

**WENTWORTH INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
COMMUNITY TASK FORCE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2009**

MINUTES

Task Force Members Present: Cynthia Brophy, Robert Chambers, Matilda Drayton,
Patricia Flaherty, Marta Rivera

Guests: Amy Kohn, Goody Clancy
Patrick Cunningham, Perkins+Will
David Damon, Perkins+Will
Johanna Sena, Director of Community Relations, Office of City Councilor Mike Ross
Katelyn Sullivan, Project Assistant, Boston Redevelopment Authority
Terry Tungjunyatham, Perkins+Will

Wentworth Representatives: John Heinstadt, VP, Business & Finance
Jamie Kelly, Director, Public Affairs
Mary Ollinger, Assistant, Business & Finance
Sandy Pascal, AVP, Community Relations & External Affairs
David A. Wahlstrom, AVP, Business
Dick Towle, President, Fallon Towle & Associates

Public: David Holtzman, Fenway CDC

1. Welcome

a. Introductions

Katelyn Sullivan called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. Attendees introduced themselves, and Cynthia Brophy was recognized as a new member.

b. Jimmie Beverly

Sandy Pascal spoke briefly about the passing of Task Force member Jimmie Beverly. She noted that Wentworth is interested in naming one of the Mission Hill community scholarships after her. Sandy has spoken with Jimmie's daughter and will work with her family to arrange.

2. Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA)

a. Task Force Structure / Members

Having taken the concerns from the last meeting to heart, Katelyn explained that the BRA has sought recommitments from current Task Force members as well as nominations for new members, noting Cynthia's addition. The letters that were sent to current Task Force members asked them to recommit to another 10-year IMP term, as well as nominations for a replacement if they were unable to serve.

Mary Ollinger distributed the current Task Force Member list and asked people to review their information.

b. Institutional Master Plan (IMP) Process

Katelyn distributed a handout about the IMP review process and briefly discussed.

3. Where We've Been

Dick Towle spoke about how Wentworth filed their last IMP in 1999, explaining that the major component of that plan was adding the 610 Huntington residence hall (and approximately 900 beds). He stated that Wentworth filed for a one year extension last April to give them an opportunity to further evaluate their needs. He noted that tonight, Wentworth would be showing the 10-year plan for the IMP and a long-term 25-year vision, adding that since the last Task Force meeting, we have been working to scale back the plan given the economy.

Amy Kohn continued, saying that the Institute started working on the Campus Master Plan approximately a year ago. She noted that Goody Clancy and Perkins+Will had worked with a number of experts to examine what was working well, and not so well, at Wentworth. She explained that they were looking at where Wentworth is now and where they would like to be in the future. She also spoke briefly about how the internal and external communities were engaged in the process. She explained that we are in a different world economically from when we began the process, and that the plans would look different than the last time the Task Force viewed them based on additional analysis of what is doable in the near term.

4. Master Plan / Campus Center Presentation by Goody Clancy / Perkins + Will

Dick gave an overview of the proposed IMP, noting that the major focus, as discussed before, is to attract students onto campus. With that, he moved into a discussion about the Campus Center. Now located near the tennis courts, the plan for the Campus Center shows it as a freestanding building (approximately 46,000sf) versus a 100,000sf addition on Beatty. He noted that, as a late night venue with supervised activities, this new location would really centralize activity on the campus, particularly at night.

Next, Dick noted the new dormitory to be located on the gas station property at 525 Huntington. He explained that the new dorm would have six floors of apartment-style rooms, with at least 260 beds. He noted that Wentworth is open to (and has been asked about) teaming with other schools to add more beds, up to an additional 3 stories bringing the total bed count closer to 370. Dick commented on the previous plan, saying that the Ward Street parcel was too small to accommodate target bed numbers.

Having said this, Dick noted that with an average of 2,860 full-time day students, by adding 260 beds to the 1,936 existing, Wentworth would have the capacity to house up to 97% of its traditional residential students seeking to be housed. Sheneal Parker asked what currently sits on the site of the proposed dormitory. Dick explained that it was a gas station property, for which a park has been approved as an "interim use" under an amendment to the previous master plan. He added that this project would add to the residential area across Huntington.

Pat asked what year the dorm would be built. Dick took a step back and referred to the vision plan. He noted the proposed commercial development on Sweeney, and explained that the BRA is suggesting that this go through a separate review process. He said that the idea for commercial development is threefold: first, it will create revenue opportunities for Wentworth; second, it will produce economic development and activity for the area; and third, with the hope of bringing research and technology companies into that space. There is also hope that there will be job (and coop) opportunities for Wentworth students and local

residents. Revisiting Pat's question, Dick explained that the timing of the dormitory is somewhat dependant on the viability of this commercial development.

Pat asked if the Campus Center was similarly dependant on the commercial development's funding. Dick explained that the Campus Center is more affordable and, as it is under 50,000sf, it could be filed under small project review. Dick said that, ideally, the Campus Center would be under construction one year from now, adding that it is the highest priority project under any circumstances because of the need to draw and keep students on campus.

Pat asked if the Campus Center was dependent on the commercial development's approval, and Dick explained that Wentworth has approximately 68% of the funding at this point. Sandy pointed out the difference in building costs, comparing \$20.7 million for the Campus Center to \$46 million for the new dormitory.

Pat asked if the dorm was dependent on the commercial development's approval. Dick replied that it will ultimately affect how soon it could be done. He explained that the dorm project requires bond capacity, and that in this economy, it is very difficult to get bond approval without cash in hand. He noted that some of the projects could be advanced through philanthropy, pointing out naming opportunities and adding that potential donors are being approached. Dick also pointed out that the red hash marks on the diagram represent an additional \$40 million in building renovations. Emphasizing Wentworth's hands-on tradition, Dick discussed the need for many of the labs to be modernized. He explained that the additions to Annex and Ira Allen would not only bring new space, but also allow other areas to 'decompress' so they can be renovated. Dick noted that, in order to do these things, the commercial development is important. He added that, again, there are economic incentives, but ultimately it will strengthen the institute.

Cynthia asked if any companies have shown interest in that property and/or if there have been any preliminary discussions. Dick said that many companies have come to Boston and shown an interest in this type of building in the past, and that when economic times become more normal, the interest will be renewed. Dick emphasized the value of the location, and the fact that there are few opportunities remaining in Boston for development. He went on to note that, assuming it is financially viable, Sweeney would get moved to the Parker Street parking lot with parking below. He added that Wentworth would seek to replace up to the 400 existing spaces they would lose, but could end up with fewer. Dick also mentioned that, with the development of the Campus Center, the tennis courts would be moved to the Halleck Street parking lot. He added that, while community groups are currently encouraged to use the field and tennis courts in their current location, the neighborhood might be more likely to use these amenities in this new location.

Dick spoke about the timeline, saying that the Campus Center is definitely near-term with the academic additions and residence hall as soon as it is economically feasible. Pat asked if Wentworth is assuming all of these will happen within the 10 years of IMP. Dick said yes, saying that our hope is that they will happen as soon as possible.

Patrick Cunningham and David Damon went on to discuss the Campus Center. David noted that the last time they met with the Task Force the Campus Center was a proposed build-out of Beatty. There were concerns about obstructing views and the pike, thus, they created a way to keep the pike engaged in the Campus Center without obstructing it. David noted that the current Campus Center plan is for 4 main levels, plus a lower level and penthouse for mechanical space. He noted that one of the objectives of the main levels is transparency. The first level would have a café/lounge; a mezzanine level would connect to

Watson Hall; the second floor would be a late night venue with a full fitness center; the third floor would be open for fitness spill off and dance/fitness space; and the fourth floor would have student club/leadership offices and quiet space for meditation. Noted in the 25-year plan, David pointed out that there is potential to move fitness over to Nelson.

Patrick explained how the location of the Campus Center would bring students to the center of campus and really put student life on display. He emphasized that it will put activity and student life on Parker, with a main entrance and plaza on Parker and another main entrance on the Quad. He also noted the intention for it to activate the walkway between Beatty and Tansey.

Sheneal asked where the Campus Center entrance would be on Parker, and how it would relate to the tennis courts. Patrick replied that the Campus Center would basically sit in the current location of the tennis courts, set back about 60 ft from Parker Street creating the plaza area.

Marta asked if the building would be taller than Beatty. Patrick said no; the mechanical space would be taller, but with the building set back from the street, it would not be noticeable.

Matilda said that at the last meeting she attended, two representatives from Mission Main were against the field being on Parker, and asked what had changed. Sandy noted that they had gone to a Mission Main Task force meeting and discussed it with them. Amy said there was definitely a sentiment that people would not miss the parking lots, adding that their concerns about noise and lighting were manageable, and would continue to be talked about as the process moved along. Matilda asked if the residents of Mission Main had given their support. Sandy responded that it had been a meeting with the Task Force and that they did not take a vote, adding that her impression was that they were open to it, but that there would be further discussion.

Amy noted that there had been comments about how Ward/Parker feels like a back door, adding that the location of the Campus Center could really make an impact. She noted that the Campus Center could have an enormous impact on the safety of that area, energizing and lighting of that part of the street. She added that, with the help of the new crosswalk and with streetscape improvements, the overall walking experience along Parker will be safer and more inviting.

Marta asked about the level of impact we will really be able to have on the lighting of Parker. Amy noted that working on that strip of Parker would need to be coordinated with the city, adding that the lighting from the Campus Center itself would make a difference. Marta noted that some of that lighting has not worked in almost 10 years, and emphasized the importance and value of adding better lighting to that area. Dave Wahlstrom said that Wentworth has had dialogues with the city on some of the street lighting issues, adding that there are some issues in front of the Annex that really need to be addressed. Marta emphasized that that type of coordination will need to be very deliberate, and Dick agreed that that was a very important point. He added that with the two proposed projects on Parker Street, this is a perfect time to address lighting and safety, and the Institute and community need to work closely.

Patrick presented very preliminary drawings for the Campus Center. He noted its transparency and the ability it will have to really activate and showcase student life. Dave mentioned that, at first he did not like the idea of having a building there. He continued, saying that through its evolution, he realized the potential for bringing that kind of life to

Parker. He added that, with students in the Annex until 2pm, as many as 800, there is a real opportunity to enliven that street. Dick noted that they should have real renderings by the next meeting, adding that the Campus Center will be named the *Flanagan Campus Center*, after Bill Flanagan, who donated \$10 million towards this project.

David spoke briefly about the new dormitory project, noting that it would be approximately 6-9 stories. He mentioned that his firm designed 555, and that while this building would be taller than the neighboring buildings, it would still be very respectful of the neighborhood. Amy mentioned the Annex addition (on the non-operating power plant) noting that this created an opportunity for additional space. She noted that half of Wentworth students are now design students; and given the growth, spaces are used intensively and there has been limited opportunity for renovations or accommodating the programs' emerging needs. She added that the Annex complex used to be a high school, and with this addition, Wentworth would have the opportunity to build purpose-built space.

Amy noted that a small addition to Ira Allen would put the biology and chemistry laboratories near the professors who teach them. She noted the value in putting all the 'hoods' together as far as ensuring proper ventilation. Dick added that the additions would both be four stories, and set back from the street; they tried to respect the buildings both in height and scale. Amy added that the additions would also address some accessibility issues with these buildings.

Pat asked whether Wentworth plans to require students to live on campus. Sandy replied that we currently mandate traditional residential freshmen to live on campus, and added that we are looking at sophomores.

Cynthia Brophy asked about Wentworth's enrollment numbers, and Dick said that plans for enrollment are pretty level. He added that, at most, Wentworth envisioned a 5% increase because of the new biomedical program (approximately 100 students). He noted that the pricing of Wentworth makes it very attractive for students who are making economic decisions about college; for students who commute from home it is really an economic issue. Dick continued, saying that there are no plans for that to change. He reiterated Cynthia's point, that we do not want to increase bed spaces only to find ourselves farther behind; however, we want to have significant impact. Sandy pointed out that some of the newer programs are being brought in to phase out programs that are old and outdated.

Johanna Sena asked how we tell apart the students living at home from the students living in local apartments. Dick replied that it is not a precise science, adding that students can lie. He explained that we compare billing addresses to local addresses, and look at T-pass activity and parking permit numbers. He added that the Institute tries to be pretty proactive about knowing where their students live, noting that based on the numbers, there are approximately 600 students commuting from their parents' homes.

Johanna noted that, as a school that is preparing their IMP, Wentworth should have testified at yesterday's hearing. There was a brief discussion about the hearing; Pat noted that Wentworth students spoke, and added that it would have been nice to have administrators present.

Cynthia came back to local addresses, noting that, if they are from Connecticut, they have to have a local address. John responded that there is a project going right now to identify these addresses that fall outside a reasonable area. He added that local addresses are self-reported, and while the focus has been on Mission Hill, students might live on Mission Hill and not report it. Cynthia suggested that perhaps a letter go out to addresses to see if it

bounces back. Sandy added that we also make an effort to reach out and communicate with parents.

Pat revisited the question of whether Wentworth will require students to live on campus. John responded that it is already mandatory for freshmen and that we are examining it for sophomores. He added that we will have to address that question when we have the housing to require it. Pat said that given the numbers on the Hill, there is a real concern that there will not be a reduction, adding that it will be hard for the community to support dormitory projects if the number of students in the neighborhood does not change. She added that her Board has heard a lot of talk, and they want to see policies requiring students to live on campus.

Sandy noted that she and Dave have been meeting with the Dean of Students to discuss ways to fine-tune addresses and consequences. She added that student life has been very active in recruiting and retaining students into on-campus housing. Sandy proposed that the next Task Force meeting focus on student behavior issues, and include a discussion about the proposed amendment to the University Accountability Ordinance.

Cynthia noted that the amendment has passed and *is* an ordinance, adding that the question becomes what do we do with it. Sandy referenced some of the things she and Dave have seen on the Hill. She added that there needs to be a process, including the landlords, to ensure it is upheld and enforced. Pat said that was the reason for the hearing yesterday, adding that even with ISD involvement, universities still need to be an active player.

Sandy noted that she would like the April meeting to be focused on student behavior, and asked if people would be interested in having a Task Force subcommittee focused on the issue. Pat replied that she had never seen the issue of student behavior moved to a subcommittee; that it had always been covered at the Task Force meetings. Dick responded that we envisioned student behavior as being the *only* topic of these 'subcommittee' meetings. He added that, with Student Affairs administrators present, these meetings would be particularly comprehensive and proactive. Meetings will be arranged and all are invited.

Dick moved on to discuss the schedule for filing the IMP, noting that the plan is to finish by the end of the year and ideally begin Campus Center construction about a year from now. The following timeline was discussed (*dates are approximate*):

Monday, April 6th	File IMPNF
Wednesday, May 13	Task Force Meeting w/ the Public
Thursday, May 21	End of Comment Period
Monday, June 8	Scoping Issued
Monday, August 10	File IMP
Monday, October 12	End of Comment Period
Thursday, November 12	BRA Board Meeting (Public Hearing)
Tuesday, December 8	Zoning

Pat asked about the schedule for the endowment campus and when saw that process beginning. Dick replied that Wentworth was still working with the BRA to establish the schedule, but that we would like it to happen in parallel with the campus IMP process. He said that Wentworth met with BRA and that there will be another meeting soon. Pat asked Katelyn about the reasoning behind splitting the development project from the IMP. Katelyn responded that the project was a commercial project and that the Institutional Master Plan

would not be the place to permit a non-institutional project, so it shouldn't be included as a proposed project, although of course Wentworth should mention in their IMP that it's part of their larger plan in terms of how they use their land and in terms of the financial strategy.

Pat noted that this was very different from the decision with Emmanuel and their process. Katelyn agreed. Pat said that, particularly since Wentworth is not planning to sell the property, that it is really a totally different position being taken by the BRA. Katelyn agreed that the process will be different from that of Emmanuel's but that this is what was decided. Pat said that she thought other institutions had commercial projects in their IMP and Katelyn said that they were probably mentioned but not included as proposed projects. Pat asked for additional information about the change and for information about the BRA's policy moving forward, noting that it has implications on other projects. Katelyn said she would bring information to the April meeting(s).

Cynthia asked whether the property would go on the tax roll. Dick replied that we had always viewed that property as being taxable, figuring that, at approximately 550,000sf of development on 3 acres, Wentworth would end up paying \$3-4 million in taxes and significant money in Linkage. He added that while the development will be helpful to the Institute, Wentworth recognizes that it has a very significant piece of property that could be important to the economic development of the area.

5. Schedule Next TF Meeting(s)

Based on discussion during and after the meeting, it was agreed that the Task Force will meet on **Wednesday, April 1st**, and **Wednesday, April 22nd**, to specifically discuss student behavior issues in the neighborhood.

On **Wednesday, May 13th** (our regularly scheduled meeting time), the Task Force will host a Public Meeting to review, discuss, and answer questions about the IMPNF.

6. Student Behavior

Student Behavior was covered earlier in the meeting. There was no additional discussion at this point.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Public Comments

There were no comments from the public.

9. Adjourn

The meeting ended at approximately 7:30pm.