

2000 LMA Forum

Date	Institution	Project Name
January 24, 2000	Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences; Simmons College; Wentworth Institute of Technology; Emmanuel College	Update on MCPHS White Building addition project curtailed; SC Intro to Master Plan for LMA campus; WIT Master Plan and residence hall project; EC DPIR review and feedback
Feb. 28, 2000	Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center; Simmons College	BIDMC Plans to relocate ER from East to West Campus; SC IMPNF and PNF
March 27, 2000	Dana-Farber Cancer Institute; Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA)	DFCI Project to modify the Jimmy Fund Building entrance, add a 3 rd level connector, and related improvements; Urban Ring
April 24, 2000	BRA & MASCO; Harvard Medical School	LMA Forum process; HMS DPIR for the New Research Building located on Ave. Louis Pasteur adjacent to the Harvard Institutes of Medicine
May 22, 2000	Harvard Medical School; Massachusetts College of Art; Emmanuel College	HMS DPIR for the New Research Building cont'd; MassArt New residence hall plans update; EC campus plan FPIR filing overview
June 26, 2000	Simmons College; Emmanuel College; Boston Transportation Department	SC IMP and DPIR overview for new classroom/admin building and supplemental parking facility; EC FPIR overview response time; BTM update on the commercial parking regulations
July 24, 2000	Simmons College; Boston Redevelopment Authority and Boston Transportation Department; State Dept. of Environmental Protection, BRA	SC IMP and DPIR response to questions; Restricted Parking District Designation; Air Quality Discussion
August 28, 2000	Emmanuel College; Harvard Medical School	EC project details including parking spaces and mitigation measures; HMS FPIR for the New Research Building
September 25, 2000	Boston Transportation Department; Brigham and Women's Hospital	Report on ratio of parking spaces per SF of development, changes in BTM enforcement levels, and accessibility of parking in Residential areas; Truck Traffic on Francis St/Fenwood Rd.
November 27, 2000	MASCO and Brigham and Women's Hospital	Report on Commercial Parking in Residential Permit Areas; Report on Truck Traffic on Fenwood Rd.

M A S C O

Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.

LMA Forum Agenda
Monday, January 24, 2000
Mass. College of Pharmacy (MCPHS), Reed Hall, Room W 204
PLEASE NOTE CHANGE OF ROOM AND INSTITUTIONAL LOCATION

1. BRA/MASCO Updates – (5 minutes)

2. Simmons College – (20 minutes)

Simmons will give an introduction, prior to starting the Article 80 process, of master planning for its LMA campus, including concepts for a 60,000 sf classroom/administration building and underground replacement parking facility.

3. Wentworth Institute of Technology – (40 minutes)

Final presentation of master plan and residence hall project, including update on architectural design of residence hall, review of public comments and discussion of supplemental information

4. Emmanuel College – (55 minutes)

Emmanuel presented its DPIR at the November 30, 1999, Forum meeting. The community is invited to offer questions and comments on the documents.

**LMA Forum Agenda
Monday, February 28, 2000
Please Note: Change of Location
7:00 PM – 8:30 PM
Harvard School of Public Health, Kresge Building,
Rm. G2. 677 Huntington Avenue**

- 1. BRA/MASCO Updates – (5-10 minutes)**
- 2. Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital - (20 minutes)**

Beth Israel Deaconess Hospital will discuss its plans to relocate its Emergency Room and related functions, including the helipad, from the East Campus to the West Campus.

- 3. Simmons College – (40 minutes)**

Simmons College will present its Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNF) and Project Notification Form (PNF) Filings (required under the city's Article 80 process) and solicit feedback from the community.

- 4. MBTA – Urban Ring – (30 minutes)**

Based on our discussion at the December Forum meeting, we have invited the MBTA to provide an update on their work on the Major Investment Study for the Urban Ring. We will also discuss opportunities for the community to advocate for this project.

M A S C O

Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.

**LMA Forum Agenda
Monday, March 27, 2000
Please Note: Change of Location
7:00 PM – 9:00 PM
Harvard School of Public Health, Kresge Building,
Rm. G2. 677 Huntington Avenue**

- 1. BRA/MASCO Updates - (10 minutes)**
- 2. Dana Farber Cancer Institute (DFCI) – (25 minutes)**

Presentation and discussion of small project to modify the Jimmy Fund Building entrance, add a third level pedestrian/patient connector, across Shattuck Street, between the Jimmy Fund Building and the Brigham and Women's Amory Building, and related improvements on Binney and Shattuck Streets.

- 3. Urban Ring – (40 minutes)**

Overview of Urban Ring project by Peter Calcaterra of the MBTA. Discussion of next steps and schedule.

- 4. Discussion on LMA Forum Process – (40 minutes)**

Discussion on the LMA Forum Process, goals and objectives, participation, etc.

M A S C O

Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.

**LMA Forum Agenda
Monday, April 24, 2000
7:00 – 9:00 PM
Harvard School of Public Health
Kresge Building, Rm G-2
677 Huntington Avenue**

1. MASCO/BRA/BTD Updates – (10 minutes)

2. Discussion on LMA Forum Process – (40 minutes)

**Discussion on the LMA Forum process, goals and objectives, participation, etc.
Item deferred from March 27, 2000, meeting at the request of participants.**

3. Harvard Medical School – (60 minutes)

Harvard Medical School will present an overview of findings related to its recent Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR) filing for the New Research Building (NRB) located on Avenue Louis Pasteur adjacent to the Harvard Institutes of Medicine.

M A S C O

Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.

**LMA Forum Agenda
Monday, May 22, 2000
7:00- 9:00 PM
Harvard School of Public Health
677 Huntington Avenue
Kresge Building, Room G-2**

- 1. BRA/MASCO/BTD Updates – 5 minutes**
- 2. Harvard Medical School – 30 minutes**

The DPIR on the New Research Building was filed on April 11th, copies of the filing were made available to interested parties, and an overview of the project and findings were provided at the April Forum meeting. Members of the project team will be available to answer specific questions about the DPIR documents prior to the May 30, 2000 closure of the comment period.

- 3. Massachusetts College of Art – 30 minutes**

The MassArt team will present an update on their new residence hall plans, including information on building design and traffic and access.

- 4. Emmanuel College – 50 minutes**

Emmanuel College and members of the development team (Corcoran Jennison and Merck) will present an overview of the findings of their FPIR filing which was made on May 11, 2000, and will be distributed to key groups prior to the May meeting. At least half of the time allotted will be devoted to a Q & A period.

LMA Forum Agenda
Monday, June 26, 2000
7:00 PM to 9:00 PM
Harvard School of Public Health, Kresge Building, Rm. G-2
677 Huntington Avenue

1. MASCO/BRA/BTD Updates - 5 minutes

2. Simmons College – 35 minutes

Simmons College will present an overview of their Institutional Master Plan and review the findings of their Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR), which will be filed in early July. The DPIR will cover impacts of the proposed new 60,000 SF classroom/administration building and supplemental parking facility to serve the Graduate Schools of Social Work and Library and Information Science.

3. Emmanuel College – 35 minutes

Emmanuel College gave an overview of the findings of their Final Project Impact Report (FPIR) at the May meeting. This will be a question and answer session for community participants.

4. Other – 45 minutes

Commercial Parking Regulations: Update from BTD on the commercial parking regulations regarding parking in residential sticker areas. MASCO will update the group on the results of data collection on vendor parking south of Francis Street and institutional discussions on the issue

Begin discussion on Restricted Parking District Designation: The Boston Redevelopment Authority and Boston Transportation Department will provide an overview of this and other regulations in place for review of parking developments in the area.

LMA Forum Meeting Agenda
Monday, July 24, 2000
7:00 – 9:00 PM, Harvard School of Public Health, Kresge G-2
677 Huntington Avenue, Boston

1. BRA/BTD/MASCO Updates – 5 minutes

2. Simmons College – 10 minutes

Question and answer session on the college's July 3rd filing of their Institutional Master Plan (IMP) and Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR). The college presented the findings of these reports at the June Forum meeting. The public review period required under the Article 80 process ends on September 1, 2000, for the IMP; the college has extended the DPIR review period from 30 to 60 days, to be coterminous with the IMP.

3. Restricted Parking Discussion - 45 minutes

Begin discussion on Restricted Parking District Designation: The Boston Redevelopment Authority and Boston Transportation Department will provide an overview of this and other regulations in place for review of parking developments in the area.

4. Air Quality Discussion - 60 minutes

As discussed at the June, 2000, meeting, several guests will attend this meeting to review how city and state agencies evaluate proposed development projects with respect to impacts on air quality thresholds. Invited guests include: Maura Zlody, City of Boston's Environment Department; Dick Mertens, BRA Environmental Review; and, Christine Kirby, Chief of Transportation Management Programs, State Department of Environmental Management.

**Agenda
LMA Forum Meeting
August 28, 2000
7:00 – 8:00 PM
Harvard School of Public Health
Kresge Building, Room G-2**

- 1. MASCO/BRA/BTD Updates - 10 minutes**
- 2. Emmanuel College - 15 minutes**

Adam Shulman, Boston Transportation Department, will update the group on Emmanuel College's final project details including the number of parking spaces, mitigation measures, and other information. A public hearing on Emmanuel has been tentatively scheduled at the BRA Board on August 31, 2:00 PM.

- 3. Harvard Medical School – 35 minutes**

Harvard Medical School filed their Final Project Impact Report (FPIR) for the New Research Building on July 31, 2000. Members of the development team will identify how issues raised since the DPIR have been addressed in the FPIR. A question and answer period will follow.

**LMA Forum Meeting Agenda
Monday, September 25, 2000
7:00 – 9:00 PM
Harvard School of Public Health, Kresge Building S-2
677 Huntington Avenue**

- 1. BRA/MASCO Updates - 5 minutes**
- 2. BTM – Update on Approvals of Parking – 20 minutes**

As requested at the last meeting, the BTM will report on the ratio of parking spaces per gross thousand square feet of development approved in the LMA, by project.

- 3. Discussion on Enforcement/Residential Parking Spaces – 35 minutes**

At the Forum meeting in July, community representatives raised the issue of the changes in BTM enforcement levels in the afternoon/evening period and the impact on accessibility of parking in Residential Parking areas. Dan Hoffman, Director of Enforcement for BTM, and Tara Napolitano of ONS will attend to discuss these issues with the community.

- 4. Truck Traffic on Francis Street/Fenwood Road – 35 minutes**

At the August meeting, community representatives raised the issue of Truck traffic in the Francis Street/Fenwood Road area. Materials management personnel from the Brigham and Women's Hospital have been invited to discuss community issues.

- 5. Other**

M A S C O

Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.

**LMA Forum Agenda
Monday, November 27, 2000
7:00 – 8:15 PM
Harvard School of Public Health
Kresge Building, Rm. G-2
677 Huntington Avenue**

1. MASCO/BRA/BTD Updates – 10 minutes
2. Report on Commercial Parking in Residential Permit Areas – 30 minutes

MASCO and BWH staff will give the group an update on progress dealing with the issue of vendor parking violations in Residential Permit areas. By City of Boston regulation commercial parking is allowed in Residential parking areas for up to three hours. This discussion is a continuation from June 26th and the September 25th LMA Forum meetings.

3. Report on Truck Traffic/Fenwood Road Area – 30 minutes

BWH staff will update the group on truck traffic issues and options in this area.

375 Longwood Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215-5328 617 632-2310 Fax: 617 632-2759

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS:

Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center • Brigham and Women's Hospital • Center for Blood Research • Children's Hospital • Dana-Farber Cancer Institute • Emmanuel College • Harvard University (Medical School, School of Dental Medicine, School of Public Health) • Joslin Diabetes Center • Judge Baker Children's Center • Massachusetts College of Art • Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences • Massachusetts Mental Health Center • Simmons College • Temple Israel • Wheelock College • Wentworth Institute of Technology • The Winsor School

LMA Forum Summary January 24, 2000

1. Updates

The LMA Forum is co-sponsored by MASCO and the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA). Owen Donnelly (BRA) explained proposed changes to Article 80, to require institutions city-wide, to file master plans. The City Zoning Code is not currently consistent on the institutional master plan requirement in all zoning districts. The Boston Zoning Commission will review Article 80 changes in the near future. Several institutions in the LMA could be affected as a result.

Mr. Donnelly reviewed the status of several LMA projects. There was an insufficient quorum at the Zoning Commission to vote on Children's Hospital's PDA. Another meeting of the Commission will be held. Harvard is preparing their Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the New Research Building. Wentworth has submitted a Master Plan, and will respond to questions at the Forum tonight. Emmanuel College has submitted their DEIR; February 14, 2000, is the final day of the public comment period. Please send your comments to Mr. Donnelly. Mass. College of Pharmacy was issued a scope for a Master Plan and project impact report last spring.

2. Mass. College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences (MCPHS)

Rick Lessard, MCPHS, welcomed everyone to the campus. The project submitted last spring included an 87,500 SF addition to the White Building, and a potential building on Huntington Avenue. The City scoped the project impact report and master plan a month later. MCPHS has not been back to The Forum because of the focus on constructing the Worcester campus, which will open in July. The Boston project has been curtailed for now. There were no questions.

3. Simmons College

Simmons College (SC)'s presentation precedes the formal Article 80 process which begins with the filing of a Project Notification Form (PNF) and Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNF). Lisa Chapnick, SC, provided historical background on the college. This is their centennial year as a small, predominantly women's college. There are six schools at Simmons, including the undergraduate college, five graduate schools including the School of Education, the School of Social Work (the oldest in the country), the School of Library and Information Sciences, the School for Health Studies and the School of Management. The major initiative of the strategic plan includes new collaboration between departments and schools within the college, thirteen new accelerated degrees, and a commitment to technology, in order to remain competitive. A tremendous amount of thought has gone into their master plan. SC has recently renovated two dormitories and the shell of the Science Building, is currently renovating a third dormitory, and plans to do a fourth this summer. The thrust of their plan is to modernize facilities, improve adjacencies, and improve the technology on the campus. They are planning to build a 60,000 SF building, with two levels of underground parking (70-100 spaces, to primarily replace existing spaces). The School of Social Work will be moved on-campus from its current location on Commonwealth Avenue. The School of Library Sciences,

along with a new technology center, will also be housed in the new building as well. An Article 80 filing will occur shortly. Simmons will return to The Forum in February to address specific comments and questions.

Discussion

Q: What will Simmons do with the School of Social Work buildings?

A: Simmons will sell the property. These are beautiful buildings, but are not meant to be classrooms and offices. The sale of this property is required to help fund the new campus building.

Q: Did the School of Social Work have parking? Is Simmons planning to move these spaces?

A: No. Jane Howard, of Howard Stein Hudson, will be evaluating the parking requirements related to the master plan. Simmons is not looking to increase parking for employees but does need to provide parking for commuter and part-time/working students.

Q: Is Simmons planning to move the spaces on campus used at the Landmark Center?

A: No. In the long-term Simmons expects to use Landmark for parking again. Simmons will be encouraging carpooling and use of the MBTA.

4. Wentworth Institute of Technology – Master Plan

Bill McCarthy, WIT attorney, summarized the proposed Institutional Master Plan (submitted Oct. 25 1999), using a model and several drawings. This is the fourth time WIT has presented at the LMA Forum. The master plan covers an eight-year plan, but the dormitory is the only project for which they are seeking approval. The master plan and the dormitory reviews are planned to be accomplished in tandem. The new dormitory is a five-story, wedge-shaped, 473-bed building, designed to accommodate a joint pathway with Mass. College of Art. Through the BRA Design Review process, WIT has changed the building to "shorten the ends" and eliminate the ground-floor bookstore and café. The final Boston Civic Design Commission review is on January 25th. Wentworth hopes to proceed with BRA Board approval on February 17 and, subsequently, with Zoning Commission action. WIT hopes to begin construction in mid-May, and complete the building in time for the new academic year in September of 2001.

Bill McCarthy reviewed the updated parking lot proposal. Wentworth currently owns three lots at Parker and Prentiss Streets. One of the lots has historic structures on it. Through discussions with the Landmarks Commission, Wentworth will retain the original brewery brewhouse, office and courtyard on the site, for future development or reuse. In the mean time, Wentworth is redesigning the Parker and Prentiss Street parking lots to include landscaping, relocate the entrances to Halleck Street, eliminate a dozen curb cuts, improve area circulation and safety, and install a shuttle bus pull-out. Wentworth is working with the Alice Hayward Taylor residents and Mission Main Tenants' Association on this redesign. These groups have expressed a need for visitor and overflow parking. Wentworth is proposing to dedicate 80-85 spaces in the Mindoro Lot, adjacent to Amtrak, for resident-related parking. At some point, the large lot will be the site of a Wentworth gym and recreation center, requiring consolidation of parking, and termination of the MASCO lease agreement. At that point Wentworth will need the Mindoro Lot for its own parking requirements. Wentworth has also offered to give land to the City to add a curbside parking lane on Prentiss Street, for resident parking. WIT will also be offering

incentives to employees and students to take the MBTA, to carpool, and participate in various MASCO vehicle-reduction programs (i.e. the Three for Free Program).

Wentworth will not be incorporating the Sunoco Gas Station site into the dormitory project as they have no site control at the present time. The terms of a Purchase and Sale Agreement were agreed upon with the owner, however the tenant has options on the site until 2003, and has no intention of terminating the lease.

In terms of community benefits, Wentworth currently offers ten full-time equivalent (FTE) scholarships to Boston high school seniors. They hope to add four additional FTE scholarships for Mission Hill students. They are developing programs to help students become better prepared for college. This ultimately may be as important as the scholarships. These programs will work in concert with area youth activities. Wentworth also will soon have three job training/mentoring positions at Mission Main, to train individuals in building and facilities maintenance trades. Wentworth will also consider renegotiating their PILOT payments with the City Assessor's Office for the dormitory. This payment would be voluntary; WIT hopes to direct any increased payments to Mission Hill.

Discussion

Q: Do institutions have to pay PILOT fees on housing? They shouldn't have to.

A: Wentworth will look into it.

Q: Is Wentworth leasing dorm space to other colleges?

A: No, the new dorm is for Wentworth's use only.

Q: Is the Sunoco Station Wentworth's?

A: No, the Purchase and Sale Agreement has been negotiated with the owner, but it will not be executed until there is an understanding with the tenant who has rights through 2003.

Q: Why is planning and construction on the dormitory so quick?

A: The dormitory planning was part of the land swap negotiations several years ago with the City regarding the Mission Main redevelopment. Site planning began over a year ago.

Q: Where are the 400 students who will live in the new dormitory living now?

A: They are currently commuter students, or will be new students demanding on-campus housing. Keeping these students on-campus will reduce student demand for housing in Mission Hill and reduce student disturbances.

Q: In the Master Plan WIT mentions closure of Edwards Hall, the dormitory on Huntington Avenue, next to the fire station. Will Wentworth sell or demolish it?

A: It is part of the main entrance to Wentworth so it would not be sold. WIT is not planning to demolish it. The new use has not been determined yet; it depends on enrollment. Other institutions are anticipating a shortage of student housing; it could possibly be developed into shared student housing.

Q: One of the comment letters mentions parking fees. It's amazing that one-third of the Wentworth spaces (265 of the 748 used) only pay one dollar per day or less. Is Wentworth planning to raise parking fees? Does MASCO pay one dollar per day?

A: No, MASCO does not pay \$1/day. Fees are under discussion. We understand that if we raise the fees that may reduce the demand for parking. This will be discussed as a part of the Access Plan Agreement.

Q: Does Wentworth plan any improvements to the Mindoro Lot?

A: Amtrak built a facility on this lot, but Wentworth has not been paid yet. Wentworth can look into buffer planting for the station, wall or street edge.

Q: Could Wentworth say what it plans on the Guernsey Street land, and speak about thoughts on Parcel 25?

A: Guernsey Street is a 7,900 SF lot that WIT bought from the New England School of Optometry. The immediate plan is to remove the needles on-site, and remove a layer of topsoil. Once the site has been cleaned up, a layer of gravel will be put down and the site will be fenced off to stop the drug activity. A bio-remediation firm has already begun work, and has removed over 600 needles. The City of Boston owns the two vacant lots next to it. WIT asked Counselor Ross to work to get those lots cleaned and fenced. It is not in Wentworth's interest to acquire these lots. If these parcels were combined then there would be greater development potential. Housing has been mentioned as a potential use. On Parcel 25, it is Wentworth's position that the Tremont frontage should be developed consistent with the retail and service activities adjacent on Tremont Street. Wentworth will not acquire it for institutional use. The back part of the lot has severe limitations due to easements for Stony Brook and the MBTA. If a use cannot be found for that portion of the lot, Wentworth is willing to purchase it, clean it up and possibly use it for parking. This could be the Wentworth's equivalent of the Northeastern Davenport project.

Q: Why did Wentworth remove the bookstore at the dormitory? Does that mean that there is no first floor retail?

A: Bill McCarthy explained that they thought first floor retail made sense as a way to incorporate the structure into the neighborhood. Owen Donnelly said that some community members did not embrace the concept of first floor retail. During Design Review, the dormitory size was reduced. For these reasons first floor retail was dropped.

C: Three community members expressed a desire to see first floor retail in the development.

Q: WIT's master plan mentions acquiring the fire station in 15-20 years. For what?

A: Because of its adjacency, this parcel is logically in the interest of WIT. Acquisition would be predicated on the City's declaration of the station as obsolete or redundant. The idea would be reuse, not demolition.

Q: How long will the Baker dormitory remain on Huntington Avenue?

A: A minimum of 20 years.

5. Emmanuel College – Questions and Comments on DPIR

Sister Anne Donovan, EC, introduced the team including David Dixon and Rob Chandler of Goody Clancy & Associates, Bob Vanasse of Vanasse Associates, and several Merck consultants. The team has begun a series of focus topic meetings to help people to understand the complexity of the project. The next meeting will be January 31, 2000 and will focus on

environmental impacts. The following meeting is scheduled for February 15th, 2000, for people to meet with Merck representatives. The meetings are held in the Emmanuel Administration building at 6:30 PM.

Rob Chandler reviewed the scope and timing of the project. In Phase I, there will be two research buildings, Building B (The Merck Building) at 320,000 SF with underground parking; and, Building "A" (166,000 SF), lower in height than Building B with a streetwall height of 75'. There will be phased replacement of the dormitories into suite-style residence halls, beginning with one dormitory in Phase I. The second phase will include replacement of Marian Hall and the gym as well as the other two dormitories.

Discussion

C: The Merck Building will be very visible from the Landmark Center area. Merck's designers were challenged to make an interesting and appropriate top, to hide the HVAC equipment and be sensitive to the design of the Emmanuel Administration Building tower.

A: Merck shares the community's concerns, and always encloses HVAC equipment, both for aesthetic and functional reasons.

Q: The PDA negates the existing zoning. The park overlay zoning requires any structure on land within 100' of the parkway to be less than 70' high, and not commercial in use. This project is greater than 70' high and is planned for commercial use. How is this being addressed?

A: All buildings on the academic campus are within the 100' line. None of them are taller than 70'. The new dorm is 64' in height.

C: It is the land within 100' of the parkway, which includes the entire parcel.

A: The park edge is important to Emmanuel College to preserve its heritage and campus environment. Emmanuel thinks that the regulation relates to the height of structures within the 100' setback. The Parks Department will have to decide. The landscaping and scale of the project is appropriate for the location. Mr. Donnelly stated that the Boston Parks Department was invited to the scoping session, and was sent a copy of the DPIR.

C: Please develop a map showing the 100' line.

Q: Has a date been scheduled with the Boston Civic Design Commission?

A: Not yet.

Q: There are six new buildings proposed in the area, increasing the number of employees. Academic institutional buildings and research can go hand in hand. Why has the college decided to go into real estate? Why lease to an outsider? Why can't Merck go someplace else? It will cause congestion and traffic problems. Students need dorms and classrooms. If this is a commercial venture then they should pay taxes and linkage fees.

A: You have asked all of the important questions all at once. The revenue generated through the land lease to Merck will help the college to pay for their deferred maintenance and construction needs. Emmanuel will continue to own the land. It will be leased to the developers (Merck and Corcoran Jennison) for 75 years at which point it will revert back to Emmanuel College. The developers will have to pay taxes on their buildings. In terms of

traffic, the identification of a tenant has made the traffic modeling easier. Merck will have approximately 350 employees, which is one-fifth of the normal density for office buildings. Their parking ratio is expected to be .9/1000 SF, which is far less than you will find in other parts of the City. We expect the traffic impact on intersections will be de minimus. This is based on modeling which takes into account the two proposed Children's buildings, the Landmarks Center, and three other projects totaling 300,000 SF. Other uses such as office and hotel space would have generated much more traffic. By partnering with Merck, Emmanuel is being responsive to the community as well as bringing high quality jobs to the area.

Q: How would the traffic consultant characterize the existing intersections?

A: Without going into great detail, or referencing the table, a lot of them are at "E" and "F" levels of service. We need to manage demand, and need a mode split that will buttress that. We are willing to financially assist with the Sears Rotary improvements that are necessary.

Q: A laboratory requires energy and water, which will impact the environment. Merck should be a leader, and should conform to a higher standard of sustainability, especially given the sensitive environment of the Muddy River.

A: Merck is an environmentally sensitive company, particularly related to energy use. We have internal standards that exceed most City requirements. We will need to know the mix of sciences before we can further explore the sustainability options.

Q: Could Merck look at the City of Boston standards before the January 31st meeting, so that they can tell us how their standards compare?

A: Yes.

Q: In figure A-16 the percentages don't seem to add up. This is very difficult to read, and it does not appear to relate to the peak hours table.

A: The percentages add up to 100, and the arithmetic is based on the anticipated number of trips, assuming that the previously mentioned projects are built.

Q: If you add up the square footage of leased research space plus the leased dorm space (65%), and compare that to the rest of the campus, then 43% of the campus is used by Emmanuel and 57% is leased. At what point is this still considered academic space? This does not include parking figures.

A: If you look at it in terms of acres only four of the 16 acres are leased.

C: Mr. Donnelly asked the group to focus on the proposal at hand and judge whether or not it is reasonable and acceptable. The college has chosen this option to develop its land rather than sell it. Whether it is all used as a college or not is immaterial.

Q: If they sold it, would the zoning change?

A: The zoning is outdated. If they sold then they would cease to exist as an academic institution and could be bought by BIDMC (used as an example).

C: With the current zoning BIDMC couldn't buy it and use it.

A: Given that the zoning is so outdated, they could ask for variances.

C: A claim was made that Emmanuel is getting special treatment.

A: Mr. Dixon said that Emmanuel College has been working for over five years on a strategic plan to find a way to do this the right way. In 1990-91 when they first began looking at this the economic situation was worse, and in fact Emmanuel was concerned about their economic viability. The project proposed one year ago was 40% larger; it has since been reduced. Emmanuel College wants to remain here, and wants a campus environment. Emmanuel has recognized the need to develop an endowment fund to maintain the campus, and allow Emmanuel to thrive while implementing a project that fits well in the LMA. Emmanuel has worked hard to find the best alternative for everyone.

Q: Whom does Emmanuel lease dormitory space to?

A: Boston University and Northeastern have the largest share. They are modest revenue generators but, more importantly, the co-ed nature of the dorms is an important part of the social fabric of the college. Emmanuel has 300 students; NU leases 180 beds. BU has 210 beds, and the ELS School has 72 beds.

C: The college is in the rental business and should pay rental taxes.

C: If you look at the plans for the area that were done 20 years ago, during urban renewal, one objective was to build enough dormitory space to keep the students out of neighborhood housing. Another objective was to encourage institutions to share resources, and think outside their own boundaries, to reduce redundancies and building requirements. The concept presented today is consistent with this planning vision, and is still responds to valid concerns voiced today.

M A S C O

Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.

Summary of LMA Forum February 28, 2000

1. BRA/MASCO Updates

MASCO requested that attendees sign in and clearly identify their names and mailing addresses so that the mailing list can be updated. Attendees were asked their preference about the location of future meetings because the conference rooms at Mass. College of Art are all booked this semester. Mass. College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences and the Harvard School of Public Health were both considered good locations by meeting attendees.

The BRA said that Emmanuel College's comment period on the DPIR ended on February 14. The BRA was issuing a Preliminary Adequacy Determination (PAD) on February 28, with a request for additional information. The Wentworth Institute of Technology's (WIT's) Institutional Master Plan and proposed residence hall were approved by the BRA Board on February 17. The Harvard Institutes of Medicine Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR), originally expected in March, will be delayed until April due to the triggering of an Environmental Notification Form (ENF) filing, for wastewater discharge, under the State MEPA process. Simmons College made its formal Article 80 filings of a Draft Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (DIMPNF) and a Project Notification Form (PNF) on February 2, 2000. Comments are due to the BRA by March 20, 2000. This meeting is an opportunity for the community to raise issues about both documents. A question was raised about how the BRA characterizes and weighs community comments made at the LMA Forum meetings compared with written comments. Mr. Donnelly said that the BRA takes into account both sources of comments when deliberating on Scoping documents, preliminary and final adequacy determinations however he suggested that written comments might have greater impact.

A discussion ensued about the LMA Forum process that has been going on for a year, with a core of participants attending regularly from distinct neighborhood groups. Mr. Donnelly said that these meetings were helpful in creating a dialogue with each other but were not helpful in trying to set priorities. He said that MASCO's support in organizing and recording the proceedings were a tremendous assistance to the community and the City and suggested that the process be a topic at a forthcoming LMA Forum meeting. Several issues were raised by the community: the amount of information that people were being asked to absorb; the poor location of the Emmanuel College sponsored meetings which kept some people from attending those meetings; a desire for information about construction route plans earlier on in the process so that the community could consider these impacts; and the need to identify to whom to send corrections on minutes. It was agreed that additional discussion would be held at the March meeting on these topics.

2. BIDMC Presentation

Dennis Monty, BIDMC, reviewed short-term campus reorganization plans, which include a consolidation of acute care clinical functions on their West Campus and an expansion of Emergency Department functions as a result, including ambulance and emergency patient drop-off and parking areas, and the helipad. A two-story addition of 17,500 SF will be made to the Pilgrim Road side of the Clinical Center at One Deaconess Place for the Emergency Department (ED) and physicians' offices. Materials will be glass wall, brick and granite, to blend in with the existing materials of One Deaconess Place. A new ambulance entrance will be created, Along Francis Street, with a replacement of existing short-term ED parking of 16 spaces on the West Campus. Egress will be to Pilgrim Road, and then to Francis Street or the Riverway. Pilgrim Road will be made two-way for the short section between Francis Street and the curb cut on Pilgrim Road. Ambulance and ER patient/visitor parking will be segregated. New landscaping and open spaces will be created along Francis Street and Pilgrim Road, with the use of retaining walls and berms due to a nine-foot grade change from one end of the site to Francis Street. A seating area will be created at the corner of Pilgrim and Francis. The helipad will be relocated on the roof of One Deaconess Place.

Discussion:

Q: Will the hospital operate both the old and the new helipads?

A: No. The first one will not be "decommissioned" due to the expense, but it will not be permitted or operational under any normal circumstance. There will be no emergency medical staff to support trauma patients at the old helipad.

Q: Would the old helipad be used if the demand for landing exceeded the capacity of the new helipad?

A: No. Mr. Monty said there are only about five to seven landings per week at BIDMC. Mr. Deloia from Boston Medflight said if, as an operator that was the case, they would land at Boston Medical Center and continue the trip via ground transport.

Q: What will the use of the present building be?

A: BIDMC is in the process of evaluating this and other questions and will update its master plan in 2001. The institutional goal is to become financially sound by merging functions on both campuses to achieve greater efficiencies of space utilization. In general, all acute care functions will relocate to the West Campus while ambulatory functions will be located on the East Campus. Perhaps some 300-400,000 SF of space may become redundant over the next 4-5 years. Uses currently in leased facilities may return to hospital-owned facilities. The BIDMC relocation of the ED will go through the BRA design review process required for small projects.

Q: Is there a provision for dealing with parking in the long run? The amount and location of parking related to the Emergency Room relocation may be supportable but what about demolishing parking lots and garages in association with land use changes?

A: BIDMC has been looking at parking and development. The hospital won't be asking for more parking. For acute care functions such as the Emergency Department, patients are not coming by choice and cannot take the MBTA. BIDMC has been a leader in subsidizing MBTA passes and moving employee parkers out of on-site spaces that are better allocated to patients and visitors.

Q: With more hospital closings in the future, do you predict an increase in the use of emergency medical helicopter transport of patients?

A: Dr. Whedel of Boston Medflight said that the volume of Boston Medflight transports has increased in the last 15 years. With respect to LMA trips, they are not related to hospital closings, rather they are related to the fact that these are tertiary care hospitals with technology and treatments only available at such hospitals.

Q: Is the new helipad moving closer to residential areas?

A: The hospital has met with Boston Medflight to identify the best routes to the relocated helipad. All flight paths would involve flying from Melnea Cass or the Charles River over the old helipad location and then proceed south to the BIDMC West Campus. Evaluations have shown that additional noise is minimal.

3. Simmons College Presentation

Simmons College filed its Institutional Master Plan Notification Form and Project Notification Form on February 2, 2000, formally initiating the Article 80 review process. Lisa Chapnick, Simmons Senior Vice President said that the college would extend its deadlines to ensure adequate time for community comments. Ms. Chapnick reviewed the college mission and proposed project. The college's five graduate and single undergraduate school are nationally known, including the School of Library and Information Science (in the top ten nationally), the School of Management (nationally known as the only women's graduate school of business management), and the School of Education (known particularly for its special needs programs). The Board of Directors approved the college's strategic plan for the next 5-10 year period, in April of 1999. This plan includes 13 accelerated/collaborative degree programs and eight new degree programs, with a focus on flexibility "in delivery" targeted towards older and part-time students who spend significant amounts of time off-campus, and towards technology-assisted programs. A campus renovation plan is going on for three dormitories and will continue this summer for a fourth dormitory and the Science Building.

The proposed new building was reviewed by Joan Goody, college architect from Goody, Clancy & Associates. The new academic/administrative building is intended to house the Graduate School of Social Work, the Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences, and a new technology/resource center. The building, as designed, is four stories high and relates to both the Simmons and the Isabella Stuart Gardner Museum campuses. In its location along Palace Road the building will improve the urban design of the area by removing the view of surface parking, and through the creation of a tree-lined lawn panel, approximately twenty feet in depth from the sidewalk. This area will be planted with a double row of street trees and related landscaping, and will include seating areas and a main entrance. Materials will be buff colored brick with limestone trim. Underground parking will be created for 192 spaces and 30 valet spaces, to replace 76 existing surface spaces and 51 existing valet spaces, for a net gain of 95 spaces.

Jane Howard, traffic engineer, related traffic information from the filings. There will be 666 students and faculty in the new building. Based on a 1994 survey, which is in the process of being updated through MASCO, 54% of the faculty college population walks, bicycles or takes the MBTA; 45% use automobiles. On the student side, 35% use automobiles while 65% walk,

bicycle or take the MBTA. The new building is expected to generate 121 entering and 121 exiting trips, per weekday. Detailed breakdowns on trips will be contained in the draft project impact report. The college is active with MASCO in the CommuteWorks program. Its activities are further outlined in the project notification form.

Discussion:

Q: How many of the new spaces will be for faculty and students in the new building?
Why do students need parking spaces?

A: Ninety-five spaces will be for students and faculty in the new building. Of Simmons' student body of 3,500, about 1,100 are undergraduates and the balance are graduate students. The Graduate School of Social Work, as are the other Simmons' graduate schools, is developing more part-time programs to be attractive to a changing student body. Many work and go to school and may need access to a car on a daily basis.

Q: Simmons should take a hard line and minimize the number of parking spaces being requested.

A: Simmons will be working on an increase in its MBTA pass subsidy program and parking pricing policies to offer incentives to taking alternative forms of transportation.

Q: Please give more information about the valet spaces planned?

A: There are 473 spaces now, including striped and valet spaces. Assuming permission from the Fire Department, valet spaces would be included in the garage (but not in stackers).

Q: If there are no parking spaces now serving the School of Social Work on Commonwealth Avenue, why add them in Longwood? By adding spaces it gives more justification to students to come by car.

A: To accommodate changing student needs and growth in enrollment.

Q: What is the projected turnover?

A: Employee spaces will turnover about once per day. Student spaces are spread across the day and night.

Q: How will people access the garage?

A: The current entry off Avenue Louis Pasteur will be the way into the site, with the garage being in the southeast corner of the lot. The egress will be via an existing curb cut on Palace Rd., and/or via Avenue Louis Pasteur which are currently used for egress.

Q: Will the college study its project in relation to the MCPHS project which will also impact Palace Road, and to the Boston Latin School?

A: Yes.

Q: Pedestrian crossings on (unspecified) streets in Longwood is an issue for residents. Will residents be able to cross the street?

A: Simmons shares the residents' goals for improving pedestrian access.

Q: This project is in a Restricted Parking District. How many spaces are required to be built? Is there a minimum required by zoning? Does this request require a variance?

A: No, there is not a minimum or a maximum required by zoning. The proponent needs to show that the proposal fits in the criteria for a restricted parking district. The project and the Master Plan will require approval from the BRA and the Zoning Commission.

C: There was a request of Simmons to answer the following questions in its draft project impact report (DPIR): specify the number of students, faculty and staff, and what shuttles they use (MASCO, Colleges of the Fenway).

4. Urban Ring

Due to time constraints it was agreed that the MBTA Urban Ring presentation would be on the March agenda. Ms. Lepore (BTD) inquired what specific action steps the community could take to move this project forward. Ms. Hamilton referenced the Boston Region Transportation Plan update over the next few months and the need for community participation in that process to make sure that the Urban Ring is specified in this forthcoming plan. Ms. Lepore requested, and MASCO agreed, that specific information on the upcoming hearings be distributed to participants of the LMA Forum.

Prepared by:

MASCO

Fax: 617-632-2779

Phone: 617-632-2776

Email: sarah@masco2.harvard.edu

M A S C O

Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.

Summary of LMA Forum March 27, 2000

1. MASCO/BRA Updates:

The summary of the February meeting was inadvertently mailed without the Q&A on the Simmons project. A second mailing was done with the complete summary; people should have received the correct mailing or will shortly. MASCO also mailed out information, as agreed to at the February meeting, on the Boston Region Transportation Plan update process and purpose. Participants were encouraged to participate in that process to advocate for access projects that would benefit the neighborhoods and the LMA.

On the project side, Emmanuel College (EC) was issued a Preliminary Adequacy Determination (PAD) by the BRA on February 29. EC is preparing its Final Project Impact Report (FPIR) and Institutional Master Plan (IMP) filings for review in early May. Simmons submitted its Project Notification Form (PNF) and Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPINF); public comments were due on March 20. A scoping from the BRA is anticipated on April 4th. Dana Farber Cancer Institute is before the Forum for a small project review.

2. Dana Farber Cancer Institute (DFCI)

Anne Levine (DFCI) and Myron Miller (Miller, Dyer, Spears—DFCI architect) presented information on a series of small projects planned at the institute. The DFCI and BWH are in a partnership for the care of cancer patients. DFCI's inpatient beds were moved to BWH's facilities and BWH's outpatient cancer clinics were moved to DFCI about four years ago. A third-level pedestrian bridge is planned over Shattuck Street, a private way, to connect to the Brigham and Women's (BWH's) Amory Building from the DFCI's Jimmy Fund Building. The existing connection between these facilities is provided via Children's Carnegie Building, which is slated to be demolished in association with the Children's new inpatient construction. Architectural standards were set by the Boston Civic Design Commission (BCDC) which has approved the bridge design.

In addition to the bridge, a number of improvements will be made at the Jimmy Fund Building site. A screening wall will be constructed to shield the shared Oxygen Farm at the corner of Shattuck and Binney Streets. Landscaping, new sidewalks and handicapped ramps, and seating will be installed. Inside the Jimmy Fund Building the auditorium will be renovated. A new two-story entrance lobby will be constructed and a handicapped accessible elevator added, along with a new function room and blood donor center. These projects are not associated with any volume increases at DFCI and are designed to be inoffensive to the neighbors.

Q: How high will the bridge be?

A: It will be twelve feet high, ten feet wide, and 28 feet above the ground.

Q: Where are the other bridges on the street?

A: There are two across Shattuck Street and one across Children's Way. A bridge, which will come down, connects Children's Carnegie and Bader Buildings across Children's Way. There is a bridge between Children's Bader Building and the BWH, across Shattuck Street; and, there is a bridge between Harvard Medical School and BWH, across Shattuck Street.

Q: Will these improvements do anything to curtail vehicle traffic in the future?

A: No. The street will continue to function as the main entrance for Harvard Medical School and two small parking areas. Ms. Hamilton stated that this street became more pedestrian several years ago, with the removal of a large number of curbside and stack parking particularly on the BWH side.

C: The improvements to shield the Oxygen Farm will be good.

3. Urban Ring Presentation

Peter Calcaterra (MBTA) and Jay Doyle (consultant from Kaiser Engineering) presented information on the status of this Major Investment Study (MIS). The need for the Urban Ring goes back to the I-95 Innerbelt Highway plans, which would have extended this highway through the city, to accommodate a need for "crosstown" connections. The MIS has evaluated many alternatives and is currently down to three options, which combine light rail, and bus technologies in both designated rights-of-way and mixed traffic alignments. The scope of work for the next year is to conduct additional environmental and engineering analyses on these options to conclude with one or two options (called a "preferred strategy") to proceed into the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) stage in the spring of 2001. Land use planning and an historical compact between the six cities through which the Urban Ring would pass have supported the work in the MIS. Current alternatives are a good fit with economic development target zones identified by the cities. The trip potential of the Urban Ring is 160,000 trips. See attached handout for more information. The core route of each of the alternatives is between Sullivan Square/Cambridgeport and Ruggles via Kendall Square and the LMA; this core represents the highest numbers of trips (120,000-150,000) of the entire corridor. Alternatives include light rail (Green Line) technology in the core section and overlapping articulated bus (Silver Line technology) routes at the ends. The three alternatives vary most significantly in the location of their crossing of the Charles River (BU/St. Mary's Street) versus (MIT/Kenmore Square); and, service to the east of the LMA (via Roxbury-Dudley Square/Uphams Corner or Melnea Cass) to the UMASS area. Service to the LMA under any alternative would be via light rail in an underground tunnel, with ties into Ruggles and possibly the E-Line. The route has the future potential for 160,000 daily boardings, more than the Blue and Orange Lines today. It would intersect all subway, most commuter rail and one half of all bus routes coming radially into the city. It would serve 200,000 jobs and 250,000 residents in the corridor, reduce 40,000 system-wide transfers daily and ease congestion in the Central Subway (Green Line) and it would improve access to Logan. It improves accessibility for the suburbs as well as the inner city.

Q: What are the next steps in the project?

A: To take three alternatives down to a maximum of two alternatives that provide as many benefits with less money.

Q: Could the MBTA develop a better graphic? The yellow line does not show where the routes will run.

A: The graphic shows the corridor. Specific routes are shown on alternative maps.

Q: The study shows a big demand for services to Cambridge. Did the MBTA respond?

A: Service Planning and Long-Range planning are separate at the MBTA. The Service Planning division is developing the 2000 plan and seeking input from the community. Any changes will have to be funded out of the budget without increasing the total. The MBTA did put into place the Crosstown routes (CT1, 2,3) as the result of advocacy by MASCO and other employers.

Q: Traffic is bad and will get worse. Buses won't work.

A: Surface conditions are the responsibilities of the cities and towns. They know they will need to implement surface improvements for plans identified in the MIS, for reserve lanes, advance signals and similar actions.

Q: A Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) loop is shown through the Fenway. Is this contemplated as a two-way Fenway street operation? This community member would support it.

A: The bus loop is planned using the current one-way configuration.

Q: In peak hours buses drive around without people. Can the MBTA think about smaller buses that travel faster and don't get stuck on the sidewalk when they can't make the turn from Parker Street to Ruggles?

A: Planning is oriented around providing enough capacity to make peak requirements.

C: The Urban Ring is a 2020 plan and the neighborhoods need a 2010 plan. Can the case be made for doing any thing sooner to decrease the number of private buses running? Private buses are responding to the unmet demand for services from the MBTA. How can the MBTA determine unmet needs in their study when these routes are in place?

A: The MBTA's MIS has taken into account private shuttles throughout the corridor in projecting future needs. The goal is to provide public rather than private service. In the EIR stage, efforts would be made to identify early action items where possible.

Q: Has the MBTA tried any preliminary Urban Ring service and if so, using what streets and how many buses?

A: Not yet. This would be identified in the future. They need to be located outside of dense areas to feed into them; the ring will not be one seat/one ride service, it will be connector service with people travelling on short segments.

Q: Is the LMA in an Economic Development Target Zone and what does this mean?

A: Yes. It is a designation by the BRA to encourage development in the private market and includes the LMA and sections of the Melnea Cass corridor and Roxbury.

Q: Will the stop at the Arborway Line/Huntington be surface or tunnel?

A: It would be underground with headhouses on Huntington Avenue. The viability of all stations planned is under examination from the costs and ridership point of view.

C: If this station were to be dropped, the Urban Ring wouldn't really be serving the Mission Hill neighborhood.

Q: Request for more information about the St. Mary's/Park Drive/Beacon Street station.

A: This station would link the B-Line, C-Line, D-Line, and the Framingham Commuter Rail Line (Yawkey) to crosstown destinations along the Urban Ring corridor. The Ring would be in a tunnel under the Charles River and the Mass. Turnpike. Tunnel sections planned are deep-bore rather than "cut and cover" due to the less disruptive nature of the construction.

Q: What is the process in the next year?

A: Two community meetings will be held in May. A May 2nd meeting will be held at the HSPH. The Working, Steering and Funding Committees will continue their work. Public participation is invited at all public meetings. The consultants will speak before any community group that wishes a presentation.

C: Ms. Hamilton noted that the two immediate next steps were to attend the March 29, Boston Region transportation plan meeting and testify in support of the need for the Urban Ring's inclusion in the Regional Plan; and, to attend the large general public meeting scheduled on May 2 at the Harvard School of Public Health.

Q: Is the MBTA using its own traffic studies?

A: The Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) is Boston's recognized planning body for "travel demand forecasting". Their work supports this study as well as all other planning documents generated by the State and MBTA.

Q: Which options are going forward after the evaluation next year?

A: Two alternatives plus the "No Build" and the "TSM Alternative". In this evaluation issues of Melnea Cass or Dudley routing and the Charles River crossing will be fully examined, using a "mix and match" approach on a segment basis.

Q: How will you know which two to pick?

A: This will be based on a lot of existing detailed information and what's called "focussed engineering" that will take place.

Q: How is the funding picture through next April and when will additional funding decisions need to take place?

A: The study is funded through April, 2000. In order for an EIR to move forward without delay, additional funding would be required by the fall of 2000. With Forward Funding at the MBTA, the priorities are to maintain operations and current commitments, pursue ADA requirements, and pursue expansion projects in that order. Funds are extremely limited. A number of future projects are in the mix: the Silver Line (Committed), Phase II of the South Boston Transitway (in supplemental EIR stage, with Phase I under construction and Phase II committed), North/South Rail Link (funding evaluation going on), the North Shore MIS (just begun), and discussions about how to fund the Central Artery.

C: People should leave money to the MBTA in their wills.

Q: Will the stations be staffed or unstaffed? There are safety concerns with unstaffed stations.

A: It is too soon to discuss this.

Q: Why doesn't the MBTA take over the routes that the MASCO shuttle runs and require the institutions to pay into a fund to support the development costs for the Urban Ring. What innovative funding ideas is the MBTA evaluating? The City and State should tax all of the LMA parking garages as a way to fund additional transportation improvements. If you taxed them maybe they wouldn't build parking or use so many cars. Why not a moratorium on building parking garages, using the money that it costs to build below-grade parking for the underground subway instead? It would be cheaper to move all of the development in the LMA than to build a subway.

A: Ms. Hamilton said that the common interest between the institutions and the community is to work together to accelerate the planning and funding for something that we all know is needed now. She reiterated the need for community participation at the forthcoming meetings for the Boston Regional plan update and communication with legislators. Mr. Calcaterra and Mr. Doyle responded that the MBTA is looking at joint development opportunities, linkage, tax incentives, fuel taxes, and others. They have reached no conclusions and will not until next year.

Q: Low cost alternatives on buses in mixed traffic. Is that what we're really looking at for future Urban Ring service?

A: No, light rail options are on the table with overlapping bus services at the ends.

Q: Public transportation is a service to be funded through taxes. It is a dangerous precedent and conflict of interest to consider private funding for the development of public transportation. If the institutions can keep building new private garages and private shuttles then we will never have a good public transportation system because the middle class will continue to be vested in their cars and parking spaces. The MBTA was requested to model the Urban Ring without garages to illustrate this point.

A: Ms. Hamilton noted that the Boston Region Transportation Plan meetings were a venue for the MBTA's planning assumptions to be reviewed and requests for change made.

Q: The requirements of the Restricted Parking District designation for the LMA should be discussed at the next meeting. This community member requested that the BRA and MASCO show the number of parking spaces that have been constructed in the LMA since the designation of Restricted Parking District was placed on it in the 1970s. Mr. Donnelly said that this designation carries a special review burden by the developer and it could be discussed in a future meeting.

4. Forum Process Discussion

At the request of the community this was deferred until the May meeting so that the Urban Ring discussion could go on longer.

Prepared by:

Sarah Hamilton
Director, Area Planning and Development
MASCO, 375 Longwood Avenue, Boston MA 02215-5328
632-2776 (phone)
632-2779 (fax)
email: sarah@masco2.harvard.edu

Summary of LMA Forum Meeting April 24, 2000

1. BRA/MASCO/BTD Updates

Mr. Donnelly reported that Emmanuel College will be completing their next filing in May and will be coming back to the LMA Forum then. Simmons College's Institutional Master Plan and Project Notification Form were filed and a scope issued. Harvard Medical School filed a DPIR on April 11. The comment period on the DPIR concludes on May 30. Their presentation at this meeting is the first on that document; others will follow.

Ms. Lepore announced that she will be leaving the BTD. She said she had enjoyed working with the community, which she considers to be a terrific resource for City Hall. She reported on her discussions with Dick Loring regarding construction truck routing. Permits are allowed from 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM on weekdays; special permits are required past 3:30 PM, or on weekends. Specific routing will be a function of the location of the construction site but, in general, the allowed routes will be Melnea Cass Boulevard, Columbus Avenue, Ruggles Street, Huntington Avenue, Brookline Avenue, Longwood Avenue, Blackfan Street and Binney Street. In response to questions, permission to use MDC parkways is granted only by the MDC. Boston permits cover all types of trucking purposes including removal of excavate and delivery of supplies. A participant expressed concern about debris falling from trucks and causing damage to residential and commercial properties, specifically on Huntington Avenue. A participant expressed concern over the lack of responsiveness by the MDC in answering inquiries relative to MDC permitting and said the Secretary of State's Office is helpful.

2. Discussion of Forum Process

Mr. Donnelly and Ms. Hamilton lead a discussion on the process to date. Mr. Donnelly described the initiation of the process in March 1999, by then BRA director, Thomas O'Brien, and MASCO. He noted the BRA's objective to provide community feedback on large-scale development projects, as required by the City's Article 80 process. In the absence of a Community Neighborhood Council it was hoped that leadership from community groups from Mission Hill, the Fenway and Longwood areas would regularly participate. He acknowledged the support that MASCO has provided to the BRA and the community. Ms. Hamilton added several objectives, from the institutional perspective, including creating a better dialog between residential and institutional communities through which information could be shared and issues raised and resolved. Another goal was to identify opportunities for shared advocacy for improvements that will benefit the combined communities of Fenway, Longwood and Mission Hill. An overview of topics discussed over the last year was distributed. Participants were asked to comment on the process. A summary of comments follows.

C: Institutions should include information on their construction routing plans as part of their project presentations.

C: The number of parking spaces requested by institutions should not be approved because of infrastructure issues.

C: Meetings on the Ledge Site are private and Harvard is not contributing to an open process. (Note: Harvard transferred the property to the MHNHS, which has been invited to present at the Forum.)

C: Forum meetings are good and informative on project review issues. It is an opportunity for the community to get early and consistent information.

C: Institutions are reminded to bring copies of their filings and to make sure there is ample time on the agenda for questions.

C: More information was requested from MASCO about its building plans (Note: MASCO has a long-term lease on a building that was developed in the early 1990's; it has no building plans.)

C: Request for additional information on MASCO's parking and transportation plans. (Note: this topic was discussed at least four times in the last year; it can be discussed again).

C: Issues raised about large trucks/service vehicles on Fenwood Road, about trash on Francis Street and Fenwood Road, and about commercial vehicle parking in residential parking areas. To whom do you go to discuss these issues? There was a discussion about whether these were municipal housekeeping issues that should be handled by the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services or institutional "good neighbor" issues. Ms. Hamilton said that MASCO had begun some data collection on commercial vendors' use of residential parking spaces to identify the full extent of the problem. The institutions have begun, but not concluded, a discussion on vendor parking policies to ease this issue. She will report back to the Forum when this is completed. She also said vendor management is part of the problem; the other part of the problem is that commercial vehicles have the right to park there, by City statute, but that BTM had recently gotten more rigorous on vehicle identification. The BTM was asked to report on its policies at a future meeting.

C: Issue raised about illegal parking in fire lanes and other areas in the LMA. BTM enforcement was requested, although enforcement cannot be achieved on private property.

C: Institutions were reminded to provide a simple fact sheet on their development proposals.

C: Request for inventory and plans for parking in the LMA, to include the history of parking development, and background on the Restricted Parking Overlay District regulations in the Boston Zoning Code. This will be reported to the Forum as soon as is practical.

C: Comment made that the "O'Brien Letter" which invited residents to the LMA Forum included a goal of enhancing the residential environment. Additional comments made regarding parking development, shuttle bus traffic on restricted (MDC) roadways, and the specific sign-off process on new parking spaces and their relationship to neighborhood degradation. Frustration expressed that community comments are not being heard on these issues and that three new garages (Northeastern, Wentworth, Children's) had been approved. Mr. Donnelly said that Wentworth's parking spaces were replacement spaces, and that Children's projects of over 400,000 SF had been approved with effective net new parking spaces of 88.

C: Comment made about the MASCO buses being used for Red Sox routes from Ruggles to Fenway Park. (Note: The Red Sox are using the same provider that MASCO does --Paul Revere Transportation—but the provider is not allowed to use buses dedicated to the services under contract to MASCO for the Red Sox).

C: Comment made that the goal should be reduction of existing spaces, rather than replacement of spaces lost or reduction of the ratio of parking spaces per thousand square feet of development.

C: Request made to hear about the MDC approval process for waivers for buses on their roadways, citing the "MASCO fiasco", and the lack of responsiveness from the MDC.

C: Request made that MASCO take on an advocacy role with the MDC on the community's behalf because it can communicate clearly with the MDC and give advance notice to the community on decisions relative to institutional use of the roadways. (Note: It was agreed that the MDC should be invited to a future meeting).

3. Harvard Medical School – New Research Building Draft Project Impact Report

Eric Buehrens (HMS) introduced the project team, noting the DPIR filing on April 11, 2000. Copies were available at the meeting for interested individuals and had been mailed to key community groups. They had also been sent to the appropriate libraries and public officials. The purpose of the presentation was to highlight the project changes since the last public meeting on the project. Rob Quigley, Architectural Resources, Cambridge; David Bohn, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin; and, Lisa Serrafin, Epsilon Associates, were introduced.

Mr. Quigley identified the project components, using a model of the campus area. The project had been scaled back from Avenue Louis Pasteur in response to comments from the neighborhoods, resulting in preservation of an urban outdoor space along the avenue. Taller massing resulted along Blackfan Circle. Surface parking in the Vanderbilt Lot was replaced under the building to allow for delivery vehicle queuing off-street on an "internal alley". A "pull-off" is proposed on Blackfan Circle to serve drop off needs for the facility. Building materials will be sympathetic with the neighborhood and will include stone, metal and glass, if affordable.

Mr. Bohn described the traffic and access plans for the development. There will be a single auto access, at the existing curb cut on Avenue Louis Pasteur, with one lane each way. Pedestrian access to the site will be via Blackfan; access to the garage, via Avenue Louis Pasteur. The exclusive service driveway will provide off-street waiting areas to reduce truck interference with traffic. The DPIR transportation evaluation looked at traffic, pedestrian access, intersection Levels of Service, and other standard requirements. Surveys were conducted of existing conditions at the loading areas and to track pedestrian movements to better predict future conditions with the new building. Background traffic was estimated for the occupancy year and included developments at Landmark Center, Emmanuel College, Mass. College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, and Children's two buildings, as well as a factor for "other" background growth. Future mode split for the site was estimated to be 33% drive alone, 5% rideshare, and 60% transit, walk or bike. Although no net new parking will be added, some new trips were assumed on the roadways. The impacts on the system were small. The areas most impacted will be at Avenue Louis Pasteur and the site driveway, and Avenue Louis Pasteur at Longwood Avenue where a 6% increase in volumes is predicted. In all other areas the impact is less than 2%.

Parking will be consolidated, underground, from three current locations: the existing stacker lot on Blackfan Circle (140 spaces), 374 spaces in the HIM Lot and garage, and 47 spaces from the Vanderbilt Lot. Current lessors of parking at the site include BWH (175 spaces) and CH (100 spaces). Leased spaces will be eliminated and used solely for the research buildings.

No sidewalk capacity issues exist around the site from the perspective of pedestrian volumes. Pedestrian volumes at Oscar Tugo Circle will be mitigated. Loading projections include an

estimated increase over existing conditions of 30 trucks per day to 50 per day at four loading bays and one dumpster bay.

Mitigation measures include transit promotions at Harvard Medical School (including carpooling, vanpooling, and information about other alternatives). HMS subsidizes MBTA passes at a \$190,000 level annually. The subsidy has just been increased from 10% to 40%. On the transit side, Harvard Medical School subsidizes the M2 Cambridge Shuttle (\$1 million/year) as a major way to reduce the use of the automobile by employees and students. HMS will require demand management measures of all research tenants in the future building. HMS is not proposing a Blackfan connector but its building plans do not preclude a future connection.

Lisa Serrafin gave an overview of environmental studies prepared for the project. The project was fully scoped and there were no major issue areas. Wind studies were conducted at 31 locations. In most cases, wind effects will remain the same in the future, with the exception of an improvement along Avenue Louis Pasteur related to the lower building shielding pedestrians from wind effects. Shadow impacts were fairly limited due to existing buildings. There will be some new shadow impacts, particularly in the winter mainly where there is existing surface parking and on the Emmanuel side of the site. Air quality impacts related to traffic and the garage are well below national ambient standards. Noise related to mechanical equipment in the building is well under the city's most strict criteria for residential areas. Water quality impacts were modeled. There will be no impacts on the Muddy River due to construction or operation of the building. Waste generating characteristics are similar to other research buildings. A construction management plan will include mitigation measures. Water and sewer infrastructure is adequate to accommodate the overall building needs.

C: The new design of the space on Avenue Louis Pasteur is good.

Q: What are the other tall buildings shown on the model?

A: Children's new research building and the Merck Building.

Q: Isn't it getting a little dense back there?

A: The City feels that is appropriate in the Blackfan Circle area, rather than directly on Avenue Louis Pasteur.

Q: What is the dimension of the setback from the sidewalk on Avenue Louis Pasteur?

A: It is approximately 78 feet.

Q: How many parking spaces are planned?

A: There will be no net new spaces, for a site total of 561, which includes spaces displaced from the Vanderbilt Lot for loading access. The spaces will all be dedicated to building use, rather than leased.

Q: Will trees along Avenue Louis Pasteur that were planted several years ago be removed?

A: They will be removed and replaced.

Q: The loading area causes traffic problems. Was this looked at in the traffic impacts?

A: These are being evaluated.

Q: Will you look at creating a real rotary there?

A: VHB has been asked to look at design alternatives that will accommodate the need for shuttle and MBTA bus movements to avoid unnecessary circulation through the area.

Q: Will stacker parker be included in the future? How many levels will be in the garage? Will there be queuing issues on Avenue Louis Pasteur?

A: There will be two levels of parking in the garage, with no stacker parking. The driveway is planned deep into the site to avoid queuing onto Avenue Louis Pasteur.

Q: What is the length of the setback from Avenue Louis Pasteur to the face of the tall building?

A: About 150 feet.

Q: What will the hours of operation be; the amount of turnover for 561 spaces?

A: Similar to the existing site, the use will be predominantly from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM, although some building tenants will be there overnight. Because this is not a patient care facility there is no significant second or third shift. There are only 24 visitor spaces, which would be expected to turn over during the day. The remainder of the spaces are primarily one trip in and one out per day.

Q: Will commercial traffic related to the building be restricted from using the Fenway?

A: HMS is not near completing a plan. They do not anticipate a need to use the Fenway but they are "not that far along".

Q: The project filed a Notice of Project Change with MEPA and the ENF comment period is closed. What is the next step in the process?

A: HMS is waiting for a MEPA scoping.

Q: Will HMS consider installing the new city street furniture at the bus stop in front of the facility?

A: MASCO is looking at siting possibilities for the entire area. HMS will certainly consider this.

Q: How will entry to the garage be monitored?

A: An attendant opens the gate and will monitor stickers.

Q: In the Children's process, it was said that Children's leased 200 spaces from HMS and would no longer be so doing. Yet this evening it was said that Children's leases 100 spaces from HMS and BWH leases 175 spaces. Statement made that, in effect, the displacement would cause the construction of 200 spaces to accommodate Children's loss and 175 spaces would be moved elsewhere.

A: Children's was asked to vacate a total of 200 and is now vacating the last 100 spaces.

Q: What is the number of spaces in the existing HIM garage?

A: An estimate of 70.

C: HMS stated that the full number of spaces were projected for the site when it was acquired, and were permitted from the city then. Because HMS hasn't had the need for all of those spaces they made them available to the hospitals.

C: Owen Donnelly noted the need for institutions to have an agreed upon number of spaces in their access plan agreements and the city needs to know where the unmet demand will be handled.

Q: What is the new ratio of spaces per SF in the future and the demand for spaces?

A: The ratio will be .6 per 1,000 SF of space. Based on projected employees and using a 33% drive alone rate, it is estimated that a total demand of 600 is appropriate for the site but will only be met with 561 spaces.

Q: Is the future research complex geared to "rush hour" travel?

A: There will be researchers there at all hours, with a core administrative staff working 8-4/9-5).

Q: Is there currently a crosswalk near the site to Boston Latin School?

A: Yes.

Q: When will this project start and be completed?

A: It will begin construction in Q4 of 2000, with an anticipated occupancy o Q3 in 2003.

C: This project will be going on simultaneously with Emmanuel's development.

A: MASCO sponsors a construction coordination process to maximize coordination among private and public parties and to minimize disruption to the neighborhood.

Q: Will HMS resolve the illegal turns at Higgenson Circle and pedestrian access at that location? Enforcement issues to protect the pedestrian?

A: MASCO suggested data collection on the extent of the illegal turns would be appropriate. HMS agreed to look at the issues and to encourage enforcement activities.

Comments on Summary may be made to:

Sarah Hamilton
Director, Area Planning & Development
MASCO, 375 Longwood Avenue
Boston, MA 02215-5328
Ph: 632-2776
FX: 632-2779
E-Mail: sarah@masco2.harvard.edu

LMA Forum Summary May 22, 2000

1) Updates

Mr. Donnelly reported that BIDMC has begun relocation of the Emergency Room functions, and helipad, to their West Campus. Harvard Medical School will review its Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR) this evening. Simmons will attend the June meeting to discuss its DPIR. Emmanuel College's submission of the Final Project Impact Report (FPIR) on May 11 triggers a 75-day review, which will conclude on July 24th.

2) Harvard Medical School – New Research Building

Eric Buehrens, HMS, distributed a fact sheet, which highlights the findings of the DPIR, which were presented at the April meeting. The purpose of this evening's discussion is to hear the community's comments on the filing and the project. He noted that Harvard had filed a notice of project change with the State MEPA division, and received a certificate from that office that no further environmental review is required by MEPA. Team members were introduced, including Arthur Cohn, Rob Quigley, Lisa Serrafin, and David Bohn. The comment period on the DPIR closes on May 30.

C: Commenter was pleased to see the reconfiguration of the design of the buildings as they relate to Avenue Louis Pasteur and the open space there.

C: Commenter felt that transportation information lacked sufficient references to the proximity of Ruggles Station to the Longwood Medical and Academic Area (LMA). This is a key node and connection for Harvard Medical School. The information in the report was skewed towards the Green Line. Commenter wants to ensure that employees are aware of Ruggles as a connection that is within walking distance and noted opportunities to make the walk more pleasant.

A: MASCO runs a shuttle to Ruggles that has gained great popularity among LMA employees. MASCO is also looking at the Ruggles Street corridor to develop a better urban design and pedestrian experience through street tree and sidewalk improvements. The institutions' transportation coordinators and MASCO's CommuteWorks program fully market Ruggles as a key station served by all transit modes. Harvard Medical School said that these efforts would be fully described in their final document. Mr. Donnelly said the institutions have an opportunity to look at the plans of Northeastern, Wentworth and others and develop a good pedestrian connection to and from Ruggles Station.

3. MassArt

Members of the team working on the new residence hall were introduced by Paul McCaffrey, including Martha Rothman (architect, Rothman Partners) and Howard Meuse (traffic engineer, VHB). Handouts were distributed including facts on transportation,

student statistics, parking, and other project details. Ms. Rothman oriented the group to the siting and design of the new residence hall. This project is considered Phase I. A future phase may be planned. Subgrade utilities and the MWRA building are site constraints that are driving the design of the residence hall. There will be 210 parking spaces at- and below-grade. Vancouver, which is a private way, will be 18 feet wide with parking along the MassArt side, and eight-foot sidewalks planted with trees on both sides. Ground floor uses include an entrance lobby and café oriented towards the pedestrian crossing of Huntington Avenue. Gallery space for student and faculty work, apartments for the Residence and Building Directors, and two green courtyards, will also occupy the ground floor. The building will be nine stories, with brick skin and metal panels around the towers and elevator lobbies. Two-story studio spaces are a distinctive part of the program and the building design. An art wall of glass, eight feet above the ground, will relate to upper floor studios and the pedestrian crossing. This is intended to serve as an entrance and statement about MassArt. The surface parking lot will also be marked as a basketball court for weekend/evening use. Pavement treatment at Vancouver at Ward Street will differentiate the street's nature as a "limited use" area. It will be a public way owned by the two abutters and maintained privately.

On the transportation impacts, Mr. Meuse said that 250 MassArt students would be housed in the new dorm, reducing the amount of commuting students to the campus. Current parking spaces (290) are occupied half by students and half by faculty. In the future, 80 student spaces will be lost and reduce the amount of traffic coming to the site (30%). Regarding pedestrian conditions, the improvement of the pedestrian crossing at Huntington under the Huntington Boulevard plan and creation of a clear path to MassArt and Wentworth campuses, will make the pedestrian environment better. On Vancouver, there will be six parking spaces on the WIT side. The remainder of the street will be "traffic calmed" with landscaping and speed tables. Current access from Huntington will be closed with a modest shifting of volumes to Ward Street in the peak hours and no impacts to a reduction of traffic at all intersections studied by the college. Trips that currently access the site from the Southeast Expressway are most likely to shift to Ward and Tremont.

Q: Why is MassArt lit up at night?

A: Students work at all hours in the studio. One of the functions of the studios in the residence hall is to address this need.

Q: Will Vancouver turn into a cut-through from Huntington Avenue?

A: No, right turns from Huntington Avenue will be prohibited.

Q: Where are the studios in the plan?

A: One studio is planned on each residential floor.

Q: Why is this building so high? Other dormitories this size are half the height.

A: Not all of the site is buildable due to below grade utility easements.

Q: Why is there a Phase II?

A: There may be an additional phase in the future but nothing is planned currently.

Q: Why is the college renting out space? Couldn't the height be reduced if MassArt built for its needs only?

A: The finances of the building work for 310 students. The MFA has a need to house 60 students. The School and the MFA are putting out the capital outlay. MFA students will pay more than MassArt students. The State is not subsidizing private parties. MFA has a 10-year lease with a 5-year option to renew.

Q: What other changes will be undertaken at MassArt?

A: An outdated cafeteria from the 1950's will be renovated beginning in January 2001.

Q: What about the mechanical penthouse?

A: It is not on the model because it hasn't been fully developed. It will be setback from the parapet and screened by metal panels.

Q: What about the community's use of the basketball court on the surface parking area?

A: The college will work with the community to identify opportunities for use. The parking will be used during the daytime and early evening by faculty.

Q: How do you close the lot to open it up for recreational use?

A: 200 spaces used by faculty and staff will be vacated on a daily basis. Parking for 30-40 commuting students may be provided but will still be vacated on a daily basis. This is predominantly non-student parking.

Q: Will Vancouver be one-way or two-way.

A: It will be one-way to Huntington from Ward, as approved by the Fire Department.

Q: Will the street function as a loading area?

A: Not for MassArt.

Q: What about for WIT?

A: There will be two loading bays used periodically. WIT representatives volunteered the information that these loading bays are located the request of the City to keep them off of Ward Street. They will be used one or two times daily.

Q: Won't the traffic changes exacerbate a dangerous intersection at Huntington and Ward Street?

A: The reconstruction of this intersection will create a narrowing and a barrier to right turns onto Ward Street and eliminate the possibility of a right-turn.

Q: Will the parking lot be fenced?

A: Just for cars, not for pedestrians.

Q: Will there be a "no turn" sign on Huntington?

A: It will be signed when the city changes the geometry.

Q: Will there be a problem of enforcement?

A: It is not anticipated.

Q: The college plans on running a shuttle from relocated parking lots at Roxbury Community College. How many spaces are there and what route will the shuttle follow?

A: About 200 spaces will be used at RCC for the construction period. The bus will travel from Columbus to Tremont to St. Alphonsus to Longwood to Palace Road. The college has asked the City to make Tetlow Street two-way during this period to allow the creation of a bus stop at the Kennedy Building at Evans Way.

Q: What kind of vehicles will be used?

A: There will be an 18-20 passenger vehicle, running all day from September, 2000 to September, 2002. Seven-minute service will be provided from 8-10 AM; one bus will provide service from 10 AM to 4 PM; two buses will provide service from 4-6 PM; and one bus will provide service from 6-11 PM.

Q: Why not drop passengers off at Ward Street rather than get into the congested loop of Longwood and Tetlow?

A: The college feels this location would be a better convenience for its faculty. It will run until 11:00 PM.

Q: Can't they walk? Tremont Street is congested.

A: The college could look at using Ruggles to Parker to Ward Street.

Q: Who uses the spaces at RCC now?

A: No one.

Q: Can the college coordinate to provide its bus service with BWH or MASCO to reduce the number of additional buses in the area?

A: MASCO and MassArt agreed to take a look at this and report back.

Q: Has the Huntington Avenue construction be put on hold due to these building projects?

A: If it has been delayed it is not due to projects in Longwood, but rather, funding issues at the State level.

4. Emmanuel College – Final Project Impact Report (FPIR)

Sister Anne Donovan noted the college's filing of the FPIR and master plan on May 11, beginning a 75-day public comment period, which ends July 24, 2000. Copies were made available at this meeting to interested individuals. Rob Chandler summarized the changes since the DPIR/DEIR. The size of the project has been reduced as has the parking, from 632,000 gsf to 466,000 gsf for the Endowment Campus Buildings and 318,000 to 156,000 gsf for the Academic Campus; and from 1,200 parking spaces to 423 net new spaces. Changes are summarized in Table II.C.1-2 of the Final Project Impact Report. The report shows a new Blackfan Street connection to Avenue Louis Pasteur to improve traffic conditions and urban design of the area, in response to discussions with BRA and BTB staff. While Emmanuel is not enthused they will allow it to occur. Building B has been reduced in length to provide a better visual connection to

neighbors in the Fenway. The face of Building A on Avenue Louis Pasteur is more active and has a better relationship to the external community. The residence halls have been changed from two buildings along Brookline Avenue to three separate buildings with two openings to Brookline, to create more dynamic space, which is also in keeping with the residential scale in the Fenway. The number of parking spaces has gone down from 1200 to 423 on the endowment campus, for a ratio of about .8 spaces per 1000 gsf of development. TDM measures will be pursued by Merck, including employee parking fees and a 50% T-pass subsidy. Emmanuel will offer a 30% subsidy to college employees and participate fully in CommuteWorks programs such as Emergency Ride Home and CommuteFit. The environmental analysis included a look at the issue of Muddy River flooding. The proponents wanted the development to contribute to the solution of some of these problems, by going beyond minimum standards of no net increase. Because of their location in relation to documented flood surges in the watershed, they were not able to plan retention basins because it would actually increase the risk of flooding. The project will not contribute net new flow to the watershed. Building design will include a 4-story "nose" closest to the Fenway, including a clear glass atrium wall, attached to an 11-story research building. The upper floors of Building A have been changed to metal panels set further back from the parapet to relate better to the scale of urban design along Avenue Louis Pasteur. The Building B tower has been shortened by 22 feet, with a program reduction of 20,000 gsf. The Blackfan Street area will be landscaped and decorative pavement installed to emphasize that the street is not for general use. The mechanical penthouse will include six exhaust stacks and heat recovery units, screened by a 24-foot screening wall.

A review of zoning issues included background on the fourth report in the filing. The institutional master plan provision had expired with the conclusion of permanent zoning in Mission Hill, leading the college to initially file a master plan PDA. Since that time the BRA has taken steps to amend Article 80 to include the master plan requirement citywide in all zoning districts. After the Emmanuel DPIR submission, they were asked to file a Master Plan. In the BRA's Preliminary Adequacy Determination (February, 2000) it was written that Article 80 would be amended to require a master plan. The Zoning Commission is expected to act on the Article 80 amendment on May 24. The zoning appendix will be disposable after the Zoning Commission action.

Q: What about a mechanical penthouse on the Merck Building?

A: A cooling tower might not be necessary depending on the resolution of whether chilled water will be made on the site or provided by MATEP.

Q: What is the timeline for review of these reports?

A: There is a 75-day review period. The college will be back in June if the community wishes this schedule.

Q: Is Blackfan Street in existence now?

A: The existing Blackfan Circle would be extended, to improve the urban design of the area and to carry some of the trips from this and other developments. This site generates 219 and 212 trips in the AM and PM peaks, respectively.

Q: Would this be a right-turn only onto Avenue Louis Pasteur?

A: No, turns would be allowed both ways.

Q: This would add to congestion on the Fenway.

A: Avenue Louis Pasteur is underutilized.

Q: How much of this traffic is destined to Brookline Avenue? Avenue Louis Pasteur is currently a pleasant promenade, which will become trafficked. People will just get stuck at Fenway and Brookline Avenue. Commenter feels that ball game traffic is a horrendous situation that the LMA has to contend with and is concerned about the ability of fire and ambulance to get into the area.

A: The analysis doesn't look at game days; its focus is peak hour traffic impacts, which will be minimal.

Q: Will Merck provide notification to employees about game days?

A: A transportation coordinator will be provided to notify the employee population.

Q: What is the white space on the site plan behind Marion Hall?

A: It is replacement surface parking.

Q: Can it be landscaped and greened up?

A: Yes, the site design will be further developed.

Q: Is this parking lot served off the Fenway?

A: Yes.

Q: Is there a potential Phase III?

A: The additional building, Building C, is no longer in the plan which covers a ten year period.

Q: Will you be looking at this again in five years?

A: No, it would be in the ten-year timeframe or beyond.

Q: What percent of employees will be provided a parking space in the new development?

A: The ratio will be .8 spaces per 1,000 SF of development. This is consistent with other facilities in the LMA.

Q: The number of parking spaces for employees is too large and it should be lowered. Public transportation is good in the area. The community is impacted by pollution related to automobile traffic and parking spaces. How are these impacts measured? Why can't studies be done on the collective impacts of air pollution? Wind and shadow studies are performed.

A: The reports contain air quality studies on the micro and meso scales. No thresholds are exceeded by the project, in fact compared to Federal and State standards the impacts are minimal. City, MEPA, and DEP requirements are being fulfilled.

C: Commenter accepts that but suggests that a next step would be to include EPA officials in the Forum to explain their rationale and identify where the saturation point is.

Q: What will employees pay for T-passes vs. parking?

A: Employees will pay \$35-\$65 for T-passes, which will be subsidized. The market rate for employee parking spaces is \$240/space/month.

Q: What linkage funds will be contributed?

A: About \$3 million will be contributed to housing and jobs creation. \$500,000 will be contributed to assist in fixing problems at the Sears Rotary. They are considering improvements to the Emerald Necklace parkland across from the college. They are willing to target housing linkage to local housing creation options. This notion is not universally accepted in the neighborhoods. The project will generate \$2 million/year in tax revenues.

Q: What use of the facilities is anticipated for the community, particularly the gymnasium?

A: Emmanuel provides community access now and has for many years, to the gym, chapel and library, to name a few.

The next meeting will be on June 26 from 7-9 PM.

Prepared by:

Sarah Hamilton

Director, Area Planning and Development

MASCO

617-632-2776 (ph)

617-632-2779 (fax)

sarah@masco2.harvard.edu

Summary of LMA Forum Meeting
June 26, 2000

Errata: May 22, 2000 Summary: Correction to MassArt section in the last paragraph before the Q & A section, to read that there will be six parking spaces on the MassArt (not the WIT) side of Vancouver Street. Those spaces are included in the total MassArt site parking space count of 210.

1. MASCO/BRA Updates:

Sarah Hamilton distributed information on MASCO's CommuteWorks' program success in the Free for Three Program, where LMA parkers may receive a free MBTA pass for three months in exchange for trying the MBTA. Of the people who have completed the program, as many as 60% have given up their parking spaces permanently. Information was distributed on the issue of the need to site a refueling station in Boston to reduce some redundant helicopter trips into the LMA. MASCO, BIDMC and BWH will be meeting with the appropriate staff at the BRA to continue these discussions.

Owen Donnelly reported that the Harvard New Research Project comment period ended and a Preliminary Adequacy Determination (PAD) has been issued by the BRA. Simmons will present this evening on the findings in their DPIR and Institutional Master Plan filings. Emmanuel is in the FPIR stage with comments due on July 24.

In answer to a question on the process for approving projects, Mr. Donnelly used the example of the Harvard New Research Building. In that case, public comments received during the LMA Forum and in writing are evaluated by the BRA. The BRA raises questions of clarification and requests additional information in the Preliminary Adequacy Determination. The proponent then addresses these questions in the Final Project Impact Report (FPIR). Substantial issues are handled by having the proponent meet with BRA and BTB staff. Staff recommendations are reviewed by policy makers at the BRA. The conclusions are summarized in a memorandum to the BRA Board, which then votes on a proposed project. The BRA Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Zoning Commission are all public hearings and are advertised in the newspapers. Mr. Donnelly advises institutions to send out their documents with a copy of the public notice, to interested community members and the document repository list set up by MASCO and the BRA for the LMA Forum. He noted that the LMA institutions already do more than the statutory requirements of Article 80, in terms of notification and document distribution. A request was made that notification of public hearings of these boards be sent out through the LMA Forum for appropriate LMA projects.

A question arose on whether or not any of the LMA projects were paying linkage. The answer is yes; Children's, Harvard, Emmanuel and WIT are all paying linkage. Ms. Hamilton offered to develop a one-page summary of the anticipated linkage payments from LMA projects in the pipeline.

A question arose on the construction impacts on the neighborhoods. Ms. Hamilton noted that Ms. Lepore of BTB had addressed probable routing of construction trucks, at a previous meeting. More detailed construction schedules are not available typically until later in the

development process. She noted that a conclusion of the Forum discussions was that the city would be asking for as much information as possible on the front end of the process.

2. Simmons College Presentation

Tom Martin, representing Simmons (SC), reviewed the project history including the filing of the PNF and IMPNF on February 2, 2000, a BRA Scoping Determination on April 4, 2000, and the anticipated filing of the IMP and DPIR in early July. The IMP and DPIR review period will be a coterminous 60-day review, because SC intends to ask for an extension of the 30-day period on the DPIR for the convenience of the community. The IMP is the result of a 2-½ year strategic planning process. The proposed project is the only one contained in the IMP with the exception of a possible project after 2007 which would involve relocating the Graduate School of Management onto the main campus.

The site plan for the new building includes creation of a buffer from Palace Road, using a double row of street trees and a generous twenty-foot setback from the curb. The four story, light colored brick building will fit with the existing SC campus and the nearby Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum and will have a main entrance and presence on Palace Road.

Jane Howard reviewed transportation and parking findings that will be in the DPIR. A comprehensive traffic study was conducted and included six intersections in the LMA. Public transportation, shuttle services and parking supply were all evaluated. Parking fees for faculty and staff will be raised from \$450 to \$1150/year. Student parking fees will be \$350/year & \$175/semester. Part time students have an option of a 10-coupon book for \$100. The parking supply is 473 spaces on the main campus and 30 spaces on the residence campus, for a total of 503. MBTA pass subsidies of 50% will be increased to 60% for employees. Students receive a 20% subsidy up to \$40/month. Employee mode split is 62% auto, 31% transit, and 7% walk/bike. Student mode split is 31% auto, 58% transit, and 11% walk/bike. Both students and employees have a 1.2 vehicle occupancy ratio. Simmons participates in MASCO's CommuteWorks programs.

The future building will continue to be accessed by Avenue Louis Pasteur and Palace Road (exits only). Average daily volume increases will be 132 vehicles per day, with AM peak hour trips expected to be 27 in/22 out, and PM peak hour trips to be 3 in/22 out. Student trips are staggered throughout the day, evening and weekends. The highest traffic impact is expected to be 14 additional autos at Palace Road and the Fenway. Trip directions are projected based on existing student patterns -- 77% from the Fenway and 23% from Longwood Avenue. Employee parking demand related to the new building is for 44 spaces; student demand is for 33 spaces, for a total of 77 spaces. There is an excess supply over projected demand of 18 spaces, or 2 spaces for each of the ten years in the master plan, to accommodate additional student growth. Parking spaces on the academic campus (473) will be increased by a net new of 95 spaces. SC's current ratio of parking spaces to gsf is .71 spaces/1,000 gsf. In the future the ratio will be in the range of .78 spaces/1,000 gsf which is close to the .75 target goal being discussed with the BTB.

Demand management activities referenced were an increase in the MBTA pass subsidy to 60%; offering a Guaranteed Ride Home Program; collaborating in shared services with the other

colleges, such as cafeterias, to minimize trips; bike racks and pedestrian improvements; and the more than doubling of parking fees for employees.

Epsilon Associates presented an overview of environmental impacts. Wind levels at the pedestrian level will be decreased, especially at the entrance to the new building. Shadow impacts are on the academic campus and slightly on Isabella Stuart Gardner Museum, but not on the Fens. Air Quality standards are not exceeded, nor are water quality and storm water standards. Solid and Hazardous waste programs will be expanded to include the new site. There are no geotechnical impacts. The DPIR will have information on construction mitigation, urban design and historic resources. Mass. Historic Commission has made a determination of no adverse impact.

Q: Did Simmons compare the overlap of shuttle services in the area?

A: No.

Q: What will Simmons be mailing out to community residents?

A: Any one who wants a copy of their filings may have one by indicating on the sign-in sheet.

Q: Did Simmons get the appropriate permits for the parking lot expansion a number of years ago?

A: Yes, the Zoning Board of Appeal process was pursued and completed in 1994.

C: Commenter wished the appropriate buffer strips had been installed at the Northeastern dormitory along Ruggles Street.

C: Comment that the Simmons architect did a terrible job on the BIDMC Shapiro Center.

A: Simmons architect is Goody, Clancy & Associates. They did not participate in the design of the BIDMC building.

Q: Is Simmons leasing out any parking spaces now?

A: No. It doesn't intend to in the future.

Q: The new building is expected to bring in 132 new trips per day. Given the fact that the existing graduate schools have no parking whatsoever, why are so many new parking spaces planned?

A: One third of students commuting to the existing graduate schools of Social Work and Library Sciences drive.

C: The institutions are missing the input from the community on air pollution and congestion. The cumulative impacts of these projects need to be evaluated. Attempts to obtain data from the Kenmore Square air pollution monitoring station have been fruitless. An EPA expert should be brought to the Forum for an official response that these projects are within the limits.

A: After discussion, the following resources were identified to bring to a future Forum meeting: the BRA's environmental person, the City's Environment Department, and State DEP personnel. In addition, Simmons and Emmanuel were tasked with bringing their scientists to the Forum to explain the impacts in greater detail.

Q: BTM requested additional information about loading docks and the ramp to the garage.

A: The existing loading dock at the Administration Building will stay in place with access continuing via Avenue Louis Pasteur (a gate on Palace Road exists but will remain closed). The final configuration of the parking garage ramp is under development. In the current design, cars wanting to exit onto Palace Road would have to loop back through the surface parking area to get to any exit.

Q: What are the turnover rates and shared parking arrangements?

A: That will be in the report.

Q: What about the regulation that Lisa Lepore of BTB spoke about where institutions could only develop .75 spaces/1000 gsf of land use?

A: This is not a regulation, it is a goal. The BRA and BTB have been successful in managing LMA proposals to a reduced ratio. Children's project will be about .50 spaces/1000 gsf, Harvard has no net new spaces for 450,000 gsf, Emmanuel's project is in the .7-.8 space range, and Simmons is in the .75-.8 space range, for its entire campus.

Q: Isn't this required by the Fenway IPOD zoning?

A: No, the LMA is not in the Fenway IPOD.

Q: Weren't Simmons and Emmanuel included in the IPOD?

A: Contiguous institutions to the Fenway zoning boundaries may be requested to present their projects to the Fenway Planning Task Force, but the Fenway IPOD parking ratios are not applicable.

C: The city doesn't want to approve a single new parking space in the LMA. However some parking to support development may be appropriate after a rigorous analysis. Community opinion about parking development is important to the city and it helps to effect the results. As evidenced by the trends noted above, the city has been successful in reducing parking proposals and the trend is encouraging. The community also should be aware that MASCO and their member institutions do more in demand management than any others in the city or even the nation and are a city/state model in creative programming to get more employees out of their automobiles. The necessary public transportation resources to support this institutional complex have not been delivered to this area and at least half of the cars in the LMA have no reason to be there but for the lack of infrastructure.

Q: Can someone address idling of buses?

A: BTB said there is a state Anti-Idling Law which limits idling to five minutes. Calling the police to report infractions is appropriate.

3. Emmanuel College Question & Answer Session

Sister Anne Donovan and Scott Dumont began the session with comments on project history. The FPIR was filed on May 11 and reported to the Forum in May. The comment period ends on July 24. A BRA Board hearing at the end of August is anticipated.

Q: How much of the new dorms will be for Emmanuel's use? Describe the project phasing.

A: Revenues raised from the Endowment Campus development will allow the Phase I dormitory project for Emmanuel to move forward at the same time. Phase I includes

demolition of St. Joseph's Hall and construction of three smaller buildings adjacent to Brookline Avenue, for Emmanuel students. Emmanuel feels that diversity through leasing to other college students creates an attractive community of learning, fulfills a community need for additional student housing, and a city policy for creation of student housing.

Q: The Merck Building is the first proposal and the first step. Why didn't Merck take up both buildings on the Endowment campus, which could lead to a better consolidated design?

A: The master plan looks out 10 years. Although several phases are being approved at the same time they will not be built that way. Building A and Phase I Residence Halls will be built together; Building B and Phase II of the Residence Halls and Marion Hall will be built together. The Merck Building is designed with lower heights around the perimeter and higher ones in the interior where the BRA feels that taller massing is appropriate. This buffers the impact on the Fenway and places appropriate density in the Blackfan area, which is where the LMA is expanding. The city is balancing the need for LMA expansion and sensitivity to the residential environment. The community should take comfort in the fact that this project guarantees the continued existence of Emmanuel rather than allowing denser uses in.

C: Mr. Donnelly said that additional research space of up to 500,000 sf could be future need of the LMA. This is a premier research center in the nation and Merck is a good addition to the area as a for-profit, which will pay over \$2 million/year in taxes.

Q: Why aren't opportunities for free education offered to Mission Hill and Fenway residents?

A: The college has a strong connection with the greater Boston community in terms of offering educational benefits.

Q: Where will the linkage funds end up and why aren't there any housing creation proposals on Mission Hill?

A: The developers have been working with others to identify areas that want additional housing resources to be developed. Affordable housing is not universally welcome in some communities.

Q: How is linkage directed?

A: The BRA signs a DIP agreement with a developer to contribute linkage funds for housing which goes into a city-wide pool; or, the developer submits a housing creation proposal as developer or partner with a community group for the development of affordable housing units.

4. Commercial Parking in Residential Sticker Areas

Mr. Shulman, BTd, gave an overview of the change in city regulations, effective in September, which will revise the definition of a commercial vehicle. (see hand-out). Commercial vehicles are allowed to park up to three hours in a Residential Sticker area.

Ms. Hamilton said that this issue had been raised at a recent Forum meeting, but even before that time, the BWH asked MASCO to begin an area-wide discussion with the institutions on the issue. As a result MASCO completed data collection in the area of Roxbury Tenants of Harvard and was prepared to report on the results.

Diane Gray of MASCO Planning summarized the results of data collection efforts. Data were collected for a period of 12 hours on each of two consecutive Wednesdays in May, from 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM, on Francis, Vining and Binney Streets, and St. Albans Road. Thirty-four commercial vehicles were observed parking in this area; 25% of them parked for greater than three hours; 50% were there before noon and 50% after noon; nine, or 26%, of vehicles were there before 7:00 AM but only one was there by 6:00 AM and one there past 6:00 PM. The duration was from two minutes to close to nine hours. When possible, drivers were asked their destinations. Only eight responded. Of those six were destined to BWH, one to Mass. Mental Health Center, and one to a restaurant.

Ms. Hamilton said that the institutions recognize there is a problem and are working on solutions to the problem. Mr. Donnelly said the city has no tolerance for commercial parking serving LMA institutions parking in residential sticker areas and reducing the quality of the residential environment. Ms. Hamilton reiterated that the institutions were engaged in a dialogue and she would report back as soon as agreements had been made. One of the issues is that clearance in garages is not adequate to accommodate service vehicles and there are not a lot of surface parking lots at the medical institutions. She also said that in a perfect world the institutions would be successful in clearing out vendor parking related to the LMA, however the city and community could still expect to see commercial parking there because city regulations allow it. BTD Enforcement has been called in by MASCO to enforce against violations.

The next meeting will be on July 24, 2000, from 7:00 – 9:00 PM.

Prepared by:

Sarah Hamilton
Director, Area Planning & Development
MASCO INC. 375 Longwood Avenue
Boston, MA 02215
Ph: 617-632-2776
Fax: 617-632-2779
Email: sarah@masco2.harvard.edu

LMA Forum Summary July 24, 2000

Errata: The June 26th summary of Emmanuel College's presentation in the question about phasing was incorrect. The construction phasing will be Phase I: Building B, and St. Joseph's Hall replacement followed by Building A. Phase II includes Marion Hall and two residence Halls.

1. BRA/MASCO Updates

Owen Donnelly reported that Harvard Medical School's filing of their Final Project Impact Report (FPIR) is likely at the end of July. They will present their findings to the August 28th LMA Forum meeting; the public review process will extend through mid-September.

Emmanuel College's comment period on the FPIR/IMP ended today. Their desired schedule is to have a public hearing on August 31 on their proposed projects and their Institutional Master Plan. Mr. Donnelly said he wants Emmanuel to report to the Forum again before their BRA Board hearing, on the final agreements made with the City, particularly the Boston Transportation Department. Simmons College's Institutional Master Plan and Draft Project Impact Report were submitted with a public review and comment period ending September 1st. They have requested a waiver of the Final Project Impact Report (FPIR) phase, which the BRA will grant if all issues identified during the review process have been resolved to the BRA's satisfaction. In answer to a question about how and when that decision would be made, Mr. Donnelly said that it would be a BRA Board decision based on a staff report prior to their public hearing which will likely be in mid-September.

Sarah Hamilton provided a summary of linkage contributions that MASCO promised the community at a prior meeting. With this round of LMA projects about \$6.6 million in linkage funds will be directed to the city's jobs and housing programs. In answer to a question about what percent is going to Mission Hill and the Fenway, Ms. Hamilton said that institutions are looking to partner with local groups for housing creation and that not all communities want to see affordable housing created. Mr. Donnelly noted that typical local partners are community development corporations and that the best way for housing linkage funds to be targeted is to have an expression of local interest. All linkage funds that are not in a Housing Creation Proposal will go into the city-wide Neighborhood Housing Trust for creation of affordable housing.

2. Simmons College Question and Answer Session

Simmons has attended four Forum meetings regarding their master plan and proposed project. The summary of the findings of the DPIR was presented last month. Participants have now had a chance to read the filings and were asked if they had any questions. Three participants indicated they would like copies of the filings; these were distributed.

C: Student parking in the neighborhoods is an issue.

A: Fifty-eight percent of current Simmons students at the Graduate Schools to be relocated to the LMA take the MBTA. Simmons participates fully in the CommuteWorks programs. Many graduate students commute to work and school so may need to use an automobile, often at off-peak hours.

C: There's a fault in these analyses. They all make it sound like there won't be traffic jams as a result of these projects.

A: Simmons is contributing very few trips to peak hour traffic. In addition, Simmons is raising their 50% MBTA Pass subsidy to 60% for faculty and staff. Faculty/staff parking fees will more than double. Students are offered a 20% MBTA pass subsidy on an already discounted T-Pass.

Q: College students occupy housing in Mission Hill. They will need to take the MBTA and yet the Arborway Line is in jeopardy. What is Simmons doing about that?

A: Ms. Hamilton said that by virtue of Simmons membership in MASCO, they have been active in all of the discussions about the Arborway Line. MASCO and its members recognize the importance of the service to the residential and institutional communities.

Q: What are the project cost and the cost of the garage?

A: Total project costs are about \$24.6 million, \$6 million of which is for the garage.

Q: Simmons is asking for 95 more parking spaces now. Is this only for Phase I or will it request more in the future?

A: This will be the new supply for the foreseeable future. The master plan contains a possible project in the 8-10 year time frame, to move the Graduate School of Management to the LMA.

Q: The institutions keep putting people onto the MBTA but the Green Line is at capacity. How will the system handle them?

A: Many of these graduate students are travelling off-peak when the system is not at capacity.

C: Commenter expressed concern about equitable review by the community on institutional projects, citing concerns about the large numbers of new employees that will be brought in by Merck that should be scrutinized to the same level as the small number of new students being brought into the area by Simmons.

A: Emmanuel can address this again when they return in August. There has been consistent review from one project to the next with each project proponent requested to perform the same kind of evaluation on the impacts of their project.

3. Restricted Parking District

Owen Donnelly reviewed the regulations contained in the Boston Zoning Code on this topic. The Boston Zoning Code divides the city into districts, each with a set of rules regarding uses and dimensional requirements. For example, uses are either allowed, conditional or restricted in Residential, Industrial and Commercial areas, to name a few. Allowed uses in a district are key. A Conditional Use designation requires an additional review process for that use, namely Zoning Board of Appeals. Parking, as a use, is actually required and specified in some parts of the city. In the LMA, parking as a use is conditional. The Code establishes a Special Purpose Overlay and imposes a Restricted Parking District designation on the LMA, including the Fenway. There are several ways to get a Conditional Use Permit in a Restricted Parking District: 1) appeal through the Inspectional Services Department to the Zoning Board of Appeals; 2) through a Planned Development Area (PDA); 3) through an Institutional Master Plan; and, 4) through an Urban Renewal Designation. In the first case (ZBA), the BRA must prepare a report, submit it to the BRA Board acting as the city planning commission, and then to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The BRA Board uses several criteria in evaluating a parking

proposal before making a recommendation to the ZBA. In the second way (PDA), a proposal has to be approved by the BRA Board and the Zoning Commission. If it meets their requirements then it is deemed to meet the zoning requirements. In the third way (IMP) the BRA Board and the Zoning Commission must approve the construction of conditional use parking. In the fourth way, there are few applications for Urban Renewal Designation these days. This requires only the approval of the BRA Board, but is based on review procedures set forth in Article 80 that include extensive analysis by the Boston Transportation Department. Harvard Medical School's New Research Building is in an Urban Renewal Designation; the disposition agreement had specific terms on the number of parking spaces allowed on the parcel.

C: The Restricted Parking District designation is inappropriate for the area, since 2,400 spaces have been approved in the LMA according to the West Fenway Longwood Transportation Study from 1993-1998, 3,000 spaces will be approved for the Red Sox, and 1800 parking spaces were approved for Landmark Center. There have been no denials of requests by the ZBA.

A: Mr. Donnelly said if you check the record you would see many cases where the BRA has recommended against approval of parking proposals before the ZBA. There is not a single project coming out of the LMA where the amount of parking requested got approved. Each project has been reduced. These institutions have the best demand management programs in the city yet the need for public transportation is huge and the city's and state's lack of responsiveness is scandalous. Much of the traffic going through this area is the result of through trips that have no other roadway to travel on.

C: Every project is asking for parking. Why don't they use public transportation at Ruggles Station? Radical solutions are needed like shuttle buses from the suburbs.

A: Ms. Hamilton said that the institutions employees are using public transportation and private transportation such as the MASCO shuttle that goes back and forth to Ruggles Station and is a free ride for employees. MASCO would like to plan new shuttles from the suburbs—they are very expensive to operate.

C: Public transportation is inadequate to serve this area.

A: Solutions are expensive and they need to be prioritized by the State. Political constituencies need to continue to be built to support the Urban Ring for example.

C: The Urban Ring is too long-term. All of the projects have parking proposals and we don't want more parking or more cars. What the institutions want is a "done deal"; we come to these meetings and tell you what we want and are not listened to. The Merck project has some major parking proposed.

A: Mr. Donnelly said to look at the record. Emmanuel's first proposal was for 1,150 spaces and they're down to 430 spaces and the discussion hasn't ended. It is not realistic to expect zero parking spaces.

Q: On the parking lots in the Fenway with conditional use permits granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals, aren't there timelines set granting rights for small periods of time? What percent of the institutions' lots are under conditional use permits with a timeline? Is there a way to identify when a use permit is expiring and can that be provided to the Forum?

A: Ms. Hamilton said the only MASCO lot that she knows of that might fall into that category is the Boylston Lot which had come back before the ZBA a couple of years ago. In answer to a question about the Wentworth Lot, she said she believes that is accessory to Wentworth's use and that MASCO manages it for Wentworth and MASCO parkers.

4. Air Quality Discussion

Christine Kirby, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), began with an overview of the status of the state's air quality and DEP's role in monitoring it. DEP monitors ambient air for ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, and lead. These are mandated by the US EPA. The state was classified as a serious non-attainment area for ozone in 1990 but declassified on the one-hour standard in 1999, based on clean data. The state expects a return to non-attainment in the future. For Carbon Monoxide, Boston is on maintenance while other areas of the state outside of the Boston metropolitan area are in non-attainment. There have been no violations of this standard since 1986. The state has a strategy to reduce pollution from "mobile sources" (motor vehicles), which contribute over 40% of pollutants. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT's) are rising. At the same time cleaner fuels, cleaner vehicles and a new enhanced inspection program are all contributing to maintenance of the standards. Other transportation control measures include parking freezes in Boston, Cambridge and Logan Airport, and requirements of large employers to promote demand management programs.

DEP also reviews development proposals that are subject to MEPA review. This has been in place in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) since 1982. Analysis is undertaken on the project impacts on carbon monoxide, ozone and volatile organic compounds. The review threshold for CO in a Maintenance area or CO non-attainment area, is projects generating 3000 or more to the average daily traffic (ADT). These are projects, which have the ability to generate a "hot spot". The review threshold for VOC is any office project generating 3,000 or more ADT or any other non-residential project generating 6,000 or more ADT. Proponents must model and analyze their total emissions comparing a "no build" condition with a "build" condition. Projects' combined impacts are considered; the later project takes into account the cumulative impacts of the projects that precede it. DEP is monitoring exceedences of the standards. There have been no exceedences of the standards. Ms. Hamilton distributed excerpts from the report, "Massachusetts 1998 Air Quality Report" referencing the monitoring program in general, and in specific, results related to the closest monitoring station at Kenmore. She also provided a summary of the main results. The report is available at <http://www.state.ma.us/dep>.

Dick Mertens of the BRA spoke about that agency's review process under Article 80 in the Boston Zoning Code. Their analysis begins with the air quality impacts produced by the traffic generated by the project, and the Level of Service (LOS) at intersections near the project. Any intersections with LOS degradations to E or F or with existing conditions at E or F are required to analyze CO and other pollutant generation. A LOS of D or better is acceptable in an urban area. The evaluation takes place through computer modeling with methodologies set up by the state and emission factors developed by the EPA, that take into account weather, types of vehicles, speed and CO emissions factors. The output of the modeling is the amount of CO generated by traffic flowing through the particular intersections and measured at sensitive receptors (parks, sidewalks). The 1-hr. standard is 35 parts per million (PPM); the 8-hr. standard is 9 PPM. Cumulative impacts of the project are taken into account with the modeling. They start with existing traffic and model five years after completion of the project (full

occupancy). Background growth assumptions are factored in and the impacts of the proposed project are added to result in a cumulative impact assessment.

Q: What is the amount of ozone on Mission Hill?

A: Ms. Kirby said ozone is not monitored. CO is monitored but the state selects sites that are representative of larger areas.

Q: Where are the parking freeze areas and what are they?

A: Ms. Kirby said they create caps on commercial parking spaces at Logan, downtown Boston, and Cambridge.

Q: What number of cars will be added and their related emissions from the LMA projects?

A: Ms. Kirby did not have that figure. Cumulative impacts of projects are modeled and taken into account for projects under MEPA review.

Q: What increase in pollutants will be caused by all of the projects?

A: The state hasn't seen a modeled exceedence. Due to reforms in gas, automobiles, preventative maintenance and adoption of California standards, exceedences have been avoided.

Q: Does the City do its own monitoring?

A: No, the EPA requires the state to perform this.

Q: Aren't the SIP guidelines for reduction low? Isn't the SIP not being observed? The state secretary said that South Boston doesn't have adequate transportation infrastructure for the amount of development being planned.

A: The SIP is not a traffic control plan; it is the state's identification of goals and programs that will be pursued in order to attain air quality goals. Massachusetts has more traffic controls and mitigation than many other states have.

Q: Decreased automobile travel and investment in public transportation should be the goals. What is the State doing for the Arborway Line?

A: EOTC completed a new "infeasibility study" for the line, that has been rejected by DEP.

Q: What about the parking freeze? A lot of community activists believe that environmental justice ends at Massachusetts Avenue. Can't the freeze area be extended?

A: While DEP wouldn't rule this out, it would not be easy politically. Employee parking would still be excluded since the freeze areas only cover commercial parking.

Q: How do you get a freeze placed on employee or visitor parking?

A: Ms. Zlody from the Boston Environment Department said that it must be authorized by the State legislature. The Boston Air Pollution Control Commission oversees local implementation and it is not a simple process. The City must continue to pursue policies, which place a limit on employee parking.

C: Mr. Donnelly commented that a downtown freeze area standard of one parking space per 1,000 gross square feet of development has emerged in the LMA without the extension of the freeze district, using this as an example of how city policies have reduced construction of parking in the LMA.

C: Ms. Zlody said that activists shouldn't give up on extending the freeze due to political difficulty. She referenced the city Transportation Plan that is underway, as a process for activists to become involved in to shape parking policies in the future.

C: Ms. Hamilton noted that LMA medical institutions have the highest parking fees for employees in the city, for similar institutions, and have shown a change in mode split with a six percent reduction in driving alone and an increase in other modes of travel as a result of a combination of steep parking fees, T-pass subsidies, and other programs such as Three for Free where qualified employees can receive a free T-pass for three months in exchange for giving up parking on a trial basis. This program has succeeded in converting about two thirds of participants away from driving alone permanently.

Q/C: Several participants complained about the City's redeployment of enforcement personnel from the 3-11 pm shift, which has caused additional friction in the Residential Parking areas with non-residential parkers. Neighbors feel that employees, students and visitors to the institutions are parking there now that enforcement capability is diminished.

A: Ms. Hamilton suggested that appropriate city personnel from the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services, BTB's Enforcement Division, and others as identified by the neighborhood be invited to the September meeting so that residents could have a fuller airing of the issues and some solutions. She noted that MASCO and the hospitals had evaluated the commercial parking impacts in the neighborhood and were continuing to work on solutions to that problem.

Q: A question was asked about the construction routing plans for trucks.

A: Ms. Hamilton referenced Ms. Lepore's (of BTB) overview of routing given at a previous meeting. She said that the institutions were working to closely coordinate their impacts, through MASCO's construction coordination process, and that she would be happy to report on that process as it unfolds.

The next meeting will be held on Monday, August 28, 2000, from 7:00 – 9:00 PM, at HSPH Kresge Building, Rm. G-2. Likely presenters will be Emmanuel College and Harvard Medical School.

Prepared by:

Sarah Hamilton
Director, Area Planning & Development
MASCO, 375 Longwood Avenue
Boston, MA 02215-5328
Ph: 617-632-2776
FX: 617-632-2779
Email: sarah@masco2.harvard.edu

LMA Forum Summary August 28, 2000

1. BRA/BTD/MASCO Updates

Owen Donnelly reported that the comment period for Harvard Medical School's Final Project Impact Report closes on September 14th. A public hearing for this phase II project at the Harvard Institutes of Medicine is tentatively scheduled for October 12th.

The comment period for the Simmons College Master Plan and Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR) closes on September 1st. The BRA's public hearing on this 8-year Master Plan with its proposed 60,000 sf building and 95 net-new parking spaces is scheduled for September 28th at the BRA. Adam Shulman reported that BTD considered the DPIR to be adequate, and contained enough information to allow for waiver of a Final Project Impact Report. In response to a question about the increased number of vehicle trips associated with the proposed project, Adam stated that the effect of any such increase was expected to be rather minimal and that Simmons was proposing adequate mitigation measures.

At this point, several people in the audience raised concerns about the cumulative effect on traffic and congestion throughout the area as a result of all of the projects being proposed. In particular, concern about the amount of traffic that this and other projects bring to the area, and onto neighborhood streets, was expressed. In addition, people wanted to know whether or not the stated goal of reducing the parking ratio to the .7 range was being achieved. It was agreed that information showing the degree to which this has been accomplished for LMA projects under review during the past year would be presented at the next LMA Forum Meeting in September.

2. Emmanuel College Update

Emmanuel College was scheduled to present their 10-year Master Plan and Large Project Review plans for approximately 600,000 sf of development at a BRA sponsored public hearing on August 30th. In response to expressed community concerns, the scope of their proposed projects has been reduced dramatically since the filing of their Project Notification Form (PNF) last year. The square footage of the proposed projects has been decreased. The Endowment Campus proposals have been reduced from 640,000 SF to 466,000 sf with the amount of parking reduced from an original request of 1,200 spaces to a total of 393 net-new spaces. BTD has approved Emmanuel's transportation plan and is currently working to finalize an access plan agreement. A parking ratio of .63 spaces per 1,000 sf of development will be achieved as a result of Emmanuel's traffic mitigation efforts, including (but not limited to) participation in all of MASCO's CommuteWorks activities, a 50% T-pass subsidy program, and a \$500,000 commitment toward area-wide transportation-related improvements. As part of the mitigation program, Merck employees will be charged market rate (currently \$240/mo) for parking, while Emmanuel College employees will see their rates double in price. Parking for resident students is not being provided as part of this development. Construction of the Merck research building is scheduled to begin in the first quarter of 2001, and should be completed within three years. The second research building construction is then scheduled to begin. Dormitory construction is scheduled to begin in the spring of 2001, and should take approximately 10 months to complete.

3. Harvard Medical School Update

Eric Buehrens from Harvard Medical School introduced the rest of the development team for the Harvard Medical School New Research Building Project that is being proposed for construction along Avenue Louis Pasteur. Copies of the Final Project Impact Report (FPIR) were distributed to anyone who hadn't already received a copy, and it was noted that the comment period for this FPIR ends on September 14th.

Some minor changes in design have occurred since the last time this project was presented, primarily in response to streetscape concerns along Avenue Louis Pasteur. The building frontage along Avenue Louis Pasteur has been lowered, and additional green space has been added in that location, as well as on the Blackfan Street side of the building. A wide set-back, similar to that of the Latin School across the street, will be maintained along Avenue Louis Pasteur, and loading access will be maintained off-street along the Vanderbilt Hall corridor. A sense of openness and transparency will be affected through the use of glass throughout the structure (including the penthouse) and an interior courtyard and walkway connector will serve as a public link from Avenue Louis Pasteur to Blackfan Street.

This non-profit development will be covered by a Payment-in-lieu-of-taxes (PILOT) agreement, and the FPIR contains information on additional community benefits.

It was also noted that there is no net-new parking associated with this project.

4. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the LMA Forum is scheduled for Monday, September 25th. Due to concerns raised about the amount of truck traffic being experienced on neighborhood streets around the LMA, particularly Fenwood Road, it was requested that this issue be placed on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting and that appropriate institutional representatives be invited to attend.

Prepared by:

David Eppstein
MASCO INC.
617-632-2860 phone
email: david@masco2.harvard.edu

Summary of LMA Forum Meeting September 25, 2000

1. MASCO/BRA Updates

Mr. Donnelly (BRA) reported the BRA Board's approval, in late August, of the Emmanuel Master Plan and Phase I projects: the Merck Research Building, a second research building, and the Emmanuel dormitory demolitions and new construction. Simmons received BRA Board approval on September 21st of its master plan and proposed administrative/academic building. A public hearing on the Harvard New Research Building will be held on October 12, 2:00 PM, BRA Board Room, 9th floor, City Hall.

2. Parking/Development Ratios

Mr. Shulman (BTD) reviewed recent project approvals in relation to the city's desired goal to approve only essential new parking, achieving a ratio of .75 spaces for employees per one thousand square feet of development. The ratio for Emmanuel will be about .63 spaces/thousand taking into account its master plan developments. The original request was for 1,200 spaces in relation to the new development; the final number is 393 net new spaces, for a total development of 1,032 spaces. Simmons ratio will be about .76 spaces, with a net new development of 77 spaces and a total parking supply of 580 spaces. The Harvard New Research Building will have no new parking, however due to the elimination of 200 leased spaces on the site, the "effective ratio" will be around .64. Their old ratio of .8 is being reduced. Children's Hospital is at about .7, taking into account their total parking supply and their new construction of about 430,000 SF with 288 net new spaces. Wentworth is creating no new parking in relation to their new dormitory; they lease about 320 spaces to MASCO. MassArt is creating a new dormitory, closing down a lot of about 293 spaces, a portion of which have been relocated to Roxbury Community College during construction. When the new facility is completed, they will have a net loss of spaces. The Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences project is on hold. In summary 758 net new spaces have been approved for about 1.5 million SF of development.

C: Mass Pharmacy's property is being used for illegal parking; graffiti is appearing there.

A: MASCO will point out these issues to the college.

C: Wants the Mayor to know that there are serious quality of life issues here and the ratio of parking spaces should be less than .75. Saturation is the issue. The institutions should move their parking out of the area; maybe new construction should not be allowed in the LMA and new development should be moved elsewhere.

C: The total number of spaces approved is less than what was proposed but the neighborhood is concerned about the impact of turnover parking.

C: Ms. Hamilton said that the institutions are moving in the right direction, having shifted 6% of employees from automobiles to the MBTA and increased employee parking rates. Boston is a very successful city and while the institutions are part of the problem, they are not the whole problem. Citywide, employment is up and construction is up.

C: What will the city's stance be on parking development at the Ledge Site? Zoning allows for a space per 1,000 SF or more. That development will have an institutional tenant who will build more parking for themselves? The Ledge Site project should be invited to the Forum.

A: Mr. Donnelly said that the Ledge Site project will go through an Article 80 review; if there is an institutional use the appropriate community review process will have to be examined. He will seek clarification on this question by the next LMA Forum.

Ms. Flaherty, representing Councilor Ross, said that an extensive community participation process was conducted in the predevelopment planning stages and would be repeated in the future. A parking and transportation consultant has been hired.

3. BTD Enforcement Issues

Kathleen Moccia, Deputy Director of Enforcement at BTD, was introduced. Issues about enforcement had been raised in a July meeting. Ms. Moccia said that with changes in the 3-11 shift, the department has more enforcement personnel to dispatch to two shifts: 7:30-3:30 PM and 11 AM to 8 PM. The police cover from 8-10 PM. A number of parking and enforcement issues in the neighborhood were brought up: the need for parking meters on Tremont Street and for six meters on Huntington Ave at Brigham Circle; need for enforcement at 611-619 Huntington Ave illegal parking in front of handicapped ramps, driveways and intersections; the need to enforce the city's ordinance on commercial parking in residential sticker areas; too much tagging on Hillside and Calumet; the need for residential parking on those streets and Sewell Street; safety issues due to lack of enforcement on corner of Dell Ave; poor signage at corner of Hillside and Parker; need for residential parking at South Whitney; enforcement issues on Francis St and Fenwood Rd; enforcement on Terrace St at two-hour parking spaces; ticketing prior to street cleaning.

Ms. Moccia encouraged people to contact her or her office. Residents were encouraged to contact Ms. Flaherty and Ms. Napolitano (ONS) regarding needs for new residential parking areas; Councilor Ross' office has been instrumental in filing petitions for parking on Wesley and Allegheny Streets.

Mr. Donnelly expressed concern about institutional vendor parking in the neighborhoods and charged MASCO with continuing and concluding its discussions on this issue with its members and reporting regularly back to the Forum. The issue of resident parking in the Mission Park Garage was raised. When the garage was first built, residents were allowed to park there for a dollar on weekends and holidays. Mr. McGonagle (BWH) explained that spaces are more limited and if available, residents would have to pay the going rate. The issue of vendor parking doesn't have a simple solution: institutions don't control the enforcement; due to height restrictions in garages many commercial trucks cannot be accommodated in structured parking facilities.

4. Truck Traffic on Fenwood Road

The neighborhoods adjacent to Francis Street are upset about the amount of truck traffic on Fenwood Road in particular. Their recollection is that truck traffic from Huntington Avenue had been expressly forbidden and tonnage limits had been posted. Partners Shuttles have also been observed using the street. Some observers believe that the overall level of truck traffic has increased over the last four months. Mr. McGonagle (BWH) said that the Materials Handling Center on Fenwood Road is the only service area for the hospital. There are four trucks of significance (Owens/Miner and Hospital Laundry are 18-wheelers) that can't make the corner from Francis Street to Fenwood Road. If these services were to be shifted to smaller trucks it would be logistically impossible, requiring a doubling or quadrupling of the volumes of truck traffic. Neighbors requested a total ban on using these streets. Ms. Hamilton said there are no simple solutions to this issue because there are a limited number of streets in the LMA. Mr. Donnelly stated that the institutions have to be more sensitive to truck routing systems and impacts on the neighborhoods and asked MASCO to address this on an institution-wide basis, collecting information on truck traffic and Reporting back to the Forum in the future.

M A S C O

Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc.

LMA Forum Summary November 27, 2000

1. MASCO/BRA/BTD Updates

Owen Donnelly, BRA, reported on the status of several institutional projects. The BRA approved Emmanuel College's Master Plan and projects on August 30, and by the Zoning Commission on September 27. The BRA approved Simmons' Master Plan and project and the master plan was to be presented at a Zoning Commission hearing on December 6 at 9:00 AM. The Harvard New Research Building was presented for approval at a BRA Board meeting on October 12. Due to outstanding issues on their PILOT payment, the vote was tabled on that date and reviewed and approved on November 2. Children's Hospital had been quiet for a few months. Recently they had begun to move ahead with design review on their research building for an anticipated construction start in early 2001. Mr. Donnelly said he did not know of any other institutional projects that would be forthcoming.

Q: A question was asked about whether or not Children's would need to come back to the LMA Forum related to the design review process.

A: No, schematic designs are done at the front end of the Article 80 review process. After BRA approvals subsequent design review is conducted on an agency basis.

Q: If a project underwent some changes, would they be required to return to the public participation process?

A: Only if design changes resulted in a change in impact, which would necessitate a change in the impact studies, done in association with that project.

Q: What about the construction management plans? When can the community see the impacts of truck traffic during construction?

A: Ms. Hamilton said the construction management plans are in the domain of the Boston Transportation Department; they have been invited to attend the LMA Forum at the appropriate time. It was agreed that the January meeting would be good.

Q: Is there time to have this information presented at a meeting before they get their permits?

A: They will need certification of Article 80 review, with construction plans stamped and approved by the BRA in order to get their building permits, according to Mr. Donnelly.

Q: Will any institution request use of MDC roadways? By what process does the MDC review and grant permission for the use of their roadways?

A: Mr. Donnelly suggested that any property owner who abuts an MDC roadway has the right to access their property by way of those roadways. He said that BTD has a lot of say over what happens on roadways in the City whether or not they are MDC roads.

C: Ms. Hamilton said that regardless of BTD's traffic management planning, MASCO and the institutions constructing in the North Campus area would be meeting to review different plans in early December. She said the intended outcome of these meetings is to develop a plan that is the least disruptive to the residential and institutional community. She concluded that she would try to get the right agency people to attend the meeting in January.

2. Vendor Parking in Residential Sticker Areas

Ms. Hamilton introduced the topic to the group. This issue had been brought to the Forum in June. Data collection was completed by MASCO and reported on at the September Forum meeting. The issue is commercial parking in Resident Sticker areas on Francis Street, Binney Street, Vining Street and St. Albans Road. Commercial parking is allowed for up to three hours in Residential Sticker areas; after that they can be ticketed and towed. MASCO's data collection showed some correlation between commercial vendors and the BWH but that was not exclusively the case. John McGonagle and Arthur Mombourquette were introduced from BWH and asked to describe what they had been working on to address the issues. BWH staff said that they had made progress in two areas. First, they had been seeking surface parking in or near the LMA to be able to direct commercial vendors to as an alternative to parking in the neighborhood. They were optimistic that they could soon announce a program for vendor parking that would entice trucks and vans. They also had developed a "vendor letter" (see attached draft), which would be distributed to vendors working at the hospital and used as a leaflet to put on windshields. They were going to use the lot and the letter in a pilot program, which would entail offering parking off-street to a vendor. Their goal is to develop a program that is self-enforcing and they recognize the need to put something into place to be "good neighbors". There was some discussion about the number of parking spaces that BWH intended to set aside for vendors and how many vehicles that would serve. The BWH expects to be able to access six spaces to serve about 12 vehicles. The community and City wanted to see more "teeth" in the vendor letter and wanted the BWH, and other institutions, to change their contracts with vendors to include provisions that require they park off-street in order to do business with the hospital(s). There was acknowledgement that the BWH was not the only destination for these vendors. Ms. Hamilton said the BWH should be applauded for taking the first step in the right direction. She said that this issue had been discussed at the management level with other institutions and that many, but not all, had off-street parking provisions for vendors. She said that the issue could be discussed at a more senior level. Mr. Donnelly stated that with the level of money budgeted annually for property maintenance in the LMA community there were probably in excess of \$50 million spent with vendors. That translates into a lot of clout with vendors, which he said all institutions should pursue in a more substantive way to protect the quality of life of residential areas surrounding the LMA.

C: A participant expressed disappointment in the lack of concrete steps on this issue, saying that a six-month issue had really been more like a six-year issue.

A: Mr. Mombourquette responded that the hospital did not have options to deal tangibly with this issue, without off-street surface parking. Through brainstorming of possibilities with MASCO and others, the BWH is close to having a concrete way of handling this problem.

C: A question was raised about enforcement and monitoring.

A: Ms. Hamilton said she had contacted the BTB Enforcement division, which had increased enforcement in the area with the result of more vendor tickets and less vendor presence. Every one agreed that the goal here was to develop a self-enforcing program.

C: A participant volunteered to monitor the outcome of the pilot program once it was put into place.

A: The BWH made it clear that they did not expect the BTB or the community to bear responsibility for monitoring progress made in the program. Ms. Hamilton volunteered MASCO to collect data several times a year to take the burden off the City and the community.

Q: A request was made that a list of vendors serving the area be comprised and brought back to the Forum.

Q: A request was made for better parking enforcement in the Triangle area and for the installation of parking meters on Tremont Street, south side.

A: Mr. Donnelly suggested that the parking meter and enforcement requests be made to BTB. Mr. Shulman noted the work that had been done under the Main Streets Program and requests for parking meters promoted by Councilor Ross. He said the process is to submit a request to the BTB Commissioner, and the operations division will evaluate the request.

Q: A participant asked for better information about the Main Streets program and meetings.

A: Interested individuals were referred to the Community Alliance of Mission Hill and the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services.

3. Truck Traffic on Fenwood Road

John McGonagle and Arthur Mombourquette reported on the BWH's progress in handling truck traffic to the materials handling center on Fenwood Road near Brookline Avenue. Mr. Mombourquette described the existing loading dock as not designed correctly to be able to handle truck deliveries from Brookline Avenue. He said they had looked at reconfiguring the docks but at this time, truck traffic from Huntington Avenue seems to be the only feasible route. He is pursuing the following actions to help address the problem: he has hired a traffic consultant to evaluate the configuration of the loading docks, to look at overall levels of truck delivery traffic, and their required turning radii to see if they can utilize other streets; he is also discussing the possibility of a major vendor –Owens-Miner, which uses tractor trailer trucks three times a day—to utilize smaller trucks. There are repercussions to the hospital and to traffic including contractual issues with a potential financial impact and the prospect of requiring greater frequency of delivery and therefore having a greater impact on queuing and traffic in the area.

C: A participant stated that trucks were supposed to service the BWH using streets other than Fenwood Road, as a condition of approval for the Servicecenter. Semi's will not be tolerated. The hospital should just write new provisions into its contract and pay the additional money.

A: The curb radii are too narrow for trucks to make the turns from Brookline Avenue to Francis, Binney and Fenwood. The hospital has retained a traffic engineer to look at what might be done to address this. The logistics of delivering goods to the hospital in more and smaller trucks is a bigger issue than the cost of adding more trucks. Mr. Mombourquette asked the community to give him time to complete these evaluations. He recognizes the importance of this issue to the community and would like to report back to the Forum in February on the scope of work for his evaluation.

C: A participant complained about trucks parking at bus stops and handicapped parking spaces and the safety issues these activities pose for pedestrians and school children.

A: Illegal parking activities should be reported to BTD Enforcement (635-4BTD).

C: A participant raised the issue of LMA Forum minutes not recording all the issues raised by the neighborhoods, using turnover parking rates at garages, limited tonnage signage on Fenwood Road, and SPH stackers as examples.

A: Ms. Hamilton said she tries to capture the LMA Forum discussions accurately and invited all participants to communicate with her if they felt there were omissions in the minutes. She has and will continue to amend minutes as these issues are brought up.

Q: A participant asked about the status of MASCO's satellite parking activities including Crosstown and Wentworth.

A: Ms. Hamilton said that there are a total of about 1800 spaces in the inventory, about the size of the Landmark Center parking garage. MASCO's goals are to secure long-term parking leases for that supply because the current leases are very short-term. In that context, MASCO had signed a lease for 750 parking spaces in the Crosstown

Development which would not come on line for another two or three years. In the interim, three hundred spaces had been leased short-term at the Renaissance Center garage, as a way to bridge the need. Reconfiguration of the Wentworth-owned parking lots had been completed over the summer, in accordance with Wentworth's master plan approved by the city and the community.

Q: Is MASCO running shuttle buses to Ruggles? What are the off-site parking rates?

A: Ms. Hamilton said MASCO is running the Ruggles Shuttle, currently using Forsyth Street to Huntington Avenue. MASCO charges between \$150 and \$250/parking space/month for offsite parking. These rates include the costs of shuttle bus services.

Q: Can MASCO map out its off-site parking lots and routes?

A: Ms. Hamilton said that these materials had been presented at previous LMA Forum meetings but that she would be happy to cover these materials again.

C: A participant commented on the sheer density of what goes on in the LMA and asked where it would end and what plan is in place to address the transportation issues?

A: Ms. Hamilton said that MASCO and its members had worked very hard over the last decade to implement a program of continuous access improvements to continue to balance the impacts of new development and higher densities of activity on the neighborhoods. She said it was an iterative process that would continue to be a focus for MASCO and the institutional community.

C: A participant asked about the prospects for regional transportation improvements.

A: Ms. Hamilton noted that MASCO and its members had and would continue to press City and State leaders for prioritization of regional transportation improvements that would benefit the LMA and residential neighborhoods. She invited community members to continue advocating with the institutions for solutions to these regional problems.

Prepared by:

Sarah Hamilton
Director, Area Planning and Development
MASCO INC.
375 Longwood Avenue
Boston, MA 02215-5328
Ph: 617-632-2776
Fx: 617-632-2779
Email: shamilton@masco.harvard.edu