

**Harvard Allston Task Force**  
Meeting Minutes  
Monday, August 6, 2007  
Allston-Brighton Resource Center  
6:30 p.m.

**I. Attendance**

**Harvard Allston Task Force**

Mary-Helen Black  
John Bruno  
Cathi Campbell  
John Cusack  
Rita DiGesse  
Brian Gibbons  
Mike Hanlon  
Bruce Houghton  
Harry Mattison  
Ray Mellone, Chair  
Brent Whelan

**Harvard University**

Harris Band  
Will Donham  
Chris Gordon  
Peggy Hayes  
Allison Nichols  
Alison Reinhardt  
Kathy Spiegelman  
Dennis Swinford

**City of Boston**

Bill Conroy, Boston Transportation Department  
Vineet Gupta, Boston Transportation Department  
Linda Kowalcky, Boston Redevelopment Authority  
Michael Glavin, Boston Redevelopment Authority  
Kairos Shen, Boston Redevelopment Authority

BRA representative Linda Kowalcky began the meeting at 6:34 pm, and then turned it over to Harvard Allston Task Force chair Ray Mellone to run the meeting. Ray made several announcements, which were:

1. Ray reviewed the agenda items for the meeting: Boston Civic Design Commission Update; Charles River Watershed Association Announcement; Harvard Update Boston Transportation Update; Task Force Discussion of the Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR) for the Science Complex.

2. There are three scheduled meetings left before the September 10<sup>th</sup> deadline to review the DPIR. The Task Force may or may not get through the review by then but that is the goal.
3. A recent email from Harvard about it scheduling a night football game at Harvard Stadium will be addressed, but Ray doesn't want to spend too much time on it and would like to stay focused on the agenda.
4. Ray's original thought was to hold on the discussion of community benefits until after the review of the DPIR. Since he has heard from many community members for the need to discuss it before the September 10<sup>th</sup> deadline, he suggested beginning the August 13 Task Force meeting with a discussion with educational community benefits.
5. The plan for the August 22 meeting is for the Boston Transportation Department (BTD) Commissioner to present a wrap-up on its position on Harvard's construction mitigation plan. Vineet Gupta, BTD, will also provide an update tonight.
6. Another meeting may be scheduled for the week of August 27 if it is necessary for the review process. The plan for the August 27 meeting (if it is scheduled) will be to review historic resources and infrastructure sections of the DPIR. Ray thought there wouldn't be much discussion on these topics and thought there may be time to also continue the discussion on community benefits.
7. The September 10 meeting will be the final night for the DPIR review for the Science Complex. If the review is not finished on this date, either Harvard must allow for an extension, or the Task Force must allow for a September 27 BRA Board meeting in order to find out whether they deem the responses from Harvard are adequate.
8. Ray thanked the Task Force members and community members for their effort and time commitment so far in the review process.

## KICK OFF AGENDA

Kairos Shen is the director of planning at the BRA. He said he would provide an update on the Boston Civic Design Commission's (BCDC) review of the Science Complex and the BRA planning staff's review of the project. The planning department at the BRA is responsible for reviewing the physical design and public realm of Harvard's master plan and the Science Complex. As urban designers and architects, their review tends to focus on the landscape and building design. The planning department also handles any issues related to zoning. For example, any zoning change that is required by the master plan has to be reviewed and approved by the Zoning Commission and the commission bases its approval on the recommendation from the planning department.

The BCDC is comprised of 11 professionals appointed by the Mayor. They work as a volunteer group to provide a peer review for Boston development projects such as Harvard's Science Complex. The commission has no approval rights or jurisdiction, but they review, as professionals, the value and qualities of a project, specifically related to public realm and architecture. At the end of the process they make a recommendation to the BRA Board. Almost 100% of the time the BCDC review concurs with the BRA planning staff review.

Kairos has spoken with David Carlson, Executive Director of the BCDC and Senior Architect, about the commission's discussion about Harvard's Science Complex at the BCDC meeting last week. Two topics that were the focus of discussion were:

1. Massing of the building –The Commission discussed height of Building 1 and its visual impact. The commission has asked for a larger scale model to understand how the Science Complex will relate to the rest of Western Avenue. They also are pleased to see variations of the heights of the buildings, since they don't want one continuous building and a flat top across the whole site.
2. Character of Western Avenue –Since the Science Complex is the first building, the Commission asked questions as to how the building will relate to the rest of Western Ave, both toward the river and to the west of Barry's Corner. Questions were also asked regarding the retail component and program; the commissioners want to see greater elaboration on how the retail program would work, and how it will fit with the rest of Western Avenue.

Kairos, the BRA planning staff, and the BCDC are focused on the broader context that surrounds the Science Complex and how it will relate to Harvard's future development.

Kairos said last week's BCDC meeting was a BCDC design subcommittee meeting. When the subcommittee is satisfied with the design, they make a recommendation to the full commission and then there is a vote. The design subcommittee did not make a recommendation to the full commission and instead they asked Harvard to provide more information. There is one BCDC meeting scheduled at the end of August and Harvard has not indicated it is ready to be on the agenda for that meeting so he anticipates that Harvard will come back to design subcommittee sometime in September and then there would be a vote with the full commission.

Q: [Brent Whelan] Is the commission amenable to getting community responses and comments?

A: [Kairos] The commission is a public body, so the meetings are public and advertised. The commission welcomes public comments and letters as part of the deliberation and review process. The design subcommittee meetings are not typically well attended, but if you have comments, please send them in to David Carlson who oversees the BCDC.

Q: [Harry Mattison] Can you confirm the next meeting when the Science Complex will be discussed?

A: [Kairos] The next meeting BDCD meeting date is August 28 [NOTE: the correct meeting date is September 4]. The commission doesn't usually recommend the proponent come back until they've tried to address some of the questions raised by the commission and provide the additional information that was requested. At this point the commission has not received a request from Harvard to be on the BCDC agenda for August 28<sup>th</sup>.

Q: [Harry Mattison] Can Harvard provide an update about when they think they will be going back to the BCDC?

A: [Kathy Spiegelman, Harvard University] Harvard has not determined yet when it will be ready to go back to the BCDC because they have asked for a larger scale model and Harvard needs to get together more information to respond to their questions.

Q: [Harry Mattison] Will the Task Force and community be given an appropriate amount of advance notice for when the meeting is scheduled?

A: [Kathy Spiegelman] As soon as we have a date we will let the Task Force know. Since we are meeting on a weekly basis we will be able to update you at one of the next few meetings.

There was general concern that there will not be enough notice about when the meeting is scheduled and there were several questions regarding administrative rules of notice. Kairos said that as a courtesy to the BCDC, they are typically given two weeks notice about what will be on the agenda. Once the agenda is full, nothing else can be added with a very few exceptions. He said that he did not anticipate the BCDC granting an exception in this instance, and he assured the Task Force that they would be given enough advance notice.

Kairos said the planning staff has been impressed by the Behnisch architectural team, since they've shown an advanced thinking of what a science building can and should be. Many of the members of the BCDC have a lot of experience with lab buildings so in general they are pleased with the architectural team. He said he liked that the architect chose to do 4 smaller buildings with space in between them rather than one big building. But this leads to questions regarding the public character of the space in between the buildings. He said he is favorably impressed by the sophisticated approach of the architectural team and the efforts made by the client (Harvard). There's a potential to do something quite unique regarding green technology, and humane space for the scientists. The big question that remains is how to make it humane both internally for those who work there and externally for the public.

Kairos explained that the Commission and the BRA are still pursuing questions regarding the openness of the buildings and spaces, and diminishing the "town and gown" kind of complex. These questions are good ones, and he believes that there's good potential for this building, but the commission shares the concerns that the community has voiced.

Q: [Mike Hanlon] Can you expand on what you meant by the "character of Western Avenue"?

A: [Kairos] Harvard has been very clear in that they don't own all the property on both sides of Western Ave. Practically speaking, they can't plan on property they don't own. We feel strongly at the BRA that there still needs to be a framework to plan for the rest of the stretch of Western Avenue. We want develop more of a "main street" and mixed-use community. We have to have an idea of whether there will be the physical dimension and generosity available in the buildings and the development plan to achieve that "main street" character.

Kairos explained that he is cautious about being overly optimistic in the plan, especially because this is the first building. They need to understand what kind of retail the street can actually support. The critical interface is what's inside the ground floor buildings, etc. An example of what the BRA does not want to see is something like Kendall Square where there are "pockets" of retail, which is contradictory to a "main street" idea. They're worried that if they don't think big and in a larger context, the result will be like Kendall Square, which has taken about 20 years to start changing. He says that they need to look forward into the future more and be more ambitious.

Kairos directed everyone to Figure 1.3-1 and Figure 2.2-16 in the DPIR, which deal with the public realm component. The BRA planning staff has spent several months thinking about what the public realm component should include and how these figures could be amended.

Ray then acknowledged Pallavi Mande, Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA), and said she has some agenda items for the meeting. Her group will submit a proposal regarding the public realm and how Harvard's plan can be improved. Pallavi said the CRWA wants to be a resource to the community during their review of the Environmental Notification Form (ENF) filing with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) office. CRWA is happy to provide whatever detail and help they can.

Vineet Gupta, Boston Transportation Department (BTD) was asked to give an update on BTD's position regarding Harvard's proposed truck routes in its construction mitigation plan. He said that the curbside regulations will occur sooner rather than later, in the form of residential permit parking or no-parking signs on either North Harvard Street or Western Avenue.

Vineet explained that they have evaluated the two truck route options submitted by Harvard and are at looking at options that will be more effective at minimizing the impact on residential quality of life and the impact on traffic flow. The BTD has come up with a general direction at this stage, and will ask Harvard to use the option that brings trucks from the Massachusetts Turnpike, to Soldiers Field Road, to Western Avenue. He thinks that the community should be happy to hear this. However, Vineet let the Task Force and community know that himself, Bill Conroy, and others at BTD are still cautious about what the impact might be using the outside route, but at this time this is the route that Harvard should use. The BTD wants to make sure that if the route doesn't work there are other options available. BTD is going to work with Harvard to develop a monitoring program in place to monitor the impacts once the trucks start using Soldiers Field Road. There are some queuing issues and truck weaving issues with this route but the direction that BTD is giving to Harvard is to use that route. The BTD will work with the Task Force and community, so that everyone is comfortable once the trucks actually start using that route. He explained that the further details that come along with using this route have not been worked out. For example, they they are still discussing how the staging of trucks will be accomplished, especially in the morning before trucks get to the site, but they have asked Harvard to use Harvard's own property as much as possible. BTD is open to the idea of using a parking lane on Western Avenue for the overflow of trucks in the staging area. There are many questions that still need to be answered, but the BTD has been at most of the Task Force meetings and has heard the comments from the community, and shares their concerns.

Q: [Audience Member] Please explain monitoring program more fully. Will it include enforcement officers or just monitoring? Will it include monitoring the situation on Windom Street and not just the situation at intersections?

A: [Vineet Gupta] The BTD is still in the process of figuring out the details. It will be monitoring the route on a day to day basis. It's too early to know the details, but BTD will work with the community to get it right.

John Bruno thanked Vineet for the signs that have already been posted on North Harvard Street. Vineet apologized that the residence permit parking signs aren't up yet, but promised that it will get done.

Q: [Harry Mattison] What effect does this decision have on Harvard's proposal to provide worker parking at the former Sears site?

A: [Vineet Gupta] We haven't analyzed yet exactly how the worker parking will work- that is next on our review list.

Harry Mattison asked about a third truck route option that has been proposed by the community at multiple community meetings. Harry displayed a figure illustrating the proposed route that includes the possibility of an abandoned train line that runs along the Mass Pike and goes directly to Harvard's property. Audience member Tom Lally described the idea in further detail and suggested that all that was needed was a curb cut onto the Mass. Pike loop and that Harvard and BTD shouldn't get hung up on the need to build a bridge in order for this option to be feasible. Vineet responded that they've asked Harvard to analyze that situation, and if Harvard decides that it can't be done then they need to explain to the BTD why it can't. The burden of explanation and analysis is on Harvard.

Q: Does the City of Boston have a sense of how hard Harvard is working with the CSX to negotiate the right for the land?

A: [Linda Kowalcky] The meetings are private business meetings and the City is not part of the negotiations. Harvard has told us they are working hard on the negotiations with CSX.

There was a general feeling of concern from the community about being assured that this route is being validly considered. Some audience and Task Force members think the community deserves a seat at the negotiation tables with CSX. Ray said that since Harvard owns the land they have a legal right to determine what to do with it. He said he doesn't think that the community can have a say in the negotiations, regardless of the public interest involved in the project.

An audience member reminded the room that this is a 50-year plan. He suggested it would be easier to "just bite the bullet now", and create the infrastructure that will allow Harvard to construct their master plan far into the future without impacting the community. He said the proposed truck route is only going to further worsen an intersection that is already very bad. He said the City should enforce that construction trucks not be allowed on city streets at all.

A: [Kathy Spiegelman] Though we are in a situation now that we can't use the CSX land, in the future this may not be the case. We fully understand that it would be better for everyone if we could use our own property, and we tried to do that by using the Sears site. One of the advantages of using the perimeter route that BTD has suggested is that it allows us to continue the negotiations and put a traffic monitoring program in place.

Ray turned the meeting over to Kathy Spiegelman to give an update from Harvard. She said MEPA is trying to schedule the ENF consultation meeting for the week of August 20. They have proposed August 23, which is the day following one of the Task Force meetings. She explained

that MEPA typically holds its meetings during the day, but they've agreed to hold a night time meeting because of the public interest in this project. As soon as the date is confirmed, it will be formally noticed by the MEPA Office, and the community will be notified. She said the BRA has suggested that Harvard compile a list of questions and responses that come up during the Task Force meetings and make them available to the Task Force and community in order to make the process more open and so that there is a record of the things that have been asked and responded to.

Kathy apologized that neither Kevin McCluskey, Harvard community affairs office, nor Jeremy Gibson, Harvard athletics office, were able to attend tonight's meeting. She suggested that it may be better to wait until next week's meeting to have them answer questions but she explained that Harvard would like to schedule a night football game against Brown University on September 21st. Kathy said that in order to get approval, Harvard has to apply to the License Commission and there will be a meeting on August 20th at 10:00 a.m. at City Hall, which is open to the public, and the concerns of the community can be voiced.

Harry Mattison said the Harvard Athletic Director should come to a Task Force community meeting. He is worried about thousands of undergrads coming into the neighborhood for a big nighttime football game. He also expressed concerns that the Director is not taking this Task Force seriously. Harry questioned the collaborative relationship between Harvard and the community when the community wasn't informed that the game had already been scheduled. He said it doesn't seem like there are any plans in place to manage the parking, tailgating, or transportation. Other Task Force and community members shared his concern that the communication breakdown keeps happening.

Kathy responded that she will contact Bob Scalise, Harvard Athletics Director, and see if he's able to attend next Monday's meeting.

John Bruno said the City of Boston's Licensing department has to approve a night game. If the department says no, the game will not happen even if Harvard has already printed tickets. If the community isn't pleased with what Harvard has requested to do, people can go to the licensing meeting and express their concerns. John said that in the past the licensing commission has said no, for example, they changed a BC game to 4 p.m., instead of 9 p.m.

Harry Mattison asked how Task Force member Mary-Helen Black felt about the situation because she probably lives the closest to the Stadium. Mary-Helen said that in the past the lacrosse games haven't posed a problem. She thought that since parking at the stadium is only around \$10 then people will probably be willing to park there rather than trying to find a spot in the neighborhood. She said that at times the games have added life to the community. She thought that if there are problems, "it seems like a bridge we could cross when we get there."

Kathy Spiegelman apologized that there wasn't anyone at the meeting from Harvard to answer their questions but because there is another community meeting between now and the Licensing Commission meeting she hopes that their questions can be addressed before then.

Harry Mattison asked if a system could be put in place so that we know about stuff like this before it gets announced publicly. He said the lack of communication seems to be what bothers the community the most. John Cusack agreed that the lack of foresight with the athletic department “gives us a black eye.” He said that the Task Force wants to know about these kinds of decisions before Harvard puts it in the paper.

Ray then turned the meeting back to discussion of the DPIR.

Task force member John Cusack gave a summary of last week’s discussion and then turned the meeting over to Kairos Shen.

Kairos expressed several things that the planning staff at the BRA has been discussing in regards to the design of the Science Complex and the information in the DPIR.

1. Public Realm – He directed the group to figure 1.3-1 in the DPIR. He said that right now, they’re trying to get to a clear understanding with the proponent [Harvard] about how much of the project is really considered on the site: the trapezoid boundary of the Science Complex site. He explained that Harvard has a proposal for “off-site” improvements, and they’re looking at a number of extensions in addition to the things that Harvard has proposed. He said that he agrees with comments raised by the Task Force regarding how “public” the public space within the building is. He explained that the planning department is producing its own diagram as an alternate to Harvard’s, and will show it to the Task Force once it’s vetted internally.
2. Western Avenue – How the building will fit with the rest of Western Avenue- both now and in the future.
3. Interim – The planning staff also don’t like the word “interim“ and instead are looking for specific commitments and a timeline for when they will be phased
4. Milestones - They are able to set up a timeline and checkpoint schedule for Harvard. For example, at the point in Article 80 when the BRA Board gives final approval, Harvard should be providing schematic designs for the streets and open spaces associated with the project. Once the building permit is granted and when the architect orders the materials for the building are other critical moments. At that point the planning department will be asking for design development drawings. Once the occupancy permit is approved, Harvard should be providing complete construction documents.
5. Rena Park – Should be made a reality now. There should be public connections into the courtyard. There should be a pathway providing river access in the first phase of development such as a pathway between Smith Field and Harvard’s athletic facilities to the River. River access is important.

Regarding the public realm, Kairos said that planning staff feels very strongly about building public streets and avoiding a “super block.” He said that with public streets the Boston Transportation Department commissioner can regulate the streets. He wants to ensure public access to and around the building, whether it’s by Harvard owning the fee or there’s a public easement on the streets, sidewalks, and pathways that Harvard will build. He explained that in the past, the planning department at the BRA has given up on the ownership of the streets way too early, and then you don’t have the control to regulate them. It’s very critical to have smaller

public streets to reduce roadblocks. He explained that they're advocating for the smaller blocks and public streets that have also been suggested by the Task Force.

Q: [Harry Mattison] Can you provide more clarification on eliminating superblocks?

A: [Kairos] Each of the buildings in the Science Complex are not small. The idea is that there are bike and pedestrian paths between the buildings providing additional connections. We're not suggesting there should be streets, but there should be connections and we should be monitoring how people are using them. Many people in the community have expressed concern about not connecting the new proposed road to the existing Rena Street. While we understand that, the planning staff also sees the connection as a way to provide more permeability and accessibility to and around the site. If the City owns the street then they can manage it and be responsible to the Task Force and the community. The same thinking is being applied to the proposed Stadium Way.

Kairos explained his concerns about the courtyard, especially about how public it really will be. He said they've looked at the landscape design, and while they're impressed with the bioswale, they're concerned that it could become a moat. They want to make sure that it's not a way of keeping people out.

Other concerns and issues the planning staff are discussing are:

1. The height of the street wall for Buildings I and IV.
2. Ensuring that bridges connecting the buildings don't come across as gates.
3. Exterior lighting in the public realm.
4. The façade of the underside of the bridges.
5. Massing and scale- They appreciate the moderation of heights of the four buildings, but there is a concern about the mechanical components on top of the buildings.
6. Overhangs that extend out beyond the main building- how high up they are; how they're lit; the façade, etc.

Kairos explained that the building is driven by green design and will be built with very sophisticated materials and systems. The building will be assembly of parts and will be very functional but it's a question of how it can become beautiful, and this is something the architectural staff is focused on.

He also said that through the regulatory permitting process, it can be determined how much of the building will need to be designated as public spaces, the kinds of retail and who gets to rent the space.

He explained that it is very important to understand what the next pieces will be in the development. For example, how Western Avenue and Barry's Corner will become what we want them to be. He also said there needs to be some flexibility. In other projects, when the community has insisted on certain types of retail, the buildings have stayed empty, or a 10-year lease is signed for an unwanted business.

Task Force member Bruce Houghton said he felt the need to "express a tremendous urge and get up and cheer," and thanked Kairos for all the concerns he had expressed. There was a feeling of

relief of finally getting the impression that the community was being heard. He said throughout the process it has been difficult to get to discuss the broader vision and the discussion has been so restrictive and focused on this one building. He said it is a relief to know that the City is also thinking in a broader context.

Q: [Bruce Houghton] We've only got about 30 days left in the review process. How do you expect to continue the discussion with this committee? I'd like to know how you will keep us informed.

A: [Kairos] People tend to procrastinate, and now that there's a deadline approaching, they're more motivated. Michael Glavin has joined the BRA and has been able to provide more continuity to the various levels within the review process and will make sure the discussion is more focused.

[Bruce Houghton] Keep in mind that it's much more important to the neighborhood to do it right, rather than making sure it gets done in 30 days.

A: [Linda Kowalcky] I want to assure everyone that even though the public comment period officially ends on September 10<sup>th</sup>, the BRA planning department's review of this project does not stop in 30 days.

A: [Kairos] I'm willing to take as long as it takes to get it right, but there is an opportunity when there's a deadline coming up to do things that otherwise people would drag their feet on.

[Brent Whelan] I want to point out that there is another kind of activation space— exhibition space that also provides a form of education. That dropped out of the design of the building from the Project Notification Form, but I wonder if you might find it interesting to try to restore it into the program of the building.

A: {Kairos} There is a public lobby in the building, the question is how the community will be able to use it and how public is it. For example, at the Harvard Graduate School of Design the lobby is an exhibition space. We haven't gotten into that kind of detail review regarding the programming of the lobby yet, but it'll become part of the review. The article 80 process is the time when we think about the general structure. So, we would not be focusing on the exact dimensions are of the lobby space, yet.

Q: [Brent Whelan] Are you concerned about massing of the building to the point where you would step back the upper floors, to reduce the effect of the wall height?

A: [Kairos] We've asked that the Behnisch team look more closely at the design of the mechanicals themselves. For instance, there's a power plant [Distributed Energy Facility] that will be built in the basement that will be serving other buildings. We've asked how much of the mechanicals are for that; how much they will be enclosed; how much they can be compacted on the roof.

Kairos explained that this building may be the most green research building built in the City of Boston, and maybe the country. He doesn't know whether the design team is heading in the direction of unifying or desegregating the mechanical. For example, Buildings II and III have a more modest presence at the street level. It's still in the 78 ft range, but the mechanical could be brought in toward the courtyard side of the building. This is one of the reasons why the BCDC has asked for a bigger scale model.

Q: [Audience Member] You said something about a river walk that would be an access way from the community to the river?

A: [Kairos] Harvard has proposed a connection across Western Ave, along the edge of Charlesview, and then across to North Harvard Street. We think that orientation is not in the right place, and isn't where the true alignment of Stadium Way ought to be ultimately. We have to be very strategic about introducing new pedestrian crossings in the short term to make sure they're safe. We don't want to add unnecessary traffic lights, but we also want to add access. We've asked Harvard to come and meet with us to discuss new ideas on the public realm, and we'll work with City public works department to implement them.

[Audience Member] Right now the community has expressed a desire to have some of the existing neighborhood streets to be dead ends.

A: [Kairos] It seems as if the community has expressed a desire for permeability. I find that to be contradictory with the fact that you don't want to connect the streets. The streets are what offer permeability. I'd much rather start with connected streets then choosing to close them off later. It's much harder to open the streets up again after you've closed them.

Q: [Audience Member] Do you know how many square feet are required per child in a daycare?

A: [Kairos] I don't know. One of the things we've been focusing on hasn't been the size of the day care, but rather the open space design outside it. The indoor and outdoor design is more conducive to better daycare. We're looking for quality. If it's a modest path between Smith Field and Harvard athletic facilities, we'll go for that as opposed to the biggest, fattest connection possible.

Q: [John Bruno] How would the pathway provide access to the River once we got through Harvard's athletic fields?

A: [Kairos] DCR is much more open to ideas when the cost is not theirs. When they're simply asked to permit it, they're much more open to these designs and ideas.

Q: [John Bruno] Are you referring to a bridge or a walk-over?

A: [Kairos] There's one idea, for example, there's a connection right next to the Career Center. I don't want to be overly ambitious, but we believe, at the appropriate time, that there's more than one way to connect to the River. Harvard has been very on top of proposing new bridge connections and ways the community can benefit, not just the students.

Q: [Ray Mellone] If there are issues in the Project Notification Form (PNF) scoping determination that are unmet, would that have an effect on the adequacy determination?

A: [Kairos] While it is a concern if there are issues in the PNF that deals directly with scoping have not been addressed, I'm looking at the final product as opposed to the scoping determination. With the PNF, often we're responding to a document that hasn't been fully fleshed out. My feeling is that we're way beyond the PNF scoping session right now. I think that we're making progress, and Harvard deserves credit for responding to us.

[Ray Mellone] I guess I'm more concerned how it will effect the BRA's Adequacy Determination.

A: [Kairos] The adequacy determination is not "carte blanche" and we still make very specific statements such as about public realm and schedule. The provisos are done in a very specific way.

Vineet Gupta added that this is similarly done on the transportation front. With the Transportation Access Plan agreement, there may be approvals with very specific conditions.

Q: [Harry Mattison] It sounds like you're suggesting that over the next 30 days there could be a lot of back and forth. How do the community and Task Force get to see what the final product that goes to the BRA Board is and comment on and review that?

A: [Kairos] We've drafted a version of off-site improvements that we're vetting amongst ourselves that we're happy to show you once it's finished. I'm optimistic that we've made progress, but it depends on Harvard and how they will vet it internally. It's not that it will happen in 30 days; we've drafted a framework that we would share with you, and if it's consistent with what this group has talked about, then that would go a long way toward motivating Harvard. I think the next step occurs when we present this framework to Harvard.

Q: [Harry Mattison] Is your expectation that there will be an updated DPIR?

A: [Kairos] No – during the DPIR review process the proponent is meeting with the BRA, the Task Force and the community, and everyone is suggesting ideas. As soon as we're confident they're heading in the right direction, we go to the Board with revised drawings from the DPIR. The document that will hold sway is the drawings that are presented in front of the Board.

This question and answer prompted general confusion among the Task Force and audience members, who were confused as to what the 30-day deadline implied and obligated, if the revised drawings go to the Board without first giving the community a chance to comment on them.

Kairos explained that there are a lot of technical components (such as shadow and wind analysis) that don't need to be changed from the initial DPIR into subsequent versions. The changes include new drawings and new improvements, and they will all be attached to the Board memo that will go towards drafting an agreement with Harvard. At that point, the lawyers from both sides get involved and are at the table hammering things out. The BRA will take the Task Force's concerns into consideration during those negotiations.

Kairos explained that the Task Force should provide feedback in an advisory role, and Linda and Gerald will be in constant contact with the chair of the Task Force until the final moments. There is a BRA Director for the reason because there will likely be details, and deal breakers, and executive decisions made at the very last moment. So even though those details won't come back in front of this Task Force as a whole at the end of the negotiations, the concerns of the community are being expressed through representatives. The BRA is trying to stay as open and communicative as possible. They understand that they have a responsibility to the Task Force and to the community.

Q: [Harry Mattison] To talk strictly about the article 80 process, does the BRA waive final approval of the project or can they ask for further review after they propose their initial comments and improvements?

A: [Kairos] There's a possibility that if some things don't get done, we don't waive final review. The problem here is not so much the degree of detail, but the elements that don't need to be redone shouldn't be redone. What we're looking for is the best product and the best design. I would urge you not to be focused on the document itself, but rather the content that is represented in it. It can be crystallized in a few very good diagrams.

Q: [Harry Mattison] What then are we suppose to be commenting on during the comment period? If the design is still changing, what are we doing here? Do those comments all become irrelevant because the design has changed and we don't have a chance to comment on a new design?

A: [Kairos] The whole point of having all these meetings during the review process is that you are apprised of the changes from meeting to meeting. People here are acting on the changes that are discussed during the review right now.

Q: [Harry] I haven't seen anything changing right now. We don't have anything new; we don't have any information on what has been decided. Most of what we have says "we're still working on it."

A: [Kairos] We're still anticipating that this period, all the way up until when we go to the Board, to be actively working on these answers. That's why you have your chairman who can circulate everything that has been discussed. The DPIR captures the project at a very specific moment in time of where the project is.

Q: [Harry] The drawings that are in the DPIR don't really tell us anything.

A: [Kairos] My understanding is that Stefan Behnisch has presented the same materials to the community as were shown to the BCDC. There are very specific ideas in the drawings and the BRA planning staff looks at all the drawings as a whole. The information in the DPIR is actually more specific than the typical DPIR submitted by other institutions.

Bruce Houghton thanked Kairos for all of the effort he was putting in to keep the Task Force informed. He relieved a lot of frustration that the community and Task Force have been feeling over the past 18 months of not being listened to. He also said that he had gained a lot of confidence that Kairos was focusing on the things that are important to the community, but was still concerned about the lack of authority of the Task Force; that it had no role other than to hope that Kairos and his staff are listening. He hope that after the 30-day deadline has passed, that Kairos and others in the BRA keep coming to the Task Force and keeping them informed of everything that is going on. Kairos apologized for not having come sooner and more frequently during the past 18 months, and reiterated that it was very important that the Task Force continue to push the issues that are important to the community (such as public space, Barry's corner and Western Avenue) because otherwise the city and the BRA can't leverage with Harvard to change things.

Bruce Houghton requested that the BRA provide regular updates just as Harvard has been doing. Mike Glavin, BRA, responded that both Linda and Gerald Autler have continued to keep the BRA team informed of the discussion at the Task Force meetings and the community's concerns

on a much more regular basis than he thinks the Task Force has presumed. He said he will review the schedule of the meetings that are left so that representatives can keep coming back on a regular basis.

The discussion then turned to the community benefits agreement, and when the Task Force would have the opportunity to talk about them. An audience member commented that, for the public high school students and their parents, having Harvard in such close proximity will allow the high school students to advantage of opportunities that Harvard can offer. She also expressed a wish that more scholarships to Harvard should be available to the Allston residents. She also said that Harvard provides great scholarships to its athletic camps and that Kevin McCluskey sent out a letter a month ago to inform the community.

Q: [Audience Member] How much does the BRA share its recommendations on the community benefits agreement that gets signed and when does the community get to hear the recommendations?

A: [Linda Kowalcky] We've asked Harvard to come back starting next week to tell us their plans: how they want to meet the kinds of concerns and needs that the community has expressed. As that gets fleshed out in further detail, we'll be coming back to the Task Force.

Q: [Audience Member] At what point is it a done deal and there are no more opportunities for modification?

A: [Ray Mellone] In the past, the University and city sign a binding contract on community benefits. The Task Force is recommending what we think should be in the package, but we're not cosigners in the agreement. The agreement for this building will be part of a larger master plan community benefits package that will reflect Harvard's long-term growth. Not everything will be implemented at once. Ray suggested that because the topic of community benefits is so extensive, the discussion start with educational benefits.

Linda said the community benefits agreement needs to be finalized and signed before Harvard can get the construction permit for the building. The agreement is not tied to the Board vote, but the Board will have a good idea of the direction that the agreement is heading in. Harvard has a long-term master plan and as additional projects come along, community benefits agreements will also be negotiated with each project.

An audience member commented that while the discussion is fresh and lots of ideas are being put on the table, the requests should be documented so they don't get put on the back burner.

Q: [Brent Whelan] We are just in the preliminary stages of the discussion on community benefits. It doesn't sound like there will be much time to come to an agreement after the September 10<sup>th</sup> comment period and before the BRA Board vote.

A: [Linda Kowalcky] The deadline for the cooperation agreement is tied to the construction permit deadline.

Ray explained that maintaining the character of the neighborhood is the essential goal. The discussion won't end with one package of benefits and one building. It can be added to as Harvard adds buildings.

Harvard Allston Task Force  
Monday, August 6, 2007

There was general concern about the time it would take to come up with a substantive community benefits package, because as it stands now, it has no definite shape. Linda responded that she and Gerald have been discussing all the concerns of the Task Force about community benefits with the BRA and have been spending a lot of time on it. One of the things she's heard the Task Force say is "we're waiting to hear from Harvard." After having heard the goals of the Task Force, the BRA is going to start to hear from Harvard, so that they can present something concrete to the Task Force to react to.

Q: [Harry Mattison] – Is the understanding that Harvard will come next week with these concrete ideas?

A: [Linda Kowalcky] yes

Q: [Harry Mattison] This should be given to us in writing before the meeting so we have time to review it and digest it.

A: [Kathy] I don't know what it is that Harvard would be writing. We've got some ideas for community benefits and our hope would be to talk about all the things that we want to enhance and get the community feedback.

Q: [John Bruno] Can I get a definitive answer that September 10th is not the final date and the end of the conversation for the community benefits discussion?

A: [Linda] Absolutely. September 10th is only the technical deadline for the close of the comment period for comments on the science complex. The Board vote will probably take place on September 27th, and even if there is a vote on that date, that does NOT close off the discussion of community benefits. While the Task Force should start the discussion on community benefits, it's also important for you to keep focused on the science complex, and get all the comments done on that, because the community benefits discussion can continue after September 10th.

Chris Gordon asked Ray Mellone if he wanted Harvard to keep its proposal next week focused on education benefits or if it should also propose additional benefits. Mike Hanlon commented that he didn't want to limit Chris about what kind of benefits could discuss next week and suggested Harvard may want to present ideas about employment community benefits. Ray responded that community benefits is such an extensive issue that he thinks the Task Force should keep the discussion focused on educational benefits next week.

Ray adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.