



Meeting Notes  
January 5, 2009  
6:00 PM -7:45 PM  
Dudley Public Library  
65 Warren Street

**RSMPOC Members Present:** Darnell Williams, Beverly Adams, Frank Williams, Norman Stembridge, Daniel Richardson, Marilyn Lynch, Joe Cefalo, Charlotte Nelson, Jorge Martinez; Elected Officials: Councilor Chuck Turner, Candice Sealy from Representative Capuano's office; BRA: Hugues Monestime, Jeong Jun-Ju, John Dalzell, Ted Schwartzberg

Darnell Williams (OC) calls the meeting to order at 6:15 PM. He states there is a straightforward agenda for the evening:

- Review notes for 5 minutes
- Discuss the Draft RFP for Parcels 9 &10
- Review the calendar
- Discuss any other items

Councilor Tuner adds that he would like to give a short update on a City Council hearing on Parcel P3.

Charlotte Nelson (OC) states that she has an item related to the Urban Ring.

Darnell (OC) asks the committee to review notes from the previous meeting.

RSMPOC reviews meeting notes.

Joseph Cefalo (OC) makes a motion to approve the meeting notes.

Dan Richardson (OC) states that the notes are confusing: some of it is in the first person and some is in the second person. He also states that it not clear who made the motion to the BRA that there should not be any further action taken. He adds that going forward; the recording of the notes should be made clearer: all in the first person or all in the second person.

Charlotte (OC) asks if we are dealing with minutes or notes.

Joe (OC) relies that since it is an open body, all deliberations need to be in the form of minutes. That's the technicality we should follow. But with the exception of stenographers, it would be extremely difficult to do that.

Norman Stembridge (OC) states that since day one, we have always said we would take notes. We don't have the manpower to take notes that capture everything that is said exactly. He suggests that the OC continue along with meeting notes.

Dan (OC) replies that his understanding of minutes is that they are an official record of what happened and votes taken. They are the official record.

Virginia Davis (OC) adds that we can draft a form for motion makers to use, to give to the note taker. Motions are a critical part of the record.

Dan (OC) states that he made the motion on page 5 of the notes from the previous meeting.

Joe (OC) clarified that Councilor Turner had suggested the language and Dan put that language forward as a motion. [Joe] put forward an amendment to the motion. Dan, Beverly and others accepted the motion.

Darnell (OC) points out a type-o on page 2.

Dan (OC) states there needs to be a better way of keeping track of what is said.

Darnell (OC) replies that unless there is a specific change needed for something in the notes, he would like to move forward.

Councilor Tuner states he is concerned that while everyone present at the meeting can verify their statements from the meeting, those who are not there do not have such ability. Brenda McKenzie and others who are not present should give an official response as to the accuracy of the notes.

Joe (OC) replies: Not to be argumentative, but that's not procedure. Only the OC members have the right to amend what was said.

Councilor Turner withdraws his concern.

Darnell (OC) asks if there are any other corrections prior to call of the motion. He asks Ted (BRA) that going forward, there need to be more accuracy in distinguishing between speakers, motion makers and seconders in meeting notes. He then makes a motion to approve minutes as amended.

Motion is seconded by several OC members.

Motion is unanimously approved.

Darnell (OC) asks the group to move forward, and address the 4<sup>th</sup> draft of the Parcels 9 & 10 RFP.

John Dalzell (BRA) describes recent changes to the RFP including a substantial augmentation of the wealth creation section, based comments received. Other additions included green development standards and more detail on “the back end”: ground lease forms, submission requirements in detail, pro forma requirements, financial document requirements, dates and a list of appendix items. He states that this version was intended to be a more complete draft RFP. It was distributed before the holidays to give committee members several weeks to review it before going to the public for comment.

Darnell (OC) states that on page 27 there is a “TBD”.

Norman (OC) asks if there has been a decision on one or two PRC’s.

Darnell (OC) replies that there has been the intent to do it together, but there hasn’t been a final decision.

John (BRA) states the BRA and OC had envisioned a single RFP for both sites simultaneously that would allow respondents to respond to a single or both parcels. The PRC would then make a determination as to whether there would be one or two PRC’s.

Darnell (OC) asks if there would be one PRC to handle both parcels.

John (BRA) replies there would initially be one, but there are two development teams on two sites, we may need to address the need to split the PRC’s into two entities.

Hugues Monestime (BRA) adds that originally the BRA thought there would be one RFP and one PRC for both sites. Once the proposals are submitted, the BRA would go back to the Oversight Committee to determine if there should be two PRC’s.

Dan (OC) states that he is concerned about the amount of work that could be generated of OC members by having two PRC’s.

Joe (OC) adds years ago it was envisioned that the PRC would also serve as the IAG.

Dan (OC) asks if Bartlett moves forward, would that mean more work for the OC.

John (OC) replies that in terms of workload, it would be hard to see exactly what would come up.

Charlotte (OC) asks if there is a precedent for two sites and one RFP.

John (BRA) replies yes, including parcels in Jamaica Plain. He adds that flexibility seems like the best strategy.

Charlotte (OC) states that her concern is that abutters know what is going on: in terms of language we need to be clear and why we’re doing this differently.

John (BRA) replies that there is an explanation on page 4.

Norman (OC) states that we need to clear about this upfront.

John (BRA) replies that he agrees.

Darnell (OC) states that we need to have language for a tighter mechanism for communication between the PRC and BRA: what would be the communication protocols.

John (BRA) replies that the PRC selection process will be the same as has been outlined in the Master Plan and previous RFP's.

Darnell (OC) asks John about the timeline.

John (BRA) replies that the BRA team has put out the draft RFP, collected notes and would now like to put it out for public comment. [John next reads through the timeline for the draft RFP.] He then states that if the public comments are straightforward and consistent, the BRA would then present a summary of comments and a revised draft RFP. The BRA would move to produce a final RFP. Approval of that draft could extend into May or June.

Joe (OC) states that this process started almost 18 months ago. Something has to be done to streamline the process such as giving out more generic RFP's and seeing what the market comes back with.

Darnell (OC) adds that at 18 months to issue an RFP and 2 years to get something back, it shouldn't take this amount of time to get RFP's out the door.

John (BRA) replies that 60 days is long public comment period for the draft RFP. If this is tightened up, the BRA can have the RFP back in March.

Joe (OC) adds that the OC's time and the BRA's time would be best used to have time to see what is being proposed in response to a generic RFP. Going forward the OC and BRA will have basic language that has been put together. We still have the materials from Blair.

John (BRA) agrees, stating that it is a good business strategy when you can pick between multiple choices. When we look at local community building goals we have we don't put too many things in play and overwhelm potential developers.

Darnell (OC) asks what we can do to accelerate this process given what we know.

John (BRA) replies that as we progress with these, the RFP process has been revised, allowing us to turn out RFP's very quickly.

Hugues (BRA) notes that the RFP language is restrictive, which may limit responses.

Darnell (OC) states that OC has a role and responsibility not to abandon the needs of the community as it looks toward development. Maybe we can really drill down to whether they will be economic enhancements or hindrances.

Jorge Martinez (OC) notes that this is where the OC gets stuck between specific goals and looking at the RFP and setting the bar low. Looking at the needs of the community is what is needed, not setting the bar low.

Darnell (OC) states that he would like to intersect the market realities without abandoning the OC's goals.

Norman (OC) states that unfortunately politics come into play. What Joe is talking about is that we came to things on the up cycle. But when things come around, will we be behind the 8 ball. We need to be ready, not trying to wrap this up in too small a package.

Darnell (OC) states that he would not suggest lowering anything. Goals may need to be reduced, but not abandoned.

Dan (OC) notes that he would like to see the creation of an RFP template for development in a depressed community. This is what is in the Master Plan: you move around the pieces but template is the same. The reality is that community still needs jobs, housing and economic development. He added that we know what needs to be done- we've got the template now. And then asked why workshops are being done when we've already been told what needs to be done in a specific area.

Darnell (OC) states that market conditions have changed from when the process started 5 years ago, and parts of the RFP may have to be updated accordingly.

Charlotte (OC) adds that she thinks the OC has been flexible as a committee. The OC is here to hear what the needs are; the jobs are, of the people from the abutting land.

Darnell (OC) thanks the committee members for their comments and reminds them that there are 15 minutes left.

John (BRA) suggests reducing the comment period to 30 days, with the possibility of extending it longer if necessary.

Joe (OC) moves to shorten the public comment period to 30 days.

Dan (OC) seconds.

The motion unanimously passes.

Darnell (OC) recognizes Candice Sealy from Representative Capuano's office.

Councilor Tuner next reports on the December 16<sup>th</sup> hearing regarding Parcel P-3. The City Council held a public hearing with BRA staff members, including Brenda McKenzie. He notes that the BRA stated the development team was not being sufficiently responsive. He adds that because time was not sufficient, Elma Lewis did not comment, but the goal of having the BRA Director put out concerns and give the developers a chance to respond was achieved. Councilor Turner states that he said the BRA should move forward with a series of meetings with the objective that these meetings lead to a 3 part process for the project to move forward. He adds that he is in the process of setting up a meeting with Elma Lewis representatives.

Charlotte (OC) states that she received a call from Richard Garver of the BRA, informing her that he will be testifying at the January 16<sup>th</sup> Urban Ring hearing on behalf of the portion that impacts the parcels the OC is working on. Relaying his request, she asks if anyone from the OC can go to the hearing to represent the committee.

Darnell (OC) states that he can probably go and he will follow up with Charlotte over e-mail. He then moves to adjourn.

Joe (OC) seconds the motion.

Meeting adjourned.