

**WENTWORTH INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
COMMUNITY TASK FORCE MEETING
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2008**

MINUTES

Task Force Members Present: Jimmie Beverly, Robert Chambers, Susan D'Amato, Matilda Drayton, Pat Flaherty, Bill Kantaros, Judie Mercer, Sheneal Parker, Marta Rivera, Carrie Simon, Adeline Stallings,

Guests: Amy Kohn, Project Manager, Goody Clancy / Perkins+Will
David Dixon, Goody Clancy / Perkins+Will
Tim Marsters, Goody Clancy / Perkins+Will
Noel Roycroft, Legislative Aide, Office of Representative Jeffrey Sanchez
Johanna Sena, Director of Community Relations, Office of City Counselor Mike Ross
Katelyn Sullivan, Program Assistant, Boston Redevelopment Authority
John Fitzgerald, Project Assistant, Boston Redevelopment Authority

Wentworth Representatives: Kevin Fuchs, Director, Facilities Planning & Construction
John Heinstadt, Vice President, Business & Finance
Bill McCarthy, Legal Counsel
Mary Ollinger, Assistant, Business & Finance
Sandy Pascal, AVP, Community Relations & External Affairs
Dave Wahlstrom, Associate Vice President, Business

Public: Mark Laderman, Allison Pultinas

1. Welcome & Introductions

Sandy welcomed the representatives from Goody Clancy / Perkins+Will, Wentworth's campus master planning firm, and all present introduced themselves. Katelyn Sullivan of the BRA was introduced as the staff person who would succeed John Fitzgerald in working on Wentworth matters. Later in the meeting, Sandy formally thanked John Fitzgerald for all of his time and effort working with Wentworth, and he received a round of applause.

2. Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNTF)

Bill spoke briefly about the Institutional Master Plan Notification Form (IMPNTF) for the renewal of Wentworth's Institutional Master Plan (IMP), noting that (i) the current IMP expired on April 6, 2008, the eighth anniversary of original approval, and (ii) the IMPNTF for renewal was submitted to the BRA on April 4, 2008. Bill noted that, under Articles 80 and 59, IMPNTFs for renewal of an IMP must be submitted before the 8th anniversary of the original approval. Copies of the IMPNTF are available for public review at the BRA, the Main Boston Public Library, Mission Hill Public Library, and MASCO's Record Room. Public notice of the submission of the IMPNTF was published in the Globe on April 5, 2008, noting that public comments must be submitted to the BRA by May 5, 2008. Bill explained further that the IMPNTF

document proposes no new projects, a one-year term for the renewal of IMP, and a waiver of further review by the BRA. The one-year renewal period would permit Wentworth time to complete its internal campus master planning initiative (see #3 below) and to obtain certificates of consistency for the 525 & 634 Huntington Open Space Projects approved last summer (see #4(c) below).

John Fitzgerald of the BRA explained that there cannot be “gaps” in time between the terms of approved IMPs and a filed IMPNF for renewal of an IMP and that, in this case, Wentworth is effectively filing for an “extension” until it completes the internal campus master plan and is ready to submit a new IMPNF that would may propose one or more new projects. He noted that the IMP nevertheless requires a public hearing before the BRA Board of Directors (but not the Zoning Commission) and that it will probably be taken up at the next board meeting on May 15th or in June (June 3rd or June 26th). Sandy asked John about seeking letters of support from the community, and John explained that any such letters would show BRA Board Members that the IMPNF for renewal of the IMP has support within the community when it comes time for the Board to vote at the public hearing.

Jimmie Beverly made a motion to supply the BRA with recommendation for the IMPNF. Matilda Drayton seconded the motion. The Task Force voted unanimously in favor of supporting approval of the IMPNF. *Those who participated in the vote were Jimmie Beverly, Robert Chambers, Susan D’Amato, Matilda Drayton, Pat Flaherty, Bill Kantaros, Sheneal Parker, Marta Rivera, Carrie Simon, and Adeline Stallings. Judie Mercer arrived later during the meeting.*

3. Goody Clancy / Perkins+Will Presentation

Sandy introduced David Dixon and Amy Kohn of the Goody Clancy team, referencing their contributions to Brigham Circle and Parcel 25 and noting how excited Wentworth is to work with a firm that is so familiar with the neighborhoods. She also introduced Tim Marsters of Perkins+Will, noting that Wentworth has worked with Tim and his firms for over 20 years.

David Dixon gave a brief introduction and talked about some of the significant issues and opportunities Wentworth needs to plan for in the future. He discussed the fact that Wentworth sits in a vibrant, urban area which will is always undergoing change, and that there is enormous potential for Wentworth to better utilize some of its presently underutilized parcels. He talked about the need to realistically attract a larger percentage of students to on-campus housing and the importance of strengthening the mechanisms of communications between Wentworth and the neighborhood. Sandy added that going through the internal campus planning process and the Article 80 IMP process creates an opportunity to move our relationship with the neighborhood to a new place and can foster some truly creative dialogue to spark new ideas and solutions.

Amy provided a brief PowerPoint presentation that gave an overview of Goody Clancy / Perkins+Will and a sneak preview of the presentation to be presented to Wentworth during the April 10th workshop session. Amy noted that it was important to have the Task Force meeting first to incorporate members' input on neighborhood issues into the workshop session. Commenting on feedback from Task Force members at the last meeting, she noted that the team would be building upon information that was collected at the last meeting as well as the workshop session.

The Goody Clancy presentation introduced the project team, described the firm's experience, both locally and across the country, and provided an outline of what to expect during the Campus Master Planning process. The process will have four main stages: gathering information, quantitative understanding, growth and development alternatives, and formatting and preparation for IMP submission. Currently, we are in the second stage.

The Goody Clancy team has been examining the Institute from a number of perspectives, including: conducting facilities condition assessments (to determine building-life and deferred-maintenance needs); conducting interviews (to determine both academic and administrative space needs as well as student life space needs); examining the campus context and systems; redefining the campus edges (both on campus and externally with our abutters); and bringing all the pieces together to create a plan for the future.

At this point, Amy and David Dixon discussed the information that has been gathered so far regarding academic space concerns, student life space, office space, and open space.

During the discussion regarding student life space, David Dixon noted the importance of engaging and providing entertainment opportunities for students *on campus*. There were a number of points made by the task force members in this regard:

- Jimmie Beverly expressed the need for an exercise gym/facility.
- Pat said that, in addition to examining space, that the hours of operation should be explored too, potentially offering students an alternative to wandering Hillside Street.
- Adeline proposed an all-night night-club.
- Pat noted that students are seeking everything off campus. It's not just the parties, but the *search* for the parties.

Sheneal asked about the task force's role in evaluating the design of the Campus Master Plan. Sandy noted that that the Task Force would be briefed at all upcoming meetings on the progress of the plan and that the Task Force would also have a very formal and involved part in the development and review of the Institutional Master Plan that would go through community and BRA review next year. She added that presently, we are just going through the internal "visioning" process to

look at our needs and the potential for our facilities. David Dixon spoke briefly about the timeframe, noting we are really trying to create a long-term vision to ensure that Wentworth is headed in the right direction with respect to its facilities and related needs.

There was a brief discussion between Amy and Mark Laderman regarding parking spaces. Also, Mark inquired about the status of the hockey rink project and John Heinstadt noted that it is currently off the table. He added that the master planning process will help us determine the current needs of the institution and what can be done to address these. David Dixon added that Wentworth has developed substantially institution, and the ability to accommodate facilities that are not directly related to the Institute's mission is becoming more difficult.

Amy continued with the presentation, building on the neighborhood concerns raised at the previous task force meeting. The conversation went in the direction of student life space and student housing issues:

- Pat noted that keeping students on-campus is also an issue of affordability. It is an economic issue for students as well as for families. She stressed the need to make on-campus housing both affordable and appealing.
- David Dixon added that students who live off-campus don't get the community experience. Sandy added that Wentworth tries to work with these students to give them more of an on-campus experience by trying to get them involved. Students who live off-campus typically have more retention issues.
- Marta added that, as a resident, she is less concerned about who gets a campus experience. She's more concerned about creating incentives to get students off "the Hill", adding that the primary incentive needs to be affordability.
- David Dixon responded that the issue is one of creating a situation where students can afford to and *want* to live on campus.
- Matilda suggested that Wentworth make accommodations for those students who cannot afford to live on campus, adding that you need to know about the student to do that.
- Pat noted that there should be more opportunities for students in abutting neighborhoods to go to Wentworth, instead of feeling like there are "walls around the institution".
- Matilda emphasized the importance of targeting local youths, noting that the average resident is not prepared to come to Wentworth and ends up dropping out.
- Alison Pultinas noted that meal plans raise board costs. She also voiced her concern regarding "land banking", noting the row houses on Louis Prang and Vancouver Streets. She inquired that, since in her opinion they are on the "edge" of the campus, perhaps they could be turned into faculty/family housing as a way to give something back to the community and enhance faculty/student relationships.

- Marta noted the difference between accessibility and opportunity. She emphasized the importance of making on-campus housing affordable to students, adding that Wentworth should provide incentives for students who do not have the option of commuting, getting them on-campus rather than having them live in the community.
- Pat added that, based on her conversations with students, the idea of buying into a meal plan does influence whether or not they want to live on campus.
- David Dixon noted that there are ways to influence on-campus housing that are within Wentworth's control (such as meal plan policies) and then there are issues that fall outside of Wentworth's control.
- Sheneal said that the list of neighborhood concerns looks great. She added that consideration should be given to the times and let-out times of on-campus activities, noting that students can be loud and rowdy as they make their way back from these activities. She also asked if there is a student center at Wentworth and it was noted that, while Beatty Hall provides several student-service functions, there is presently not a facility fully dedicated to being a student center.

Mark Laderman noted that there is a lot of information that he would like to see: where students live by zip code, where faculty and staff live by zip code, and how many Boston residents are employed by Wentworth, noting that the community doesn't end at the campus boundaries. Sandy noted that this information would be presented as part of our Institutional Master Plan, and asked Amy to review the difference. Amy noted the distinction between *campus* master planning and *institutional* master planning, explaining that, when Wentworth completes the *campus* master plan, it will begin preparing the document required by the BRA for formal approval. The document will include detailed information about our students, faculty, and staff as far as where they are living, how they travel to and from campus, etc. Pat added that it is unusual to be involved so early in the planning process. Generally, the community isn't involved until the Institutional Master Planning phase.

David Dixon asked the task force for their view of the concept of "overdevelopment", specifically, what is it? Tim added that it is a concept that can be difficult to define, but "you know it when you see it". Pat noted that enrollment increases could be seen as overdevelopment, and that controlling these is important. David Dixon added that some people might see expanding parking as an overdevelopment issue.

At this point, Task Force members were asked for suggestions about how to extend this conversation into a community meeting that would be held in June. Jimmie emphasized the importance of the meeting location, and the Tobin Center and Mission Main Community Center were recommended. Jimmie added that it is nice to have the meetings at Wentworth, noting that it gives people a chance to see the campus. Sheneal advised that we vary the locations of meetings, giving everyone a chance to attend. It was suggested that the first meeting be held off-campus, followed by a second meeting at Wentworth. The task force seemed to agree that

Saturday would be the best day to hold the meeting, as people are generally too tired in the evenings.

Amy reiterated that Wentworth will be having its workshop April 10th in Watson Auditorium. Task force and community members are welcome to attend the evening drop-in session from 4:30-6:30pm to see the results of the workshop and to offer input.

4. Updates

a. Freshmen Move-In Plans – Fall 2008

Sandy noted that Wentworth has discussed the revised on-campus move-in with numerous constituents, City Councilor Ross and State Representative Jeffrey Sanchez, and the consensus is to move ahead with the revised plans for this fall. The on-campus move-in will occur on Wednesday, August 27th and Thursday, August 28th. Approximately 800 students will be moving in over the two-day period, timed and distributed so as to minimize the impact on surrounding streets and neighborhood. Bill added that one of the major objectives is to shorten the orientation period to prevent freshmen from having too much free time during the orientation period.

b. Parcel 25

Sandy noted that Wentworth is continuing to work with Mission Hill Neighborhood Housing Services regarding senior housing development on the Gurney Street parcel. Pat thanked everyone who participated in the process and noted that they went through a very positive zoning commission process. She added that they would be moving into the Article 80 process soon.

c. Former Gas Station Sites (525 & 634 Huntington)

Kevin Fuchs noted that monitoring wells were recently installed on the 634 site, and the car wash structure was finally taken down on the 525 site. Wentworth is in the process of finalizing landscape documents and awarding contracts for the landscaping and related improvements. The landscape architects for both sites, CDM, were recently selected also to work on Phase II of the Evans Way Park capital improvements project. We anticipate getting started as soon as the documents are finalized and permits have been obtained from ISD. It was noted that we do not have to go before the Public Improvements Commission for removal of the curb cuts, just obtain permits from the Public Works Department. The sites will no longer have vehicular access so it will be viewed as a repair.

Mark Laderman asked whether we had installed pollution or ground water monitoring wells. Kevin noted that they were ground water monitoring wells. Dave Wahlstrom confirmed that both sites are within the Groundwater Conservation Overlay District (GCOD).

d. Urban Ring

The current status of the Urban Ring planning was discussed. Mary noted that the consensus of local institutions and organizations is that the tunnel alternative is the only acceptable option for this area. David Dixon and Sandy spoke briefly to the point that the surface routes are simply not an option. Rep. Sanchez noted that the Urban Ring project (a.k.a. “the baby dig”) is big and expensive and noted that some are going to look at the outer-ring versus the inner-ring aspects of the project.

e. Crosswalk (and Meters) on Parker Street

Wentworth is continuing to work with Gary Hebert of FST and the City on this project. The mid-block crosswalk would run between the gymnasium area and the Annex and have a raised, textured surface. The design and construction drawings are complete and received no comments. Since it is going from curb to curb, we should be ready to go to the Public Improvement Commission in early May. We are also in the process of getting pricing from a contractor.

Regarding the installation of parking meters on Parker Street between Ward and Ruggles, Wentworth had put in a request to the BTM two years ago (and again 6 months ago) to install the meters. These spots appear to be mainly used by residential students. Installing meters would force turnover in these spots. There is no progress to report since the last meeting.

5. Other Business

- a.** Sandy noted that she had passed by 64 Louis Prang recently and wanted to emphasize that this is **not** a Wentworth-owned building. She added that the building is a mess and that she wanted to make sure that was clear. Bill said that he had been informed the condominium trust owner only have a demolition permit so far which might explain the state of the building as well as the slowness.
- b.** Mark Laderman asked if Wentworth could prepare a parcel-by-parcel report for what Wentworth owns and the names on the parcels. Sandy noted that, with respect to the numerous small parcels that comprise Wentworth’s parking lots bounded by Parker, Prentiss, Mindoro and Station Streets, we are currently working with the Boston Assessing Department to consolidated and “re-parcelize” the lots to reflect how the lots are laid out and used. In addition, Sandy mentioned that, by the time the new IMP will be ready sometime next year, Wentworth expects to have all of its miscellaneous parcels listed under Wentworth’s name. Mark referenced the template used by Northeastern and Sandy said they could discuss it further after the meeting. Bill said that as part of the campus master plan, Goody Clancy/Perkins+Will are doing an extensive assessment of the campus. Mark, again, requested the parcel-by-parcel breakdown, including total square footage, total square footage owned, total value, noting that the information could be taken off the assessor’s website.

6. Schedule Next Meeting(s)

Our next regular Task Force Meeting will be on Wednesday, June 11th in the Faculty / Staff Dining Room. As mentioned above, there will also be a campus master planning meeting in the community in June, so this next meeting will either serve as a preview or follow-up to that community meeting. As always, dinner will be available at 5:30pm and the meeting will begin at 6pm.

The meeting ended at approximately 7:45pm.