

City of Worcester, Massachusetts

Edward M. Augustus, Jr.
City Manager

Michael E. Traynor, Esq.
Chief Executive Officer
Worcester Redevelopment Authority



WORCESTER REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

March 19, 2019

8:00 A.M.

City Hall, Levi Lincoln Chamber
Worcester, MA 01608

Present:

Worcester Redevelopment Authority Board

Vincent Pedone, Chair
Michael Angelini
Jennifer Gaskin
David Minasian
Sumner Tilton

Staff

Michael Traynor, Chief Development Officer
Jennifer Beaton, Deputy City Solicitor
Thomas Zidelis, Chief Financial Officer
Erin Cahill, WRA Financial Manager
John Odell, Energy & Asset Management
Greg Ormsby, Office of Economic Development
Peter Dunn, Office of Economic Development
Jeanette Tozer, Office of Economic Development
Jane Bresnahan, Office of Economic Development

Pursuant to a notice given (attached), a meeting of the Worcester Redevelopment Authority was held at 8:00 A.M. on Tuesday, March 19, 2019.

1. Call to Order

Chair Pedone called the meeting to order at 8:12 A.M.

2. Roll Call

Mr. Traynor called the roll.

3. Approval of Minutes: February 8, 2019

Chair Pedone asked the Board to review the minutes of the February 8, 2019 meeting. The meeting minutes were moved by Mr. Angelini and seconded by Mr. Tilton.

Chair Pedone noted that Item No. 2 would be held.

New Business

Chair Pedone stated that Agenda Item #2 would be held until later in the meeting and that Agenda Item #10 would be taken out of order

1. Authorize the award of the Construction Manager at Risk Contract for the Canal District Ballpark Project to Gilbane-Hunt, a Joint Venture

Mr. Traynor informed the Board that this item was placed on the agenda in anticipation of being able to authorize the award. Certain language in the contract was still being fine-tuned, and the vote to make the award must be held until all contract language is agreed upon, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 149A. Mr. Traynor stated that he would like to hold the item and poll the board members to identify a date and time to reconvene. Board members discussed various options, and Mr. Traynor suggested that the meeting be recessed to reconvene the following day as a continuation of the March 19, 2019 meeting. After discussion, the Board agreed to reconvene the meeting on Wednesday, March 20, 2019 at 11:00 A.M. to discuss the awarding of the Construction Manager at Risk contract for the ballpark.

3. Authorize execution of a contract with WSP Buildings, Inc. in the not to exceed amount of Thirty Five Thousand, Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and no cents (\$35,250.00) for energy modeling related to the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report required under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA)

Mr. Traynor noted that Item 3 relates to a contract with WSP Buildings, Inc., a consultant that was brought on board for the greenhouse modeling required for the MEPA filing. The services would be split fifty-fifty with the developer in the same manner as the other work being done for the environmental impact report.

Mr. Angelini moved the following motion as written:

Voted that the Worcester Redevelopment Authority hereby authorizes its chair or vice-chair to execute a contract with WSP in the not-to-exceed amount of Thirty Five Thousand Two Hundred Fifty Dollars and no cents (\$35,250.00) for professional engineering services relative to energy modeling for the Canal District Ballpark Project MEPA filing.

Mr. Minasian seconded the motion. Mr. Tilton recused himself from Item 3.

4. Authorize execution of Amendment No. 1 in the amount of Eight Thousand Dollars and no cents (\$8,000.00), to the Appraisal Services Agreement with Tyburski

Appraisal & Consulting Services for additional appraisal services related to the Canal District Ballpark Project

Mr. Traynor informed the Board that Item 4 is an amendment to one of the existing appraisal contracts for additional services required for two of the properties.

Mr. Traynor stated for the record that Mr. Tilton is recused from Item 4, 5, 6 and 10.

Mr. Angelini moved the following motion as written:

Voted that the Worcester Redevelopment Authority hereby authorizes its chair or vice-chair to execute Amendment No. 1 to the contract with Tyburski Appraisal and Consulting Services, Inc. in the not-to-exceed amount of Eight Thousand Dollars and no cents (\$8,000.00) for additional appraisal and consulting services relative to the acquisition and disposition of land as part of the Downtown Urban Revitalization Plan.

Mr. Minasian seconded the motion. Mr. Tilton recused himself from Item 4.

- 5. Authorize execution of a contract with Bohler Engineering MA, LLC in the not to exceed amount of Seventy-two Thousand, Nine Hundred Dollars and no cents (\$72,900.00) for engineering services related to the conceptual design, permitting, and final site plan for a parking structure and for services related to the discontinuance of existing public streets and property acquisition relative to the Canal District Baseball Project.**

Mr. Traynor informed the Board that Item 5 is a contract with Bohler Engineering MA, LLC negotiated by Public Works and Parks for services related to various street abandonments that are needed for the ballpark construction site. The firm is also completing conceptual drawings and site plans for the parking garage that will be constructed on the south side of Madison Street. Mr. Angelini noted that the contract and other materials were distributed in advance of the Board meeting, and they have had an opportunity to review these and assume that the vote is consistent with what was received before the vote. Mr. Traynor confirmed that it was consistent.

Mr. Angelini moved the following motion as written:

Voted that the Worcester Redevelopment Authority hereby authorizes its chair or vice-chair to execute a contract with Bohler Engineering MA, LLC in the not-to-exceed amount of Seventy Two Thousand Nine Hundred Dollars and no cents (\$72,900.00) for professional engineering services relative to the conceptual design, permitting, and final site plan for a parking structure and for services related to the discontinuance of existing public streets and property acquisition relative to the Canal District Ballpark Project.

Mr. Minasian seconded the motion. Mr. Tilton recused himself from Item 5.

- 6. Discussion regarding procurement process for properties required for the Ballpark Project**

Mr. Traynor noted that Item 6 was intended to be a short discussion regarding the procurement process for the properties that are required for the ballpark project. The appraisals

had started to come in, consisting of two independent appraisals and a review appraisal for each property. Due to the timeline of the project, and after discussing with the Chairman, Mr. Traynor had begun sending the appraisals to the Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) upon receipt, as DHCD must approve and review the appraisals. At the same time, Mr. Traynor had begun sending letters to property owners to make an offer per the appraisals, which is required per the Urban Renewal regulations. The regulations require that the WRA enter into good faith negotiations and to reach an agreed upon acquisition price prior to the receipt of authorization to complete a taking. Mr. Traynor explained that rather than waiting for a WRA Board meeting after receiving the appraisals, he had been sending the offers out pending the Board's approval of the offers. This is a timing matter, and Mr. Traynor wanted to inform the Board of the actions being taken. If there were no objections, Mr. Traynor stated that he would like to continue in this manner; this was determined to be the most prudent way to move this forward after discussions with the Chairman. Mr. Traynor also noted that a couple of the offers that were sent out would be discussed in Executive Session. Mr. Minasian asked to be reminded about how many active businesses and residential tenants are located in the properties that the WRA is looking to acquire. Mr. Traynor stated that there are no residential tenants in any of the properties; they are all commercial tenants, and eleven are businesses that qualify for relocation benefits.

Mr. Minasian inquired about the relocation benefits. Mr. Traynor responded that the relocation benefits include moving expenses, certain other expenses such as upgrades to electrical equipment and server equipment; at the same time, the WRA is actively engaging them to find another location, and those costs are incurred by the WRA. Mr. Traynor noted that they have a relocation specialist, Mr. Mollica, who was the former head of the relocation agency for the Commonwealth. Mr. Mollica helped write the current regulations; he is well-versed in the regulations and works directly with the business owners as well. When the time comes that the businesses qualify for the benefits, they will be given a form to fill out and Mr. Mollica will walk them through the whole process. Mr. Minasian asked if there is a maximum amount that someone would receive during relocation. Mr. Traynor responded that there are a couple of different formulas; one has a maximum amount capped at \$40,000.00, and there are others that could exceed \$40,000. Mr. Minasian requested that the Board receive a summary of what the relocation requirements are. Mr. Traynor responded that Mr. Mollica put together a relocation handbook that had been submitted to DHCD for approval. Once it has been received back from DHCD, Mr. Traynor would then submit a copy to the Board members. Mr. Traynor further stated that it is their duty under the regulations to enter into good faith negotiations and to reach an agreed-upon acquisition price prior to any taking. Mr. Traynor informed the Board the Plan has already been approved by the State under the Uniform Relocation Act, M.G.L. c. 79A; once DHCD receives and approves the handbook he will then submit the handbook and the Plan back to the Board.

Chair Pedone inquired if Mr. Tilton could be included in the Executive Session, and Mr. Traynor responded that he cannot. Mr. Tilton asked if all of the discussions would relate to the ballpark project, and Mr. Traynor responded affirmatively.

7. Authorize the issuance of an Invitation to Bid under the provisions of M.G.L. c.30, §39M for the demolition of the building situated at 36 Washington Square

Chair Pedone inquired about Item 7, and Mr. Traynor responded that it relates to the former vacuum cleaner building at Washington Square. The structure has been open to the elements for some time and the building must be taken down before it poses a danger to the public.

Mr. Minasian inquired as to whether the recent Responsible Employer regulations apply to the demolition; Mr. Traynor stated that it would not because the estimated contract amount fell below the \$100,000 threshold.

Mr. Angelini offered the following motion:

Voted that the Worcester Redevelopment Authority hereby authorizes its chief executive officer to solicit bids pursuant to M.G.L. c. 30, §39M, through the city of Worcester purchasing division, for the demolition of the building situated at 36 Washington Square.

Mr. Minasian seconded the motion.

10. Request Executive Session to discuss the value and acquisition of real property

Chair Pedone offered the following motion:

WHEREAS, the chair has declared that an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the Authority;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT VOTED that the Worcester Redevelopment Authority hereby convene in executive session for the purposes of considering the value and acquisition of real property. The Authority will reconvene in open session immediately following the Executive Session.

The Board voted 4-0 on a voice vote. Mr. Tilton was recused from Item 10.

Chair Pedone stated that the WRA is reconvening in open session and would like to hold Item 2 and take Item 8, Financial Report Update.

**8. Financial Update Report
Report on Prior Month's Executed Contracts and Payments**

Ms. Cahill reported that for the period of February 6, 2019, through March 5, 2019, the WRA incurred \$635,352.26 in expenses. Of this amount, approximately \$25,348.00 was for capital building improvements, approximately \$25,000.00 for urban renewal expenses, approximately \$376.00.00 was for the ballpark project, and approximately \$208,000.00 was for operating expenses. Chair Pedone asked Ms. Cahill to give the Board an update on the checks that were just signed. Ms. Cahill stated that what is not included in the current report are checks that the Chairman signed today: approximately \$515,000.00 for design services related to the ballpark, snow removal expenses, and security costs for Union Station.

9. Status Reports:

- a) **Union Station Exterior Stucco Project**
- b) **Union Station – Vendor & Maintenance Performance**
- d) **Union Station – Leak Remediation Project**
- e) **Tenant Updates – Former Tenant**
- f) **Security Update**
- g) **Urban Revitalization Plan**

Mr. Traynor stated that Mr. Odell would be providing an update regarding the stucco project. Mr. Traynor noted that they also have a tenant update regarding Mr. Broullon and his proposal to put a restaurant and entertainment space in the former Byblos Lounge space. Mr. Broullon had informed the WRA that he received all of his financing and that his investors were ready to go. Mr. Traynor advised the Board that in speaking with the City Manager, they thought it was good proposal and the WRA should move forward with negotiations. Mr. Traynor stated that he is recommending to the Board, without a formal vote, to move forward with negotiations with Mr. Broullon in terms of a lease. There would be no capital expenses incurred by the WRA; Mr. Broullon would be completing his own fit out and is aware that some of the space within the former Byblos Lounge would be lost in order for the WRA to construct a wall that will provide access from the Grand Hall to the proposed Fire Museum space. Mr. Traynor noted that the proposed restaurant/entertainment space would round out tenancy within Union Station and would provide a service to commuters as well as visitors coming to the Cannabis Control Commission's new offices. Mr. Broullon's proposal includes serving breakfast, lunch and dinner. The proposal would activate the space and appears to be a good proposal. If the Board is so inclined, Mr. Traynor would like to move forward with starting negotiations.

Chair Pedone stated that the only issue he would like to raise is that Mr. Giordano has expressed interest in acquiring the Byblos Lounge space. Chair Pedone inquired about any discussions that may have been had with Mr. Giordano and the administration. Mr. Traynor stated that there have been no discussions with Mr. Giordano, as no proposals or offers had been received other than the one letter to the Board seeking permission to make a proposal. They had offered to work with Mr. Giordano for the past year, and he had not shown his business plan or his financing plan. Mr. Angelini asked if there had been a formal plan from Mr. Giordano, and referred to a letter to the administration showing an interest in the Byblos Lounge space and in acquiring essentially all of the Grand Hall area in order to run his operation. Mr. Traynor responded that the one letter being referred to is the only letter that he has seen. There had been no discussion and Mr. Giordano had not contacted the administration since that letter was received asking to prepare and submit a proposal. Mr. Angelini stated his desire to make sure that there were no misunderstandings and recommended that someone communicate with Mr. Giordano that if he has interest in the Byblos Lounge space, he should be explicit about it and then the WRA could deal with the matter; it should not keep the WRA from starting negotiations with Mr. Broullon. Chair Pedone asked that the administration reach out to Mr. Giordano to notify him that the WRA is moving forward with Mr. Broullon, and if he has an interest that he needs to make it public and clear. Mr. Traynor noted that the administration had approached Mr. Giordano in the past about renegotiating his lease and to give the WRA back the Grand Hall; he was not receptive. Those discussions were with Mr. Zidelis, CFO; since then, there have been no further discussions. Mr. Traynor stated that he would be happy to reach out to Mr. Giordano to let him know that they are moving forward, but they are at a stalemate since they have not seen anything come in from Mr. Giordano. Mr. Traynor further noted that he was a bit confused that they are going forward with lease negotiations but are also reaching out to Mr. Giordano to bring a proposal before the board. Mr. Angelini stated that they should proceed with the lease negotiations with Mr. Broullon, but reaching out obviates a claim later and is an act of courtesy. Mr. Traynor agreed to reach out and send a letter to Mr. Giordano.

Mr. Odell informed the Board that the stucco project is still progressing; the front façade would be finished in April, and the remainder of the building would be finished in May and June. Bid documents for the Miscellaneous Renovations project – which includes the previously mentioned corridor between the proposed Fire Museum space and the Grand Hall, the Police substation, the Harding Street corridor, and upgrades to the basement and second floor restrooms – are now complete and would be put out to bid in the spring.

Chair Pedone turned the discussion to the two properties that the Board agreed to move forward with appraisals on at the last meeting; one of those being the Great Wall building at 521

Main Street. Chair Pedone inquired about the status of that property and the two appraisals. Mr. Traynor responded that he had not taken any steps towards the appraisals for the Great Wall since our last meeting, as they had been focusing on Front Street properties. An update would be provided at the April Board meeting. Chair Pedone followed up with an inquiry about the status of the building, and Mr. Traynor noted that there was a certain amount of work that was done due to an emergency order issued by Inspectional Services, who has been trying to arrange for access to the building. Mr. Traynor continued, noting that to his knowledge they had not moved forward with renovations to the upper floors and the business was not open. Mr. Tilton inquired if the building was just sitting there and the Board intended to do nothing. Chair Pedone responded that they have asked for updated appraisals; Mr. Traynor clarified that one new appraisal would be received. The Board was not happy with one of the previous appraisals and therefore a new appraisal would be received in addition to an update on the second appraisal. Mr. Tilton inquired about what could be done in the interim, and Mr. Traynor stated that the appraisals had to be completed first and sent to the State for review and approval. Mr. Tilton further inquired if the WRA would have to complete the appraisal process again should the properties stall again. Mr. Traynor responded that if the Board wants to collectively take a run at the Great Wall building, they would have to start with new appraisals, see what the values come in at, and make an offer to acquire the property. They did not try to acquire the property the last time they received the appraisals. Chair Pedone noted that they did not try to acquire the property because the owner had stated that they were moving forward with making a significant investment in the property; not only to the restaurant but to the upper levels of the building. The owners had not accomplished this and there may be some financial concerns; at this point, the WRA may need to move forward as it is inhibiting development of the back portion the building. Chair Pedone further noted that WBDC was incredibly disappointed when the WRA did not move forward on the property previously. Chair Pedone stated that the owners' inability or unwillingness to move forward is why the property had been included in the redevelopment plan. Mr. Minasian stated that it would be helpful to have an update from Inspectional Services about the current status of the building. Mr. Traynor stated that he would provide an update to the Board and bring the proposals for the appraisals to the April meeting.

2. Update Regarding 12 Front Street and 22 Front Street properties proposed for acquisition and rehabilitation in the Downtown Urban Revitalization Plan

Mr. Traynor informed the Board that they had not taken any actions to acquire the 12 Front Street and 22 Front Street properties; they are only looking to have appraisals completed at this time. The Board had asked at the last meeting that information be obtained from Inspectional Services and the Police Department; that information was included with the Board packet. Mr. Traynor summarized the data, noting that since 2014 there were 21 occurrences of violations; 14 were reported by tenants and the general public. Eight of those occurrences contained nuisance violations, and four resulted in court proceedings for non-responsiveness. Violations from Inspectional Services records included multiple occurrences of infestations, trash, electrical violations, water leaks, mold, lack of occupancy permits, broken glass, accessibility issues, graffiti, significant fire safety hazards including ceilings built under sprinklers, missing fire alarm beacons, lack of exit signs, faulty emergency lighting, and blocked egresses. In addition, the exterior façade has structural issues which have caused debris from to fall in the public way. One tenant of record had stated that the mice infestation had existed for five years and had not been addressed; in another instance, overflowing trash behind the building delayed a work crew from National Grid. Mr. Traynor noted that this results in a drain of city resources, including inspections, constables, and court proceedings. Additionally, some of the leakage issues pose a significant risk of electrical violations. Worcester Police Department records indicate that there had been 602 calls in the last ten years, 347 which had been in the last five years; these calls

included issues that may have occurred in the public way just outside the building. In terms of the recently created Business Improvement District, the owner had not made the BID fees to date.

Mr. Traynor informed the Board that a public hearing would be held per the Board's request on April 4, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in the Levi Lincoln Room. A legal ad would be placed and a flyer would be distributed to the tenants of the building so that there would be as much notice as possible for those that are interested in attending. The hearing would be a visioning session with a goal of eliciting input and ideas from the tenants as well as the general public as to what they see as the future of the Midtown Mall. Mr. Tilton referred to the data report and sought clarification about the number of properties, as the report referred to four separate properties. Mr. Traynor stated that there are two properties, 12 and 22 Front Street, as identified in the urban renewal plan. The Midtown Mall has an address of 22 Front Street. Mr. Tilton inquired about 20 Front Street, and Mr. Dunn noted that the address is reported by Inspectional Services as 22 – 28 Front Street; there are four addresses that could be associated with that property, and the back side of the building is listed as Mechanic Street. Mr. Traynor further clarified that there are only two properties, 12 and 22 Front Street, and referred to a similar address issue that occurs with Union Station.

Chair Pedone reiterated that the public hearing had been set for April 4, 2019 at 5:30 p.m. in the Levi Lincoln Chamber, and that the public is invited. Mr. Marcus and Midtown Mall tenants were also invited to attend.

Mr. Marcus requested that he address the Board prior to the public hearing, and began clarifying that the Midtown Mall is composed of three buildings – the five story building is made up of two buildings with two different deeds that have been combined, and the Midtown Mall is one building. Mr. Marcus proceeded to present a history of the buildings, noting that he acquired the Midtown Mall in 1980 and built it out as it is seen now. Mr. Marcus stated that he has forty tenants in the 12 Front Street property, and Mr. Angelini asked if there were forty separate rental agreements with the tenants and if Mr. Marcus would provide the rental agreements to the Board. Mr. Marcus continued, stating that there were about eight or ten tenants in the five story building, and that he was speaking with a large tenant that was thinking about renting the upper floors. Mr. Angelini sought to clarify with Mr. Marcus that there were forty-eight landlord-tenant relationships, and Mr. Marcus responded that was approximately correct. Mr. Angelini asked if Mr. Marcus would provide that documentation to Mr. Traynor. Mr. Marcus continued providing a history of his tenants, stating that the property had been an incubator for many years.

Chair Pedone stated to Mr. Marcus that there are two purposes for the public hearing; one is Mr. Marcus' concern about the WRA's potential taking of the Midtown Mall properties. For the purposes of this meeting, the Board would like to understand what Mr. Marcus would like to get out of the public hearing, as well as provide an opportunity for the WRA Board to share their concerns about the condition of the property. Chair Pedone referred to an article in the Telegram & Gazette, noting that for whatever reason – either because of an inability to secure financing to upgrade the property or an unwillingness to do so – the WRA had found itself in a position where they are talking about these two properties and the potential for the WRA to execute a taking in order to make the two buildings a vibrant component of the Downtown Urban Revitalization Plan. Chair Pedone stated that if Mr. Marcus has a different view, it would be important for the Board to understand Mr. Marcus' plan for the properties prior to the public hearing. Mr. Marcus responded that the buildings are very old and that new tenants have moved in, including a tattoo business and two churches. Mr. Marcus reiterated that there are about forty active tenants, with vacancies on the third floor and part of the second floor. Mr. Marcus also stated that his properties give tenants a chance to start small businesses, and his tenants are made up minorities and immigrants representing sixteen or seventeen different countries, and that they cannot afford to move.

Chair Pedone inquired as to how Mr. Marcus was able to charge half the cost per square foot of any other business downtown, and Mr. Marcus explained that the building was bought for \$260,000.00 in 1980. Chair Pedone noted that there had been a lack of investment in the building, which is the point of the WRA's urban revitalization plan. It is on business owners to make investments in their properties, and if they are unable to do so, the WRA has an obligation to the surrounding property owners to make that property viable as an investment. Mr. Marcus informed the Board that in 2017 he invested about \$50,000.00 in the building, and about \$80,000.00 the prior year to convert from oil to a gas system. Chair Pedone asked Mr. Marcus about his vision for the properties, as they were included in the urban renewal plan in order to provide an opportunity to talk to Mr. Marcus about rehabilitating them or allow the WRA to move towards acquiring the properties. Mr. Marcus spoke about different properties that he has developed in the past, including 340 May Street and apartments above 371 Main Street. Mr. Marcus stated that he has been in contact with several different developers. Chair Pedone stated that is great and what the WRA has been asking for. The Board knows that there are developers interested in Mr. Marcus' properties and that have approached him. Mr. Marcus responded that he is dealing with a number of different developers with different concepts for the buildings. Chair Pedone asked Mr. Marcus to bring to the public hearing any developers that he is currently working with; the Board would be making a decision as to whether they move forward with an acquisition of the properties because there had been no evidence that anything is being done with them – no development, no rehabilitation, and no vision.

A tenant of the Midtown Mall approached Mr. Marcus, and Chair Pedone encouraged the tenant to speak at the public hearing. Chair Pedone stated that the Board wanted to give Mr. Marcus a chance to be heard at their business meeting, and inquired about the name of the person at the table. Shaheen A. Adelinia identified himself as a tenant of the building. Chair Pedone turned back to Mr. Marcus, stating that he thinks Mr. Marcus is committed to the city of Worcester, has invested in the city, but they are not talking about occupancy; the Board wants to talk about development of this property and Mr. Marcus' vision for its redevelopment. Ms. Gaskin agreed with Chair Pedone, and noted that she understands why Mr. Marcus would be upset given what had been written about the Midtown Mall properties. Ms. Gaskins continued, noting that she is a first generation immigrant and can relate to the tenants in the building; however, that does not make it okay that the building is in the condition that it is and it does not make it acceptable for someone who is struggling to live in poor conditions – the same applies to their business. It does not make it okay for churches to be in a building that is infested with rodents. It is important to have organizations, institutions and buildings that act as incubators in the city so that people have springboards to build their businesses; there are opportunities available to develop the Midtown Mall properties or other buildings around the city into incubators with Wi-Fi and common office space. It has been done already in the city in other areas, so there is the opportunity for that to happen at the Midtown Mall; however, something has to change in Mr. Marcus' building in order for it to be successful. Ms. Gaskin referenced the detrimental effects that properties in disrepair have on those around them, and stated that the WRA would like Mr. Marcus' buildings to be part of efforts to make Worcester a world class city. Ms. Gaskin noted that Mr. Marcus came to the meeting to defend himself and his property, and stated that the WRA respects that his buildings are occupied and that tenants have created a village and are doing good work. The WRA does not dispute that, and is prepared to work with Mr. Marcus and the businesses that are there. What is needed is change and for all parties to come to a resolution. The WRA and Mr. Marcus cannot continue down the same path because it is not working for the WRA or for the tenants that are in the building. A plan is needed, and when the WRA meets for the public hearing on April 4th they would like Mr. Marcus to come to that meeting with a vision and plan for the next steps in terms of developing the Midtown Mall properties.

Mr. Tilton encouraged Mr. Marcus to come to the April 4th public hearing prepared to talk about the 602 police calls to his properties in ten years and the 21 code violations. Mr. Marcus stated that he had asked the city for help and that there had been no programs to help. Mr. Marcus also informed the board that his sprinkler and alarm systems were up-to-date. Mr. Angelini reiterated that the discussion about the Midtown Mall has nothing to do with Mr. Marcus as an individual and that the WRA's responsibility is to the city. As the owner of the Midtown Mall, the WRA has to hold Mr. Marcus responsible for the condition of the building, as Ms. Gaskin had said. Mr. Angelini urged Mr. Marcus to do two things at the April 4th meeting; one, to respond to Mr. Tilton's request, and two, to respond to Ms. Gaskin's concerns. Mr. Angelini also asked Mr. Marcus to come to the meeting with a plan that is supported with data. Mr. Angelini turned back to Mr. Marcus and reiterated the need for a plan with facts and figures that are reliable and documented. Mr. Marcus responded that he had taken responsibility for his properties in the city, and Mr. Angelini stated that the matter at hand is not about Mr. Marcus, it is about the Midtown Mall properties. Mr. Minasian expressed agreement with what the other members had said, and noted that he would look at this as an opportunity to develop a plan to make the building more viable. There had been concerns raised in not just the media, but at City Council, about this process and what would happen with the tenants. The Board had talked about this previously and there are legal requirements that dictate what would happen. Mr. Minasian stated his belief that this is an opportunity to improve the property for the businesses/tenants that are there, and that is why the Board wanted to move forward with a conversation about how to best utilize the property for the tenants and the city.

Chair Pedone stated that the Board would be recessing the meeting to March 20, 2019 at 11:00 A.M.

11. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting recessed at 9:03 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Traynor, Esq.
Chief Executive Officer