



**Back Bay / South End Gateway Project**  
**CAC Working Meeting #9**  
**Monday, March 13, 2017, 6:00 p.m.**  
**Location: Boston Common Hotel & Conference Center**

**CAC Attendees:**

Ann Beha, Boston Society of Architects (BSA)  
Kenzie Bok, Bay Village Neighborhood Association  
Jacquelyn Cox-Crite, Tent City Resident  
Jack Fitzgerald, Ellis South End Neighborhood Association  
Meg Mainzer-Cohen, Back Bay Association  
Ted Pietras, SEBA  
Russ Preston, Congress for the New Urbanism  
Jacquelin Yessian, Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay (NABB)

**Ex-Officio Attendees:**

Kate Bell, Office of Boston City Councilor Josh Zakim

**City of Boston Attendees:**

Yissel Guerrero, ONS  
Catherine McCandless, BPDA  
Michael Rooney, BPDA  
Lauren Shurtleff, BPDA  
Josh Weiland, BTB

**Project Members:**

David Black, VHB  
Michael Cantalupa, Boston Properties  
Kyle Greaves, VHB  
Rebecca Hatchadorian, ARUP  
Ben Myers, Boston Properties  
Heidi Richardson, VHB  
Melissa Schrock, Boston Properties  
Susan Tracy, The Strategy Group

**State of Massachusetts Attendees:**

Mark Boyle, MassDOT  
Rob Guphill, MBTA  
Jim Kersten, MassDOT  
Peter Paravalos, MBTA

**Members of the Public:**

Donald Bockstein, Resident  
Deborah Dunmire, Resident  
Randi Lathrop, RG Lathrop Consulting  
Sue Prindle, NABB  
Martyn Roetter, NABB

**Project Website:** <http://bit.ly/BBSEGP>

**Meeting Summary**

On Monday, March 13, 2017, the ninth meeting of the Back Bay / South End Gateway Project Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) commenced at approximately 6:10 p.m. with an introduction by Lauren Shurtleff, BPDA Senior Planner, at the Boston Common Hotel & Conference Center at 40 Trinity Place.

Lauren began the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. She noted that the presentation will be made available on the project website, listed above. She reminded the attendees that the CAC is serving as the Impact Advisory Group (IAG) for the project and that it is important for the CAC members to represent and share information with the group that they were nominated to represent.

Michael Rooney, BPDA Project Manager, stepped forward to discuss dates of the project milestones. A Scoping Determination was issued by the BPDA this past August, which included all of the comment letters, questions, and feedback received in response to the Project Notification Form (PNF). The Proponent then filed their Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR) on January 31, 2017, which responded to the Scoping Determination and provided more in-depth studies on the project. The filing of the DPIR initiated a 75-day comment period, which ends on April 18, 2017. The DPIR is available on the BPDA's website: <http://www.bostonplans.org/getattachment/81985ac5-b24c-47cc-90af-da07b744a897>. Michael added that additional comments can be sent to him at [Michael.Rooney@boston.gov](mailto:Michael.Rooney@boston.gov).

Melissa Schrock, Boston Properties (BP), explained that the meeting would address comments from the CAC members from the previous meeting, as well as include a presentation on air quality and greenhouse gas emissions, sustainability, Boston Properties' green strategies, and traffic and parking.

Melissa invited Kyle Greaves, VHB, to discuss questions from the previous meeting related to shadow. At the previous meeting, a CAC member asked to review the project's shadow impacts excluding the Simon Property Group's Copley Place Residential Tower, a project that has recently been put on hold but is fully permitted. Kyle explained that the project's shadow impacts without the Simon Tower are nearly identical to the original scheme, and remain in compliance with the Stuart Street Zoning. The DPIR presented net new shadow

impacts on Copley Square and the surrounding neighborhood. By removing the Simon Tower from the model, the project's shadow impacts remain largely unchanged (Note: please review the presentation slides to see the incremental changes). Kyle explained that there remains 1 hour and 54 minutes of net new shadow on Copley Square.

Melissa came forward to continue answering questions related to shadow impacts on historic resources. At the previous meeting, a CAC member asked about the new shadow that would be created on the stained glass windows of Trinity Church and the New Old South Church. Melissa explained that there is new shadow generated on the New Old South Church windows during approximately 12 weeks out of the year during the winter months, lasting between 10 - 100 minutes. There is also new shadow generated on the Trinity Church windows during approximately 11 weeks out of the year in the winter months, lasting between 10 - 60 minutes.

Next, Heidi Richardson, VHB, gave a presentation on air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) mobile sources. She explained that air quality studies are broken into pieces, including both the mobile source (*i.e.*, vehicle impact) and the stationary source (*i.e.*, buildings/greenhouse gas). She explained that one must consider if the project area is in an attainment area or a non-attainment area, which means that it is below or above the standards of health risk. In this study area, they are in a maintenance area, which means that the area is close to being an attainment area, and so the project team is required to look at the impact of project-related vehicles. VHB looked at 28 intersections and screened them for highest delay and highest volume of emissions. They found four intersections to look at the vehicular CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to see if the conditions are below the standards and to figure out if mitigation would be required. She explained that the emissions are very closely tied to traffic. The modeling studies found that the project is well below the standards in terms of exceeding any health risks. The modeling study looks at three pollutants, including CO<sub>2</sub>, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>). The level of these pollutants drop when comparing the existing conditions to the build or no-build scenarios. There will be a 60% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from roadway improvements and TDM measures, and a 25% reduction in NO<sub>2</sub> and VOCs.

Rebecca Hatchadorian, ARUP, explained that the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Greenhouse Gas Policy, the Massachusetts Stretch Energy Code, and Article 37 in the City of Boston Zoning Code all provide the regulatory context for energy use and sustainability principles. She then reviewed the project's sustainability approach, as outlined in the presentation slides. A new section in the DPIR includes an analysis of renewable energy sources, including solar thermal (solar energy used to make hot water) and wind, but they were not found to be cost effective. Solar photovoltaic (PV) and combined heat and power (CHP) sources had the best payback, and were considered cost effective potential solutions. While there are no renewable systems in the base energy analysis, the project team will continue to look at them going forward. Under Article 37 of the Boston Zoning Code, the project is required to demonstrate a minimum of LEED Silver

certification. Garage West is targeting LEED Gold, and Station West, Garage East and Station East are targeting LEED Silver.

Ben Myers, Boston Properties, came forward to discuss Boston Properties' approaches to sustainability. BP seeks to promote its growth and operations in a sustainable and responsible manner across their five regions, and has a focus on the economic, social, and environmental aspects of their work, including the design and operation of new and existing buildings. As a company, BP has adopted corporate goals for sustainability, such as energy use, greenhouse gas emissions, water use, and waste reduction. Other areas of focus for BP in sustainability are in health, wellness, improved air quality, and green cleaning practices.

David Black, VHB, came forward to walk through the transportation and parking analysis. He explained that the analysis is based on the conditions for the existing, no build, base, and alternate schemes. The analysis compares the future build and no build scenarios to see identifiable changes in each situation. There is very little difference between the base and alternate schemes for the overall number of project-generated trips. The peak hour of vehicle trips between the base and alternate schemes exhibits minimal differences. There are 28 intersections analyzed in the study, 20 of which are signalized and eight of which are not. VHB did an analysis based on the Level of Service (LOS) and grade that service from A to F. In urban areas, LOS D or better is considered acceptable. There are four mitigated locations in the base scheme and five in the alternate scheme, comprising of roadway improvements, signal timings, and more. David moved on to transit trips and showed the number of peak hour transit trips. The transit analysis also looks at no build and future build conditions. They used MBTA policy capacity in the analysis, which is based on a certain level of safety and comfort, versus crush capacity, which occurs when trains are fuller than usual. The new Orange Line cars that are set to arrive in 2019 will be able to cut the headways from six minutes to four minutes. The project-generated trips will not negatively impact the Orange Line as it will operate well under policy capacity. The Commuter Rail and Bus services are also anticipated to operate within their capacities, even with no future service improvements. There is no need to build additional parking for the project, as there are 2,013 parking spaces provided by the garage that are not fully utilized.

At the previous meeting, a CAC member had asked about the parking ratios for the project and how they were determined. David Black, VHB explained that the parking ratios are based on other Downtown projects and transit-oriented development projects. Also at the previous meeting, a CAC member had asked for a better understanding of the project's bicycle provisions. David identified the existing bike accommodations. There will be a large number of bike parking spaces associated with each phase and location of the project. There are over 180 permanent bike spaces for residents and workers, and there are 60-70 short term spaces, such as bike racks or a bike courier system. He also noted that there will

be transportation demand management (TDM) measures in place to reduce the number of single occupancy cars, including preferential parking for carpools/van pools and more.

CAC questions and comments made in response to the presentation included:

- A CAC member asked if the parking ratio is lower than that required in the Stuart Street Zoning. Lauren responded that they can provide that information at the next meeting.
- In response to a request from a member of the CAC, David explained that a full pedestrian Level of Service analysis will be provided at the next meeting.
- A CAC member asked why the project cannot afford to install vertical wind turbines. Ben explained that wind turbines have a relatively poor payback, whereas solar PV systems are more efficient at generating energy and have a shorter payback period.
- A CAC member asked about the emissions and odors that come from the train tracks. Peter Paravalos, MBTA, explained that there will be a separation between the tracks and concourse, as well as a mechanical pressurization system to prevent fumes from traveling up to the concourse. In addition, jet fans and ductwork will be installed in the tunnels to better capture the fumes, which may be vented through the new and existing vent stacks. They are currently at the 60% Design stage of this system and Peter reiterated that this project is the MBTA's project, not BP's. An additional public meeting to share the ventilation project's progress will be scheduled for sometime in the Spring.
- A CAC member expressed disappointment that the non-signalized intersection at Isabella and Arlington Streets was not included in the DPIR. David replied that the problem at this intersection is more of a pedestrian one than a vehicle one – and that the issue at this intersection may be more of a geometry issue and less of a volume issue.
- A CAC member asked if the proposed traffic mitigations are guaranteed and how are they funded. David explained they are negotiated and documented in a Transportation Access Plan Agreement (TAPA) with the Boston Transportation Department (BTD) and are funded by the proponent.
- A CAC member asked if the traffic study takes into account the potential removal of the Commuter Rail service on weekends. Melissa explained that traffic analysis is performed for the weekday scenario, because that is when the majority of the volume occurs. David also explained that weekend volumes were studied to verify that they are far lower than weekday volumes.
- A CAC member noted that it would be helpful to see pedestrian data and counts, noting that all of the vehicular, train, bus, and commuter rail trips eventually become pedestrian trips. He believes volume is important as well as speed, and encouraged the proponent and the City to consider slower vehicular travel speeds.
- A CAC member asked the proponent to make the shadow studies more legible, stating her opinion that the shadow studies are difficult to read. She expressed concern about the impacts to the stained glass windows on the New Old South

Church and Trinity Church. Melissa explained that the shadow studies are also available in the printed DPIR and that the shadow restriction only applies to Copley Square itself (no more than two hours of net new shadow on Copley Square from 8:00 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. between March 21<sup>st</sup> and October 21<sup>st</sup>). She reiterated that the project has respected those limits comprehensively across all four buildings, and is thus in compliance with the Stuart Street Zoning. The amount of shadow generated on these historic resources exists during limited periods of the year and at limited times.

- Another CAC member requested that an overview of the Stuart Street Guidelines be presented at a future meeting. Lauren replied that this would be beneficial and agreed to do so.
- A CAC member asked if a Section 106 Review under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 would be initiated, and BP explained that a Section 106 Review is not triggered by this project. A CAC member asked about the square footage of the plaza on Clarendon Street without the vehicle drop-off areas. Melissa explained that it is 7,500-SF. There are two other pedestrian areas on the Clarendon Street plaza that are 1,000-SF and 750-SF.
- A CAC member asked about a Tufts University study on air quality that presented research about ventilation for those who live near highways, which residents of the project would be. She would like to understand if the upgraded ventilation is addressing ultra-fine particles. Heidi explained that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) does not regulate ultra-fine particles, so VHB is not required to study it. Rebecca explained that they are looking at a filter that functions above what is required. However, the higher the filtration, the higher the energy use, and so an appropriate balance must be struck.

Public questions and comments made in response to the presentation included:

- A member of the public asked if the new rolling stock on the Orange Line will be more efficient and produce fewer fumes. Peter explained that the existing and future Orange Line cars and the tracks are electric, so they do not produce fumes. Josh Weiland, BTD, explained that they are trying to promote alternative modes of transportation aside from cars. He suggested reading Go Boston 2030, the City's recently released transportation plan.
- In a follow-up comment, a member of the public also noted that there has been no discussion of affordable housing during this meeting and expressed his desire to see it built on-site.

Lauren concluded the meeting by stating that a second public meeting will be scheduled soon for the first week of April and the next CAC meeting will be on March 29<sup>th</sup>. Subsequent to the meeting, the public meeting was scheduled for April 4<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.