



Meeting Notes  
May 4, 2009  
6:00 PM – 8:00 PM  
Dudley Public Library  
65 Warren Street

**RSMPOC Members Present:** Darnell Williams (Chair), Charlotte Nelson, Dorothea Jones, Frank Williams, Joseph Cefalo, Marilyn Lynch, Daniel Richardson, Norman Stembridge, Beverly Adams, John Barros & *Dolly Battle (RNC representative)*; BRA: Hugues Monestime, John Dalzell, Ted Schwartzberg

Darnell Williams (OC) called the meeting to order at 6:06 PM. He entertains a motion to review meeting notes from the last meeting. Members review minutes from last meeting.

Daniel Richardson (RSMPOC) moved to accept meeting notes, motion seconded by Norman Stembridge (RSMPOC).

Darnell Williams (OC) asked to add page numbers to the minutes.

Norman Stembridge (OC) asked that the comments at the bottom of the third page be attributed to Mr. Tourse rather than Mr. Gaither.

Ted Schwartzberg (BRA) stated that he will correct the errors. No additional changes are requested. Meeting notes are accepted unanimously

Darnell Williams (OC) stated he sent an e-mail requesting interest in the RSMPOC Executive Committee. As a result, Dorothea has become a member of the Executive Committee. The committee meets between the regular, monthly meetings and corresponds with the committee between meetings. It is easier to get the 5 member committee together than the full 15 member RSMPOC.

He commended the committee for work done during the last meeting on April 6<sup>th</sup>. He stated that it was challenging, but it reflected our years of work and the wishes of the community. He presented a memo given by Brenda McKenzie to the BRA Board about Parcel P-3. He stated there is a certificate of the BRA Board vote laying the protocols and expectations related to the reporting back to the RSMPOC by Elma Lewis Partners. This document made clear how it will work, making the process and expectations transparent and clear. There is an 18 month extension for the Elma Lewis team, with clear benchmarks laid out.

John Barros (OC) he was extremely happy with the BRA Director's response to come here and meet with the community and to listen and respond to our feedback. He wants to make sure that this was noted. He would also I like to invite him to come back regularly, when it is warranted.

Darnell Williams (OC) noted that they will do that and put it in writing when they're going in. The Director, John Dalzell, Hugues and Maria Faria from the BRA are with us. One concern is that when we work with Hugues on the planning side, we don't have the same continuity and communication problems. Maria has been assigned from Economic Development to work with us closely from now on.

Norman Stembridge (OC) stated that there was a RSMPOC working session on April 27 at Central Boston Elder Services. The RSMPOC has been informed that Brenda McKenzie wants to meet with the RSMPOC. We presume she wants to meet with the Executive Committee about what the role of the RSMPOC is going forward, but we're not sure exactly what she wants to discuss.

Darnell Williams (OC) stated that if we're meeting with the Director of Economic Development, we should do it with the entire committee.

Norman Stembridge (OC) stated that that was our consensus as well, and that she could come to the next working session on Monday, May 18<sup>th</sup> also at Central Boston Elder Services.

Joseph Cefalo (OC) added that another recommendation from the working session: that the request to meet with the RSMPOC is to be put in writing and state the purpose of the meeting, and who from the BRA will be accompanying her so that RSMPOC members may be prepared.

Daniel Richardson (OC) noted that Brenda asked him in person to meet with the Executive Committee, which he brought it to the working session and suggested that she meet with everyone.

Norman Stembridge (OC) noted that in this meeting we discussed that we may want to meet with Elma Lewis Partners during the working session. We also discussed help -- technical and other administrative assistance to help the committee.

Darnell Williams (OC) asked Norman to clarify: to have Elma Lewis come to the monthly public meetings or the working sessions.

Norman Stembridge (OC) stated that if there are some specific details or areas of concern that would be the working sessions. But that would not replace presentations to the public at the monthly public meetings.  
(He added that 7 members attended the last working session meeting.)

Joe Cefalo (OC) stated that they also reviewed sheet on qualifications for a staff type person that would work with the RSMPOC on clerical work and coordinating the RSMPOC. This is something that needs to be addressed and it's something we wanted to put back on the radar screen and get some feedback from the BRA.

Darnell Williams (OC) recognized Ms. Battle and acknowledges that she is representing the RNC. He then shifted the discussion to Parcels 8, 9 & 10.

Hugues Monestime (BRA) stated that BRA staff continues to work with the state on site assembly (DCAM and DCR). On Parcel 8, we met with DCR. Regarding Parcels 9 & 10, we met with DCAM. We had one meeting with each where we discussed procedures for disposition of properties. DCR would require legislation prior to making Parcel 8 available for development by RFP. There are also additional restrictions that go with DCR land that we're exploring. At our meeting with DCAM, we asked the agency to describe their disposition methods.

Darnell Williams (OC) asked to deal with Parcel 8 by itself. We were told the city, the BRA and the DCR all owned Parcel 8: totaling 3 owners.

John Dalzell (BRA) responded that the owners are just DCR and the city. DCR owns two separate parcels on the site. Because their land has parks and open space designation, it's required to have legislation. Also, open space needs to be replaced with open space of equal value and the former factory. They like the vision of the committee and the community, vis-a-vis the planning report. They also like the idea of having the former factory as an information center. The line between state and city land goes right through the building. The DCR also has to do its own due diligence. DCR is not used to transferring land for development.

Darnell Williams (OC) stated that what seems complicated is that the Master Plan indicated that there would be a MOU (MOA): that the parcels of land would be turned over to the BRA for the disposition process. Now we're being told that there has to be legislation before the land is transferred.

Norman Stembridge (OC) stated that the MOU is the beginning of the process, but something legislatively would still need to be done.

Beverly Adams (OC) asked if John said legislation is needed for change of use and ownership.

Darnell Williams (OC) yes and that is what we're talking about.

John Dalzell (OC) stated that it doesn't actually say it needs to be transferred to the BRA. The BRA runs the process, so what would be a likely outcome, like with Bartlett, is the BRA crafts the RFP and the disposition agent would actually be the state.

Darnell Williams (OC) noted that the committee stated two months ago the preference of coming up with a generic RFP to expedite the disposition process.

John Dalzell (OC) responded that we've discussed that and will work on it. Now transitioning to Parcels 9 and 10, and the Crescent Parcel, Mass Highway (DCAM handles their dispositions) requirements are: to canvass other state agencies, city agencies (we don't want it) first. Then they would join us in creating the RFP. Their parcels would go with the city parcels and we would do a joint closing so that city and DCAM parcels are simultaneously transferred to the designee. We are still awaiting DCAM's more detailed review.

Norman Stembridge (OC) stated that at this point, Parcel 8 would take some sort of legislative action, but Parcels 9, 10 and Crescent would not.

John Dalzell (OC) responded that he is correct. We expect that it will look much like our planned process.

Norman Stembridge (OC) asked is it the highest bidder, or whatever the community asked for. The (T) ignored what the community asked for.

Darnell Williams (OC) stated that what the community and committee agreed to was not what we got at Bartlett. What conditions do we have to prevent something like that from happening again?

Norman Stembridge (OC) stated that given what the state is up against now, I think the Parcel 8 legislation would be a difficult thing to accomplish

Joe Cefalo (OC) asked for clarification on whether Mass. Highway still has an ownership interest. Would they put a tax on future sales as the BRA and T do?

John Dalzell (BRA) responded that DCAM is holding the disposition process. But the deed would come from Mass Highway. Addressing the Chair's question, we've got smarter after Bartlett and try to catch those things.

Darnell Williams (OC) stated that the RSMPOC wants to see the very final version of the RFP before it goes out.

Dan Richardson (OC) suggested having the parcels declared surplus so we don't have to go through another RFP process. This is what we would like to have done by the BRA and other agencies involved.

John Dalzell (OC) responded that he didn't understand, because he understood the land to already be surplus. The legislative process is not an easy one, but it's one we intend to go through. Issues can be addressed through the legislative process.

Dan Richardson (OC) stated that it would be best to get this done in a way in which you wouldn't have to do fair market value stuff and extraordinary changes at the legislative level.

Joe Cefalo (OC) stated that on the DCR, they can't do anything without an act of the legislature that is a built in protection. It would be helpful if the General Counsel could do a quick memo explaining what is happening with the disposition process.

John Dalzell (BRA) I agree and it would be a good idea for them to come here to these meetings.

John Barros (OC) having done a project that involved Mass Highway land, I've seen the surplus process done, and we should try to avoid some the challenges of the Bartlett process.

As far as relationships on Beacon Hill, we should be talking to Rushing, Fox, Chang-Diaz, Sanchez and St. Fleur. Who is talking to them, is that us or the city?

Darnell Williams (OC) I think both, since there are people who have been participating in this for years.

John Barros (OC) we should also have point person here.

Darnell Williams (OC) I suggest that we first get the facts, then in one of the working sessions, drill down to who would be the best person (elected) to be the go-to person.

Daniel Richardson (OC) Byron Rushing indicated that he wants to sit down with the BRA and do this work. The BRA director and Hugues know about it. He has indicated that Gloria would be involved.

Darnell Williams (OC) let's put it out to the delegation, make it inclusive and let them decide if they want to get involved.

Daniel Richardson (OC) I also wanted to clarify that there has already been discussions along these lines.

John Barros (OC) I would like to ask for a clearly stated process about how that process is working.

Charlotte Nelson (OC) we've been batting around the names of legislators. It's now time for someone to come to us in writing about how they are to proceed. What is our next step in terms of formalizing the process and having a record for us?

Darnell Williams (OC) I want the BRA to interface with DCR and DCAM and tell us what must happen on these specific parcels. Once we have this data in written form, in the working session we should discuss our strategy for working with legislative offices.

Joe Cefalo (OC) I agree with Darnell, and we need a timeframe.

Norman Stembridge (OC) we should drive the timeline. We need to ask for this information now and target the June working session.

Darnell Williams (OC) what is the BRA's expectation in terms of timing for getting us that information.

John Dalzell (BRA) we could get back with that information at the June regular meeting. (June 1<sup>st</sup>).

Hugues Monestime (BRA) we will obtain the outline from DCAM and DCR.

John Dalzell (BRA) the challenge is that we're being asked to commit to a timeline for information from another agency. We will try to get that in time for June 1<sup>st</sup>, but will get back to you if we can't achieve that.

Darnell Williams (OC) asked for questions from committee.

Charlotte Nelson (OC) what is the timeline?

John Dalzell (OC) we will come back to the June meeting with a timeline, sequence and key terms. Then we could map out legislative strategy.

Darnell Williams (OC) I would consider that baseline data, to be used to formulate a strategy at the June working session, and then have a strategy when we talk to the elected officials.

Norman Stembridge (OC) asked to have them at the working session at June

Darnell (OC) stated that perhaps we should have elected officials at the meeting.

Charlotte Nelson (OC) I think the conversation on Parcel 8, as opposed to the other parcels, is going to be a lengthy conversation in particular, and in that regard I don't think we should rush it. The dialogue for June should be 9, 10 and the Crescent Parcel.

Darnell Williams (OC) to summarize:

- Get information at June monthly meeting

- Discuss it at our June working session.

- July: invite the legislators to meet with us at the end of July

#### Comments and Questions from Members of the Public

David Goodman (member of United Neighbors of Lower Roxbury) the bottom line, the only thing I can see and smell: have them declared a surplus so they can be dealt with.

However, a problem I see with that is they will next be taken by special interests. I smell a rat. The bottom line is where's the money going to come from?

Darnell Williams (OC) thanked him and states that the point is well taken.

Barry Gaither (Elma Lewis Partners) I would like to commend the RSMPOC for its steadfastness and resolve on behalf of the community of Roxbury through these turbulent waters. I would like to thank BRA staffs who have worked closely with the committee. We look forward to better and swifter progress in the future.

Darnell Williams (OC) on behalf of the committee, it is a tremendous responsibility we've taken on in representing the community. There have been many twists and turns in the process but I think the community voice has prevailed.

Carmen Moran (artist and community member) thanked the RSMPOC for its work. What is the process for neighborhood professionals to get involved in the RFP process?

Darnell Williams (OC) ask one of the RSMPOC members or BRA staff to walk you through this process after this meeting, given time considerations.

What is timeframe for public input for Parcels 9 & 10? When would it end?

Hugues Monestime (BRA) we've gone pass the deadline twice. Aside from RSMPOC member comments, we didn't see any comments from the public on the draft RFP above and beyond that. From an economics prospective we don't see a lot of value to rushing an RFP out to the street at this time. In response to Darnell's question: we should wait for information from DCAM before going ahead with 9 & 10.

Joe Cefalo (OC) we should look at information we get from the BRA at the June meeting before we discuss the process and timing of how we dispose of these parcels.

Darnell Williams (OC) I agree. I also suggest we get another copy of the final version. And have all of this (including DCAM and DCR information) to review before the June meeting.

John Dalzell (BRA) what are RSMPOC members' thoughts are on the planning process and timeline for the Crescent parcel?

Joe Cefalo (OC) as I mentioned earlier, I suggest coming up with a more general RFP that would allow respondents to come up with a creative process and allow the PRC to whittle down the number of proposals. Perhaps the BRA could come up with a sample generic RFP that we could look at.

Darnell Williams (OC) asked for other thoughts.

Charlotte Nelson (OC) we should look at what we discussed on the Crescent Parcel several years ago.

Norman Stenbridge (OC) we need to take that all in consideration

Darnell Williams (OC) asked if we are on the same plate in terms of boiler-plate RFP's but not short-changing the community, and asks community members present if there is further input. He entertains a motion to adjourn.

Joe Cefalo moved to adjourn.

Meeting is adjourned.

DRAFT