development team representative responded, that is indelible, there is no doubt about that.

Community Comments

- A community member asked, what is the role of the National Museum in that joint venture or if it is excluded from it. A development team representative responded, the joint venture is between P-3 Partners and Landmark Properties P-3 Partners is a made up of Feldco Development and Elma Lewis Partners, who are 50/50 partners in P-3 so both entities have a 50/50 role in the agreement with Landmark.
- A community member asked, are you speaking about a ground lease for all of P-3. A BPDA staff member responded, with most if not all BPDA property for any designation we enter into a ground lease with the development partner.
- A community member asked, after the construction is complete will Landmark participate in ownership. A development team representative responded, Landmark will own the 418 unit residential tower at the corner of Tremont and Whittier. Through construction we will be joint venture partners. Once there is a certificate of occupancy, we will create commercial condominium unit for the different uses. Landmark will own the commercial condominium unit which has the 418 unit residential tower and P-3 Partners will own the rest of the development project, which has always been the plan.
- A community member asked, how small- and medium-sized businesses will fit into the project. A development team representative responded, we have spent a considerable amount of time on this subject. One of our community benefits is that we have an annual subsidy for local entrepreneurs, primarily from Roxbury and entrepreneurs of color. Right now it is set at \$80,000 per year coming from P-3 Partners to subsidize rent for local, small businesses. Choice

Neighborhoods Project is contributing another \$20,000 as part of our collaboration so in total there is \$100,000 per year for the project. We have started that outreach meeting with restaurants, barber shops and also the city representatives about the process to make sure everyone has a fair chance to be part of the program. The subsidy is set for 15 years to support businesses as they grow. Built into the project is the Office of Opportunity which is a permanent office will have the responsibility to maximize the opportunity for business owners and workers in Roxbury to create career paths to bring together the enormous institutional resources around the project. For all of the tenants on the property will need services which can be provided by small- and medium-sized businesses which already exist in Roxbury on a continuous basis to make sure the matches happen continuously.

- A community member stated, I want to thank you for coming into this area and developing it with minority participation, it is very important. Going to the Landmark and P-3 partnership, what is the numerical division of the project? Also, will there be assistance to support, encourage and sustain entrepreneurship? A development team representative responded, 405,000 square feet of retail, the museum, and two residential towers, 418 units and 300 units, the Whittier townhomes, an office building, and a parking structure. Landmark will own the 374,000 square foot, 418 unit tower. Everything else will be owned by P-3 Partners. On the second question, it is one things to provide space and rent subsidies but putting and sustaining people in business is just as important. Part of the collaboration with Choice Neighborhoods, is they will be providing incubation services given job training and counseling, accounting courses, and providing micro-loans.
- LOST Questions. A development team representative responded, as of now we do not have an office tenant, we have 108,000 square feet of office space approved by the BPDA. We fully intend to execute on that, we understand it is an important part of the economic development potential of the site and our mission so we feel good about it but it is not fully developed as of yet.
- A community member asked, directed to the RSMPOC and BPDA officials, the difficulty to develop the office space over the years seems to be a resistance to come across the line and so raising the question if there is the opportunity to have a discussion the present barriers which have prevented office space development over the past 13 years. A BPDA team member responded, the point is well taken. The opportunity to ensure the inclusion of a significant office tenant is important. In additional to the great points raised, the pace of this progress is also a contributing challenge. Given the current progress, interest in a project which seems real will provide an opportunity to keep eyes on it for appropriate discussion.
 - A RSMPOC member followed-up stating, what we see in the Newmarket and Roxbury area is a newer interest in office space. The group Waterstone Properties has had a lot of interest in office. Unless you are six months out from when an entity can take occupancy, they will not commit because it is hard for them until they know.
- A community member asked, after the three-month extension of the tentative designation, what is the total number of extensions by months given to the P-3 Partners project. A BPDA team member, responded the number of months is not known in this moment but this project's tentative designation has been active for the better part of 7-9 years.
 - A community member followed-up asking, what are the consequences for a development team tying-up a \$10 million community asset for that long in a project that will not serve the community. A BPDA team member responded, it is not lost on the agency or anyone in this room the amount of time this project has occupied. While the

development team has made the progress it needs to make on the regulatory and site plan considerations, it has also been very clear the amount of time of any extension will have very clear completion requirements. Managing expectations, there are not consequences to speak to at this time but it is not loss on anyone that appropriate progress must continue.

- A community member asked, can the relationship between P-3 Partners and Landmark Properties be clarified, going back to initial engagement and the community pushback against working with an entity which has a portfolio with a lot of student housing. What is the reason for the break and re-entering into a partnership with Landmark? A development team representative responded, the reason we stopped working with Landmark did not have to do with the type of housing Landmark is prepared to build. At one time, we did test student housing with the community and we not able to reach consensus. We brought that back to Landmark and since they love Boston as a market and as professionals had substantial multi-family experience in their backgrounds, they wanted to stay in the deal, not do student housing but traditional multi-family housing. We brought Landmark to the community, RSMPOC, and PRC to have them approved as non-student housing developers. They were by our side at the BPDA board approval as traditional multi-family partners. We parted ways with Landmark momentarily due to timing and process. For the better part of a year we worked with the City to accomplish some components. We kept our conversation with Landmarks going and now we are at a point where they have the confidence they need we are going to get this done.

Parcel 10 - Madison Tropical:

<http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org/projects/development-projects/madison-tropical-parcel-10>

- The development is under tentative designation. This is an approximant \$52 million project and is proposed by Madison CDC and Tropical Foods. The Tropical Foods in operational and the next components of the project, is 2101 Washington, now 9 Williams which is completed and fully occupied. 2085 Washington is under design review and proposed for commercial/ office. The development team is working diligently on tenanting for the project. The designation runs through the end of February. The project is in pre-construction and marketing underway for the third and final phase of the project.

RSMPOC Comments

- No RSMPOC comments.

No Community Comments

- No community comments.

P 9 – Melnea Hotel and Residences:

<http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org/projects/development-projects/melnea-hotel-and-residences>

- 137 million square feet project, approximately \$50 million dollar development cost. This team has reached final designation meaning they have met all the criteria including securing all financing and pulling of permits for the project. Now the focus is starting construction on the residential component with construction on the hotel underway.

RSMPOC Comments

- A RSPMOC member asked, is there a concern of hotel glut with conversations about the Alexandria hotel being built nearby. Phase 2, the former 2101 Washington St is complete. The development team is currently working on Phase 3, which is a large commercial component with some residential. A development team representative responded, it is a good sign because it indicates that this area is a viable place for a hotel.
- A RSMPOC member asked, in regards to the continued conversations about the hotel's name since our last meeting, is the conclusion that the name cannot be anything other than what is now. A RSMPOC responded, as we said at the last meeting we are in discussion with folks at Marriot. We have raised the issue to the highest levels at Marriot we feel appropriate and there will be meetings to go over this. So it is not over yet but if and how it will be done, is to be determined.

Community Comments

- A community member stated, conversations with Marriot need to happen because it is a joke for developers to get the community's attention and then do something completely different, we are not accepting it.
- A community member asked, given this is still city land, can the city take additional steps. A BPDA team member responded, it was articulated at the last meetings and may not be popular thought to hear but though this is city land, the naming of the development was not built into the RFP. This is a learning point as landowners and purveyors of RFPs that if there needs to be a specific naming attached to a project that it needs to be said up front. That said there are ongoing conversations on this topic, it is not over yet. Marriot is very much aware of it. The neighborhood, stakeholders, and the City are concerns about this turn of events. The hope is that there can be some change that takes place. Current understanding is that the City cannot legally say to Marriot "you have to name the hotel this." At the City we can make known the concerns of the city and community but cannot require it.
- A community member asked, the hotel is already built, where is the parking for those using the site? A development team representative responded, parking for the residences and hotel will be in the back. However, if the hotel management feels there is a need they will do valet parking but I am not in charge of hotel management - that is a question for the Marriot. The hotel has close to 40 parking spaces in the back.
- A community member stating, I want give kudos to the Melnea Hotel development team leader because after several meetings, they too agreed with the community the hotel should be named Melnea Hotel.
- A community member asked, can you clarify what the licensing board meeting happening this week is for. A development team representative responded, there is a hearing for revising parts of the liquor license but that is not something the development team is part of.
- A RSMPOC member asked, will the residences be the Melnea Residences. A development team representative responded, today we had a meeting with the property entity regarding the name

and shared we would like it to be called Melnea Residences. They suggested given the name of the hotel next door is named Marriot Residences, should it be call Melnea 425. I said we should really study that because it a concern I have. I said whatever it is, it is going to be brought up here.

- A community member stated, in the spirit and honor of Melnea Cass and Elma Lewis, that neither of these women would have any interest in having anything named for them in the footprint where they and their people once thrived and no longer do. We are busy losing what we had while we are talking about what we are going to have is going to look like.
- A RSMPOC asked, what is the tentative date for the hotel opening? A development team representative responded, according to Marriot the hotel is slated to open at the end of January.
- A community member stated, I have still concerned about the designated that is very vague and does not relate to the community. I am also concerned about not hearing about the jobs promised to Roxbury residents.
- A RSMPOC member asked, the Marriot has a temporary license to open, is there any way that to be withheld until they meet with the community. A BPDA team member responded, we can check with legal counsel to see where our purview lies with making requirements like that.

Meeting adjourned 7:50pm