

MassDOT Parcel 25/26 Community Questions and Comments sorted by major theme:

1. Overall Community Process//Selection Criteria//CAC vs. IAG; Disposition Process/Objectives

Question/Concern: What is the community process? What is the disposition process? What are the objectives of MassDOT and the BRA for the development of this site? Community expressed major concerns about the timeline and the import of community involvement. Community also noted the desire to have a Citizen's Advisory Committee. Will there be design visions prior to the selection of a developer?

Response: We appreciate the concern expressed by the community and the desire to have a multistep process with community participation in the planning and selection process.

The great advantage we have this time compared to past solicitations for the site is that we have Veolia, a private company, pooling their property with that of MassDOT. This allows for much better development potential than that of past solicitations. The developer will be able to plan and develop all of Parcel 26, including the Kneeland Street frontage, and will not be required to build around the plant with its impacts on development attractiveness and potential.

Because of the joint offering of public and private parcels and the need to obtain land payments upfront, the offering will be for a sale transaction as opposed to a typical State ground lease. Veolia needs to sell its property and obtain payment up front to cover the cost of building a replacement plant and demolition and cleanup of their existing site. It is not feasible to sell the Veolia parcel and lease the State parcel. Further, the State needs proceeds upfront from the sale to relocate the current MassDOT District 6 headquarters. *With a sale transaction, MassDOT is restricted in its process for offering the property. They will accept bids from responsible developers and are required by statute to select the highest responsible bid.*

Therefore, we see the community involvement in two parts: 1. Helping to inform guidelines that will put potential developers on notice as to community/MassDOT/BRA objectives and expectations. The ITB (Invitation to Bid) process will set guidelines for the site with community input. 2. Once selected, the developer will go through robust Article 80 and PDA processes conducted with a community IAG (Impact Advisory Group), as done with other large projects in the area, *i.e.* Parcel 24.

The 2004 South Bay Planning process contemplated a two-phase process. The first phase was completed in 2004. The second phase was expected to be completed by the selected developer. The selected developer will be required to complete phase two of the planning process. This will be in conjunction with the BRA Article 80 and PDA

processes. As noted above, the guidelines will be instrumental in informing the selected developer of objectives for the site that they will be responsible for addressing in order to successfully complete the Phase II plan and the Article 80 and PDA processes. There will be numerous opportunities for community input during Phase 2 of the South Bay Planning process and the Article 80 and PDA processes, which will be run by the BRA, as well as the MEPA process, which will be run by the Secretary of Environmental Affairs.

2. Public land

Question/Comment: Community member expressed that as public land, this site should remain for public use and benefit.

Response: A major portion of the property is owned by MassDOT, and a significant portion is owned by Veolia. The costs of replacing the Veolia plant, relocating the District 6 Headquarters, and covering the highway ramp on Parcel 25 are very significant costs that must be covered by funds from the sale of the properties. If all MassDOT received at the end of the process was replacement facilities, why go to the enormous effort involved? MassDOT would not be a very good steward of land and resources. Hopefully the result, in addition to economic development, new housing, a better environment and expanded neighborhood, provides new tax revenue to the City and revenue from the sale to the Commonwealth to help support a range of objectives, including funding transportation and affordable housing programs.

3. Past Studies

- Incorporating/understanding ideas
- Parcels 24/25/26

Question/Comment: What past studies have been done? What were the outcomes of past studies? What elements of past studies will be incorporated into the current process?

Response: Since 2004 there have been three studies:

- South Bay Planning Study Phase I (2004)
- Chinatown Master Plan (2010)
- ULI Governors Advisory Panel Report (2012)

Links to these studies are provided here.

These are commendable works and we, the BRA, and future developers do not intend to ignore their results. The key findings of these studies will form the basis for the Phase II study and the Article 80 and PDA processes. However, we must recognize that there were differences between the studies, particularly the 2004 study and the ULI report. We have learned from previous attempts to offer the properties. We are proposing to follow the Parcel 24 lead and continue development along Kneeland Street. The key driver is that we now have Veolia as part of the offering. We have learned that it is not

economically feasible to create an island of development on expensive air rights first. With the development of Parcels 25, 26a & b, and the Veolia property we can provide a link to the neighborhoods and South Station.

The mission statement of the 2004 South Bay Planning Study remains a worthy objective, "South Bay is this generation's opportunity to add to Boston's rich history of creating new land through the artful combination of land and air-right parcels at the crossroads of the region's transportation network. Working with the City of Boston and MassDOT, the communities surrounding South Bay have drawn on the diversity of their people and activities to envision South Bay as a vibrant, new, mixed-use district..." We do not plan to overlook the efforts that have already been put into planning for this site, but we must work within the parameters of the current market, and use what we have learned in the years since the study to understand the economic feasibility of past plans. The past studies will serve as useful jumping off points for this new development effort.

4. Design issues

a. Zoning, height and shadow

Question/Concern: What is the current zoning, including height, setback, and FAR for the site? Will heights and density along Kneeland street be lower, with increasing heights and density as one goes South on the site? Will a shadow study be conducted?

Response: The site includes multiple zoning districts. It is both within the Chinatown District and the South Station EDA (Economic Development Area).

Parcels 25 and 26a are within the Chinatown District's "Chinatown Gateway Special Study Area/Chinatown Gateway PDA Area". A portion of parcel 26a is also zoned OS-RC within the Chinatown District. Parcel 26b is within the South Station EDA's "New Economy Development Area".

Within the Chinatown Gateway Special Study Area, if a proposed project undergoes Article 80/Large Project Review, a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 6.0 and a maximum height of 100 feet are permitted as of right (see Article 43 of the Zoning Code and Table E for a complete listing of allowed, conditional, and forbidden uses). The maximum height and FAR can be increased up to 300 feet and 10.0 if the development is designated an approved PDA.*

**Note: Zoning requires that the South Bay Planning Study, commissioned by the BRA in Fall 2003, must be completed before any PDA can be approved. Phase I of the South Bay Planning Study was completed in September 2004. Proposed projects are expected to conform to the design guidelines resulting from the South Bay Planning Study in place at the time of the Article 80 Submission.*

Within the New Economy Development Area, a proposed project is allowed an as-of-right building height of 300 feet and an as-of-right FAR of 12; and any other Proposed Project shall have an as-of-right building height of 400 feet and FAR of 14 as determined under Section 40-8(2) if a Development Plan for such Proposed Project has been approved pursuant to Section 3-1A.a and Planned Development Area Review.

1C/1G/1N Leather District and South Station EDA, Chinatown, Bay Village Neighborhood Districts

South Station Economic Development Area
 General Area: 300' 12'
 Parcel-to-Parcel Linkage Development Area: 400' 14'
 New Economic Development Area: 300'-400' 12'-14' (See Section 40-7)

Leather District
 Leather District: 80' 60' (See Section 44-5, 68)
 See Article 44.

Chinatown District
 Liberty Tree Protection Area: 60' 60'
 Beacon Square Protection Area: 60' 60'
 Historic Chinatown Protection Area: 60' 60' (See Section 43-6)
 Residential Chinatown Subdistrict: 80' 60' 4/5
 Institutional Subdistrict: 80' 60' 6/8
 Commercial Chinatown Subdistrict: 80' 60' (See Section 43-6)
 Turnpike Air-Rights Special Study Area: 80' 60' 6/7
 Chinatown Gateway Special Study Area: 80' 60' 6/7
 Tyler Street Special Study Area: 80' 25' 6/8
 OS-RC: Recreation Open Space Subdistrict (See Sections 33-10 and 43-10)
 OS-UP: Urban Plaza Open Space Subdistrict (See Sections 33-10 and 43-10)

Bay Village Neighborhood District
 Residential Subdistricts: RH, MFR, MFR/S-2, MFR/S-3, MFR/S-4, MFR/S-5, MFR/S-6, MFR/S-7, MFR/S-8, MFR/S-9, MFR/S-10, MFR/S-11, MFR/S-12, MFR/S-13, MFR/S-14, MFR/S-15, MFR/S-16, MFR/S-17, MFR/S-18, MFR/S-19, MFR/S-20, MFR/S-21, MFR/S-22, MFR/S-23, MFR/S-24, MFR/S-25, MFR/S-26, MFR/S-27, MFR/S-28, MFR/S-29, MFR/S-30, MFR/S-31, MFR/S-32, MFR/S-33, MFR/S-34, MFR/S-35, MFR/S-36, MFR/S-37, MFR/S-38, MFR/S-39, MFR/S-40, MFR/S-41, MFR/S-42, MFR/S-43, MFR/S-44, MFR/S-45, MFR/S-46, MFR/S-47, MFR/S-48, MFR/S-49, MFR/S-50, MFR/S-51, MFR/S-52, MFR/S-53, MFR/S-54, MFR/S-55, MFR/S-56, MFR/S-57, MFR/S-58, MFR/S-59, MFR/S-60, MFR/S-61, MFR/S-62, MFR/S-63, MFR/S-64, MFR/S-65, MFR/S-66, MFR/S-67, MFR/S-68, MFR/S-69, MFR/S-70, MFR/S-71, MFR/S-72, MFR/S-73, MFR/S-74, MFR/S-75, MFR/S-76, MFR/S-77, MFR/S-78, MFR/S-79, MFR/S-80, MFR/S-81, MFR/S-82, MFR/S-83, MFR/S-84, MFR/S-85, MFR/S-86, MFR/S-87, MFR/S-88, MFR/S-89, MFR/S-90, MFR/S-91, MFR/S-92, MFR/S-93, MFR/S-94, MFR/S-95, MFR/S-96, MFR/S-97, MFR/S-98, MFR/S-99, MFR/S-100, MFR/S-101, MFR/S-102, MFR/S-103, MFR/S-104, MFR/S-105, MFR/S-106, MFR/S-107, MFR/S-108, MFR/S-109, MFR/S-110, MFR/S-111, MFR/S-112, MFR/S-113, MFR/S-114, MFR/S-115, MFR/S-116, MFR/S-117, MFR/S-118, MFR/S-119, MFR/S-120, MFR/S-121, MFR/S-122, MFR/S-123, MFR/S-124, MFR/S-125, MFR/S-126, MFR/S-127, MFR/S-128, MFR/S-129, MFR/S-130, MFR/S-131, MFR/S-132, MFR/S-133, MFR/S-134, MFR/S-135, MFR/S-136, MFR/S-137, MFR/S-138, MFR/S-139, MFR/S-140, MFR/S-141, MFR/S-142, MFR/S-143, MFR/S-144, MFR/S-145, MFR/S-146, MFR/S-147, MFR/S-148, MFR/S-149, MFR/S-150, MFR/S-151, MFR/S-152, MFR/S-153, MFR/S-154, MFR/S-155, MFR/S-156, MFR/S-157, MFR/S-158, MFR/S-159, MFR/S-160, MFR/S-161, MFR/S-162, MFR/S-163, MFR/S-164, MFR/S-165, MFR/S-166, MFR/S-167, MFR/S-168, MFR/S-169, MFR/S-170, MFR/S-171, MFR/S-172, MFR/S-173, MFR/S-174, MFR/S-175, MFR/S-176, MFR/S-177, MFR/S-178, MFR/S-179, MFR/S-180, MFR/S-181, MFR/S-182, MFR/S-183, MFR/S-184, MFR/S-185, MFR/S-186, MFR/S-187, MFR/S-188, MFR/S-189, MFR/S-190, MFR/S-191, MFR/S-192, MFR/S-193, MFR/S-194, MFR/S-195, MFR/S-196, MFR/S-197, MFR/S-198, MFR/S-199, MFR/S-200, MFR/S-201, MFR/S-202, MFR/S-203, MFR/S-204, MFR/S-205, MFR/S-206, MFR/S-207, MFR/S-208, MFR/S-209, MFR/S-210, MFR/S-211, MFR/S-212, MFR/S-213, MFR/S-214, MFR/S-215, MFR/S-216, MFR/S-217, MFR/S-218, MFR/S-219, MFR/S-220, MFR/S-221, MFR/S-222, MFR/S-223, MFR/S-224, MFR/S-225, MFR/S-226, MFR/S-227, MFR/S-228, MFR/S-229, MFR/S-230, MFR/S-231, MFR/S-232, MFR/S-233, MFR/S-234, MFR/S-235, MFR/S-236, MFR/S-237, MFR/S-238, MFR/S-239, MFR/S-240, MFR/S-241, MFR/S-242, MFR/S-243, MFR/S-244, MFR/S-245, MFR/S-246, MFR/S-247, MFR/S-248, MFR/S-249, MFR/S-250, MFR/S-251, MFR/S-252, MFR/S-253, MFR/S-254, MFR/S-255, MFR/S-256, MFR/S-257, MFR/S-258, MFR/S-259, MFR/S-260, MFR/S-261, MFR/S-262, MFR/S-263, MFR/S-264, MFR/S-265, MFR/S-266, MFR/S-267, MFR/S-268, MFR/S-269, MFR/S-270, MFR/S-271, MFR/S-272, MFR/S-273, MFR/S-274, MFR/S-275, MFR/S-276, MFR/S-277, MFR/S-278, MFR/S-279, MFR/S-280, MFR/S-281, MFR/S-282, MFR/S-283, MFR/S-284, MFR/S-285, MFR/S-286, MFR/S-287, MFR/S-288, MFR/S-289, MFR/S-290, MFR/S-291, MFR/S-292, MFR/S-293, MFR/S-294, MFR/S-295, MFR/S-296, MFR/S-297, MFR/S-298, MFR/S-299, MFR/S-300, MFR/S-301, MFR/S-302, MFR/S-303, MFR/S-304, MFR/S-305, MFR/S-306, MFR/S-307, MFR/S-308, MFR/S-309, MFR/S-310, MFR/S-311, MFR/S-312, MFR/S-313, MFR/S-314, MFR/S-315, MFR/S-316, MFR/S-317, MFR/S-318, MFR/S-319, MFR/S-320, MFR/S-321, MFR/S-322, MFR/S-323, MFR/S-324, MFR/S-325, MFR/S-326, MFR/S-327, MFR/S-328, MFR/S-329, MFR/S-330, MFR/S-331, MFR/S-332, MFR/S-333, MFR/S-334, MFR/S-335, MFR/S-336, MFR/S-337, MFR/S-338, MFR/S-339, MFR/S-340, MFR/S-341, MFR/S-342, MFR/S-343, MFR/S-344, MFR/S-345, MFR/S-346, MFR/S-347, MFR/S-348, MFR/S-349, MFR/S-350, MFR/S-351, MFR/S-352, MFR/S-353, MFR/S-354, MFR/S-355, MFR/S-356, MFR/S-357, MFR/S-358, MFR/S-359, MFR/S-360, MFR/S-361, MFR/S-362, MFR/S-363, MFR/S-364, MFR/S-365, MFR/S-366, MFR/S-367, MFR/S-368, MFR/S-369, MFR/S-370, MFR/S-371, MFR/S-372, MFR/S-373, MFR/S-374, MFR/S-375, MFR/S-376, MFR/S-377, MFR/S-378, MFR/S-379, MFR/S-380, MFR/S-381, MFR/S-382, MFR/S-383, MFR/S-384, MFR/S-385, MFR/S-386, MFR/S-387, MFR/S-388, MFR/S-389, MFR/S-390, MFR/S-391, MFR/S-392, MFR/S-393, MFR/S-394, MFR/S-395, MFR/S-396, MFR/S-397, MFR/S-398, MFR/S-399, MFR/S-400, MFR/S-401, MFR/S-402, MFR/S-403, MFR/S-404, MFR/S-405, MFR/S-406, MFR/S-407, MFR/S-408, MFR/S-409, MFR/S-410, MFR/S-411, MFR/S-412, MFR/S-413, MFR/S-414, MFR/S-415, MFR/S-416, MFR/S-417, MFR/S-418, MFR/S-419, MFR/S-420, MFR/S-421, MFR/S-422, MFR/S-423, MFR/S-424, MFR/S-425, MFR/S-426, MFR/S-427, MFR/S-428, MFR/S-429, MFR/S-430, MFR/S-431, MFR/S-432, MFR/S-433, MFR/S-434, MFR/S-435, MFR/S-436, MFR/S-437, MFR/S-438, MFR/S-439, MFR/S-440, MFR/S-441, MFR/S-442, MFR/S-443, MFR/S-444, MFR/S-445, MFR/S-446, MFR/S-447, MFR/S-448, MFR/S-449, MFR/S-450, MFR/S-451,

Question/Concern: What public realm elements are being considered for the site and neighborhood? Concerns have been expressed regarding: traffic, sidewalks, homeless presence, and cultural experience.

Response: There will be guideline objectives as part of the ITB so that potential developers understand what will be expected of them as they complete the South Bay Planning Study Phase 2 and the Article 80 and PDA processes. As part of the guideline objectives the South Bay Planning Study Phase I community vision will be included: “establish a vibrant new mixed-use district”. In addition, specific goals of the Phase I study will be restated, for example:

- Create a dramatic gateway to city from the south
- Form attractive and diverse new residential neighborhood
- Provide a framework for public realm that can expand over time to integrate with development of adjacent areas
- Create significant new open space for district and adjacent communities

c. Character/iconic

Question/Concern: Community would like the design of the site to have an iconic character. They do not want to recreate the “blandness” of the Seaport.

Response: Design guidelines will help set expectations for high quality design and strong architectural identity for the development. Furthermore, any future development will work closely with BRA Design Review during the Article 80 and PDA processes to ensure that development on this site acknowledges its unique and highly visible position as the southern gateway to the city.

5. Air quality/pollution

Question/Concern: Air quality and pollution are of major concern to the community. What will be done to ensure the development mitigates these issues to the benefit and health safety of neighbors and users of Reggie Wong Park?

Response: MassDOT appreciates the concerns regarding air pollution and are assisting the Tufts professor studying the area to install air monitors at the tunnel and park. Air quality and air pollution will be considered as part of the MEPA and BRA/city Article 80 review.

6. Construction mitigation/management

Question/Concern: What construction mitigation and management policies will be required of the selected developer? Can funds be used for benefits to the district, such as Lincoln Plaza improvements? What will be the process and impacts of demolition and construction?

Response: All major projects are required to file and implement a construction management plan that will limit daily hours of operation during construction, truck routes, project staging, etc. to limit disruption of neighbors. Detailed construction

management plans will be signed between the developer and the Boston Transportation Department.

7. Open Space/Streetscape

Question/Concern: Will there be significant public open space on terra firma to support large trees? There should be a rich streetscape and pedestrian-scale development on street fronts. We should ensure adequate pedestrian access and engagement to the site. There should be new open space, particularly along Kneeland Street. We should consider children and families, and include a small playground.

Response: We will be including Guideline objectives as part of the ITB so that potential developers understand what will be expected of them as they complete the Phase 2 study and the Article 80 and PDA processes. It is important that the new development feel like part of the adjoining neighborhoods and walkable with active uses such as retail, restaurants and possibly activated open spaces along Kneeland Street and connecting to the interior of the site.

8. Reggie Wong Park

Question/Concern: What will happen with Reggie Wong Park? The Community has expressed an interest in retaining its function and expanding its capacity and programming, if possible.

Response: The bid package will require either the retention or acceptable relocation of the park on site.

9. Traffic and parking/pedestrian and bicycle access / Connectivity to other areas

Question/Comment: How will traffic and access (vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle) be addressed? Connectivity to other Boston neighborhoods and to future development on the ramp parcels should be considered. Will the South Station Connector road be incorporated and be actively used for the site? Will there be planning to think about connections to the southern parcels beyond what a developer can be responsible for?

Response: These issues will be explored as part of the South Bay Planning Study Phase II study and Article 80 and PDA processes.

10. Economic Development

Question/Comment: How will this project promote economic development? There should be ambitious local hiring goals for the development. Workforce development with enforceable goals for jobs and small businesses should be a requirement.

Response: The selected developer will be required to undertake Phase II of the planning process in order to establish a PDA for the site. This process outlines the types of economic development goals mentioned above.

As part of the South Bay Planning Study Phase I report, these goals were outlined:

- Enhance Boston's place in the regional economy
- Contribute to prosperity of Chinatown and Leather District
- Promote stability of Chinatown as a social, cultural and economic hub for city and region's Asian community
- Provide new job opportunities for city residents, particularly adjacent neighborhoods

11. Affordable housing

Question/Comment: How much of any new housing development (what percentage) will be affordable and to what percentage of AMI? Community has expressed a desire to require more than the minimum percentage of affordable units, and has noted a need for middle-income housing options. What will be the requirement for the inclusion of middle class housing? What is the percentage or total number of affordable units that will be required, and what is the mix of income level?

Response: MassDOT recognizes the objective of a mixed use development that is compatible with the two adjoining neighborhoods of which it is part. Parcel 24 was the first of the three parcels along Kneeland Street to be developed. MassDOT was willing to lease the parcel at a significantly reduced price so that the joint venture of a community-based developer and a for-profit developer could deliver 40% affordability.

For the South Bay Kneeland Street Parcel 25 and 26, MassDOT and the City understand that meeting a 40% affordability level would be challenge given site conditions and other requirements of sale. The Invitation to Bid (ITB) Guidelines, to be reviewed by the community prior to issuance, will include specific percentage ranges anticipated for affordable units and Area Median Income levels. It will also be stated in the ITB guidelines that any development in the city of this scale is anticipated to exceed the City of Boston's Inclusionary Development Policy (IDP) requirement of 13%. A higher percentage will be outlined in the ITB guidelines. The final percentage of housing affordability will be determined with the community, State and City agencies, as well as the developer as part of the Article 80 and PDA processes.

12. 185 Kneeland

Question/Comment: What will happen with 185 Kneeland building and staff?

Response: It is likely that the District 6 headquarters and all employees located in 185 Kneeland will be relocated. At this stage in the process we don't know where the headquarters will be located. A needs assessment is being conducted currently to identify potential options.

The developer may choose to keep building initially and remove it in a later phase. The expectation is that employees will be moved eventually. Any relocation will have to be within District 6. We expect maintenance, engineering, construction employees will stay together, with the possibility of other departments being located separately. No definitive determination has yet been made.

We wanted to be clear that the 185 Kneeland building site and its parking field are intended to be part of the offering and an alternative location within District 6 will be found for the functions in the building.

13. Miscellaneous factual clarifications

Question: Do we already know who the developer will be?

Response: There is no developer currently. Any reference to a "developer" is to a potential future developer to be selected by competitive bid response to the ITB.

Question: How does federal highway interact with this process? What are central artery commitments to this project?

Response: The Federal Highway Administration would have to review and approve any project that spans the highway. For this site, the key central artery commitment is to cover ramp on Parcel 25, which would be required of any developer who comes in. Specific plans for ramp access will be addressed with potential developer.

Question: In the current ITB structure, who is owner's advisor from urban design perspective?

Response: Stantec has been retained as the owner's advisor.

Question: Has there been any thought of city buying land and putting another school on this parcel?

Response: There were discussions about locating a school on this site a while back. It was determined that it would be a very expensive project to build over the ramp parcels. The Massachusetts School Building Authority was not supportive of a project on this parcel and were asked to go back out and look for other parcels. This was done 2014.

Question: Will Parcel 26c be included in the offering?

Response: Parcel 26c will not be included in the offering. Covering the Tunnel would require either an easement or a lease with approval from the Federal Highway Administration. We believe this will complicate the offering given that the rest of the property will be on a Fee Simple basis. Also the very great cost of building over the tunnel, limits potential for Parcel 26c.