June 15, 2006

Ms. Kathy A. Spiegelman, Chief Planner
Allston Development Group
Harvard University
Holyoke Center 912
1350 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Re: **Harvard University Allston Campus**
Institutional Master Plan Amendment Scoping Determination

Dear Ms. Spiegelman:

Please find enclosed the Scoping Determination for Harvard University's proposed amendment to the Allston Campus Institutional Master Plan. The Scoping Determination describes information required by the Boston Redevelopment Authority in response to the Institutional Master Plan Notification Form, which was submitted under Article 80D of the Boston Zoning Code on April 28, 2006. Additional information may be required during the course of the review of the proposals.

If you have any questions regarding the Scoping Determination or the review process, please contact me at (617) 918-4438.

Sincerely,

Gerald Autler
Senior Project Manager/Planner

CC: Tom Miller, BRA
Jansi Chandler, BRA
Paul Holloway, Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
SCOPING DETERMINATION

FOR

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ALLSTON CAMPUS
INSTITUTIONAL MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

PREAMBLE

On April 28, 2006, Harvard University ("Harvard" or the "University") submitted an Institutional Master Plan Notification Form ("IMPNF") to the Boston Redevelopment Authority ("BRA") pursuant to the provisions of Section 80D of the Boston Zoning Code (the "Code"), in order to initiate the Institutional Master Plan ("IMP") amendment process for three institutional projects proposed for Harvard University's Allston campus.

Notice of the receipt by the BRA of the IMPNF was published in the Boston Herald on May 1, 2006 initiating the public comment period that ended on June 2, 2006. Pursuant to Section 80D-4.3c of the Code, scoping sessions were held on May 22, 2006 with the City's public agencies and in a separate meeting on May 24, 2006 with the Harvard-Allston Task Force (the "Task Force") where the proposed Amendment to the IMP, as outlined in the IMPNF, was reviewed and concerns were discussed. Following the scoping sessions and based on the BRA's review of public comments, comments from the City's public agencies and the IMPNF, the BRA hereby issues its written Scoping Determination ("Scope") pursuant to Section 80D-4.3 of the Code. Comments from the City's public agencies and the public, found in Appendix 1 and 2 respectively, are incorporated as a part of this Scope.

The three institutional projects proposed in the IMPNF include: (1) the construction of a new scientific research and education complex ("Science Complex") of approximately 500,000 square feet, on a site south of Western Avenue and east of Travis Street; (2) reuse of the existing commercial properties at 1360 and 1380 Soldiers Field Road to provide approximately 90,000 square feet of space for interim use by the Harvard University Art Museums ("HUAM"); and (3) renovation of an existing 25,000 square foot commercial building at 224 Western Avenue to provide additional space for Harvard arts and culture uses on an interim basis. Collectively, these three projects are referred to as the "Proposed Projects."

As part of the request outlined in the IMPNF, Harvard also seeks to renew/extend the current IMP for the Allston campus, including the authorization for institutional uses at 1230 Soldiers Field Road and 25 Travis Street granted via a 2002 amendment, until such time that the BRA approves a new IMP for Harvard's Allston campus.

Harvard is proceeding with planning work that will define the University's 10-year development program and infrastructure investments for the Allston campus. This work will culminate in a new Institutional Master Plan for the extended Allston campus, to be completed in 2007. For

purposes of this document, "Phase 1" refers to Harvard's 10-year development program and related infrastructure improvements, and the term "Phase 1 IMP" refers to the Institutional Master Plan that will describe and grant approval for the entire Phase 1 development plan. The Institutional Master Plan Amendment proposed in the IMPNF will be referred to as the "IMP Amendment" or the "Amendment."

The BRA and Harvard are in agreement that the desired timeline for implementing the institutional projects proposed in the IMPNF, and in particular the Science Complex, warrants the use of the amendment mechanism. However, both parties also recognize the importance of a clearly articulated and comprehensive planning framework to ensure that the Proposed Projects are compatible with the long-term development of Harvard's campus in Allston and with the orderly development of the neighborhood and the City. Thus, the IMP Amendment serves as both an extension of the existing IMP and a building block of the future Phase 1 IMP. The BRA expects that the IMP Amendment will anticipate key aspects of the Phase 1 Master Plan in order to demonstrate how the projects presented in the IMPNF relate to both Harvard's existing Allston campus and Harvard's future development in Allston.

On the basis of this shared understanding, Harvard and the BRA have agreed that:

- The BRA will not approve the IMP Amendment until Harvard has filed another IMPNF in order to seek approval of a full Phase 1 IMP, as well as initial filings for project-specific reviews for the three projects outlined in the IMPNF.
- The IMPNF for the Phase 1 IMP will not only demonstrate a general understanding of Harvard's future facilities needs but will also set forth a satisfactory planning framework to assess development proposed in the Amendment. To this end, Harvard will continue to collaborate with the BRA, other City agencies, and the Harvard-Allston Task Force to produce the required planning framework as the IMPNF is being developed and as project-specific review is conducted.

Therefore, this Scope must accomplish several related goals:

- First, and most simply, the Scope must address the broad planning, zoning, and institutional data issues that are a standard part of the IMP mechanism.
- Second, the Scope must request sufficient information about the Proposed Institutional Projects to judge their compatibility with Harvard's evolving planning framework AND the planning principles articulated by the community and the City in existing planning documents.
- Finally, the Scope is intended to set forth current City and community expectations for the issues that Harvard will address as it develops the components of the Phase 1 IMP, including the IMPNF that will constitute the first submission of the Phase 1 IMP.

It is important to note that this Scope is NOT intended to address:

- Issues that are a standard component of project-specific reviews. As the design of the three Proposed Projects advances, Harvard will coordinate with BRA and City agency staff regarding the scope of project-specific reviews, including the BRA's Large Project Review process.

- Specific aspects of Harvard's 10-year Phase 1 building program. Although this Scope requests general information on the magnitude of Harvard's Phase 1 program and the anticipated uses and locations of those uses, the IMP Amendment will focus on putting the Proposed Institutional Projects in the proper context. The detailed 10-year development program will be described in the Phase 1 IMP.

The proposed Amendment is Harvard's first step in laying the groundwork for its future Allston campus. Decisions made now will affect the options available in the future in everything from the alignment of new roadways and pedestrian circulation corridors to the siting of housing and community facilities. Therefore, it is essential that the IMP Amendment demonstrate that the Proposed Projects will contribute to the implementation of a larger vision for the Allston campus.

The overriding criteria that the BRA will apply to its review of the IMP Amendment is the degree to which the Proposed Projects are consistent with existing neighborhood planning principles, the degree to which they are seen to fit into a broader plan for the Allston campus, and the degree to which they expand, reduce, or maintain planning options. Should the projects be seen as limiting options for the development of future campus and neighborhood-wide systems (e.g. open space, utilities, public realm, transportation, etc.), they will be less well received than if they are shown to maintain those future options and contribute to the long-term development and implementation of a coherent campus and neighborhood planning framework.

The specific submission requirements, along with broader planning expectations, are set forth in detail in the following portion of the document.

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

FOR

HARVARD UNIVERSITY ALLSTON CAMPUS
INSTITUTIONAL MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

This Scope sets forth those elements specified in Section 80D-3 of the Code that are required to be included in Harvard's IMP Amendment. The Scope requests information required by the BRA for its review of the proposed IMP Amendment in connection with the following:

1. Approval of the Harvard University Institutional Master Plan Amendment pursuant to Article 80 and other applicable sections of the Code; and

2. Recommendation to the Zoning Commission for approval of the Harvard University Institutional Master Plan Amendment.

Harvard's IMP Amendment should be documented in a report of appropriate dimensions and in presentation materials which support the review and discussion of the IMP Amendment at public meetings. Forty-five (45) copies of the full report should be submitted to the BRA. An additional fifty copies or more of the document should be available for distribution to the Task Force, community groups, and other interested parties in support of the public review process. The IMP Amendment should be a stand-alone document distinct from the impact reports submitted to the BRA in meeting the requirements of Large Project Review or other Article 80 Review processes for the Proposed Projects discussed in the IMPNF. The IMP Amendment should include this Scoping Determination and text, maps, plans, and other graphic materials sufficient to clearly communicate the various elements of the plan.

Whenever possible, the submission requirements outlined below distinguish between the issues and questions that may be addressed during the preparation of the Phase 1 IMP and those that require specific responses as part of the IMP Amendment. In some sections, a portion of the text is devoted to specific submission requirements for the IMP Amendment. In these cases, the remainder of the section should be interpreted as setting forth the current expectations for Harvard's overall future planning. These expectations will help shape the planning over the coming months and, ultimately, the IMPNF for the Phase 1 IMP. If there is no part of the section explicitly devoted to submission requirements, all of the contents of the section should be viewed as required submissions for the Amendment.

The BRA recognizes that Harvard's planning is an ongoing endeavor and that not all issues raised in this Scope can be addressed fully in the IMP Amendment. There may be submission requirements set forth herein that Harvard deems more adequately addressed as part of the project-specific review processes or in the IMPNF for the Phase 1 IMP and the subsequent review process. In such cases, the IMP Amendment should clearly identify the document in which the specific issue will be addressed and the intended strategy for addressing it, and

should present the timeline for the preparation of those documents. The BRA reserves the right to make final determination of the adequacy of the Amendment.

Comments from the City's public agencies and the public, found in Appendix 1 and 2 respectively, are incorporated as a part of this Scope. These comments highlight issues related to the IMP Amendment as well as to the forthcoming project-specific reviews and the IMPNF for the Phase 1 Master Plan. The IMP Amendment should respond to the comments in both sets of letters and, as in the case of the submission requirements, should state the University's intended approach to any issues not addressed in the Amendment.

1. INSTITUTIONAL DESCRIPTION, MISSION, AND GOALS

- **Institutional Mission and Goals.** The Amendment should provide a statement with basic background information on Harvard University and Harvard's institutional mission and goals, particularly those aspects of the mission that are driving the University's expansion in Allston.
- **Goals for Allston Development.** The Amendment should also articulate the broad, over-arching goals of Harvard's planning and development in Allston, with particular reference to the role of the Allston campus in fulfilling the University's strategic goals, as well as a statement of the ways that the IMP Amendment and the specific projects proposed therein will advance Harvard's mission and goals.
- **Institutional Needs and Objectives.** The IMP Amendment should define specific program needs and objectives for the Allston campus in sufficient detail. The focus of this discussion should be the buildings and uses proposed as part of the IMP Amendment, but the analysis should also begin to frame the discussion of the needs and objectives that will be the focus of the Phase 1 Master Plan and subsequent IMPNF filing. A description of the analysis which was undertaken to identify the needs and objectives should be summarized. Included in the description should be current and future trends that are impacting Harvard and shaping program objectives. Projection of changes in the employee and student population, new or expanded programs, research, parking, and other activities that require space on the Allston campus should be included.
- **Consistency of Allston Planning With Other Planning Frameworks.** Finally, the Amendment should include a statement of the goals of Harvard's planning with regard to ensuring the broad consistency of Harvard's planning with the existing planning frameworks for the neighborhood and the City, and with regard to ensuring that Harvard's development in Allston generates benefits for the host community and the City of Boston at large in a way that is consistent with Harvard's goals and mission.

2. EXISTING PROPERTY AND USES

The IMP Amendment should present maps, tables, and site plans clearly displaying the following information:

- **Description of Property Holdings.** All of Harvard's property holdings in Allston, whether part of the existing or proposed Phase 1 Institutional Master Plan Area or not. For all buildings and lots, the tables and maps should provide the square footage, height in feet

and number of floors, including floors below grade, uses and area devoted to each use, footprint, age, condition, a description of off-street parking and loading areas and facilities, including a statement of the approximate number of parking spaces in each area or facility and proposed action (rehabilitation, demolition, replacement, or other) during the term of the Phase 1 IMP. For non-institutional uses, a basic classification system such as industrial, office, retail, vacant may be used. For vacant properties, information on the last use to occupy the building should be provided.

- **Amendment Additions to Institutional Master Plan Overlay Area.** Specific parcels to be added to Institutional Master Plan Area through the amendment process, with sufficient information to facilitate amendment of the relevant zoning maps by the Boston Zoning Commission.
- **Phase 1 Additions to Institutional Master Plan Overlay Area.** An indication of the land that will likely be added to the Institutional Master Plan Area through the Phase 1 IMP, as well as an indication of the likely phasing of development on other Harvard-owned land not included in the above categories.
- **Underlying Zoning.** A description of the zoning in effect in the areas to be added to the Institutional Master Plan Area through both the Amendment and the Phase 1 IMP.

3. INTERIM USES OF PROPERTIES NOT INCLUDED IN PHASE 1

- **Planning for Interim Uses.** Harvard owns a large number of properties that are not included in the land areas covered either in the IMP Amendment or the Phase 1 Master Plan. While it is understood that there are no proposed institutional uses for these properties, the Amendment should discuss the planning process for identifying institutional and interim non-institutional uses for these properties.

4. NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING FRAMEWORK

In May 2005, the BRA published the North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning, also known as the North Allston Neighborhood Strategic Plan ("NANSP"). The NANSP contains a conceptual vision for the future of the area between the Massachusetts Turnpike and the Charles River. Although it is clear that, given the conceptual nature of the NANSP, many of the specific elements of the vision will not be realized in the form that they appear in the document, the vision is based on planning goals and principles that enjoy broad support from North Allston residents, businesses, institutions, and community groups. Other existing plans, including the Boston Bicycle Plan, Access Boston, and the Boston Open Space Plan, also suggest ideas and strategies relevant to Allston.

The broad goals and principles embodied in these plans should be acknowledged, respected, and, whenever possible, furthered by Harvard's planning and development. For each major topic area, the IMP Amendment and other Article 80 review documents should reference the NANSP and other plans, and discuss consistencies and inconsistencies between Harvard's proposal and the principles laid out in those plans. In the case of inconsistencies, the Amendment should describe the principles Harvard is adopting that account for the differences.

5. CAMPUS-WIDE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AND CONCEPT PLANS

Phase 1 planning will need to present a broad array of information in order to facilitate analysis and review by the BRA and other City agencies. Among other things, this will include:

- **Existing Conditions.** Harvard's planning should include a description and analysis of existing conditions in Allston and Harvard's goals for the Allston academic campus and the Allston neighborhood including all the land between the Massachusetts Turnpike and the Charles River. It should include a discussion about Harvard's planning objectives for the Cambridge and Longwood campuses, insofar as they relate to planning for the Allston campus, and should include the specific objectives Harvard intends to achieve in Allston during the next 5-, 10-, and 20-year periods. The IMP should include illustrations that describe the objectives for each of these periods.
- **Campus-Wide Concept Plan.** The IMPNF for the Phase 1 IMP should include a concept plan similar to the concept plan presenting the proposed overall layout of a new Allston campus. It should describe a framework for organizing the amounts of space dedicated to each use, building location, size and use, environmental and open space improvements and their relationships to buildings and land uses, and the systems of streets, blocks, and other infrastructure elements. The plan should pay particular attention to the areas of the campus which interface with adjacent neighborhoods, public streets, historic resources and public open spaces. The IMPNF should describe the qualitative and quantitative attributes of this new mixed-use neighborhood and campus and its relationship to the existing Harvard campus as well as the Allston neighborhood. The concept plan should include the following:

    - Definition and description of planning objectives.
    - Illustration and description of a campus development concept.
    - Design concepts which are used should be clarified.
    - Articulation of subareas of the campus based on use, density, and/or physical features.
    - Definition of design principles which will serve as guidelines for campus development.
    - Identification of the pedestrian circulation system and its objectives and guidelines.
    - A discussion of the process by which the proposed concept plan was developed.

- **Implementation Strategies.** The planning framework should also include a description in general terms of the strategies Harvard intends to employ to achieve its objectives, including schedules for the development of buildings, open space improvements and infrastructure, and the financial resources associated with the development on a project-by-project and year-by-year basis.

5.1 Submission Requirements: Campus-Wide Development Program and Concept Plans

- **Overall Phase 1 Development Program.** The IMP Amendment should describe the projected Phase 1 development plan, with approximate square footage by type of use and development timeframe and phasing. The current proposals should be presented within the context of both overall development and phasing. It is understood that this presentation of Phase 1 development is based on current planning and may change.
- **IMP Amendment Concept Plans.** Concept plans similar to the one described above should be prepared and analyzed for each area containing a Proposed Project. Although

much of the planning work to date has focused on Harvard's large contiguous landholdings that will form the basis of the Phase 1 IMP, Harvard also owns many parcels outside this area. Two of the Proposed Projects are located on parcels that abut land not owned by Harvard, and that do not fit into the traditional concept of "campus." Despite this, the concept plans should address the same issues for those sites. For example, the IMP Amendment should present proposed streetscape improvement plans for all three project sites, and it should also describe in general terms how these specific streetscape plans can fit into streetscape plans for Harvard's campus and into the principles outlined in the NANSP. This portion of the submission may be combined with the submission requirements outlined in Section 6, which discusses Proposed Institutional Projects.

6. PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL PROJECTS

A description of all the significant physical changes proposed for the term of the existing IMP should be provided at the level of definition required by Section 80D-3.4 of the Code. Included here should be information regarding the three Proposed Projects identified in the IMPNF. For those locations which are to gain zoning rights through the IMP Amendment, the information required is defined in Section 80D-3.4 of the Code. The impacts of each proposal should be discussed at a level of definition appropriate to the IMP Amendment, with the understanding that the projects will be subject to project-specific Article 80 Review. The Amendment should present the following information:

- **New and Recycled Building Projects.** For each Proposed Project, the Amendment should present at a minimum the following:

    - Site location and approximate building footprint.
    - Square feet of total gross floor area and principal subuses.
    - Gross floor area of space that is demolished or occupancy terminated.
    - Floor area ratio (FAR) for each lot.
    - Building height in approximate feet and stories.
    - Number of parking spaces.
    - Current zoning of site.
    - Total project cost.
    - Estimated development impact project payments.
    - Estimated month and year of construction start and completion.
    - As much detail as possible on the proposed program and uses, with the understanding that more detail will be provided as part of the project-specific review.

- **Campus Improvements.** The Amendment should present a description of all proposed campus improvements, including the nature of the improvement, location, estimated cost, and estimated month and year of construction start and completion.
- **Development Program Context.** The context for the Proposed Projects should be presented as follows:

    - A series of context drawings should be prepared showing phase-by-phase the proposed developments in their larger surroundings for the campus. These items, with the

exception of the study model, should be submitted in both printed form and as printable and duplicable digital files.

- A series of neighborhood plans showing existing and proposed building heights, building uses, pedestrian circulation, open space, and vehicular circulation of cars, service vehicles, and ambulances; the area to be included in the plans should extend not less than 1,500 feet in all directions from the proposed project sites.
- Diagrammatic sections through the neighborhood cutting north-south and east-west at the scale and distance indicated above.
- True-scale three-dimensional graphic representations of the area indicated above either as aerial perspective or isometric views showing all buildings, streets, parks, and natural features in the district.
- A study model showing the proposal in the context of other buildings extending 500 feet in all directions from the project site.

- **Rationale for Proposed Projects.** In order to elucidate the rationale for the Proposed Projects, the Amendment should present an analysis of the existing facilities in light of the identified program needs and objectives. The analysis should include a description of the site selection process and a summary of alternatives considered.

7. UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

A well-planned infrastructure and utility network is essential to orderly campus development and to achieving a range of sustainability goals. The Amendment should present the following information:

- **Existing Utility and Infrastructure Systems.** The Amendment should present relevant information on the existing infrastructure systems, the capacity of those systems to accommodate the development proposed in the IMPNF, and a description of the required investments along with phasing information. The Amendment should make clear how the approach to the needs generated by the initial Proposed Projects will be coordinated with ongoing infrastructure and utilities investments.
- **System-Wide Planning.** The BRA recognizes the opportunities afforded by a system-wide planning approach to infrastructure and utilities that can yield efficiencies in construction and operation. The Amendment should also describe Harvard's approach to planning the infrastructure and utilities systems for the entire Phase 1 development program and beyond. The approach should make clear the process for ensuring that infrastructure planning is coordinated with other elements of campus planning in a way that will reduce the need for new infrastructure investments and maximize the efficiencies and synergies resulting from those investments that do take place. For example, the open space plan can be designed in such a way that it contributes to stormwater goals, roadway construction and reconstruction can be coordinated with major utilities work, and the coordinated development of systems can yield opportunities for harnessing energy that would otherwise be wasted.
- **Distributed Energy System.** With regard to the above, the development of a new and expanded campus offers an opportunity to provide for district energy needs in a comprehensive and sustainable manner. The use of a distributed energy system for the campus is both possible and sustainable. The IMP Amendment should provide any information and analysis available on the potential scope of such a system, location options

for such a system, and the ways in which potential air quality and noise impacts can be addressed. If no such analysis is available, the Amendment should present a timeline for conducting such an analysis and releasing the results. The Amendment should also describe the ways that energy issues, and sustainable energy and district energy planning in particular, are being integrated with other components of the planning framework. The PNF for the Science Complex should include a discussion of the potential for locating a distributed energy facility on site. PNFs for each project should also discuss the use of other renewable technologies for energy generation.

- **Boston Water and Sewer Commission Comments.** The IMP Amendment and project-specific review submissions should respond to the comments submitted by the Boston Water and Sewer Commission, which are contained in Appendix 1. The Amendment should also articulate the ways in which the planning and design work related to water, sewer, and stormwater issues are being integrated with other infrastructure issues, the sustainability agenda, and any other relevant components of the planning framework.
- **Other Comments.** The IMP Amendment should respond to all other comments related to infrastructure and utilities included in the Appendixes, or discuss when those issues will be addressed.

8. URBAN DESIGN

Significantly more information will be required for the purposes of evaluating the Phase 1 development program than is requested for the purposes of the Amendment. In order to evaluate fully the urban design impacts of Phase 1 development, the BRA will require a coherent physical framework describing the short-, middle-, and long-term context for all the Harvard-controlled properties in Allston and a discussion about the relationship between the Cambridge, Longwood, and Allston campuses. Harvard should present the physical framework in text, diagrams, maps and drawings that fully describe Harvard's intended outcomes for the 5-year, 10-year, and 20-year terms in the following categories:

- **Streets, Blocks, and Major Physical Features.** The Phase 1 planning framework should provide proposals for the 5-year, 10-year, and 20-year futures showing in graphic form the intended size, location, and character of new and existing streets, blocks, major pedestrian paths, esplanades, canals and other major elements of the physical infrastructure. The plan should include the proposed schedule for implementing the improvements and should describe which infrastructure projects are associated with each building project. The proponents should clarify the uses and intended hierarchy of the streets, and should describe their relation to existing and proposed blocks and their uses. Harvard should recognize in preparing the street-and-block plan the dramatic difference between the scale of the existing Allston residential neighborhood and the Harvard-owned property. The master plan is an opportunity to create the infrastructure that should be necessary to serve the new development over the next 20 to 30 years, to connect the existing streets with the new infrastructure, and to create a smooth transition between the two scales.
- **Relationship to the Charles River.** Harvard's planning framework should acknowledge that the Charles River and its banks are a strong armature on which to build an open space system that can enhance the existing residential community, organize the new developments Harvard intends to create in the future, and integrate the existing neighborhood, its expansion, and the academic community. Harvard's planning should

include an assessment of the impacts that future projects will have on Charles River parklands.

- **Open Space System.** Harvard should present a description of the existing and proposed (for the short-, middle-, and long-term futures) system of improved public, semi-public, and private open spaces clearly indicating the character of each. The system should recognize the opportunity for streets and boulevards to enhance the landscape system by connecting, for example, parks and plazas by tree-lined streets. The plan should describe the phasing of landscape improvements and should indicate which landscapes are associated with each building or infrastructure improvement. The plan should discuss the relationship of Harvard's campus open space system with the broader neighborhood open space and public realm systems.
- **Relationship to Existing Plans.** Harvard's open space planning should acknowledge the *Boston Open Space Plan*, the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation's *Master Plan for the Charles River Basin: The Second Century*, and the NANSP, and should discuss areas of potential overlap and an evaluation of potential improvements to existing parklands.
- **Public Realm.** The Phase 1 IMP should establish clear guidelines for the development of the public realm on Harvard's campus, and for the relationship of the campus to the broader neighborhood public realm framework, i.e. streets, plazas, and parks.
- **Pedestrian Circulation.** The Phase 1 IMP should identify and explain the pedestrian circulation system and its objectives and guidelines. The relationship between the structure of the pedestrian circulation system and other planning elements, most notably the larger open space system and the transportation system, should be fully explained.
- **Architectural Form and Character.** The Amendment should set forth the proponents' general intentions regarding the design of proposed buildings, districts, streetscapes, and landscapes, and should define design principles which will serve as guidelines for the development of the campus.

8.1 Submission Requirements: Urban Design

- **Amendment Urban Design Framework.** The Amendment should contain as much information on the above elements as possible. In particular, it should clearly demonstrate the contribution of the three Proposed Projects and any proposed associated infrastructure investments to the development and ultimate implementation of a campus-wide urban design framework addressing all of the above elements.
- **NANSP Principles.** The Proposed Projects present an opportunity to address to some degree the principles set forth in the NANSP. These include the transformation of Western Avenue into a pedestrian-friendly, neighborhood-serving Main Street and the creation of pedestrian and bicycle connections between the neighborhood and the Charles River. The Amendment and project-specific submissions should indicate the short-term streetscape improvements that will accompany the project that address these principles.
- **Other Comments.** The IMP Amendment should respond to all other comments related to urban design included in the Appendixes, or discuss when those issues will be addressed.

9. TRANSPORTATION

The magnitude of Harvard's anticipated future development in Allston, the neighborhood's poor traffic conditions and paucity of transit connections, the need to connect Harvard's emerging Allston campus with its existing Cambridge and Longwood campuses, and the potential to develop significant new transportation connections based on existing rail and roadway infrastructure all speak to the need for an ambitious and comprehensive transportation vision for North Allston.

The creation of such a comprehensive vision is a complex and ongoing endeavor, and much of the existing and potential future infrastructure is not under Harvard's direct control. Therefore, Harvard will not be expected to present a complete plan for a transportation system before approval of the IMP amendment or the individual projects.

Harvard has presented many concepts that could be incorporated into a comprehensive transportation system. The BRA and BTD expect to continue to work with Harvard as these concepts are further developed as part of the Phase 1 development framework and as implementation strategies and timelines are discussed. The BRA's broad expectations with regard to the transportation system can be summarized as follows:

- **Integrated Transportation System.** Harvard's planning should yield options for a comprehensive transportation system that includes a pedestrian/open space system, a bicycle network, public transportation and shuttles, campus and neighborhood parking, and a hierarchy of roadways that includes both a regional road network and smaller neighborhood and campus streets. These elements should all fit together and support one another as part of an integrated system.
- **Ability to Respond to Future Opportunities.** The transportation system should be designed in such a way that it can evolve and respond to future opportunities. For example, the Executive Office of Transportation (EOT) is committed to completing an Urban Ring Phase II DEIR/DEIS by December 2007. To that end it expects to develop alternative alignments through early 2007 and to carry out its evaluation of these alternatives through the fall of that year. Among the alternatives EOT is required to develop is one serving Harvard's Allston campus. The BRA would expect the University to actively participate with the City and EOT in the development of such an alternative. The University's transportation planning should take into account the possibility that an alignment serving the Allston campus may be under consideration in the near future.
- **Emphasis on Alternatives to the Automobile.** The transportation system should be designed to minimize the use of private automobiles and maximize the transportation alternatives for both Harvard affiliates and neighborhood residents. Improved shuttle service, enhanced public transportation, bicycle infrastructure, car-sharing, and other elements should all be considered. This goal should be supported by aggressive transportation demand management programs.
- **Neighborhood Transportation Impacts.** Harvard's planning efforts should take transportation needs and impacts into consideration at the master planning level, not only at the project-specific level. The consistency of programmatic and land-use planning decisions with transportation goals should be an important consideration in the University's campus planning.

- **Consistency with Other Plans.** The transportation system should be consistent with and support the transportation goals and principles presented in the NANSP. Moreover, the transportation system should be consistent with and support key non-transportation goals in the NANSP, other neighborhood planning documents, and Harvard's own Institutional Master Plan. For example, the main streets in North Allston should be vital neighborhood corridors and not just transportation routes; the roadway network should support public realm goals as well as transportation goals; and the transportation system should reflect and help implement Harvard's sustainability agenda.

9.1 Submission Requirements: Transportation

As described in its comment letter on the IMPNF, the Boston Transportation Department ("BTD") has outlined the City's transportation priorities for North Allston. As part of coordinating its development with these priorities, Harvard should work with the BTD on developing an area-wide transportation framework and to establish appropriate scopes of study for the project-specific reviews, including, as applicable, the Article 80 Large Project Review process.

- **Existing Conditions.** The IMP Amendment should include a summary of the current transportation and parking characteristics in and around the sites of the Proposed Projects.
- **Parking Inventory.** The number of parking spaces in Allston leased, owned, occupied and controlled by and on behalf of Harvard.
- **Transportation Demand Management.** The Amendment should describe the existing TDM program and report the number of students, faculty, staff and contract employees (reported in actual numbers, not full-time equivalents, and as a percentage of the whole for each category) who participate in each major element of the TDM program, both campus-wide and for Allston specifically.
- **Transportation Priorities.** The BRA, BTD, and Harvard have agreed on a set of short-term and long-term transportation priorities for North Allston that are described in BTD's comment letter in Appendix 1. The Amendment should reference this letter and describe progress made on addressing these priorities and the estimated timeframe and process for responding to each one.
- **Transportation Model.** The Amendment should clarify the terms and timeline for transferring the Harvard transportation model to the City and any modifications to the model that would be required for it to meet the City's standards for such a model.
- **Impacts of Proposed Projects.** The Amendment should assess the general transportation impacts associated with the three Proposed Projects. The project-specific Scopes will describe detailed review requirements.
- **Shuttle and Transit Connections.** The Amendment should clearly indicate the elements of both the short-term and long-term shuttle and transit connections to the Cambridge and Longwood campuses that would be accomplished in conjunction with the Proposed Projects. For example, attractive facilities for shuttle and transit patrons should be incorporated within the Science Complex site plan and design, and the Amendment should indicate the extent to which the shuttle system would be accessible to non-Harvard riders. The Amendment should also should state whether the interim museum facility will be served by a shuttle and should assess the potential to implement such service, as well as to provide services and facilities that would increase the attractiveness of existing bus service for all visitors to the museum.

- **Proposed Roadway and Intersection Improvements.** Indicate and program any proposed modifications to current roadways, including new signalized intersections or dedicated lanes.
- **Pedestrian and Bicycle Network.** The Amendment should propose a robust set of pedestrian and bicycle connections from Harvard's proposed new facilities to a variety of academic, recreational, transportation, and neighborhood facilities within North Allston, including the NANSP's proposal for a pedestrian/bicycle promenade between Smith Field and the Charles River. At a minimum, the Amendment should outline enough of the broader transportation and open space frameworks to show that the Proposed Projects will be compatible with longer-term plans.
- **Consistency with Broader Planning Framework.** The Amendment should explicitly take into consideration the impact of current transportation- and parking-related decisions on other components of the planning framework and the campus-wide and site-specific level, for example the open space framework and the sustainability goals. The Amendment should also show the degree to which proposed roadway and intersection improvements meet the guiding principles of the NANSP to direct regional traffic to the regional network and minimize traffic cutting through North Allston residential areas.
- **Net New Parking Spaces.** The Amendment should clarify the number of net new parking spaces proposed based on an clarification of the number and locations of existing spaces to be lost.
- **Parking Demand Calculations.** The Amendment should describe the methodology for estimating parking demand generated by the Proposed Projects and the projected ability of the proposed 1,300-space parking garage planned for the Science Complex to meet existing parking demand, demand generated by the Proposed Projects, and demand generated by the Phase 1 development program. The role the proposed garage will play in the overall parking program for Phase 1 development should be clarified.
- **Other Comments.** The Amendment should respond to all other comments related to transportation included in the Appendixes, or discuss when those issues will be addressed.

10. SUSTAINABILITY

The City of Boston expects a high level of commitment to principles of sustainable development from all developers and institutions. Harvard has shown a commitment to sustainability in many of its development projects and campus operations, but the Allston campus requires a different approach. The construction of a largely new campus by a leading institution provides exciting opportunities for innovation and excellence not only in individual buildings, but across the campus as a whole. A sustainable campus, just like an effective transportation network, must function as an integrated system. Although the City's sustainability goals are most clearly articulated in this section, they should be considered and addressed at every stage of the planning process and in conjunction with every topic in order to ensure that the overall campus components and framework further the goal of sustainability as much as any individual element or initiative.

Harvard will be expected to set high goals and make firm commitments to sustainability in its Phase 1 IMP, incorporating sustainability goals into campus-level planning, site planning, and building design. Topics to be addressed will include:

- **Green Building.** New campus buildings should achieve a superior level of performance in the areas of materials and resources (recycled content, construction waste management, local/regional materials), energy (energy performance, renewable energy), water management (water efficiency, stormwater management, graywater and stormwater recycling, etc.), indoor environmental quality, and other standard performance areas of high-performance or "green" buildings. Whenever possible, buildings should achieve a high level of certification through LEED or another appropriate system.
- **Infrastructure and Utilities.** As the section on infrastructure and utilities makes clear, sustainability considerations should be integrated throughout Harvard's approach to planning and developing these systems, and the approach should be coordinated with other planning efforts in a way that generates maximum opportunities for efficiencies and synergies.
- **Transportation.** The transportation sector, particularly the use of private automobiles, is a major generator of negative environmental impacts, including degraded air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. Harvard's transportation planning should strive not only to minimize and mitigate transportation impacts attributable to its development, but should incorporate ambitious transportation-related goals from the beginning. Planning should emphasize minimizing vehicular traffic (both passenger cars and trucks) while maximizing alternative transportation options. Strategies include enhanced public transportation options, the design of an open space/transportation framework that facilitates and encourages walking and bicycling, careful land-use planning to ensure critical adjacencies or otherwise facilitate alternatives to the automobile, and the use of clean energy technologies, e.g. electric vehicles for on-campus and car-sharing use. Although the Transportation section above presents specific goals and priorities, the IMP Amendment should also integrate the discussion of transportation impacts and planning with the discussion of sustainability.
- **Climate Change.** Harvard's planning should set ambitious goals in the area of climate change, aiming for a significantly lower level of carbon emissions than the existing campus, or even carbon neutrality. High-performance buildings, conservation techniques, use of renewable fuel sources (wind, solar, geothermal, thermal energy from sewer lines, biomass), combined heat and power generation, and carbon sequestration should all be considered as part of the campus planning process.
- **Stormwater Retention and Treatment.** Harvard's planning and development should go beyond the minimum requirements related to stormwater runoff with the goal of reducing the pollution flowing to the Charles River. Individual building design, site design, and street-level interventions should all maximize the opportunities for stormwater retention and treatment through innovative approaches. To the extent possible, the systems put in place should strive to work with the natural hydrology of the area.
- **Wastewater Treatment.** Future campus development should consider opportunities to assess and demonstrate the viability of on-site or on-campus wastewater treatment through constructed wetlands and other innovative approaches.
- **Air quality.** Harvard's future campus development should seek to minimize negative air quality impacts stemming from the transportation system or building mechanical systems, and to mitigate air pollution through the use of urban forests and other techniques.
- **Solid Waste.** Campus master planning should set the goal of reducing the level of solid waste generation from the baseline level of comparable facilities. This goal should apply to both construction and operation of buildings.

- **Environmental Restoration.** Harvard's planning and design work should commit to the principle of restoring environmental health and natural systems to the greatest extent possible. This includes committing to the highest possible standard of environmental remediation for any sites that are determined to be contaminated and, when possible and compatible with other goals, committing to the restoration of the original functioning of the landscape with regard to hydrology and other natural functions.
- **Landscape and Natural Features.** A well-considered program of landscape design can not only create a high-quality aesthetic realm but can also enhance regional biodiversity, help mitigate air pollution, reduce heating and air conditioning costs and associated energy consumption, reduce water consumption, and reduce stormwater runoff and water pollution. Sustainability should be a primary consideration in the design of the campus open space system as a whole as well as the design of individual spaces and the design of the roadway network.
- **Human Health.** Pedestrian and bicycle networks, urban forests, and healthy buildings should be considered as part of a broad sustainability agenda related to human health. The proposed relocation of Harvard School of Public Health and the health-related mission of many of the scientific units on the future Allston campus strongly suggest that the design of the new campus should support the mission of public health as much as the activities of the academic units that will locate there.
- **Performance Standards and Indicators.** Harvard should commit not only to broad sustainability principles, but also to specific performance standards and a system of indicators and metrics to track performance, in line with the University's stated principle of "Developing planning tools to enable comparative analysis of sustainability implications and to support long-term economic, environmental and socially responsible decision-making."

10.1 Submission Requirements: Sustainability

- **University Sustainability Principles.** The IMP Amendment should clearly state and explain Harvard's sustainability principles. In particular, the document should describe how Harvard's capital planning and approvals process for new construction and major renovation of existing campus facilities has been expanded to incorporate the sustainability principles in its review. For those principles that have not yet been applied, or not fully applied, the document should describe Harvard's commitment to and strategy for addressing them.
- **Existing Sustainability initiatives.** The IMP Amendment should summarize key existing sustainability initiatives; this summary should include an inventory of LEED-certified and other high-performance buildings.
- **Application of Sustainability Principles.** The IMP Amendment should describe how Harvard's sustainability principles have been applied throughout the development of the IMP Amendment and should discuss the aspects of the Amendment and the Proposed Projects that further those principles and the performance areas described above. The PNFs should address these issues on a project-specific level. The Amendment should also describe how Harvard's sustainability principles will be applied in the preparation of the Phase 1 IMP, particularly regarding the performance areas listed above. The Amendment should discuss any intended commitments, goals, performance criteria, possible or proposed strategies for achieving the goals and meeting the criteria, and indicators for tracking performance.
- **Air Quality.** The Amendment or other review documents should discuss the potential for both short- and long-term effects on air quality as a result of traffic and use-related

emissions generated by the Proposed Projects. Known options for mitigation should be identified.

- **Site Contamination.** The Amendment should indicate the presence of any contaminated soil or groundwater and any underground or aboveground storage tanks on land to be added to the Institutional Master Plan Area through the Amendment. As applicable, the Amendment should summarize the results of any studies or findings, including types and concentrations of contaminants encountered and should include appropriate tables and maps. The reports should be made available to the BRA. Information about mitigation plans should be included in the Amendment and in the PNF for each of the three project sites.
- **Solid Waste.** The Amendment should quantify and describe the generation, storage, and disposal of all solid wastes from the construction and operation of the Proposed Projects. In addition, measures to promote the reduction of waste generation and recycling, particularly for paper, plastics, glass, metals, and other recyclable products, and compliance with the City's recycling program, should be described.
- **Other Comments.** The IMP Amendment should respond to all other comments related to sustainability and environmental quality included in the Appendixes, or discuss when those issues will be addressed.

11. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The City of Boston views its academic institutions as tremendous assets and as valuable partners in economic development. The development of Harvard's new campus in Allston provides important opportunities to collaborate with the University on key economic development goals. These include the following:

- **Employment and Workforce Development.** Harvard is already a major employer in the City of Boston, and the development of the Allston campus will only expand the number of Boston-based employees. At the same time, the development of the campus will be one factor leading to a shift in the types of employment available in the Allston-Brighton neighborhood. Harvard is an active partner in the City's workforce development efforts, and the City looks forward to working with Harvard to explore creative approaches to education, employment, and workforce development.
- **Technology Transfer and Commercialization of Research.** Given the potential of Harvard's planned major life sciences research to yield economic benefits for the City of Boston, the Phase 1 IMP should document Harvard's current and planned activities related to commercialization of research, support for start-up companies including development of incubator space and other commercial real estate, investment of capital in technology-related companies, and strategies for collaborating with the City of Boston to translate academic research directly into commercial economic activity.
- **Creative Economy.** Harvard's planned investments in arts and cultural facilities could yield a number of important benefits for Boston's creative economy. The Phase 1 IMP should explore ways that Harvard can collaborate with the City to leverage those investments to create employment in creative industries and ancillary businesses, including but not limited to the use of Harvard-owned real estate on an interim basis.
- **Purchasing and Small Business Development.** Harvard's role as a major purchaser of goods and services suggests that there are untapped opportunities for Boston-based

businesses to benefit from current University spending, and that the University could play an active role in helping local businesses access opportunities and in marshalling its own academic resources, such as Harvard Business School, for this purpose in a way that is consistent with the overall mission of the University. The Phase 1 IMP should explore opportunities to collaborate with the BRA and other City agencies to this end.

- **Economic Spinoffs from Phase 1 Development.** As Harvard plans its Phase 1 development program, including the possible move of the School of Public Health and the Graduate School of Education to Allston, the planning should consider strategies for partnering with the City of Boston to leverage future development for economic development benefits.

11.1 Submission Requirements: Economic Development

- **Harvard Employment.** The IMP Amendment should document Harvard's existing employment in Allston and the anticipated employment added as a result of the Proposed Projects by job category, skill level, and pay level. The Amendment should also describe any outreach and training initiatives designed to help Allston residents and Boston residents generally gain access to these opportunities. There is particular interest in learning about that part of the workforce drawn from adjacent neighborhoods and about programs to recruit, train and promote this population.
- **Employment in Harvard-Owned Buildings.** The Amendment should provide information on existing employment by business type in real estate currently owned by Harvard, and an assessment of the likely impact of the Phase 1 development program on that employment.
- **Purchasing.** The Amendment should provide background information on the structure and scale of Harvard's purchasing activities, an estimate of purchases from Boston-based businesses, and current outreach activities to Boston-based businesses.
- **Life Sciences Business Development.** The Amendment should outline the role that the Office of Technology Development and other University entities currently play and will play in the future in promoting life sciences technology transfer and business development in Allston and Boston generally.

12. OTHER

- **Public Safety.** Some public comments have raised concerns about the impact of the proposed Science Complex on public safety. The IMP Amendment and the Large Project Review submissions should address public safety concerns related to infectious diseases and possible protests directed at research activities. In light of anticipated undergraduate housing to be included in the Phase 1 IMP, the Amendment or other documents should also address issues related to student behavior and models for working with the Boston Police and other City departments to address such problems. Finally, the attached comments from the Boston Fire Department should be addressed at the appropriate point in the review process and, more generally, Harvard should engage in an ongoing discussion with the Boston Fire Department regarding public safety services in Allston.
- **Historic and Archaeological Resources.** The staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission (BL) has reviewed the IMPNF. BLC staff are concerned about the three project sites and the planning area. Harvard has provided insufficient information for staff to

determine the process for consistent planning regarding historic and archaeological resources. Accordingly, BLC staff requests a meeting with Harvard to discuss consistent planning and review criteria.

- **Taxes and PILOTs.** In the context of the master planning process, Harvard should meet with the City's Assessor.
- **Status of Current IMP Projects.** Table 1 of the IMPNF lists 7 projects currently not scheduled. The Amendment should provide a brief clarification of Harvard's intentions regarding these proposed projects and whether or not they will be included in the Phase 1 IMP.
- **Public Notice.** Harvard will be responsible for preparing and publishing in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the City of Boston a Public Notice of the submission of the Master Plan Amendment to the BRA as required by Section 80A-2. This Notice shall be published within five (5) days after the receipt of the IMP Amendment by the BRA. In accordance with Article 80, public comments on the IMP Amendment shall be transmitted to the BRA within sixty (60) days of the publication of this notice. A sample form of the Public Notice is attached as Appendix 3. Following publication of the Public Notice, Harvard shall submit to the BRA a copy of the published Notice together with the date of publication.

13. COMMUNITY BENEFITS PLAN

Harvard's expansion into Allston will have both positive and negative impacts on the existing neighborhood and its residents. The focus of the discussion of community benefits for the purposes of the Amendment should be on the Proposed Projects. However, the discussion should also begin to describe the community benefits that will occur as a result of the Phase I Master Plan. It is understood that the IMPNF and subsequent IMP for the Phase I Master Plan will continue to provide information on the status of the ongoing discussions on community benefits.

- **Existing Community Benefits Programs.** The IMP Amendment should document Harvard's existing commitments to the community with information on how opportunities can be accessed.
- **Proposed Community Benefits Programs.** The Amendment should also propose community benefits related to the Proposed Projects, e.g. access to the museum collections and cultural facilities, educational and enrichment programs, etc.
- **Process for Community Benefits Planning.** Beyond taking appropriate steps to mitigate the negative impacts of development, Harvard should work with the BRA, the Task Force, and the community at large to fashion an appropriate plan for community benefits that will be included in the Phase 1 IMP.
- **Other Comments.** The IMP Amendment should respond to all other comments related to community benefits included in the Appendixes, or discuss when those issues will be addressed.

APPENDIX 1

COMMENTS FROM CITY PUBLIC AGENCIES

June 6, 2006

Mr. Gerald Autler
Senior Project Manager/Planner
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Square, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02201-1007

Re: Comments on the Harvard University Institutional Master Plan Notification Form for the Proposed IMP Amendment (April 2006)

Dear Mr. Autler:

The Parks and Recreation Department (the "Department") has received the April 2006 *Institutional Master Plan Notification Form* to Amend and Renew the Harvard University Allston Campus Institutional Master Plan.

This *Institutional Master Plan Notification Form* ("IMPNF") has been submitted to the Boston Redevelopment Authority ("BRA") pursuant to the provisions of Section 80D of the Boston Zoning Code (the "Zoning Code"), in order to initiate the Institutional Master Plan ("IMP") amendment process for three institutional projects proposed for Harvard University's Allston Campus. The three institutional projects proposed in this IMPNF include: (1) the construction of a new scientific research and education complex of approximately 500,000 square feet, on a site south of Western Avenue and east of Travis Street; (2) reuse of the existing commercial properties at 1360 and 1380 Soldiers Field Road to provide approximately 90,000 square feet of space for interim use by the Harvard University Art Museums ("HUAM"); and (3) renovation of an existing 25,000 square foot commercial building at 224 Western Avenue to provide additional space for Harvard University ("Harvard") arts and culture uses on an interim basis. As part of this request, Harvard also seeks to renew/extend the current Allston Campus IMP— including the authorization for institutional uses at 1230 Soldiers Field Road and 25 Travis Street (the "2002 Amendment Properties")—until such time that Harvard submits, and the BRA approves, a new IMP describing the University's larger Phase I development plans for the extended Allston Campus. For purposes of this document, "Phase I" is intended to refer to those Harvard development projects and related infrastructure improvements that are expected to occur over approximately the next ten years.

The Department wishes to submit the following comments:

General Remarks

- Our overall perspective is that Harvard will bring in more residents and non-residents, and thereby create additional pressure and demands on existing open space resources, as well as on transportation systems and water, sewer, and other utility systems. It will end up overtaxing the very limited open space and natural resources available; therefore Harvard needs to adopt a social imperative of helping to improve rather than destroy the neighborhood it is absorbing and redeveloping, and of connecting to and enhancing the adjacent neighborhoods. A productive and socially responsible approach for Harvard would be to create an overall framework of open space resources that are linked to and complement the existing resource base, and to emphasize public, community access to as much of the improved open space system and new facilities as possible, thereby improving the overall open space system in North Allston.

Background

- The two place-oriented guidance documents for our comments are the City of Boston's own *Open Space Plan 2002-2006* and the BRA's *North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning*.
- The *Open Space Plan 2002-2006* has a chapter on Allston-Brighton. It states that "[t]his northeast portion of the larger community [i.e., Allston] has fewer neighborhood parks. The disorganized growth of Allston has resulted in difficult community access to existing parklands as well as a general lack of green space in the community." Further on, it also mentions Harvard's proposed campus expansion in Allston: "With sizable land purchases in Allston by Harvard in the past decade, it is hoped that the community will also benefit by improvements to the public realm in scenic, passive, and recreation facilities that will result from development of these new holdings." (Page 36.)
- The *Open Space Plan 2002-2006* recommends that the City of Boston "[w]ork with Harvard University to create more community benefits from its existing open spaces and sports complex. Urge the provision of open space amenities in future developments on Harvard University land to reduce impacts on existing public resources. Provide community and public realm benefits from new Harvard developments to mitigate impacts and to better integrate these new developments with the surrounding community." (Page 39.)
- It also recommends that "[r]ehabilitation of the [state-owned] Charles River Reservation … should take place along with improved access from the community to this regional park." (Page 38.)
- The *North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning* sets out the following shared goals for the public realm:
  "• Expand the limited number of neighborhood parks by creating new parks and improving access to Smith Field.

• Convert Western Avenue into an amenity-rich, pedestrian-friendly commercial district, with streetscape designs and improvements that reflect these new uses.
• Enhance access – both visual and physical – to the Charles River from the traditional neighborhoods and other parts of the community.
• Ensure that any new academic and other development not be walled off from the neighborhood physically or visually.
• Use identifying signage to help establish gateways, connections and nodes of pedestrian activity, and to reinforce North Allston's sense of place." (Page 5.)

- Later in the same document, planning principles are set out:
  <u>Guiding Principles for the Public Realm</u>
  ■ Create open space, and improve existing parks, in ways that more effectively serve neighborhood residents.
  ■ Increase community benefits associated with new development by promoting partnerships between the City and non-public landowners to develop new open spaces and improve and maintain existing ones to improve streetscapes.
  ■ Transform Western Avenue into a more pedestrian friendly neighborhood "Main Street" by using a variety of streetscape-improvements techniques.
  ■ Improve access and visible connections to the river.
  ■ Provide for permeability of and community access to Harvard's campus.
  ■ Use signage to establish gateways, pedestrian connections, and nodes of pedestrian activity, and to reinforce North Allston's sense of place.
  (Page 18.)
- In the "Framework for Planning" chapter, it states that public realm and open space issues include the following:
  "• Crowding and limited accessibility of neighborhood parks.
  • Inadequate access to the river.
  • Ensuring neighborhood visual and pedestrian access to the new academic/research campus."
  (Page 29.) ["Crowding" strongly suggests a neighborhood underserved by parkland.]
  It then goes on to state that this effort by Harvard represents planning opportunities:
  "• Creation of permeable new campus.
  • Creation of new and expanded parks, enhanced access to the river, and pedestrian-friendly Main Street." (Page 29.)

Comments

- As many city staff have commented, the IMPNF is "light," and considerably less informative than anticipated. The most "substantive" reference to open space in this scoping document is "[I]ncorporate the building [the proposed new Life Sciences center] and the surrounding site into a larger open/public space network plan." (Page 15 of the IMPNF.) Given the need for open space that both the city's open space plan and the BRA North Allston plan indicate, as well as the major change anticipated by the campus expansion, a much more detailed and substantive approach must be taken for the amended IMP and, in the future, for the new IMP, as well as for each building.
- In order to properly scope the open space portion of this project impact assessment, given the large significant scale of this project, we are recommending that the open space impact assessment portion of the urban design element in the scoping determination be based on Open Space impact assessment process outlined in the City of New York City Environmental Quality Review Technical Manual. This document provides the defined structure and procedures needed for impact assessment in light of the paucity of information submitted in the IMPNF, while allowing for flexibility given the changing nature of this IMP process. This text is available at the following website: http://www.nyc.gov/html/oec/downloads/pdf/ceqr_chapter_3d.pdf
  The proponent will need to consult with the Boston Parks Department staff to determine the level of detail and analysis needed at this Amended IMP step, as well as changes needed from the New York City approach so that it will be more appropriate to Boston conditions. Such consultation should occur no later than 10 business days after the date of the BRA's scoping determination.
- Every other aspect of this project impact review, from transportation, environmental protection, historic resources, and infrastructure, must reference whether it affects open space resources and issues, and be referenced in the open space section of the document.
- The Amended IMP must present the "larger open/public space network plan" referred to on page 15. This plan must be developed early in the process of developing the Amended IMP (within 20 business days after the date of the BRA's scoping determination) so that reviewers can assess how each of the structures that are the subject of the Amendment are "incorporated" into the "larger open/public space network plan."
- Park Commission review will likely be required for the 224 Western Avenue proposal, as the property is within 100 feet of Smith Playground, a public park.

Should you have further questions regarding these comments, please feel free to contact me at 617 961-3033 or at srplnr@ci.boston.ma.us

Sincerely,

Aldo Ghirin
Senior Planner

c: H. Kenneth Crasco, Chief Landscape Architect, BPRD

June 7, 2006

Mark Maloney, Director
Boston Redevelopment Authority
Boston City Hall, Room 925
Boston, MA 02201
Attention: Gerald Autler, Senior Project Manager/Planner

Re: Institutional Master Plan Notification Form to Amend and Renew the Harvard University Allston Campus Institutional Master Plan

Dear Director Maloney:

The City of Boston Environment Department has reviewed the Institutional Master Plan Notification Form to Amend and Renew the Harvard University Allston Campus Institutional Master Plan (IMPNF).

In 1997, a five-year Institutional Master Plan (IMP) was approved for the Harvard University Allston Campus. It was amended in 2002 to add facilities at 1230 Soldiers Field Road and 25 Travis Street to the IMP area.

The IMPNF filed in 2002 to renew the 1997 IMP indicated that Harvard would submit a new IMP upon completion of the North Allston Neighborhood Strategic Planning Process. Harvard indicated that no significantly greater impacts would result from renewal of the previously approved IMP and a waiver of further review was requested. No date for completion of the planning process was put forward. Harvard requested a July 1, 2006 expiration date for the renewed IMP, consistent with the "sunset provision" date noted in the IMP amendment. The IMP was renewed.

Harvard and its consultants are framing the planning for the Phase I of the Allston campus. Phase I is considered near term – ten years. Harvard expects the planning framework to be complete during the fourth quarter of 2006 and an IMPNF filed by the end of the year.

Harvard now seeks to renew/extend the IMP amended in 2002 with a new amendment that will add three proposed projects - a science complex, interim arts and culture uses and an interim museum facility. Interim is defined as ten years. The science complex is the only project within the IMP area.

Harvard worked for four years with a Strategic Planning Group to develop a North Allston Neighborhood Strategic Plan. It is now part of a 17-member task force assembled by the BRA to help structure Harvard's Allston Master Plan and to advise the BRA and Harvard through development and implementation of the IMP.

The BRA has indicated that it will not approve the requested amendment until Harvard has submitted an IMPNF for their next IMP, which will encompass all the new land they expect to develop over the next 10 years. That document will be much more detailed, and will include much more information on both a 10-year development program and the larger planning framework.

RESPONSE

It is reasonable to assume that some space on the Cambridge campus will be vacated as uses move to and expand in Allston. When the vacated space in Cambridge is THAN occupied, transportation impacts through and in Allston, in addition to those associated with the Allston campus, are likely to occur. This suggests that information about planned changes for the Cambridge campus must be integrated into planning for Allston and that an aggressive, University-wide Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program be developed and implemented. The IMPNF should describe:

- the existing transportation characteristics in the Allston IMP area and the surrounding roadways;
- the work locations and number of users of the 1,300-space parking garage planned for the science center complex;
- the anticipated number of spaces that will serve portions of the Phase I development area (page eight);
- planned net new parking spaces for the three projects and for the Phase I development area;
- the number of parking spaces in the IMP area for each 1,000 square feet (SF) of development;
- the number of parking spaces leased, owned, occupied and controlled by and on behalf of Harvard;
- the eligibility criteria for parking in each facility;
- parking rates reported as weekly, monthly, semester or annual charges;

- market-rate parking charges for the same areas;
- the level of subsidy, if any, provided for parking;
- the transportation characteristics expected during the 10-year near term and beyond for the Allston IMP area and the surrounding roadways;
- the existing TDM program;
- the number of students, faculty, staff and contract employees (reported in actual numbers, not full-time equivalents, and as a percentage of the whole for each category) who, at the time of the filing, participate in each major element of the TDM program.

Similarly detailed information should be provided in each PNF for the proposed projects regarding:

- the transportation characteristics of employees moving from Cambridge to Allston;
- the number of those students, faculty, staff and contract employees (reported in actual numbers, not full-time equivalents, and as a percentage of the whole for each category) who, at the time of the filing, participate in each major element of an existing TDM program;
- the transportation characteristics for other users of the existing arts and culture uses and museum facility and for employees who will move from Cambridge to Allston;
- expected transportation characteristics for each project;
- the number of parking spaces that will be leased, owned, occupied and controlled by and on behalf of Harvard;
- planned net new parking spaces for each of the three projects;
- the number of parking spaces per 1,000 square feet (SF) of development;
- the eligibility criteria for parking in each facility;
- parking rates reported as weekly, monthly, semester or annual charges;
- market-rate parking charges for the same areas; and
- the level of subsidy, if any, that will be provided for parking.

The potential for both short- and long-term effects on air quality as a result of traffic and use-related emissions should be discussed in the IMPNF. Known options for mitigation should be identified.

Expectations about the locations and sizes of facilities that can be accommodated on the Allston campus should be identified in the IMPNF. The potential for and general locations of increased pedestrian level wind and shadow and combined wind and shadow likely to result from the design of new and expanded facilities should discussed in general. Any locations that may cast shadow and affect wind on open space and historic and natural resources should be identified. A policy regarding protection of these resources should be developed and included in the IMPNF.

Methods for compliance with the Commonwealth's anti-idling law (MGL 90 s16A and 310 CMR 7.11), the use of "No Idling" signage, installation of "Don't Dump…" plaques and compliance with the city's noise ordinance must be addressed in the PNFs.

Options for stormwater management that will decrease existing runoff, increase on-site detention and re-use stormwater should be identified and described in the IMPNF as should groundwater characteristics and needs. The same issues should be addressed in the PNF for each proposed project.

Information about existing hazardous waste and mitigation plans for the planning area should be in the IMPNF and in the PNF for each of the three project sites.

The IMPNF and PNFs should reflect Harvard's significant commitment to sustainability. The IMPNF should demonstrate how each of the identified sustainability principles will be put into practice as part of a campus-wide plan for designing and operating green buildings and sites. The PNFs should address this issue on a project-specific level.

The development of a new and expanded campus offers an opportunity to provide for district energy needs in a comprehensive and sustainable manner. The use of a distributed energy system for the campus is both possible and sustainable. In this regard, the IMPNF should include descriptions of:

- the potential scope of such a system;
- location options for such a system; and
- the ways in which potential air quality and noise impacts can be addressed.

The PNF for the science site should include a discussion of the potential for locating a distributed energy facility on site. PNFs for each project should also discuss the use of other renewable technologies for energy generation.

The staff of the Boston Landmarks Commission (BL) has reviewed the IMPNF. BLC staff are concerned about the three project sites and the planning area. Harvard has provided insufficient information for staff to determine the process for consistent planning regarding historic and archaeological resources. Accordingly, BLC staff requests a meeting with Harvard to discuss consistent planning and review criteria. As currently documented, BLC staff cannot determine how each project site relates to the others and how the boundaries of the planning area were developed if significant projects will occur outside of these boundaries.

A plan for avoiding, minimizing or mitigating construction-related effects should be described in both the IMPNF and PNFs.

According to the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), about 33 percent of mobile source particulate matter (PM) and ten percent of all nitrogen oxide (NO_x) pollution in the northeast is caused by construction vehicles. More than 90 percent of diesel engine particulate emissions are highly respirable and carry toxins deep into the lung, exacerbating human respiratory ailments. The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has proposed classification of diesel exhaust as "highly likely to be carcinogenic in humans." It estimates that diesel engines currently on the road can run for 1,000,000 miles and remain in operation for as much as 20 to 30 years. This amounts to 160 to 240 tons of pollution over the life of each engine.

The DEP's Clean Air Construction Initiative (CACI) is designed to reduce air quality degradation caused by emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOC), NO_x and air toxins from heavy- duty, diesel-powered construction equipment. Oxidation catalysts and catalyzed particulate filters reduce toxic emissions of formaldehyde, benzene, acrolein and 1-3 butadiene by as much as 70 percent. The CACI offers contractors a cost-effective way to decrease localized adverse impacts and reduce dust and odor complaints from project abutters and regulatory agencies. Experience with a pilot project that retrofitted 83 pieces of equipment working on the Central Artery/Tunnel (CA/T) project showed that:

- Vehicles did not experience significant power loss.

- There are no additional operation and maintenance (O & M) or fuel costs.
- Engine manufacturers continue to honor vehicle warranties.

We strongly urge Harvard to require that general contractors and sub-contractors use only ultra low-sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel (15 ppm) and retrofitted off-road construction equipment for all projects.

TDM policies and programs for the construction period should be outlined in the IMPNF and PNFs.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer comment. We look forward to planning and project filings.

Sincerely,

Bryan Glascock
Director

HvdMPrenewal2006.doc.DBG.mtz/060602

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gerald Autler

FROM: John Walser

DATE: June 1, 2006

SUBJECT: Harvard Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNF) for proposed IMP Amendment – Large Project Review

Harvard proposes three institutional projects as part of the IMPNF for the proposed IMP Amendment filed with the BRA on Friday, April 28, 2006. The projects include: 1) the construction of a new scientific research and education complex of approximately 500,000 square feet, on a site south of Western Avenue and east of Travis Street; 2) reuse of the existing commercial properties at 1360 and 1380 Soldiers Field Road to provide approximately 90,000 square feet of space for interim use by Harvard University Art Museums; and 3) renovation of an existing 25,000 square foot commercial building at 224 Western Avenue to provide additional space for Harvard arts and culture uses on an interim basis.

I have reviewed the IMPNF dated April 28, 2006 and submit the following Environmental Protection Component for the Scoping Determination for the proposed IMP Amendment. Please note that additional detailed environmental scoping of the three institutional projects will occur during the upcoming Article 80 large Project Review process during 2006. As applicable, the analyses shall be required for the Project Proponent's preferred alternative as well as for any other alternative(s) that may be required to be studied by this Scoping Determination.

Wind

Pedestrian level winds are anticipated to be in compliance with the Authority's guideline of an effective gust velocity of 31 mph not to be exceeded more than 1% of the time. As stated in the IMPNF, the Proposed Project is not expected to significantly change pedestrian level winds in the area. No additional analysis is required.

Shadow

Information provided in the IMPNF indicates that the IMPNF Amendment may have significant shadow impacts. Therefore, a shadow analysis is required.

A shadow analysis shall be required for existing and build conditions for the hours 9:00 a.m., 12:00 noon, and 3:00 p.m. for the vernal equinox, summer solstice, autumnal equinox, and winter solstice and for 6:00 p.m. during the summer and autumn. It should be noted that due to time differences (daylight savings vs. standard), the autumnal equinox shadows would not be the same as the vernal equinox shadows and therefore separate shadow studies are required for the vernal and autumnal equinoxes.

The shadow impact analysis must include net new shadow as well as existing shadow and must clearly show the incremental impact of the proposed new building. For purposes of clarity, new shadow should be shown in a dark, contrasting tone distinguishable from existing shadow. The shadow impact study area shall include, at a minimum, the entire area to be encompassed by the maximum shadow expected to be produced by the Proposed Project (i.e., at the winter solstice). The build condition(s) shall include all buildings under construction and any proposed buildings anticipated to be completed prior to completion of the Proposed Project. Shadow from all existing buildings within the shadow impact study area shall be shown. A North arrow shall be provided on all figures. Shadows shall be determined by using the applicable Boston Azimuth and Altitude data as provided in Exhibit 1 (Sun Altitude/Azimuth Table, Boston, Massachusetts) below.

Particular attention shall be given to existing or proposed public open spaces and pedestrian areas, including, but not limited to, the existing and proposed sidewalks and pedestrian walkways within, adjacent to, and in the vicinity of the Proposed Project and the existing and proposed plazas, park areas, and other open space areas within and in the vicinity of the proposed development, and any other public and private open space areas that potentially could be affected by project-generated shadows.

The above shadow analysis shall be required for any alternative required to be studied by the Scoping Determination as well as the preferred development option.

SUN ALTITUDE/AZIMUTH TABLE – Exhibit 1

Boston, Massachusetts

Latitude: N42.36 Longitude: W71.06

	Altitude	Azimuth	Time
21 March			Standard
9:00 a.m.	33.0	125.7	
12:00 Noon	48.0	-176.9	
3:00 p.m.	30.5	-121.8	
21 June			Daylight Savings
9:00 a.m.	39.9	93.5	
12:00 Noon	68.8	149.4	
3:00 p.m.	56.5	-113.7	
6:00 p.m.	23.9	- 79.3	

21 September			Daylight Savings
9:00 a.m.	25.9	115.3	
12:00 Noon	47.4	166.0	
3:00 p.m.	37.4	-132.9	
6:00 p.m.	7.3	- 96.0	
21 December			**Standard**
9:00 a.m.	14.2	141.9	
12:00 Noon	24.1	-175.6	
3:00 p.m.	10.0	-135.1	

Source: Autocad/MassGIS

Daylight

A daylight analysis for both build and no-build conditions should be conducted by measuring the percentage of skydome that is obstructed by the Proposed Project building and evaluating the net change in obstruction. If alternative massing studies are requested as part of the Article 80 development review process, daylight analysis of such alternatives shall also be conducted for comparison. The study should treat the following elements as controls for data comparison: existing conditions, the context of the area, and the as-of-right background zoning envelope. The areas of interest include viewpoints along Western Avenue and Travis Street. Daylight analyses should be taken for each new major building façade, or grouping thereof within the limits of the Boston Redevelopment Authority Daylight Analysis (BRADA) program, fronting these public or quasi-public ways. The midpoint of each roadway or public accessway should be taken as the study point. The BRADA program must be used for this analysis.

Solar Glare

If the design of the Proposed Projects included in the IMP Amendment incorporate substantial glass-facades, an evaluation of potential solar glare impacts shall be required.

This analysis shall measure potential reflective glare from the building onto potentially affected streets and roadways, and nearby public open spaces (including the campus quad) in order to determine the potential for visual impairment or discomfort due to reflective spot glare for pedestrians/students and motorists. Mitigation measures to eliminate any adverse reflective glare shall be identified. Technical data used for the analysis shall be included.

The solar glare analysis also shall examine the potential for solar heat buildup in any nearby buildings receiving reflective sunlight from the Proposed Project. In some cases, this condition can result in overheating or the receiving structure or incapacitation of its air conditioning system. Mitigation measures shall be described for any identified negative impacts on nearby buildings.

Air Quality

The DPIR shall describe the existing and projected future air quality in the project vicinity and shall evaluate ambient levels to determine conformance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Particular attention shall be given to mitigation measures to ensure compliance with air quality standards.

A future air quality (carbon monoxide) analysis shall be required for any intersection (including the proposed garage entrances/exits) where level of service (LOS) is expected to deteriorate to D and the Proposed Project causes a 10 percent increase in traffic or where the level of service is E or F and the Proposed Project contributes to a reduction of LOS.

The study shall analyze the existing conditions, future No-Build and future Build conditions only. The methodology and parameters of the traffic-related air quality analysis shall be approved in advance by the Boston Redevelopment Authority and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. The results of the air quality analysis shall be compared to the Massachusetts State Implementation Plan to determine project compliance with the Plan. Mitigation measures to eliminate or avoid any violation of air quality standards shall be described.

An indirect source air quality analysis of the operation of proposed parking garage(s) shall be prepared to determine potential air quality impacts on nearby sensitive receptors and compliance with air quality standards. Garage emissions should be estimated using appropriate U.S. EPA guidance. The EPA SCREEN3 model should be used to calculate maximum CO impacts from the garage at the various sensitive receptors.

A description of the project's heating and mechanical systems and of the parking garage ventilation system, including location of intake and exhaust vents and specifications, and an analysis of the impact on pedestrian level air quality and on any sensitive receptors from operation of the heating, mechanical, and exhaust systems, including the building’s emergency generator, shall be required.

Solid and Hazardous Wastes

The presence of any contaminated soil or groundwater and any underground or aboveground storage tanks at the project site shall be evaluated and remediation measures to ensure their safe removal and disposal shall be described. As applicable, the Proponent should summarize, in detail, the results of any studies or findings, including types and concentrations of contaminants encountered and shall include appropriate tables and maps. The reports shall be made available to the BRA.

If asbestos, asbestos–containing materials, lead paint or other hazardous compounds (e.g., PCBs, biohazards) are identified during demolition, renovation or removal activities, the handling and disposal must be in compliance with Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, the Boston Public Health Commission and the Inspectional Services Department guidelines and requirements.

The Proponent shall quantify and describe the generation, storage, and disposal of all solid wastes from the construction and operation of the Proposed Project. In addition, measures to promote the reduction of waste generation and recycling, particularly for paper, plastics, glass, metals, and other recyclable products, and compliance with the City's recycling program, shall be described.

Noise

The Proponent shall establish the existing noise levels at the project site and vicinity and shall calculate future noise levels after project completion based on appropriate modeling and shall demonstrate compliance with applicable Federal, State, and City of Boston noise criteria and regulations. The noise evaluation shall include the effect of noise generated by the area's traffic, and other noise sources. Future noise levels shall include the noise generated by the Proposed Project's mechanical equipment (including emergency generators). Measures to minimize and eliminate adverse noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors, including the project itself, from traffic noise and mechanical systems shall be described.

The Proponent should also consult with the APCC regarding intermittent noise testing to ensure compliance with all noise standards.

Stormwater Management

As stated in the IMPNF, stormwater management controls will be established in compliance with the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (BWSC) standards. Compliance with those for the final site design will be reviewed as part of BWSCs Site Plan Review Process.

Please note that the Proposed Project's stormwater management system, including best management practices to be implemented, measures proposed to control and treat stormwater runoff and to maximize on-site retention of stormwater, measures to prevent groundwater contamination, and compliance with the Commonwealth's Stormwater Management Policies are also required.

If the project(s) involve the disturbance of one acre or more of land, a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Construction consistent with the requirements of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and the Boston Water and Sewer Commission will be required. In addition, a stormwater pollution prevention plan must be prepared and submitted (to BWSC and DEP) prior to commencing construction. A copy of this plan(s) should be made available to the BRA.

Geotechnical Impact/Groundwater

Please consult with the Boston Groundwater Trust regarding potential groundwater issues.

Measures to ensure that groundwater levels will be maintained should be described in detail. Installation of observation monitoring wells, preferable on public land, may be required if existing wells are not already present. If dewatering is necessary during construction, a replenishment system must be installed and levels maintained. Upon completion of construction, monitoring wells will need to be assigned to the Trust by the developer with an agreement granting the Trust access if wells are on

private property. A complete description of the proposed recharging system or recirculation program must be provided.

Contact information for the Trust:

Boston Groundwater Trust
234 Clarendon Street
Boston, MA 02116
Attention: Elliott Laffer, Executive Director
617-859-8439

In addition, a vibration monitoring plan should be provided that ensures potential vibration impacts from project construction on adjacent buildings and infrastructure is mitigated.

Construction Impacts

As stated in the IMPNF, a Construction Management Plan will need to be submitted to the Boston Transportation Department for review and approval prior to the start of construction. A construction impact analysis should include a description and evaluation of the following:

(a) potential dust and pollutant emissions and mitigation measures to control these emissions, including participation in the Commonwealth's Clean Construction Initiative.

(b) potential noise generation and mitigation measures to minimize increases in noise levels.

(c) location of construction staging areas and construction worker parking; measures to encourage carpooling and/or public transportation use by construction workers.

(d) construction schedule, including hours of construction activity.

(e) access routes for construction trucks and anticipated volume of construction truck traffic.

(f) construction methodology (including foundation construction), amount and method of excavation required, disposal of the excavate, description of foundation support, maintenance of groundwater levels, and measures to prevent any adverse effects or damage to adjacent structures and infrastructure.

(g) Method of demolition of existing buildings on the site and disposal of the demolition waste.

(h) potential for the recycling of construction and demolition debris, including asphalt from the existing parking lot.

(i) identification of best management practices to control erosion and to prevent the discharge of sediments and contaminated groundwater or stormwater runoff into the City's drainage system and into the adjacent river and harbor waters during the construction period.

(j) coordination of project construction activities with other major construction projects being undertaken in the project vicinity at the same time, including scheduling and phasing of individual construction activities.

(k) impact of project construction on rodent populations and description of the proposed rodent control program, including frequency of application and compliance with applicable City and State regulatory requirements.

(l) measures to protect the public safety.

Sustainable Design

A new construction project presents opportunities for sustainable design and construction to prevent damage to the environment, consistent with the goals of Executive Order 385. The Proponent should more fully describe appropriate environmentally protective technologies and practices that will be incorporated into the design and operation of the proposed development and commitment to include such measures. Details regarding the University's Campus-Wide Sustainability Principles including indicators for sustainability should be provided. Measures shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Participation in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star/Green Lights program and adoption of the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards for the project.

- Optimize natural day lighting, passive solar gain, and natural cooling, specify energy efficient HVAC and lighting systems, appliances, and other equipment, and solar preheating of makeup air.

- Favor building materials and purchases of supplies that are non-toxic, made from recycled materials, and made with low embodied energy.

- Application of cool roofing material for energy conservation, including reduction in cooling energy use.

- Build easily accessible recycling system infrastructure into the project's design.

- Incorporate additional opportunities to conserve water beyond water-saving technologies required by law.

- Make the building design adaptable for the future inclusion of innovative energy and environmental technologies as they develop over time.

- Conduct annual audits of energy consumption, waste streams, and the use of renewable technologies.

In addition, the project(s) should include significant green features such as native landscaping, increased water and energy efficiency, improved indoor air quality, green roof systems, and renewable energy technologies to the extent possible. Please describe commitments to the following:

- Sustainable Sites (public transportation access, bicycle storage, alternative fueled vehicles, stormwater management, green roofing, light pollution reduction)
- Water Efficiency (water use reduction, water efficient landscaping, innovative wastewater technologies)
- Energy & Atmosphere (energy performance, CFC reduction in HVAC&R equipment, renewable energy)
- Materials & Resources (Recycle content, construction waste management, local/regional materials)
- Indoor Environmental Quality (Environmental tobacco smoke control, ventilation effectiveness, low emitting materials (adhesives & sealants, paints, carpets, composite wood), daylight and views)
- Innovation & Design Process (innovation in design)

To: **Gerald Autler**
From: **Richard Garver**
Date: **May 26, 2006**
RE: **Comments on Harvard's Proposed IMP Amendment**

GENERAL

- The IMP amendment should clearly indicate the site areas for the three projects that it proposes to add through amendment to the current IMP.

- The North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning emphasizes the importance of transforming the North Allston traffic model created by Harvard into a model that the City can maintain as a basis for evaluating all future developments in the area. Prior to the submission of the IMP amendment the university and the City should reach agreement on the terms for transferring the Harvard model to the City and any modifications to the model that would be required for it to meet the City's standards for such a mode.

SCIENCE CENTER

- The University's April, 2006 Overview of Transportation Options explores Phase I (ten year) transit elements that would connect the center to the undergraduate campus and to the Longwood area. It also introduces a longer-term vision of both connections that would build on those created in Phase I. The proposed Institutional Master Plan amendment and the accompanying Article 80 submission for the Science Center should clearly indicate the elements of these two systems that would be accomplished in conjunction with the Science Center project, including,

    a. Any modifications to current roadways, including new signalized intersections or dedicated lanes, that would be required by these links should be indicated and programmed
    b. Attractive facilities for shuttle and transit patronsshould be incorporated within the Science Center site plan and design
    c. The proposal should indicate the extent to which the science-to-science connections would be accessible to non-Harvard North Allston patrons.

- The April Overview indicates that Phase I program includesimprovements that would have a direct bearing on the impacts the Science Center will have on the surrounding roadways. These include improvements to the North Harvard Street/Soldiers Field Road and the Cambridge Street/I-90/Soldiers field Road Interchange intersections, a Cambridge Street/Western Avenue Connector, and an I-90 ramp from Western Avenue. The amendment and Article 80 submission should,

a. Incorporate these links within the traffic model to determine the relative benefit/impact of each on area roadway circulation. In particular it should,
    i. Show the impacts of the project and associated roadway improvements on the area intersections which Harvard's earlier assessments have been shown to operate at substandard levels, such as those on Cambridge Street.
    ii. Show the degree to which they meet the guiding principles of the North Allston strategic framework to direct regional traffic to the regional network and minimize traffic cutting through North Allston residential areas.
b. Indicate which of these elements are proposed to be implemented in conjunction with the Science Center.
c. Integrate these elements with the transit circulation system referred to above.

- The Science Center site plan should include a robust set of pedestrian and bicycle connections to a variety of academic, recreational and neighborhood destinations within North Allston. In particular, these should,
    a. Address the North Allston strategic framework's guiding principle to enhance Western Avenue as a pedestrian and bicycle friendly environment.
    b. Address the strategic framework's proposal for a pedestrian/bicycle promenade between Smith Field and the Esplanade.

INTERIM ARTS AND CULTURAL CENTER

- The center presents an opportunity to address the objectives set forth in the North Allston Strategic Framework for Barry's corner. As part of goal of creating a vibrant mixed-use area, these include the transformation of Western Avenue into a pedestrian-friendly, neighborhood-serving Main Street and the formation of pedestrian and bicycle connections between the neighborhood and the Charles River. The IMP and Article 80 submission should indicate the streetscape improvements that will accompany the project that address these objectives.

INTERIM MUSEUM FACILTIY

- The proposed facility is located near the Western Avenue/Market Street intersection, which Harvard's assessment has indicated has a severely sub-standard level of traffic operation. The amendment and Article 80 submission for this project must address the intersection's deficiencies and suggest measures to mitigate the project's impacts on its operation.

- The site is on the 70, 70A and 86 bus routes. It also has the potential to be linked to the campus as a whole by university shuttle services. The proposal should state whether the project will be served by a shuttle and suggest ways to provide passenger

facilities, possible of a shared nature, that would increase the attractiveness of public and university transit services.

- The North Allston strategic framework highlights the opportunity for streetscape improvements to this section of Western Avenue. In particular, it calls for improvements to the pedestrian characteristics of the Western Ave./Market Street intersection and the potential of bike lanes on Western Avenue. The proposal should address this opportunity.

Boston

Gerald Autler
Senior Project Manager/Planner
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201-1007

May 8, 2006

Dear Mr. Autler:

Regarding the Project Notification Form for the Harvard university Institutional Master Plan project submitted to the BRA in April 2006 the Boston Fire Department requires the following issues addressed by a qualified individual.

1. Emergency vehicle site access to the new buildings as well as existing buildings that might be affected.
2. Impact on availability and accessibility of hydrant locations for new buildings as well as for any existing buildings that might be impacted.
3. Impact on availability and accessibility to siamese connection locations for new buildings as well as for any existing buildings that might be impacted.
4. Impact that a transformer vault fire or explosion will have on the fire safety of the building. Particularly as it relates to the location of the vault.
5. Need for Boston Fire Department permit requirements as outlined in the Boston Fire Prevention Code, the Massachusetts Fire Prevention Regulations (527 CMR), and the Massachusetts Fire Prevention Laws (MGL CH148).
6. For projects involving air-supported structures, it is critical that the impact of the design has on fire safety relative to the interaction of the area underneath the structure to the structure as well as to the interaction of the structure to the area underneath the structure.
7. Due to the increasing popularity of private wireless communication services, it has become increasingly difficult and costly for the Fire Department to locate our emergency communications equipment at appropriate sites. At the same time, the need for antenna sites has grown as development continues in downtown/Back Bay. We would appreciate it if the BRA, as part of its development review process for high-rise towers, could assist the Fire Department in obtaining rooftop access for our communications equipment as a public benefit too meet this critical public safety need.

These items should be analyzed for all phases of the construction as well as the final design stage. This project will need permits from the Boston Fire Department as well as the Inspectional Services Department.

Respectfully,

Peter A. Laizza
Fire Marshal

Pjm
Cc: Paul Donga, FPE, Plans Unit, BFD

BOSTON
TRANSPORTATION
DEPARTMENT

ONE CITY HALL PLAZA/ROOM 721
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02201
(617) 635-4680/FAX (617) 635-4295

June 2, 2006

Gerald Autler
Senior Project Manger/Planner
Boston Redevelopment Authority
City Hall, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02201

Dear Gerald:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Harvard University Allston Campus Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNF) dated April 2006.

The purpose of the IMPNF is to renew and amend the existing Harvard University Institutional Master Plan. Three development Projects were discussed:

1.) New Science Complex. Construct an approximately 500,000 s.f. science complex and 1,300 underground parking spaces. Approximately 1,000 of the parking spaces will replace existing surface spaces.

2.) Interim Art Museum Facility. Reuse two existing commercial properties at 1360 and 1380 Soldiers Field Road for a temporary museum facility to house conservation labs, administrative offices, art storage, and exhibit galleries. 85,000-90,000 s.f. and 170+ surface parking spaces.

3.) Interim Arts and Culture Space. Renovate the approximately 25,000 s.f. former Verizon building at 224 Western Avenue in Barry's Corner, adjacent to Teele Hall. The space will be used for art studio/work, gallery, rehearsal, and small performance space.

This IMPNF Amendment is unique because it is not the Article 80 Development Review filings for these Projects, but rather an amendment and renewal of Harvard's existing Master Plan. The purpose is two-fold. 1.) To allow Harvard to pursue planning and design for these parcels which are not currently part of Harvard's existing Master Plan. 2.) To extend Harvard's existing Master Plan until such time as the University submits and the City approves a new long-term Master Plan. Harvard is actively engaged with the City and community in developing such a long-term 10-year Master Plan for its Allston Campus.

BTD supports Harvard's IMP Amendment, pursuant to Harvard's continued commitment to working with the City and community on our common transportation goals and vision, as documented in the *North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning, May 2005,* and as discussed below.

City of Boston Transportation Priorities for North Allston

Below are the City's transportation priorities for North Allston. It is the context in which Harvard should work with BTD and the community as they advance their Projects and Master Plan and it forms a starting point for community review and further discussions. It should be noted that the list is a summary and not a definitive list. BTD also notes that Harvard is expected to submit details for their specific Projects and new 10-year Master Plan under Article 80 Review at which time BTD will issue detailed scopes.

1. Establish a Synchro traffic model for North Allston to provide the following:
    - Establish the existing traffic conditions and known-future baseline network to serve as a starting point for all analysis, including evaluating new developments or growth scenarios.
    - Create a tool to quickly propose or evaluate any traffic circulation, signal phasing or timing changes.
    - Provide a consistent network to evaluate future development projects or roadway changes.

2. Implement curbside parking regulations for North Harvard Street and Western Avenue.

3. Develop a plan for shuttle bus operations between Cambridge, North Allston and Longwood Medical Area.

4. Analyze and improve Bus route #66 service including, consolidating bus stops, increasing service frequency and reliability. Establish bus priority corridors along key arterials.

5. Establish/update a parking inventory for North Allston including:
    - Existing on and off-street spaces, public and private spaces, parking utilization, turnover rates, parking fees, and parking management and operations plans.
    - In addition to a report, create the inventory in an Excel spreadsheet or a database.

6. Improve pedestrian and bicycle connections including:
    - Upgrade pedestrian signal equipment (i.e. pedestrian countdown signals, ADA compliant, pedestrian ramps, etc.).
    - Establish street cross-sections that accommodate bicyclists, off-street public bicycle and pedestrian paths and bicycle storage facilities.

7. Investigate truck routes/bypass roads to keep trucks off local roadways.

8. New development should improve, not degrade, traffic flow in North Allston:
    - Development projects shall use BTD's Traffic Signal Operations Design Guidelines.
    - Intersections adjacent and/or near development projects should be improved through signal re-timing/phasing, geometric modifications, updated hardware and software and intelligent transportation systems such as, providing real-time traffic monitoring cameras linked to BTD's Traffic Management Center.

BOSTON TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
ONE CITY HALL PLAZA/ROOM 721, BOSTON, MA 02201 • (617) 635-4680

Printed on recycled paper

Lastly, the *North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning, May 2005,* contains substantial information and guidelines regarding the City and community's transportation goals for North Allston. Harvard should refer to this document often to guide their Development plans. Harvard has been and should continue to develop an area-wide transportation framework. The next steps are to develop the implementation timeline in coordination with BTD to accommodate the vision expressed in the North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning and the transportation priorities listed above.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the Harvard's IMPNF. BTD looks forward to working with the BRA, Harvard and community on Harvard's short and long-term development plans.

Sincerely,

Adam Shulman, AICP
Transportation Planner
BTD Policy and Planning

Cc: Vineet Gupta, Director of Policy and Planning

BOSTON TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT
ONE CITY HALL PLAZA/ROOM 721, BOSTON, MA 02201 • (617) 635-4680

Printed on recycled paper

June 1, 2006

Mr. Gerald Autler
Senior Project Manager
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Re: IMP Amendment for Harvard University

Dear Mr. Autler:

The Boston Water and Sewer Commission has reviewed the Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNF) submitted by Harvard University to amend and renew the University's Allston Campus Institutional Master Plan. Harvard University proposes to amend its Institutional Master Plan (IMP) in order to proceed with three projects as follows:

1. A new 500,000 square-foot science complex on a site south of Western Avenue and east of Travis Street. The complex will include an underground parking garage with approximately 1,300 spaces.
2. Reuse of existing commercial properties at 1360 and 1380 Soldiers Field Road to provide 90,000 square feet of space for use by the Harvard University Art Museums.
3. Renovation of an existing 25,000 square foot commercial building at 224 Western Avenue to provide additional space for arts and culture uses on an interim basis.

Water use and wastewater generation for the new science complex are expected to closely resemble the usage rates of other multi-purpose laboratory buildings. The proposed art museum facility and interim arts/culture facility are not expected to result in significantly different water usage/wastewater generation rates than did the previously existing commercial uses at those sites. The proposed projects are not expected to produce significant changes in either the pattern of, or rate of, stormwater runoff from the sites.

Construction of the new science complex may require relocation of water and/or sewer utilities within the project area, although this will not be confirmed until the design process proceeds.

The project proponent met with the Commission in May, 2006, to begin discussion's regarding water, sewer and drainage facilities on the Allston campus, and the University's future development plans. These discussions will be ongoing as the University's plans progress.

The Commission has the following comments regarding the proposed IMP and amendment:

General

1. The Master Plan document must provide estimates of water demand, sanitary sewer flow and stormwater runoff generation (including the basis for the estimates) for each phase of construction under the Master Plan. The amount of potable water required for air conditioning make-up water and landscape irrigation must be quantified and provided separately.

2. It is the proponent's responsibility to evaluate the capacity of the public water, sewer and storm drainage systems serving the Allston campus, and each construction phase to determine if they are adequate to meet future project demands. A written summary of these evaluations must be provided in the Master Plan document.

3. For each phase of construction the proponent must submit a site plan and a General Service Application to the Commission. The site plan must show the location of existing public and private water mains, sanitary sewers and storm drains which serve project sites, as well as the location of proposed service connections. With each site plan, the proponent must provide detailed and updated estimates for water demand, sanitary sewer flows and stormwater runoff generation for the proposed project. The amount of potable water required for landscape irrigation must be quantified and provided separately.

4. To assure compliance with the Commission's requirements, the proponent should submit site plans and General Service Applications to the Commission for review when project design is 50 percent complete.

5. The proponent is advised that any new or reconstructed water, sanitary sewer and drain pipes required to accommodate future development must be designed and constructed at the proponent's expense and in conformance with the Commission's Sewer Use and Water Distribution System regulations.

Sewage/Drainage

6. The Allston campus is served by separate sanitary sewers and storm drains. Separate sanitary sewer and storm drain services must be provided from new buildings constructed to the respective pipe in the street.

7. Site plans must show in detail how drainage from building roofs and from other impervious areas will be managed. Roof runoff and other stormwater runoff must be conveyed separately from sanitary waste at all times.

8. The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), in cooperation with the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) and its member communities, are implementing a coordinated approach to flow control in the MWRA regional wastewater system, particularly the removal of extraneous clean water (e.g., infiltration/ inflow (I/I)) in the system. In this regard, DEP has been routinely requiring proponents proposing to add significant new wastewater flow to assist in the I/I reduction effort to ensure that the additional wastewater flows are offset by the removal of I/I. Currently, DEP is typically using a minimum 4:1 ratio for I/I removal to new wastewater flow added. The Commission supports the DEP/MWRA policy, and will require the proponent to develop a consistent inflow reduction plan.

9. The proponent must fully investigate methods for retaining stormwater on site before the Commission will consider a request to discharge additional stormwater to the Commission's system. Under no circumstances will stormwater be allowed to discharge to a sanitary sewer. A feasibility assessment for retaining stormwater on site must be submitted with each site plan.

10. The discharge of dewatering drainage to a sanitary sewer is prohibited by the Commission. The proponent is advised that the discharge of any dewatering drainage to the storm drainage system, whether temporary or on a permanent basis, requires a Drainage Discharge Permit from the Commission and an NPDES Permit issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

11. For each phase of construction covering one acre or more, the proponent will be required to obtain coverage under the EPA's NPDES General Permit for Construction. A copy of the Notice of Intent and the pollution prevention plan prepared pursuant to the Permit should be provided to the Commission, prior to the commencement of construction.

12. The proponent is advised that a Drainage Discharge Permit is also required for the long-term (permanent) discharge to the drainage of infiltrated groundwater collected via an underdrain system, such as those that are commonly installed in below-grade parking garages.

13. The Commission requests that the proponent install a permanent casting stating: "Don't Dump: Drains to Charles River" next to any new catch basin installed as part of this project. The proponent may contact the Commission's Operations Division for information regarding the purchase of the castings.

14. In conjunction with each site plan and General Service Application submitted, the proponent will be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. Each plan must:

    - Identify specific best management measures for controlling erosion and preventing the discharge of sediment, contaminated stormwater or construction debris to the Commission's drainage system when construction is underway.

    - Include a site map which shows, at a minimum, existing drainage patterns and areas used for storage or treatment of contaminated soils, groundwater or stormwater, and the location of major control or treatment structures to be utilized during construction.

    - Specifically identify how the project will comply with the Department of Environmental Protection's Performance Standards for Stormwater Management both during construction and after construction is complete.

15. Oil traps are required on all drains discharging from all new and existing enclosed parking garages. Discharges from garage drains must be directed to a building sewer and not to a building storm drain. The requirements for oil traps are provided in the Commission's Requirements for Site Plans.

16. Grease traps are required in all new and existing cafeteria or kitchen facilities in accordance with the Commission's Sewer Use Regulations. The proponent is advised to consult with Mr. Richard Fowler, Deputy Superintendent of Field Operations prior to preparing plans for grease traps.

17. The proponent should note Article V of the Commission's Sewer Use Regulations as it pertains to medical and laboratory facilities.

Water

18. The Commission utilizes a Fixed Radio Meter Reading System to obtain water meter readings. Where a new water meter is needed, the Commission will provide a Meter Transmitter Unit (MTU) and connect the device to the meter. For information regarding the installation of MTUs, the proponent should contact the Commission's Meter Installation Department.

19. The proponent should explore opportunities for implementing water conservation measures in addition to those required by the State Plumbing Code. In particular the proponent should consider outdoor landscaping which requires minimal use of water to maintain. If the proponent plans to install in-ground sprinkler systems, the Commission recommends that timers, soil moisture indicators and rainfall sensors be installed. The use of sensor-operated faucets and toilets in common areas of buildings should also be considered.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

Yours truly,

John P. Sullivan, P.E.
Chief Engineer

JPS/as

cc:
J. Walser, BRA
M. Zlody, Boston Env. Dept.
P. Laroque, BWSC

To: Gerald Autler, Economic Development

From: Bob Kroin, Urban Design

Date: June 5, 2006

RE: Harvard Allston Campus IMP Amendment Urban Design Comments

In order to evaluate fully the urban design impacts of the changes to the existing IMP, namely the three proposed projects described in the Project Notification Form of April 28, 2006, the BRA requires information to be included in the Amended Institutional Master Plan that provide a coherent physical framework describing the short-, middle-, and long-term context for all the Harvard-controlled properties in Allston and a discussion about the relationship between the Cambridge, Longwood, and Allston campuses .

In May 2005, the BRA published a document, *North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning*, which presented the goals and principles of North Allston residents, businesses, institutions, and community groups, and a conceptual vision for the future of the neighborhood including all of the area to between the Massachusetts Turnpike and the Charles River. The Institutional Master Plan shall describe in detail the similarities and differences between it and the BRA document and shall describe the principles Harvard is adopting that explain the differences.

The master plan shall present the physical framework in text, diagrams, maps and drawings that fully describe Harvard's intended outcomes for the 5-, 10-, and 20-year terms in the following categories.

<u>Planning Principles and Framework</u>

The Institutional Master Plan shall include a full exposition of the organizing principles that lie behind the proponents' proposals regarding a concept for the overall layout of a new Allston campus. It shall describe a framework for organizing the amounts of space dedicated to each use, building location, size and use, environmental and open space improvements and their relationships to buildings and land uses, and the systems of streets, blocks, and other infrastructure elements. The IMP shall describe the qualitative and quantitative attributes of this new mixed-use neighborhood and campus and its relationship to the exiting Harvard campus as well as the Allston neighborhood.

This section shall begin with a description and analysis of existing conditions in Allston and Harvard's goals for the Allston academic campus and the Allston neighborhood including all the land between the Massachusetts Turnpike and the Charles River. It shall comprise a discussion about Harvard's planning objectives for the Cambridge side of the river and for the Longwood campus insofar as they relate to planning for the Allston campus, and shall include the specific objectives Harvard intends to achieve in Allston during the next 5-, 10-, and 20-year periods. The IMP shall include illustrations that describe the objectives for each of these periods.

The planning framework section shall also include a description in general terms of the strategies the proponents intend to employ to achieve their objectives including schedules for the development of buildings including specifically where the three projects described in the IMPNF fir into the schedule, open space improvements and infrastructure, and the financial resources associated with the development on a project-by-project and year-by-year basis.

Density and Land Use

The proponents shall recognize the opportunities for both academic and neighborhood expansion on the Harvard-owned property. Today Allston is a small residential community bounded by large tracts of underutilized land. If the Allston campus fulfills its promise to become a truly integrated community of town and gown with real vitality, security, amenity, and a sense of place, it will be necessary for Harvard to create over the years a new neighborhood with large numbers of residential units for both academic and non-academic populations.

The IMP shall provide a picture of what Harvard intends to develop regarding size and location of major land uses including :

1. housing for students and community,
2. teaching, research, and academic office space,
3. athletic facilities and their supporting spaces,
4. public parks, plazas, and esplanades,
5. commercial office space,
6. cultural uses,
7. retail uses,
8. industrial uses, and
9. parking spaces.

The plan shall include an item-by-item analysis of how the Harvard vision compares with the conceptual vision presented in the *North Allston Strategic Framework for Planning*. The proponents shall provide projections for the 5-year, 10-year, and 20-year futures, and shall present the projections in tables, maps, and text.

Streets, Blocks and Major Physical Features

Proponents shall provide proposals for the 5-, 10-, and 20-year futures showing in graphic form the intended size, location, and character of new and existing streets, blocks, major pedestrian paths, esplanades, canals and other major elements of the physical infrastructure. The plan shall include the proposed schedule for implementing the improvements and shall describe which infrastructure projects are associated with each building project. The proponents shall clarify the uses and intended hierarchy of the streets, and shall describe their relation to existing and proposed blocks and their uses.

The proponents shall recognize in preparing the street-and-block plan the dramatic difference between the scale of the existing Allston residential neighborhood and the Harvard-owned property. The master plan is an opportunity to create the infrastructure that shall be necessary to

serve the new development over the next 20 to 30 years, to connect the existing streets with the new infrastructure, and to create a smooth transition between the two scales.

New and Existing Buildings and Lots

The master plan shall clearly indicate in maps and tables which buildings and lots Harvard intends to retain as-is, which shall be converted to new uses or expanded or decreased in size, and which shall be demolished. The plan shall tabulate the size, age, use and condition of all such buildings and lots.

The plan shall also indicate the size, location and use of buildings Harvard intends to build and shall show which lots shall remain vacant and which shall be in transportation-related uses or surface parking lots during the 5-, 10-, and 20-year terms.

Parks, Plazas, and Esplanades and Other Landscapes

The master plan shall present a description in graphic forms of the existing and proposed (for the short-, middle-, and long-term futures) system of improved public, semi-public, and private open spaces clearly indicating the character of each. The plan shall recognize the opportunity for streets and boulevards to enhance the landscape system by connecting, for example, parks and plazas by tree-lined streets. The plan shall describe the phasing of landscape improvements and shall indicate which landscapes are associated with each building or infrastructure improvement.

The master plan shall acknowledge that the Charles River and its banks are a strong armature on which to build an open space system that can enhance the existing residential community, organize the new developments Harvard intends to create in the future, and integrate the existing neighborhood, its expansion, and the academic community.

Architectural Form and Character

The master plan shall set forth the proponents' intentions regarding the design of proposed buildings and landscapes. The absence of a clear stylistic context in most of the Harvard-controlled property offers an opportunity to create in Allston a forward-looking approach to architecture as distinctive as the Georgian style has been in previous decades.

APPENDIX 2

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Comment on the Institutional Master Plan Notification Form To Amend and Renew The Harvard University Allston Campus Institutional Master Plan

June 2, 2006

To:
Gerald Autler
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Submitted by:
Harry Mattison
28 Mansfield Street
Allston, MA 02134

The Need for a Holistic and Comprehensive Planning Approach

The BRA website states that the Institutional Master Planning process "will build on the now-complete North Allston strategic planning process, in which the City of Boston engaged the community and the University to create a vision for the future of the neighborhood that included but was not limited to the property owned by Harvard." Unfortunately, the current process has ignored the previous planning process more than it has built upon it. For instance, Harvard's "land swap" proposal to move the Charlesview housing complex to the site currently occupied by Kmart has not been brought before the Harvard Task Force for review. Instead it has been treated as a private transaction. Likewise, a major development planned for 156 Lincoln Street, part of the North Allston Strategic Plan's Holton Street Corridor special study area, has not been discussed in the context of the Strategic Plan. To create the best long-term outcome for Harvard, the City of Boston, and the community, we need to return to the expansive scope of the North Allston Strategic Plan.

Interim Uses for Harvard Property

Harvard's land ownership dominates the North Allston community. Many of these sites have sat vacant for years since they were purchased by Harvard. But the Phase 1 Development Area shown in Figure 3 indicates that Harvard has no plans in the next 10 years for most of its Allston holdings. This situation is bad for the Boston economy and the local community. At the same time, it is good for Harvard because it gives Harvard maximal flexibility with sites that have no tenants or current uses. But it is also bad for Harvard because it is a major source of resentment among many in the community.

Of course Boston cannot force Harvard to create institutional uses that don't exist or cannot be funded. But Harvard should not leave these sites vacant or under-utilized for decades. To balance the interests of the City of Boston, Harvard, and the local community, this Harvard, the BRA, and Task Force should collaborate on an inventory of Harvard property to identify and pursue productive uses until Harvard is ready to convert the sites to active institutional use. The results should be entered in a publicly accessible on-line database and presented to the Harvard Allston Task Force. After this information has been collected for all current Harvard property, the process should be repeated as Harvard purchases additional properties, either at a regular interval (such as quarterly) or as each purchase is completed.

For every Harvard property in Allston and Brighton, the following information should be obtained:

1) Current conditions
    a. Building size
    b. Lot size
    c. Condition of existing structures
    d. Previous uses of existing structures
2) Harvard's expected usage
    a. When Harvard expects to begin active use of the site
    b. Harvard's expectations for any existing structures
        i. Demolish & build new buildings
        ii. Renovate existing buildings
        iii. Use buildings as-is
3) Possible interim uses before Harvard expects to begin active use
    a. General categories of possible interim usages
    b. Specific companies or organizations that might be a good fit
    c. Zoning relief needed for these uses
4) Recruitment plan for outreach to possible users
    a. The City of Boston, State of Massachusetts, BRA, Harvard University, and other organizations will publicize and promote the availability of these properties to the appropriate target audiences

Transportation

The IMPNF states that "the proposed projects will not result in a significant change in traffic generation or parking demand when compared to the current and recently existing uses that the projects will replace." However, the existing transportation and parking situations are so dysfunctional that maintaining the status quo is not acceptable. As North Allston is developed over the upcoming decades by Harvard and others, options for transformative infrastructure improvements will become more limited. Therefore, we need to take bold action ***now*** to change Western Ave, North Harvard Street, the river crossings to Watertown and Cambridge, entrance to and exit from the Mass Pike, other transportation bottlenecks and shortcomings, and the public transportation system.

Open Space

The need to create new open space in Allston and improve existing open spaces has been recognized by Harvard, the community, and the City as a key priority. The Open Space Plan presented by Harvard to the Task Force on March 29 raises several questions:

1) What is the timeline for the suggested improvements? What projects can be done sooner to improve the environment for current residents and others?
2) What improvements can make the Charles River more desirable and accessible for people working, studying, and living in the area? The current version of Harvard's Open Space Plan largely ignores this opportunity, especially in the area of the River Street and Western Avenue bridges.
3) The North Allston Strategic Plan envisions small parks throughout the North Allston residential area. But Harvard's Open Space Plan has only minimal direct interface with the neighborhood and only east of North Harvard Street. A possible over-concentration of open space in this area, which is already close to the river and home to Hooker Park, should be considered carefully if it might result is a continued deficit of open space elsewhere in North Allston.

Science Complex

Public Safety: A "Global Neglected Diseases" initiative is mentioned as a possible use. What infectious diseases would be studied as part of this initiative or any other? How will people inside and outside the complex be protected from contracting and transmitting such diseases?

Parking: The underground parking garage with spaces for 1,300 is a welcome infrastructure investment. More information is needed about how many vehicles are expected to use this garage during the workday, on evenings, and on weekends, both in the near-term and as Harvard constructs additional buildings. Harvard and the Task Force should discuss opportunities for public use of the garage by Allston residents and visitors. The nearby North Allston neighborhood has a severe on-street parking shortage that could be alleviated by a reasonably-priced option for residents to park in a secure garage. Additionally, this could support the reduction of parking on Western Ave west of North Harvard Street and on North Harvard Street north of Western Ave to create extra travel lanes, reduce traffic congestion, and create bike lanes.

Potential for Public Protest: A variety of activities (embryonic stem cell research, animal experimentation, etc.) that will happen in this building could be unpopular with a vocal segment of the population. How does Harvard anticipate handling potential protest activity? How would such activity impact the roadway or sidewalks along Western Ave. and other public spaces?

Treatment of Animals: A vivarium is an anticipated use. What types of animals and how many of them will be stored? What form of experimentation will they be subjected to?

1360 and 1380 Soldiers Field Road (Harvard University Art Museums)

Temporary Nature of Project: This facility is described as "interim" and its use as "temporary". What is the expected length of use as described in the IMPNF? What does Harvard expect will happen after the temporary use has concluded when the buildings have been extensively renovated internally and externally for museum uses?

Public Art Display and Access: Admission to the gallery and other museum events should be free for Allston and Brighton residents. Approximately how many of the 250,000 objects in the Harvard Art Museums' collections will be on public display at any one time at 1360 & 1380 Soldiers Field Road? How many objects will be stored in these buildings and will not be publicly accessible?

Educatonal Opportunities: What educational programs will be offered on-site or off-site for local youth, adults, and Boston Public School students?

224 Western Ave (Interim Arts and Culture Space)

Transportation & Parking: The uses suggested for this building will bring many new people into this area – artists, people who want to view a gallery showing or attend a performance, and people "behind the scenes" delivering supplies to a ceramics studio or setting up for a theatrical program. This building is in a location of extreme traffic congestion with scarce on-street parking. Subsequent filings must detail the feasibility of the intended use in more detail.

Streetscape & Building Improvements: The building façade and streetscape should be improved as part of this project.

Community Benefit: The implied new cultural opportunities for the community should be clearly defined. Are these opportunities to learn, watch, or participate? Will there be costs involved? Will there be opportunities for community groups without a Harvard affiliation to practice, perform, or display their work?

The questions about the Soldiers Field properties regarding public access, educational opportunities, and the temporary nature of the facility also apply to this project.

Ongoing Community Benefits
Harvard has an ongoing program of community benefits that has provided funding for various worthy projects in Allston. However, this program is not well-publicized and its workings are not well-understood by many in the community. To maximize the benefit to the community and Harvard, the process through which this program operates should be made more transparent, community participation should be emphasized, and public awareness should be increased. For example, the community, Harvard, and the City could form a committee to review funding requests. A quarterly funding cycle could be established with published deadlines for application, grant dates, and criteria for selection. Funded projects could be listed at www.allston.harvard.edu.

Description of Project Boundaries
In future maps, the physical boundaries of proposed projects should be clearly indicated. The blue and purple dots in Figure 2 are not sufficiently precise.

Status of Current Institutional Master Plan
Table 1 of the IMPNF lists 7 projects currently not scheduled. Why are there no scheduled completion dates for these projects? What has changed since they were proposed? What does the uncertainty of these projects suggest about Harvard's future plans for North Allston?

Disclosure of Harvard Owned Property
The City of Boston's assessing web page (http://www.cityofboston.gov/assessing/search/default.asp) provides confusing information about many Harvard-owned parcels.

- "Harrow Corp" owns 11 properties including the Kmart site at 400 Western Ave.
- "KAS Holding Corp" owns 1360 Soldiers Field Road, a property covered by this IMPNF
- "Spiegelman Kathy A TS" owns 108 Holton Street
- "Harvard University Beacon" owns 5 properties

Harvard and the City of Boston should work together so that all properties currently owned by Harvard and those purchased in the future are listed with a single owner to increase understanding of the scope of Harvard's land purchases in Allston and Brighton.

Autler, Gerald

From: Thomas Lally [oldtomlally@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2006 2:05 PM
To: Autler, Gerald
Subject: Harvard?Allston IMPNF.

Mr Gerald Autler
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Plaza
Boston,MA 02201

I would like to comment upon the Harvard/ Allston IMPNF submitted in April 2006

I have attended many meetngs through the years, and try to keep informed in re Harvard coming to Allston. I have reviewed the IMPNF, and find it difficult to ask qustions or comment, due to the vague-ness of the submittal.I will try to be brief and concise with the following Items:
!. Will any Harvard "School" follow the Business School's move to Allston?

2.What percentage of the Harvard proposed buildings in Allston will be "ancilliary" in nature,. storage, physical plant, etc. as opposed to academic classrooms and such?

3.How many people will daily occupy the science complex, and will parking be provided?

4.Planning literature through the years doesn't show parked automobiles north-easterly from Barry's Corner along North Harvard St. and Western Ave.City of Boston traffic people indicate upwards of 350 cars parked here daily. Are provisions being Made for these cars?

5.The IMPNF specifically mentions,starting on page 14, under " Urban Design" the community interaction, and A Placemaking Workshop , yet Harvard declines to discuss the closing of community businesses that provide direct services to Allston/Brighton residents. Where is the continuity or congruity in this? Through the past 10 years of town & gown, community etc. etc. planning sessions have revolved about this theme. If this is not "institutional" then, why have we been talking about this all along?

6.I do not see any mention of a Commuter Rail Station in the IMPNF, yet the Boston Globe reports that Harvard is seeking one, down behind Boston University, nowhere near the population center of Allston.

7.Mitigation. It is my understanding that mitigation is supposed to be a central part of Article 80 process. Will the BRA be scoping this ?

Respectfully, ...Thomas M. Lally
10 Alcott St.
Allston, MA. 02134
(617)-254-1662

6/2/2006

ALLSTON BRIGHTON
COMMUNITY PLANNING INITITIATIVE

June 2, 2006

Mr. Gerald Autler
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Plaza, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02201

Dear Mr. Autler:

The Allston Brighton Community Planning Initiative is a coalition of Allston Brighton residents and organizations, including the Brighton Allston Improvement Association, the Allston Brighton CDC, the Brighton Allston Historical Society, the Joseph M. Smith Community Health Center, and the Brazilian Immigrant Center. We are writing to you to express our concerns about Harvard University's IMPNF amendment filed in May of 2006, which includes the Science Complex and two temporary arts buildings.

We believe that the BRA, the Harvard Task Force and the community at large are ill equipped to comment on Harvard University's plans at this stage. Harvard has asked us to approve three vague and isolated developments as an amendment to existing plans before presenting their impending Phase I campus framework. The proposed location and size of the science complex will impact not only the scale and character of all of Harvard's future developments, but also that of the neighborhood at large. It is in absence of a larger planning framework and of specific development details that we make these recommendations.

Below, we have listed our specific concerns related to the information Harvard has provided in their IMPNF amendment:

⇒ **Property Warehousing:** We feel that much of the blight that exists along the Western Avenue corridor is directly related to Harvard's property purchases and forced vacancies of commercial tenants valued by our community, including Frugal Fannies, K-Mart, and Office Max. Harvard is essentially warehousing properties that may become institutional uses in the future. To that end, we believe that property warehousing *is* in fact an institutional use, and should be considered as such by the BRA and in any plan put forth by Harvard University.

⇒ **Project Timing and Scope:** Given the location and scale of the proposed science building, we feel that the proposal belongs in Harvard's Phase I IMPNF, rather than as an amendment to an existing document. The science building will determine the scale of all future developments in Harvard's Phase I study area. Because it is important for the community to review Harvard's Phase I development proposals as a whole, and that we adequately evaluate the impact

that this expansion will have on our neighborhood's infrastructure and quality of life, we recommend that Harvard University file Phase I of their Institutional Master Plan before plans proceed on the new science complex.

⇒ **Staffing:** We believe that the scale of development activities contemplated by Harvard is too large for the City, the Task Force, and the community to effectively review and ensure that key issues and opportunities are addressed in this amendment, as well as in future phases of their IMP. The community must obtain financial support from a variety of sources, including Harvard University, to assess our economic, social, and infrastructure needs and priorities.

⇒ **Science Complex Height:** The PNF states that the building will reach 4 to 6 stories, but the precise height of the science building is not stated. The North Allston Strategic Plan ensures that academic buildings will not exceed 5 stories along Western Avenue.

⇒ **Parking and Traffic:** Harvard states that the proposed 1,300 spot subsurface parking garage included in their proposal are directly replacing the 1,000 surface parking spaces that WGBH now occupies and 300 spots distributed amongst Harvard's current Allston campus. However, WGBH has not left the neighborhood. WGBH will continue to generate vehicle trips (page 3-21 of WGBH's Brighton Landing Plan) through the neighborhood each day in addition to the new traffic generated by Harvard's science complex. We would like to see an accurate traffic forecast that considers the additional impact Harvard traffic will have on our roadways and air quality. We would also like to ensure sound intersection design that benefits pedestrians, but does not impede cross traffic.

⇒ **Abutters:** Harvard states that the nearest residential neighborhood is approximately 400-600 feet to the south. However, they have not included in their list of abutters the 213 families who call Charlesview home. No matter Harvard's future plans for Charlesview, it is currently a residential abutter of the Harvard campus, and should be recognized as such.

⇒ **Number of Employees and Students:** Harvard does not state the number of employees and students that will be housed in the science complex and the arts and cultural buildings.

⇒ **Transit:** We believe that Harvard's private shuttles take away from MBTA ridership and put additional, unnecessary vehicles on our roads. Community residents do not have access to Harvard's shuttles, thus they detract from our quality of life. We would like to see an analysis of the impact that Harvard's shuttles have on MBTA ridership, especially the #86 and the #66 buses. However, in absence of increased MBTA service, we would like public access to Harvard's shuttle bus system. Finally, we believe that the neighborhood is in need of a commuter rail stop, which has not been included in this IMPNF amendment. Harvard's proposed stop near Boston University will benefit only

Harvard University. We suggest that stops be placed instead near the Sports Depot and near Market Street to directly benefit the community.

⇒ **Urban Design:** Harvard cites one public workshop as their source for the community's goals for the public realm improvements in Barry's Corner. Design decisions made by Harvard University cannot be based on a sole meeting. Additional design guidelines have been generated in other community forums, such as Article 51 and the North Allston Strategic Plan. We suggest that Harvard analyze the documents produced from these public forums to better incorporate the community's desires into their design process and public realm improvements.

⇒ **Public Benefits:** To date, an open forum on appropriate community benefits has not been held by either Harvard University or the BRA. We suggest that Harvard begin this dialogue now and a formal specific proposal for public comment be presented to the community as part of the development and institutional plan. Items to be addressed include community planning, economic development, housing, open space, transportation, workforce training, adult and youth education, and community health care and public health needs. In addition, an examination of the historic distribution to the Allston neighborhood of linkage funds paid by Harvard University to the City of Boston should be presented by the BRA to the community as well as the level of commitment and distribution mechanism to the Allston neighborhood of future linkage payments

We look forward to working with you, Harvard University, and the Harvard Task Force in the future. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

The Allston Brighton Community Planning Initiative

CC: Brighton Allston Improvement Association
Joseph M. Smith Community Health Center
Brazilian Immigrant Center
Brighton Allston Historical Society

Autler, Gerald

From: Joyce Radnor [jradnor@comcast.net]

Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2006 8:54 AM

To: Autler, Gerald

Subject: Harvard's Allston Initiative

Hi Gerald,

Thank you for your meeting on May 24th, and for the opportunity to continue discussing Harvard's plans for its Allston campus.

Although several of my neighbors and I have discussed the meeting, I should be clear that I am speaking only for myself for purposes of this input (to meet your June 2 deadline). So, with respect, I'd like to offer the following observations/reservations about the ongoing process:

- At the beginning of the May 24th meeting, a resident asked that more time be spent on the agenda for community input. That request was summarily dismissed. In the future, if you're honestly looking for feedback from tax-paying residents, I would humbly suggest that these types of requests are not only legitimate, but critical to the BRA's role in this process.
- The current Harvard IMPNF does not offer a clear context for Harvard's full plan for our community. In other words, if we hear about each of these inititiatives one at a time, none seems particularly daunting. But, over the course of many years and scores of "initiatives," our entire community could become consumed by a college campus. Death by a thousand cuts, as it were. No single cut hurts that badly, but the end result could be quite lethal to well-established, happy neighborhoods. I think this causes a level of angst in us that could be quelled with more disclosure from Harvard and from the BRA.
- In the Hopedale Street/Windom Street area, parking and traffic have been an ongoing concern. As we expressed at the meeting, we are directly in the path of Harvard's current traffic/parking patterns, which can be more than difficult at times. New traffic caused by the construction, and eventual tenancy, of this new 500,000 square foot building will only increase the stress on the neighborhood. Although Kevin McClusky has been very cooperative in addressing our concerns, problems continue to arise each and every time Harvard undertakes a "new initiative." I would like to see a very clear plan on how the BRA will require Harvard to address traffic and parking -- in advance of any new project -- so our community bears a lesser burden.
- Another specific concern is rodent control. When the Western Avenue buildings are demolished and the sites excavated, Harvard will be unleashing potentially thousands of rats who currently live happily below ground. A full plan for these creatures will be crucial for our neighborhood.
- I have no personal problem about the stem cell science that will be conducted in the new Harvard science building. I do have concerns, however, about the protesters that will inevitably be drawn to our neighborhood. Years ago, I lived a couple of blocks from PreTerm in Brookline. I can assure you, it was quite an unpleasant experience to walk past the protesters each and every day. I don't think anyone in our neighborhood wants to be exposed -- or expose their children -- to that kind of vitriol. I, of course, understand that people have a right to express their views, but I would implore Harvard and the City to work on a plan to secure the neighborhood from those protesters, perhaps like what is currently done at abortion clinics, with perimeters and the like.
- At the May 24th meeting, the Harvard representatives, albeit very professional and respectful, were cagey about how this development will enhance our community. I'd like to hear more specifics.....not in terms of City-wide linkage, but in terms of real enhancements. Will our neighbors get jobs? Will our children get (earned) academic scholarships? Will we be able to use Harvard's athletic facilities, libraries, etc.?

In short, I would like to see a clear indication of Harvard's intention to become part of our neighborhood, as opposed to their current piece-meal plans that make our community part of their campus.

And, finally, I would like to see the BRA take a more proactive role in this process. Although the last meeting was informative, I felt that Harvard was running the meeting. YOU (the BRA) represents US (the community). I hope the next meeting is not about stem cells and great works of art, but rather about the continued strength of this community and how we can allow Harvard to achieve its goals without destroying the fabric of our neighborhood. To that end, my neighbors and I plan to meet this month to discuss all these topics (and others, I'm sure). After we have met as a neighborhood, we'd like to invite you to join us -- without Harvard representation -- to advise you of our thoughts and to get your feedback on the continuing process.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the IMPNF.

Joyce Radnor
59 Hopedale Street

Jon Holmes
29 Hopedale Street
Allston, MA 02134-1212
(617) 987-2123
jonholmes@rcn.com

March 25, 2006

Mr. Gerald Autler
Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Square, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02201

I attended the BRA meeting Wednesday night regarding Harvard's amended Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNF). That is, I stayed as long as I could, watching while a dozen of the Veritas squad played out the clock to avoid providing any solid information or hearing any public comment. It was all very disappointing, like most of the dozen or so meetings I have attended on the topic.

Overall, Harvard seems to be selling the city a pig in a poke. We are being asked to accept and underwrite ill-defined projects of no obvious benefit, created and managed outside of the city's standard processes. Until we have a lot more answers and a comprehensive plan, complete with specific advantages for the impacted residents, BRA should put away its rubber stamp.

Here are some of my concerns:

- At 150 sq. ft. (a standard office size) per employee/student, a building of 500,000 sq. ft. would support 3,300 of them, which is a lot more than they admit and a much bigger impact on the community. In last night's meeting they claimed that the Science Building would have only 25 to 55 faculty – and that they had no idea how many undergraduates would use the building.

- The "Science Building" of the IMPNF turns out to be a cluster of buildings plus a garage. This complex will displace current commercial real estate and cost our neighborhood jobs, plus adding traffic to new job locations. Harvard describes this as "the best available property that can meet the space and scheduling needs of the science program", when they could more easily build on their other existing real estate without the delay, expense and mess of demolition. (Has anybody seen an asbestos abatement plan?)

- The community needs strong assurance that there will be safeguards from the toxic materials used in the facility, the live animals on which they may be experimenting, violence aimed at the facility for that reason, and wastes generated by the facility. Harvard's statement that "wastes from the new facilities will be handled in accordance with applicable laws and regulations" is not good enough after watching Boston University wrestle with their tularemia release.

- The associated garage for 1300 cars, Harvard claims, will replace 1,000 spaces, characterized as "commercial" by Kathy Spiegelman, even when they are at WGBH.

Despite this 30% increase, the IMPNF states there will be "no add'l traffic impact". This is obviously untrue.

- How many surface parking spaces does Harvard maintain already at the Business School? If they were to eliminate those as well, it could certainly add to much-needed green space while reducing stormwater runoff and treatment.

- Perhaps a better location for a parking building would be at the Mass Pike exit, especially if it tied in with the proposed commuter rail station and shuttles to both Harvard and Central Squares as well as intra-University locations as far flung as Longwood Medical.

- Harvard makes the same claim about parking and traffic at the Temporary Art Museum, which will combine the holdings, staff and attendees from their three existing museums. (These are major tourist attractions whose current attendance is restricted by Harvard's refusal to build sufficient parking in Cambridge to accommodate "the general public".) This facility will clearly affect traffic on lower Western Avenue, especially at the terrible intersection with Market and Soldiers Field Road. A single blockbuster exhibit could also have serious public safety implications if this creates congestion at the State Police barracks.

- Identical questions about parking and traffic apply to the rehearsal, studio, symposia and performance space at 224 Western Avenue. Presumably, since this and the museums will occupy current commercial space, they will be operating well before Harvard's parking facility is complete and will have a big impact on street parking. (Note that these uses also take all three commercial buildings and those demolished on Western, Travis and Windom off the Boston tax rolls, so that the harried homeowners will have to pay more.)

- Table 1 of the IMPNF lists 14 discrete projects and renovations undertaken since 1997, of which half are "Currently not scheduled". Is this another quarter-million sq. ft. of construction/renovation that could be sprung on us at will? Such a deviation from the 1997 IMP, amended in 2002, speaks volumes about the Harvard's cavalier attitude toward the BRA's overall IMP process.

- Projects listed as Completed since 1997 total a half-million sq. ft., from which there was no discernable benefit to the residents of Allston or the City of Boston. Instead, we had to bear the impact of the construction (traffic, dust and debris, rat infestation and on-street parking for contractor vehicles with their New Hampshire license plates). We still suffer from the increased traffic, impassable streets, rats and decaying infrastructure caused by Harvard's impact and the City's neglect.

- I see no provision in the IMPNF for increased Fire Department coverage either during or after construction. Lower Allston has burned before, so this threat is very real.

- On Transportation, the IMPNF does not mention the new surface road from North Cambridge Street to North Harvard Street that was presented last night. Will this be a City street? Will it connect with Windom Street at the North Cambridge Street end or will there be another traffic light? Will it reduce or increase the current cut-through traffic on Hopedale, Windom and Hague Streets?

- Finally, Harvard says "the proposed science complex is currently served well by five MBTA bus routes providing 18 trips per hour in each direction". This is nonsense to

anyone who has ever ridden one of those buses. As the recent Allston transportation study shows, ridership has increased rapidly on these lines in the past few years with no increase in service. If the streets are jammed with even more Harvard auto traffic, these lines will be compromised both north-south and east-west. As for increased shuttles (which also increase surface road traffic), will they be available to residents?

As long as I am at it, let me object to BRA's allowing only six working days between this meeting and the close of public comment. This is not nearly enough time for residents to comprehend, analyze or respond to a plan as sketchy and disingenuous as the one presented by Harvard. Given the City's traditional use of Lower Allston as a dumping ground, its failure to provide services, infrastructure or enforcement, and given BRA's previous collusion with Harvard in Barry's Corner (going back to the failed project that resulted in Charlesview), the neighborhood will be justifiably suspicious until proven wrong. Rigorous management of this process by the BRA would go a long way toward allaying our fears.

Harvard has failed to plan properly and manage their internal processes. Just as in Cambridge they have created animosity with their neighbors and offered no amelioration. Now they find themselves in a situation that is "critical" and requires "Accelerated review…without delay".

That, however, is no reason why the BRA should allow a second amendment to the 1997 plan or support unilateral decisions that could undermine property values, endanger human health and safety, destroy our hard-pressed neighborhood and create huge downstream costs to the City, the Commonwealth, the MBTA and Turnpike Authority. We have a vital interest in seeing Harvard's whole plan, not just this peek-a-boo game.

Thank you for your consideration and attention to detail.

Sincerely,

Jon Holmes
(617) 987-2123

Autler, Gerald

From: Michael & Joyce Hanlon [mjhanlonjr@Comcast.net]

Sent: Sunday, June 04, 2006 7:55 PM

To: Autler, Gerald

Subject: Re: Contacts

Hi Gerald,
Just to follow up on the topic I mentioned at the last meeting, Public Safety issue. Now that Harvard is going to increase it's facilities and employees in the Allston community I would like to discuss Public Safety authority. It was good to see Captain Evans at the last meeting. Let's talk about police authority. Allston is Boston, and the Boston Police has jusdiction over matters in Allston, what about Harvard's facilities and employees. I realize that HU has a police department, but let's give the jurisdiction matter up front. As well as the Boston Fire Department and EMT service. I proposal that HU build a Emergency Center in Allston to house a Boston Fire Department facility to include staff and vehicles, as well as EMT service. When an Allston resident call 911 it's go to the Boston Police, Fire or EMT Department. Within a year or two HU will have a Art Museum on Western Avenue, as well as the Stem Cell Research Campus. HU doesn't have a Fire Department and may not have an EMT service. The Boston Fire Department for Allston is in Union Square, which is three miles away, and on the other side of the MA Pike. I would like raise this issue to a top tier.
In addition, I would like HU to increase the educational programs that it's now offers Allston residents, via the Extension School Scholarships, Summer School Scholarship and Under Graduate Scholarships. If an Allston family has a high school child who is accepted to HU, then that child should received a full scholarship to HU, full tuition and board. Just a few thoughts to add to the agenda. Please feel free to share this with Ray. Thank you.
Mike Hanlon

Charles River Watershed Association

Boston Redevelopment Authority
One City Hall Square
Boston, MA 02201

Attn: Gerald Autler

June 1, 2006

Re: Harvard University Allston Campus IMPNF

Dear Mr. Autler:

Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA) has reviewed the Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNF) submitted by Harvard University (Harvard) and offers the following comments to assist the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) and Harvard as the planning process evolves.

It is our understanding that Harvard is in the process of preparing a new Institutional Master Plan (IMP) to incorporate plans for its entire new campus in Allston, and that the new IMP will be submitted to the BRA by the end of this year. The proposed Amendment to the existing IMP is intended to be an interim measure, allowing Harvard to move forward expeditiously on the three projects described in the IMPNF, while the larger scale IMP planning process takes place.

Nevertheless, the Amendment to the existing IMP is an important planning tool and a significant element in the BRA's regulatory program: the content of the Amendment will guide planning until a new IMP is approved. We recognize that the BRA's Scoping Determination will set out the requirements of the Amendment. The BRA has made the commitment not to approve the IMP Amendment until the new IMP is filed. However, the Scope for the Amendment has to be detailed and thorough to truly "provide a basis for evaluating…the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods of the Institution's current and future projects" (Section 80D-3). Also since the Adequacy Determination will be issued based on the Scoping Determination, the Scope for the IMP Amendment must ensure that "nothing in the Institutional Master Plan will be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare, weighing all the benefits and burdens" (Section 80D-4).

While CRWA appreciates Harvard's need to move forward in the near term with design of these specific projects, and recognizes that the IMP Amendment will include far more detail, only limited information is provided in the IMPNF, and CRWA is concerned about the lack of commitment expressed in it to the larger planning concepts that have been agreed to in principle by so many stakeholders during the past several years. This lack of information makes it very difficult to comment on the submitted IMPNF in a meaningful way.

We urge Harvard and the BRA to ensure that the Amendment includes an assessment of how these projects will fit into the larger campus plan, and indeed, into the restoration efforts for the entire neighborhood. It is particularly important that the science building, major new construction, will not be simply incorporated into the existing IMP as a stand-alone project. This would contradict the scope, purpose and function of the BRA's IMP process.

CRWA believes the Amendment should contain sufficient detail about Harvard's campus plan, including approaches to open space, stormwater management, transportation, energy, and utility infrastructure so that the design of the sites fits within a campus plan context. Design of the building sites should include consideration of stormwater management at a sub-watershed scale; open space corridor plans; transportation networks; utility plans; and energy planning.

Infrastructure planning for the new campus - water supply and wastewater generation, stormwater management, energy systems and other aspects related to infrastructure – is particularly important and should not be considered at the site-specific scale. The first three projects, to be covered under the Amendment, must be evaluated within the larger context of the coming development, and the infrastructure planning, design and development should match the long-term needs of the campus and the neighborhood. Economies of scale are especially relevant, and opportunities should be sought through the planning process to design infrastructure improvements at a long time scale and a large spatial scale.

The Scope should require Harvard to address how the projects are promoting environmental restoration at a neighborhood scale rather than simply mitigating the impacts at a project scale. Instead of addressing sustainability as a stand alone section, the Scope should require Harvard to spell out how the approaches and indicators of sustainability will be incorporated in each of the areas that the project will impact: transportation, environmental protection, urban design, historic resources and infrastructure. Specific standards need to be adopted at a campus-wide level for a variety of environmental quality aspects, and metrics must be developed to reflect how impacts are being measured and the approaches being adopted to achieve these standards cumulatively. CRWA's specific recommendations are as follows.

<u>Project Area</u>
The Scope should require more specific detail about the aereal extent of land that the Amendment is to cover. While the three buildings described in the text of the IMPNF are at specific locations, the graphic in the IMPNF depicting the area to be covered in the Amendment includes substantially more land than those buildings appear to require. In particular, there is one parcel that has no apparent designated use (the parcel behind the Genzyme building). The Scope should require a clear description of all land parcels to be included in the Amendment, and a plan for their use. If no use is yet planned for a parcel, or a portion of a parcel, it should not be included in this Amendment, but should rather be included in the new IMP to be filed later this year.

<u>Transportation</u>
The detailed transportation analysis that will be submitted as a part of the IMP Amendment should go well beyond documenting how "the proposed projects will not result in significant changes in traffic generation and parking as compared to the existing

conditions," and instead include recommendations to "significantly improve" the existing conditions. The preliminary analysis that Harvard has carried out based on which it is claiming the above should be substantiated with detailed studies and data collection. Since transportation infrastructure and parking (especially given the extent of underground parking being considered) have huge impacts on stormwater management, these two aspects of the master plan should be designed in tandem to ensure that the opportunities for integrative planning are maximized to the extent possible, and that there are no unforeseen long term impacts.

Environmental Protection

In addition to detailed impact analysis on various elements such as wind, shadow, daylight, solar glare, air quality, water quality, wetland, flooding, geotechnical and groundwater, solid and hazardous waste, noise, construction impacts, and wildlife habitat**,** the IMP should focus on how each of the elements is being improved or restored (approximating pre-development conditions). Given that a major part of the land under Harvard's ownership was marshland and there are now major drainage issues stemming from the way the area was developed, a restorative approach is critical to ensure that the drainage problems are not further exacerbated and that past mistakes are remedied to the extent possible.

Urban Design

Each and every aspect of the design and planning for the campus, whether it relates to public realm improvements, density or massing considerations, or even the open space framework, should take into account the functioning of the natural landscape and systems that govern it. Accordingly, the interface of land and water, both on the surface and underground, should guide development from improvement of existing conditions to creation of new buildings, streets or open spaces. Wherever possible, re-development should seek to restore the natural hydrology and landscape processes at the sub-watershed level, which will ensure that long-term sustainability can be achieved. CRWA strongly believes that environmental restoration should be at the heart of the design approach here and detailed analysis and recommendations should be included as a part of the IMP Amendment.

Historic Resources

The Scope should include an assessment of the impacts that the proposed projects will have on Charles River parklands. These impacts will include transportation impacts on Soldiers Field Road; on the Harvard Bridge and the Western Avenue Bridge; pedestrian impacts on the pathways, walkways and bikeways; pedestrian and vehicular impacts on intersections; and active and passive recreational uses in the parks. The Scope should also require a plan to mitigate impacts that are identified and a long-term plan to improve and restore the parklands to the extent possible. The numerous planning documents that have been prepared to date can provide excellent guidance on options to mitigate the impacts of increased use.

Infrastructure

The information in the IMPNF does not reflect system-wide planning for infrastructure. The Scope should require an analysis of neighborhood-scale infrastructure, and detail what upgrades, improvements or redesign may be needed to accommodate not only the three buildings in the Amendment but the total anticipated campus needs over the coming decade. The infrastructure assessment should include an analysis of what opportunities there may be to reduce impacts on infrastructure, either through conservation measures,

alternative infrastructure elements, or innovative technologies. We suggest the following be required in the Amendment:

1. Water Supply: an institutional water audit; an assessment of options for reducing demand; managing peak demands; finding alternative water supply sources for irrigation and other non-potable water uses; assess the potential for reuse.
2. Stormwater Management: assessment of existing stormwater runoff conditions (quality and quantity, for the 2-, 10-, 20- and 100-year storms) from the areas in the current IMP and those to be included in the Amendment; potential stormwater management designs at the three new building sites to minimize pollutant loads and runoff volumes from the same areas; potential retrofits or larger scale stormwater management approaches to managed stormwater runoff from all of the area covered under the existing IMP as well as the areas to be included in the Amendment; and identification of opportunities for shared stormwater management projects with potential partners including Boston Water and Sewer Commission, Boston Department of Public Works and the Department of Conservation and Recreation.
3. Wastewater: assessment of wastewater generation; assessment of existing wastewater infrastructure and opportunities to improve carrying capacity, reduce Inflow and Infiltration (I/I) and reduce loading during potential CSO events; an assessment of the alternatives for wastewater management, including potential construction of small-scale package treatment plants, wastewater greenhouses, and other innovative wastewater management technologies.
4. Other infrastructure: energy and transportation infrastructure should be evaluated in the context of the numerous alternative design approaches that may be taken. Low Impact Development (LID), Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) and other 'green' approaches may significantly reduce the demands on the energy, water and transportation infrastructure as the new campus develops.

In sum, the scoping determination should address these areas in a comprehensive manner. CRWA appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project through the Article 80 review process and we look forward to working with the BRA and Harvard as the planning moves forward. Please feel free to contact either of us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Kate Bowditch
Director of Projects

Pallavi Kalia Mande
Urban Restoration Specialist

cc: Allston Development Group
Harvard Green Campus Initiative
Allston Brighton CDC
Allston Civic Association
City of Boston Environment Dept.
Boston Water and Sewer Commission

APPENDIX 3
EXAMPLE OF PUBLIC NOTICE

PUBLIC NOTICE

The Boston Redevelopment Authority ("BRA"), pursuant to Article 80 of the Boston Zoning Code, hereby gives notice that an Institutional Master Plan Amendment was submitted by the NAME OF INSTITUTION, on MONTH, DAY, AND YEAR. The NAME OF INSTITUTION Institutional Master Plan Amendment ("IMP Amendment") describes currently proposed institutional projects on the NAME OF INSTITUTION campus. DESCRIPTION OF IMP AMENDMENT. Approvals are required of the BRA pursuant Article 80 for the issuance of an Adequacy Determination by the Director of the BRA for the approval of the IMP Amendment.

The IMP Amendment may be reviewed at the Office of the Secretary of the BRA, Boston City Hall, Boston, Massachusetts 02210 between 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays. Copies may also be reviewed at LIBRARIES.

Public comments on the IMPNF, including comments of public agencies, should be submitted to Mr. Gerald Autler, Senior Project Manager/Planner, BRA, at the address stated above or by email at Gerald.Autler.BRA@cityofboston.gov within sixty (60) days of this notice or by _____, 2006.

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Harry R. Collings, Secretary