

**Harvard Allston Task Force**  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, January 8, 2006  
Honan-Allston Library  
6:30 p.m.

**I. Attendance:**

**Harvard Allston Task Force**

Paul Berkeley  
John Cusack  
Rita DiGesse  
Mike Hanlon  
Millie Hollum McLaughlin  
Bruce Houghton  
Harry Mattison  
Ray Mellone  
Brent Whelan

**Harvard University**

Harris Band  
Kevin McCluskey  
Dan Rabinovitz  
Alison Reinhardt  
Maile Takahashi

**City of Boston**

Gerald Autler, Boston Redevelopment Authority  
Linda Kowalcky, Boston Redevelopment Authority

The meeting started at 6:40 p.m.

Gerald Autler, Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), introduced himself. He said his goal for the meeting was to set agenda items for the year ahead. He said that he wanted to use the next Task Force meeting on Wednesday, January 24<sup>th</sup> as a workshop to look at Harvard's Institutional Master Plan in a holistic way. Gerald reviewed the current status of Harvard's filings.

On December 15<sup>th</sup> Harvard filed two documents with the City.

1). Institutional Master Plan (IMP) Amendment to amend Harvard's existing IMP. It is in response to the Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMP NF) submitted in April 2006 and the Scoping Determination issued by the Boston Redevelopment Authority to Harvard in June 2006. The BRA allowed Harvard to submit an amendment to its existing IMP to allow Harvard to begin the review process for some of its early stage projects under the condition that the BRA would not approve the IMP Amendment until Harvard submitted a larger, planning framework. A number of copies of the filing have been distributed to some neighbors and are available online on the BRA and Harvard's web sites.

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

2). Project Notification Form (PNF) for Harvard University Art Museums Art Center- This filing kicks off the review process for the proposed art center on Western Avenue at Barry's corner (224 Western Avenue).

The BRA will accept comments on both of these documents until February 16, 2007.

In October Harvard filed the Project Notification Form (PNF) for a science complex on Western Avenue. There was a public comment period and a public meeting to find out more about the project. The BRA hopes to issue the scoping determination to Harvard soon. Harvard will use the questions and information from the scoping determination to provide further analysis in a draft project impact report to be filed with the City in 2007.

Gerald acknowledged that it can be a very confusing, frustrating process especially since to date a lot of the information for Harvard's plans has come through different filings. Gerald explained that typically the review process works very well for individual projects but because Harvard is developing a broader, long-term plan while at the same time moving some projects forward, the process is a little more complicated. He hopes to run the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> as a workshop to look at Harvard's plans as a whole and in a more comprehensive way. To advertise for the public meeting, Gerald is going to distribute the flyer to all the Task Force members and individuals on his distribution list, place an advertisement in the Allston-Brighton tab, post it in local businesses, translate it into three different languages and ask Harvard to do a targeted mailing to North Allston residents.

Gerald said that he anticipates that Harvard is going to file an Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPINF) for a new IMP this week. This will provide a big-picture overview for Harvard's development plans in Allston and will hopefully, connect some of the individual projects to a larger plan and start to answer some questions.

Audience Member: Will someone from Harvard be at the public meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>?

Gerald said yes, he anticipates Harvard to play an integral role at the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>. He is hoping to use the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> to look at all the documents as a whole rather than one at a time.

The BRA asked Harvard to extend the comment period for the IMP Amendment and Art Center PNF to February 16<sup>th</sup> so that the community would have a month to review the new IMPINF before the end of the comment period. Gerald said that he has asked Harvard to put together a summary of all of the filings and hopes that they will bring it to the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>. He hopes that the summary will allow the community to get a sense of the bigger picture without having to read every document that Harvard has filed. At the workshop on the 24<sup>th</sup> Gerald doesn't want to just focus on one building or one particular document, he wants to put all the information on the table that Harvard has provided and analyze it as a whole and collect feedback on everything. He hopes this will be a lot easier because at that point the community will have much more information than it has had up until now.

Audience Member: For clarification, none of the projects will move forward until the new IMPINF has been submitted and the BRA has seen all of the community's comments, including comments on the new IMPINF?

Gerald Autler: The BRA said that Harvard needed to submit a planning framework that had enough information to provide a more comprehensive look at Harvard's development plan. We're hoping that the new IMPINF will provide sufficient information to accomplish this. The public comment period for the IMP Amendment and Art Center PNF is until February 16<sup>th</sup> and additionally there is a comment period on the new IMPINF once Harvard files that. At the end of February, the BRA hopes to issue a scoping

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

determination on the Art Center PNF. While the process can't be completely fluid because there are mandatory time frames that the BRA and Harvard have to work within, February 16<sup>th</sup> is not the last opportunity for the community to provide their input.

Audience Member: Most community members haven't seen the Art Center PNF or the IMP Amendment. How are we supposed to comment on them by February 16<sup>th</sup>? When were the documents sent to the community and are they only in English?

Gerald Autler: We have hard copies available tonight for anyone who wants one. We've also made copies available at the library. We don't do a mass mailing of the documents but we also put it on the BRA's and Harvard's web sites. They are in English only because it is a legal, regulatory filing.

Audience Member: That gives us 5 weeks to provide comments on the Institutional Master Plan Amendment, Museum PNF and new IMPNF, plus attend a public workshop. I think these are extraordinary conditions to digest all of this information. Can we get more time?

Gerald Autler: I don't have control over the length of the comment period. I understand your desire to fully digest all of the information. I'm hoping that Harvard will provide a summary at the workshop on the 24<sup>th</sup> so that you don't have to read every document. After the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> we can talk about an extension if needed.

Harry Mattison: What is the length of the IMPNF that Harvard is going to be filing this week?

Harris Band: The IMPNF is a technical document which has certain topics which are required to be addressed by the City. We will also be providing an executive summary of the Master Plan as a supporting document that is about 75 pages. This document is meant to be more readable than the technical, regulatory language as required in the IMPNF. It should present a good over of the various physical systems planned for Harvard's development in Allston.

Audience Member: I want Harvard to be successful, but we can't just read the big print. It's the little print that we need to read carefully. Harvard just sent us copies of these two documents today. I would like to follow up on Tim's request and ask that the comment period be extended to March 15<sup>th</sup>.

Gerald Autler: We're committed to do whatever we need to do to get the community the information it needs in a way that's a lot less burdensome to absorb. I'm hoping that the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> can be a start at looking at all the information together without worrying about what information is one filing verse another filing. Harvard still has to file draft project impact reports for both of those projects so it doesn't mean that the review process ends on February 16<sup>th</sup>.

Brent Whelan: For the first comment period for the science project, the BRA received many comments. Is the developer obligated to respond to each of these comments in a certain form? How is it handled if there is a vast disagreement between the community and Harvard?

Gerald Autler: We're hoping to issue the scoping determination to Harvard soon. It's up to Harvard how it reviews and responds to the comments. I'm hoping to work with the community in regards to how we should structure the meetings to work through Harvard's plans such as identifying key discussions that need to happen and focusing on key categories.

Brent Whelan: So the scoping determination leads to conversations and negotiations between Harvard and the community?

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

Gerald Autler: Exactly, that's what the process is all about.

Harry Mattison: I found it difficult to go through the scoping determination for the IMP Amendment and pair up the information in the scoping determination to the written comments that were submitted. Can the BRA change the format of the scoping determination, so that for example if there are 15 requirements it is clear what comments it corresponds to?

Gerald Autler: I can't always match up the information in the scoping determination to a particular issue in the filing. If there are particular things you are thinking of you can flag them and bring them to my attention.

Harry Mattison: (Cited an example from the scoping determination). I think you should be able to track and trace the requirements and comments. It should be clear what the BRA is requiring and how Harvard is responding. Maybe there is some way you can number it or code it.

Gerald Autler: The preamble in the scoping determination should make it much clearer.

Harry Mattison: It's my understanding that the new Master Plan that is being filed is going to evolve over the next year. I'm concerned that the IMP Amendment is going to get approved now that the new IMPNF will be filed even though the IMPNF will continue to change. We're relying on an evolving document to approve the amendment and the proposed projects. This seems problematic.

Gerald Autler: The BRA agreed that Harvard could begin to amend its Intuition Master Plan as long as they filed a new IMPNF presenting a long-term framework for its development. We expect that the key framework will be proposed and the transportation, parking and open space networks will be developed enough so that even though the program for the master plan may evolve the framework will stay relatively stable.

Harry Mattison: If key concepts evolve away it feels like we're approving the amendment under a false context. Will the evolution of the new master plan be of the same magnitude that we've seen the amendment evolve in the past year? The basic parameters in the IMPNF for the amendment have changed. There's no guarantee that the new master plan is not going to evolve significantly.

Gerald Autler: This is a conversation we can have once we have the new IMPNF in front of us. Without seeing that yet we're just talking abstractly.

Brent Whelan: We're not talking abstractly. One of the projects that was in the amendment is now happening. Something that we might think is reasonable in the IMPNF could be a completely different project a year from now.

Gerald Autler: These are all valid questions. When we have all the information from Harvard's IMPNF filing we can look at all the information together.

Audience Member: Weren't you the BRA representative on the Northeastern project that resulted in the proposed dorm being moved to another location. Weren't you also the BRA representative on the Suffolk project that the Mayor withdrew his support for? Can this community expect a similar outcome with Harvard's projects? If there is a large amount of community opposition can we expect the same outcome from the BRA?

Gerald Autler: Comparing those projects to Harvard's projects is like comparing apples to oranges. I'm not going to try and predict the outcome. Our goal is to move things forward and not to reach a stalemate

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

between the University and the community. The City and the BRA pay attention to the community's sentiment. To this date we have not seen evidence of that level of opposition. All of the community's concerns have been valid. The tone has been very different.

Gerald turned the meeting over to Kevin McCluskey of Harvard University.

Kevin gave an update on the properties that the University has acquired over the last 6 months to a year. Kevin said that he would provide a formal list of these properties to the Task Force and that Harvard wants to inform the community of its purchases on a regular basis. Harvard now purchases all of its properties under its name since it voluntarily disclosed its Allston purchases in the late 90s. Kevin announced the following property acquisitions:

- December 2006- 176 Lincoln St.
- December 2006- 269-271 Western Ave./7 Speedway Ave
- August 2006- 445-447 Western Ave.
- March 2006- 277-279 & 283 Western Ave.
- January 2006- 210 N. Harvard St.
- February 2006- 501-507 Western Ave.

Audience Member: Is Harvard exempt from paying taxes on all of these properties?

Kevin McCluskey: No, none of these are being converted to non-taxable status unless Harvard files a petition. As you may be aware, Harvard contributes PILOT payments, or Payments In Lieu of Taxes, to the City of Boston. The payment amount is determined through conversations between the University, Mayor and elected officials and we anticipate having a conversation with them and continuing our strong program of PILOT payments.

Audience Member: What do you consider "institutional use"? Why would the University need the properties on Holten Street for institutional use?

Kevin McCluskey: We were approached by the owners. The rest of the properties on that parcel are zoned for industrial uses. Please also consider our purchase of residential properties in the context of Harvard using it to provide community housing or housing for graduate students to take pressure of the community.

Audience member: As part of the PILOT program, the University should make a gesture to the community and open all of its libraries to community members. Other institutions in the area do this.

Kevin McCluskey: I'm not familiar with the policies of other institutions, but that is a good idea to bring up during the community benefits discussion.

Audience Member: Can Harvard disclose all of the properties that it has an option to purchase on?

Kevin McCluskey: The procedure that the University follows is that when it makes a purchase it notifies the City and the community. The University can't always give advanced notice.

[Audience Member: Can you address the rumor that the University has an option to purchase two residences on Seattle Street?](#)

[Dan Rabinovitz: This is not something that I am aware of.](#)

Kevin McCluskey: That is why it is helpful to have these sessions so that the community can ask questions and the University can address any rumors.

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

Harry Mattison: What is the entity name being used on the deeds?

Dan Rabinovitz: Harry, I know in the past you have expressed a concern over how current the assessing department's web site is. I wanted to let you know that it is in the process of being revised and corrected. The name the properties are purchased under is The Presidents and Fellows of Harvard College and Harvard Real Estate Services. Harvard University is working with the assessing department to make sure that their website reflects this.

Harry Mattison: Is there a target date for that to be completed?

Dan Rabinovitz: I don't know, but I'll let you know when it is completed.

Rita DiGesse: Does Harvard have any plans for the vacated houses that it owns?

Dan Rabinovitz: Harvard Real Estate Services is looking at the condition of these properties now.

Paul Berkeley: These are all properties that are west of Everett Street.

Audience Member: Are you paying full taxes on all the properties that the University is purchasing. The assessing department told me Harvard only pays a percentage.

Kevin McCluskey: If the property was on the tax roll when Harvard purchased it then Harvard is paying the full taxes.

Gerald Autler: Just because a property is owned by an Institution doesn't mean that property is tax-exempt. [If a property has an institutional use then it can apply for tax-exempt status.](#)

Kevin McCluskey: The accessing department may have misled or given you incorrect information. Harvard pays full taxes on the properties that it owns that are taxable.

Audience Member: In terms of community benefits, can we talk about the CC&F building. When that building was originally purchased there were commitments made to improve Everett Street such as removing the billboard. Now that it is owned by Harvard I would think Harvard would want to be a good neighbor and remove the billboard. Did Harvard also acquire the obligations that were made to the community when it purchased the building? I thought it was going to be a fiber optics center.

Kevin McCluskey: It is clear that the fiber optics use didn't get any takers. Harvard would like to demonstrate to the community that it is a good neighbor. This is a good issue to fold into the conversation about community benefits.

Millie Hollum McLaughlin: How much more land is Harvard going to buy? At what point is Harvard going to stop aggressively purchasing land or is it going to go on forever?

Kevin McCluskey: That's a fair question and I don't have a snap answer. At the beginning of the process, the development of the master plan was a very long road for the University planners and the purchases were considered within that process- with a potential for the university to grow 20 to 50 to 100 years from now.

Millie Hollum McLaughlin: The community deserves more information as to what Harvard's plans are.

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

Harry Mattison: What is Harvard's budget for property acquisitions? Harvard spent at least 20 million dollars in acquisitions last year. What is the acquisition budget for this year?

Brent Whelan: Is that fair information that the Task Force can be told.

Kevin McCluskey: I don't know what the budget is. In the same respect that you can't expect a private entity to provide its budget information you can't expect Harvard to provide that information. It's not at all likely that the University will provide this information. I don't know the figure, and even if I did, it's not something the University would likely disclose. I understand Millie's question and I will certainly echo that question back to the University.

Harry Mattison: It would be good if you could help us understand why the University wouldn't provide this information. Can the University provide a range? Why is the university unwilling to give a range?

Kevin McCluskey: Private institutions, just like private citizens, have a right to consider the purchase of private property and follow through on that right.

Harry Mattison: I'm not questioning the constitutional right to do this. I'm just trying to understand the scope of the University's acquisitions. Is it possible for someone from the finance department to come and speak at a Task Force meeting?

Audience Member: If Harvard wants us to give up things, then the University also has to give up things.

Kevin McCluskey: We are in the process of making development plans available. Harvard is working within the required city process. We've collaborated with the community in the North Allston Neighborhood Strategic Planning Process. The architects for the two projects have come to some of the task force meetings and presented some design goals. Harvard is looking forward to continuing to work with the community. At the same time, it is also a private institution.

Audience Member: I understand Harvard's point. For example, if you were going to buy a house, you wouldn't go and tell the seller how much money you had, that's just ridiculous.

Harry Mattison: I'm not asking for specific transaction information. I'm just trying to understand the general magnitude of Harvard's acquisitions. Are we approaching the end? Is it just the beginning?

Kevin McCluskey: I understand and I've clearly heard what you've said. I'm just being honest with you about my response. I'll bring the question back to the University.

Audience Member: You are asking us to agree to a building and we are asking to see the bigger plan. Is this it? The City shouldn't agree to anything until the University is ready to give an answer.

Audience Member: The proposed art building is going to combine uses from the three museums in Cambridge? Has Harvard begun discussions with the people of Cambridge? What is the purpose of an art facility in Allston? Is it going to be a permanent museum? I don't want Allston to be the back-office uses for Cambridge. Is it going to be a real museum?

Kevin McCluskey: Yes, it will be a real, permanent museum. I'm sorry that you may have missed the last meeting but Tom Lentz, Director of Harvard University Art Museums, presented the plans for the art center.

Gerald Autler: These are the kinds of things that we'll talk about in more detail at the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

Bruce Houghton: What you're hearing and feeling are the stresses being put on the community. Where you've purchased land it's in areas that the University doesn't have plans for the next 10-20 years. Harvard should give the community a break on its land acquisitions. The University should step back and think about what is a reasonable level of stress that can be put on the community. The community needs time to absorb these changes.

Audience Member: At the last meeting Harvard said that for the next 50 years it won't develop anything west of North Harvard Street. If this is true, why is Harvard continuing to buy land west of North Harvard Street?

Kevin McCluskey: The Institutional Master Plan filing goes from North Harvard Street at Barry's corner to the river with the inclusion of a permanent art museum at Barry's Corner.

Bruce Houghton: Can you take back to Harvard a request that the community would like the University to put a moratorium on purchasing land.

Kevin McCluskey: I will go back to the University and emphasize all the comments we have heard tonight.

Bruce Houghton: Does that mean you're not going to respond?

Kevin McCluskey: I will absolutely come back with a response on behalf of the University.

Audience Member: Harvard has taken over my mall at Brighton Mills. The community needs more stores.

Kevin McCluskey: We are working on an aggressive plan to rent some of our properties. As you may know, K-Mart is slated for a potential site for the Charleview complex.

Maile Takahashi, Harvard University, introduced herself to give the monthly interim use update. Physical improvements to some of Harvard's properties in Allston include:

- Removal of fence at Algonquin/Bickford's/NEDL (repaired)
- Painted flagpole (1284 Western Ave), painted peeled areas (355 Western Ave)
- Window covering of empty storefronts (KMART)
- Verizon fence - painted
- Investigating and traps set for rats at Brighton Mills (on-going)
- Improvements to CCF properties - clean up site, cut down 6 foot high weeds, remove signs and graffiti, organize construction material.

The University is in leasing discussions for the following properties and hopes to lease the buildings in the near future:

- Citizens Bank building
- 9 Travis Street
- 100 Holton Street

Maile also presented an overview of Harvard's Master Plan and early projects process and timeline.

- Harvard has had several submissions to date for projects and hopes to submit the IMPNF for the new Master Plan this week.
- Harvard recognizes that it can be confusing to know what to comment on, and how all the filings fit together.

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

- The plan is to share with the City and neighborhood Harvard's intentions for the next 20 years with some context for even beyond that. This is unique to the BRA IMP process which has typically focused on 5 year time horizons.
- Harvard anticipates that this is going to result in a year plus process of review with the City and neighborhood.
- Once that's approved, all projects would still be required to go through a Large Project Review with the City and neighborhood.
- As a result, over a year ago Harvard identified two urgent projects that it would like to be in construction this summer. But in order to do that, Harvard needed to have a completely new Institutional Master Plan or it needed to amend its existing IMP. Given the timing, Harvard opted to amend its existing IMP and go through Large Project Review.
- Given the pressures on Harvard to retain scientists, to provide opportunities for critical research and to protect its art collection Harvard felt it needed to move forward. However, Harvard agreed with the BRA and the neighborhood that in order to do this, it should not be given approval until it submitted the PNF for the Master Plan with sufficient detail for the City and neighborhood to understand how the two projects fit into the master plan.

Maile also went over the anticipated timeline:

- Back in April 2006, Harvard submitted the PNF to amend its existing IMP. There was a public comment period and on Dec. 15<sup>th</sup> Harvard submitted, the actual IMP Amendment to the BRA and Task Force. This Amendment supports two projects.
- The BRA requires that projects over a certain size need to go through a large project review. So Harvard submitted a PNF for the science project in October 2006. This is the project that most of been presented several times by Stefan Behnisch at the Task Force meetings already and will be presented again in the future as the design continues to evolve.
- Gerald is finalizing the document, called the scoping determination that outlines all of the concerns raised during the comment period. Harvard is hoping to submit the Draft Impact Report – the report that responds to the scoping determination in February or March 2007.
- Ideally, Harvard would like to start foundation work for the science complex possibly in June 2007
- The 2<sup>nd</sup> project is the museum project. Harvard had originally proposed to put a temporary museum project into the Citizens Bank building. During the feasibility study, it was decided that it made more sense to build a permanent museum at the Verizon site, it was better for the museum and created an opportunity to bring a significant art building to Allston sooner than the University had hoped would be possible. Harvard submitted the PNF on Dec. 15 2006 and the comment period runs through February 15<sup>th</sup>.
- Ideally, this project would start as early as August or September 2007.
- Harvard has been working on a Master Plan for the next 20 years of development. The Master Plan focuses on major systems like transportation, open space, infrastructure (like water, sewer, and electricity).
- Hopefully the MP will provide some broader context for the amendment and the two projects that the community is currently reviewing.
- Once the Master Plan is submitted, Harvard would like to work with the community and the BRA to look at the whole Master Plan and discuss how the projects fit within it.

Audience Member: Where it says foundation work, does that mean demolition or construction?

Maile Takahashi: Construction. [Demolition would likely happen 3-4 weeks before.](#)

Audience Member: What is DPIR?

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

Maile Takahashi: DPIR stands for Draft Project Impact Report. It provides further analysis regarding the proposed project in response to the scoping determination.

Audience member: Do you need a building permit to take down buildings?

Maile Takahashi: No.

Harry Mattison: Do you need any permits?

Maile Takahashi: Yes, you have to work with the Landmarks Commission for buildings that are more than 50 years old.

Audience Member: When do you expect the MEPA process to begin?

Maile Takahashi: We have been talking to MEPA. We anticipate filing the MEPA document in January/February. These are public documents that will be available.

Audience Member: Is the proposed museum building the same museum building that got rejected in Cambridge?

Maile Takahashi: No. Since that time, there is a new director of the Harvard University Art Museums. This museum has different program elements too, such as a study center where you can actually check out art. It's a different program, different architect and of a different magnitude.

Audience Member: Why can't you build the art museum on the other side of Western Avenue?

Maile Takahashi: At our next meeting we can discuss this further but when we file the new IMPNF you will see that the other proposed uses we have for the land Harvard owns are mostly institutional. We thought the location of the art museum at Barry's corner would be a good public interface and keep the more academic/institutional uses further away from the neighborhood.

Ray Mellone: Are the internal Task Forces at Harvard still working on their vision? How will their vision be implemented in the new Master Plan?

Maile Takahashi: All of the ideas for the Harvard Task Force reports have been incorporated into the Master Plan.

Harris Band: The Task Forces established a "test program" which is what is been proposed in the master plan.

Ray Mellone: What I liked about the Task Force reports is that they presented a mission statement and laid out a vision and the importance of the overall goals. When President Summers was there I thought this was a practical way of doing things. It demonstrated why Harvard needed the land and it was good to understand that vision.

Harris Band: Now, we're working with programming Task Forces that are more school by school. Harvard's vision and where the University is headed is discussed in the Master Plan executive summary.

Millie Hollum McLaughlin: I thought once the Master Plan was filed it would be more of a fluid process. This still looks like the comment periods are mixed in with everything else.

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

Maile Takahashi: There are “official” comment periods but we’ll continue to discuss the projects and the whole master plan over the next 6 months to a year.

Maile presented a list for possible future public meeting topics such as, construction mitigation, transportation, open space, utilities and project specific design. She suggested that additional subsets of the Task Force may meet on topics as needed as was done with open space and interim land use plans.

Audience Member: Community benefits should be a topic. Is Harvard going to propose any more projects over the next year? How many projects will the new IMPNF have in it?

Maile Takahashi: We don’t have any additional projects slated for the next year.

Harris Band: The IMPNF we are going to file soon is different from the typical IMPNF. It used to be that an Institutional Master Plan was used to identify specific projects that the Institution was going to be pursuing. We are in a unique situation because Harvard wanted to provide the neighborhood with a plan for Harvard’s 20 year vision within a 50 year framework so it is a very broad vision. In answer to your question, the IMPNF will not propose any specific projects. The IMPNF is a very big long-term vision within which specific projects will emerge. It’s a framework plan that is intended to provide as much information as possible for a 20 year vision. As specific projects arise, they’ll each have to be reviewed separately.

Ray Mellone: There are certain projects, such as the Stadium Way realignment, that I don’t think can wait to be carried out after a 10 year program.

Harris Band: I agree. I was using the word “project” in the way that the BRA uses the word “project” to mean a building. There will certainly be other projects like infrastructure that will need to start. The IMPNF will have suggested densities and height parameters but it isn’t so specific for building projects. For a 20-year plan you try to put as much predictability into it as possible but it still has to be flexible.

Audience Member: What about the buildings that have non-institutional uses that Harvard owns. Will they be in the plan? Is the process for review driven by the BRA?

Gerald Autler: Yes. The goal is to integrate both review and planning processes as much as possible.

Maile Takahashi: This is another topic that should be discussed this year. We are going to be starting another planning process for this whole area.

Paul Berkeley: You’re submitting a 20/50 year plan without any projects. That makes me nervous about the predictability of the document. It sounds like its going to be very conceptual. It sounds like we could have another situation like One Western Avenue. I thought we were going to try and avoid having projects come at the neighborhood one at a time.

Harris Band: You will be surprised at how detailed the document is. Given the history and magnitude of the project we thought the neighborhood wanted to see a long-term vision. We’re open to ideas for how to process different building requests.

Paul Berkeley: Maybe Harvard should have a 5-year development plan within the 20 year plan.

Audience Member: Why did Harvard have to make a special case and amend the document first?

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

Harris Band: We didn't have a master plan in place in the areas we wanted to pursue the science building and the arts center. We knew these were two projects the University wanted to accelerate. The stem cell building for its imperativeness to human health and research discoveries and the art center because the Fogg renovations are long overdue and the art needs to be protected.

Audience Member: I can understand why the University would want to do the science building fast but not the art building.

Gerald Autler: We didn't want Harvard to amend their Institutional Master Plan one building at a time. We wanted them to provide a long-term vision for their development plan. The degree of certainty will decrease for a long-term vision but it is a tradeoff. There has to be a balance of predictability and flexibility.

Bruce Houghton: Within the 20 year plan as a complex of buildings is proposed, does the BRA bring the proposal to the community? For example, I understand the University has plans to build undergraduate dorms along the river. When the dorms are planned and construction begins does a more defined plan go to the community for review?

Gerald Autler: Yes, it also depends on the level of specificity proposed in the master plan. All proposed projects won't be exempt from the large project review process. If the IMPNF is vague about future projects, then the Institution may have to amend their IMP to include new projects.

Bruce Houghton: Is this Task Force an ongoing review body?

Gerald Autler: Yes, it is a standing body. As projects are proposed the Task Force will be consulted.

Ray Mellone: I think we are going to have a practical problem with scoping the IMPNF if it is visionary and there aren't any real projects proposed.

Gerald Autler: Harvard will present a 50 year vision for the overall framework and the 20 year vision should suggest what kinds of uses will be where. A subset of this will be proposed projects as they emerge.

Harris Band: The IMPNF will provide program information for the development and break it down to square footage by use. The review process will be an iterative process but the IMPNF will provide a platform to be used for planning and review of our campus from year to year.

John Cusack: The city and community will make it very clear the thresholds and level of specificity they are comfortable with.

Harris Band: When we submit the IMPNF we're just kicking off the review process. This is not the master plan document itself.

Gerald suggested a format for the workshop on the 24<sup>th</sup>. He said that Harvard will probably give a 20 minute overview summarizing the key elements of all the filings and then suggested breaking out into smaller working groups. Gerald asked for the community's input as to whether the groups should be focused on specific topics or the level of how familiar someone is with Harvard's plans.

Some audience members expressed a desire to have it broken out by how familiar someone is with the projects and some audience members suggested breaking out by topic.

## Harvard Allston Task Force

Monday, January 8, 2007

Harris Band suggested that the presentation in the beginning of the meeting will be designed to bring everyone up to the same level of familiarity and understanding.

John Cusack felt that organizing the break out groups by topic would be a successful way to run the meeting. Millie Hollum McLaughlin felt the opposite because she felt like if she attended one group she would be missing the complete overview on all the topics. Harry Mattison asked how the meetings after the workshop would be used and suggested that in the future there should be sustained discussion on topics such as community benefits, construction mitigation and public realm.

Gerald emphasized that the workshop on the 24<sup>th</sup> was not to preclude any further discussion on these topics but was rather a kick-off meeting to start looking at all the pieces as a whole. Ray agreed that in the past charettes have worked well when the group is broken down into smaller groups and then they report back.

Harry and Brent asked for clarification from Gerald whether the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting was the public meeting to review the IMPNF filing and when the public meeting on the art center would be. Gerald said that the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> would be held as the public meeting to review the art center filing, the IMP amendment and the new IMPNF. Brent and Harry felt that there should be a separate meeting to discuss each of those filings. They thought with the February 16<sup>th</sup> deadline approaching and the magnitude of the projects there should be a public meeting dedicated to each. Bruce suggested that one of the subject groups for the meeting should be on the art center. Gerald agreed and said that the break out groups will first be on topics and then be on the proposed projects.

Audience Member: I have a lot of questions remaining for the IMP amendment and the art center PNF. There was a huge delay in getting the documents issued to the community. I only received a copy of these documents today when I asked for a copy on December 26<sup>th</sup>. I think at the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting Harvard should bring 200 copies of the new IMPNF to distribute.

Bruce Houghton: So February 16<sup>th</sup> is the deadline for the community to make comments on the IMP amendment and the art center PNF, then Harvard has to respond and it continues the discussion period. So to clarify, the date of responding to the plan is not the end date to working out all of the discrepancies.

Gerald Autler: Yes, that's correct. It is the desired timetable but it doesn't have to happen that way. Things don't grind to a halt on February 16<sup>th</sup>. It's not the end of the discussion.

Ray Mellone: The idea of a charette is practical. We have to start somewhere and it will get the ball rolling.

Audience Member: So Harvard will be filing the new IMPNF approximately 10 days before the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>? I think we should use the whole library for the meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup>. When the break out groups report back to the whole group we should have time to ask questions and respond like the community benefits meeting. I would hate not to have the benefit to hear everyone's ideas.

Audience Member: Can we submit the comments and questions raised as part of the public comments for the scoping determination? We should use the workshop as a launching point for people to form their public comments.

Gerald said that he would send out an email notification to his distribution list when Harvard files its new IMPNF.

The meeting ended at 9:15 p.m.