

**Harvard Allston Task Force
Meeting Minutes
Monday, September 17, 2007
Honan-Allston Library
6:30 p.m.**

I. Attendance

Harvard Allston Task Force

Paul Berkeley
Mary-Helen Black
John Bruno
Cathi Campbell
John Cusack
Brian Gibbons
Bruce Houghton
Michael Hanlon
Harry Mattison
Millie Hollum McLaughlin
Ray Mellone, Chair
Brent Whelan

Harvard University

Harris Band
Monika Bankowski
Will Donham
Chris Gordon
Peggy Hayes
David Raszmann
Alison Reinhardt
Kathy Spiegelman
Dennis Swinford

City of Boston

Gerald Autler, Boston Redevelopment Authority
Bill Conroy, Boston Transportation Department
Michael Glavin, Boston Redevelopment Authority
Vineet Gupta, Boston Transportation Department
Linda Kowalcky, Boston Redevelopment Authority

Elected Officials

Representative Michael Moran
Representative Kevin Honan

Harvard Allston Task Force chair Ray Mellone began the meeting at 6:34 p.m. Ray said the meeting would be an executive session meeting with comments and discussion restricted to the

Task Force members because they needed time to discuss their recommendations to the BRA regarding the Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR) for the Harvard Allston Science Complex.

Gerald Autler, Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), said the BRA Board vote on this project will now be on October 3rd at 2:00 pm.

Ray Mellone addressed the Task Force with his comments on the DPIR review process:

- The issues of benefits are from the DPIR.
- Mitigation issues have been articulated throughout the review of the DPIR.
- There has been and will continue to be multiple meetings with the City's environment department, transportation department and urban design department to ensure that the Task Force's concerns are continuously addressed even after the BRA Board vote.
- Many of the public realm issues have also been discussed throughout the review of the DPIR.
- Community benefits should be appropriate for the magnitude of development for this project. He supports Representative Mike Moran for also recognizing this.
- The DPIR analyzes the impact to the neighborhood. Requiring benefits as a condition for the recommendation of the DPIR does not allow us to go forward to the next step and is not how the process works.
- The character of this neighborhood should transcend the bricks and mortar of the development and we should outline a proposal to guarantee the character of our neighborhood is preserved.
- There should be education programs for all students living in this neighborhood regardless of where they go to school and regardless of their education focus- whether it be technical or professional training.
- In order for the Task Force to succeed we can't impose situations that will get in the way of each other. We can't preclude any condition without ongoing follow up.
- The discussion doesn't end if the DPIR is considered adequate or not by the BRA. There will still be follow up with Task Force and community to ensure their requests are addressed.

Ray asked the Task Force to look at what has been discussed to date from a broad perspective. Have the significant issues been met and dealt with in order to successfully classify the DPIR as adequate? He acknowledged that there will be normal things that will come up during the course of construction that they may not have thought of but in an on-going process there is no real risk at this point to allowing the start up of this project.

He said that knowing that the Task Force has spent many months dealing with these mitigation issues and that the BRA Board vote doesn't preclude any further discussion and rather the decision on October 3rd is a benchmark, what do we gain by delaying the start of the project? Ray suggested that the Task Force support the DPIR as being adequate and resume discussion of ongoing business to develop a master plan for community benefits. Ray also credited Representative Mike Moran for representing the community and following up on the issues. He said Representative Moran is a logical ombudsman for any project of this size.

John Cusack's comments:

- Agrees that community benefits are a separate aspect from DPIR. However, why wouldn't Harvard want to receive the permits as soon as possible once the DPIR is approved?
- The Task Force and community need the building permits to be contingent on a community benefits agreement and the changes in the DPIR. The Task Force needs to be ready with its proposals sooner rather than later.
- For the mitigation issues, there needs to be clarification from the University about the inclusion of Library Park and Longfellow Path in the DPIR.
- In terms of starting to look at the Master Plan, things such as the heights of buildings and the tradeoffs for open space will have to be discussed in more detail.

Ray Mellone addressed the height issue in Representative Moran's proposal. He said in the future, our negotiations shouldn't preclude swapping height for open space. If height is a conditional guarantee, he doesn't think it's enforceable. Ray also said the discussions on public realm aren't closed. Kairos Shen, Boston Redevelopment Authority, has said the City has a vital interest in Western Avenue. In the new Institutional Master Plan (IMP) this is going to continue to be revisited.

John Cusack clarified his point that the addition of Library Park and Longfellow Path are new commitments from Harvard and were not originally in the DPIR.

Paul Berkeley's Comments:

- The Article 80 process is 5-6 years old and was modeled after the master plan process which was in place for about 20 years.
- It's been his experience when reviewing other institutional projects that the projects are looked at in steps. First looking at the development project and any benefits it might have. Then analyzing the impacts and then community benefits in a context that is appropriate for the development.
- When the Task Force began we started down those steps but recently some members of the Task Force have only wanted to talk about community benefits and the development itself hasn't been as important.
- The DPIR is Harvard's response to the BRA scoping determination which was built on the comments received from the community after the Project Notification Form (PNF) for the science complex.
- In the absence of significant conflicts with the DPIR, we should move forward with the DPIR and allow us to focus on benefits.
- Nobody is going anywhere- Harvard is not going anywhere, the City is not going anywhere. We do have to decide if the initial piece has been dealt with adequately, we should move to approve that piece and get to the discussion about benefits. There will be other things to follow (such as the Master Plan) and there will be time to discuss other things.

Harry Mattison's Comments:

- The MEPA (Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office) decision today on greenhouse gasses is a good requirement and enforcement for Harvard.
- The requirements of the Article 80 process haven't been followed. He has a list of questions from the scoping determination that haven't been responded to. Harvard did not reply to all of them and the BRA was asked to get answers. What is the community supposed to do with the unanswered questions?
- This leaves questions open as to future development projects. If the developer decides not to answer them, what does that mean?
- Does this give us the information we need to start the project even though we are not getting answers to our questions?

Gerald Autler said the BRA has asked Harvard to respond to unanswered questions from the IMP Amendment and DPIR and can share the responses with the Task Force. The BRA decides whether the DPIR is adequate and whether Harvard has given them the information they need to understand the project. The scoping determination captures a moment in time and the questions at that time. Throughout the process we may realize that many of the key questions are different. In discussions with City departments such as BTM and planning officials, they feel the big issues regarding this project have been responded to. This is an ongoing dialogue, and it's normal for the gaps to be filled in during discussion.

Harry Mattison: This is a private dialogue. How do we see the answers to these questions?

Gerald Autler: We will be happy to show you. We look to the Task Force for their advisory opinion and this is one of the criteria we use to make our determination. We also rely on the City staff. We ask the Task Force for their judgment on the large issues, not necessarily to review the DPIR with a fine tooth comb. These big issues have been addressed, at the end of the day; we are making an overall judgment. He added that the Scoping Determination for the IMP Amendment was written very broadly, with the understanding that some issues identified in that document are better addressed in the IMP itself, rather than the Amendment. The language of the scoping determination makes it clear that there was flexibility about how and when some of those questions get answered.

Harry Mattison: It's integral to look at all details. This needs to be an open public process as opposed to a private dialogue between the City planners and Harvard. First Harvard was given fast track approval on the IMP Amendment. There are key things in the scoping determination that Harvard chose not to provide any information on such as the request for Harvard to provide a coherent physical framework for all of Harvard's controlled properties in Allston.

Gerald Autler:

- The City's urban design department is comfortable with the short term and long term improvements with this project and moving it forward.

- This is not a private process but it's impractical to discuss every detail at the Task Force meetings.
- City officials from different departments were invited to come in and share their feedback with the Task Force and answer questions and hear the community's concerns. They can't be at every meeting but they have been here and it's a signal of their commitment to interact directly with the Task Force. At the end of the day it's much more valuable to have the Transportation Commissioner, the Director of Planning, and other city staff interacting with the Task Force than for the BRA to try to explain every decision made about every scoping question.

Harry Mattison said that Gerald was misrepresenting what he said.

John Bruno's Comments:

- Will there be a final report that includes the revisions that were made to the DPIR throughout the review process that we can review? What are all the changes?

Gerald Autler said the project's major characteristics are not going to change. Design details will continue to be worked out because design is a continual process but major characteristics won't change.

John Bruno's Comments:

- What are we really addressing? Are there any relevant changes in the DPIR or are we recommending it as it is?
- Once the shovel is in the ground, as far as he is concerned that is the end of the project.
- There can be no more changes to the footprint of the project once the digging begins. For example, there are some things about the design I'm not comfortable with such as the massing on Western Avenue. Could there be more open space on Western Avenue rather than the yard?
- Let us know what the experts think and if they are comfortable the issues have been addressed.

Gerald Autler said the City urban design staff probably won't support a setback on Western Avenue because they want an active urban street front on Western Avenue.

John Bruno: If we go on record with our recommendation I need to know what we are basing our recommendation on. If it's the DPIR as is, then so be it.

Gerald Autler: Throughout the review process there have been minor changes made to the DPIR. I don't know if Harvard's intention is to modify the document but it may be easier not to modify the document and instead provide supplemental information. If you are concerned that the building design will change between now and the BRA Board vote then my answer is no, it will not change significantly.

Brian Gibbons acknowledged Harry's list of questions and asked if the Task Force was going to get answers for any of them.

Gerald Autler said he has seen the list and Harvard is preparing answers for a lot of the questions that have been raised throughout the review. He said at the same time, he has also asked City departments to determine what level of detail they want and need to feel comfortable with the project.

Harry Mattison clarified they are not a list of his questions but rather they came from the BRA's scoping determination and were the questions the BRA asked Harvard to answer.

Gerald Autler explained that the scoping determination reflects the BRA's questions about the project a year ago and their thinking about the project has evolved throughout the review. For example, Kairos Shen's need for answers may be different today than it was a year ago.

Harry Mattison and Gerald Autler discussed the scoping document and the process for getting all of the original questions posed answered. Harry suggested that the process should be improved and rather than calling it scoping requirements it should be called "scoping suggestions" if the BRA is not going to require the developer to answer the questions. Gerald said that if the BRA can improve the process in any way, it will do that moving forward. He said Article 80 does not say to write a scope and adhere to it blindly. We said the BRA tries to get to the heart of the issues and during the scoping process tends to over-scope rather than under-scope, because it's easier to waive requirements than add them. He said he thought it has been useful to bring out key decision makers at City Hall to these meetings and he hopes that others agree it has been useful.

Brent Whelan's comments:

- He's bewildered about the review process and asks what the last 2 months have been about?
- He said the DPIR has significantly different information from the PNF for the Science Complex.
- Over the review process they have systematically examined and raised questions about the information in the DPIR and requested changes. If the DPIR is submitted as is, what has the review been worth and what about all the changes the community requested? Where is the net effect?
- Suggests that we present the new changes and we insist that these things need to be changed because the community wants changes. The project is conditional upon our approval of the changes.
- BRA can vote but these are the things that need to be adjusted and modified before the DPIR will be approved.
- Questions the design and how does the building serve the public. Is the building accessible and does it meet the needs of creating a lively Western Avenue? In the process the community lost a lot of things that we are not happy about. Those things need to be spelled out and attached to the DPIR.

- Addressed the community concerns regarding construction mitigation: We don't want workers parking behind the neighborhood in the Sears lot and the pest control proposed will not be adequate.
- DPIR does not protect community. BRA needs to be the negotiator for the community and to push the list of things that need to be done.

Brent asked to move Representative Moran's resolution forward and asked the Task Force to support it. He asked that the BRA represent the community's interests and approve the DPIR with considerations. This should be done right now before the permitting is complete. Also the community benefits proposed are not adequate compared to the scope of the project and the hopes of the community. The education portal is inadequate and underfunded. The Task Force should support the resolution as a way to ask the BRA to help it negotiate.

Ray Mellone's comments:

- The form of this resolution is improper.
- The Task Force should not be dictated by a set of conditions.
- The way the resolution is written it isn't practical. The wording would require exemptions from City laws. There are rules in place set by the City where they are not allowed to accept a certain amount of private funds.
- The resolution as is will not pass BRA approval. The Task Force will start to lose credibility on the way they handle business.
- There has been enough dialogue to suggest that there is going to be follow up to all of the mitigation issues. Between the City's environmental staff and the BTB to name a few, they will be continuously looking at all of these issues.
- The Task Force and community will be able to negotiate things in the future much as they already have in the past. There is a set way to conduct this business.
- He stressed the need to stay on point, and asked that they focus on keeping an open dialogue. To have a vote on every comment would just allow for anyone to ask for a vote moving forward.
- We all have been well advised that none of these issues will be left unresolved; and have already discussed a majority of items on this list.

Bruce Houghton's Comments:

He's speaking from the heart because he feels so strongly about what he is speaking about. He has sat through these meetings since the onset. In the beginning he was excited about the services and programs Harvard could offer. He hasn't said anything about this for months, and he apologized if what he said would offend anyone.

He disagrees strongly with Ray Mellone. He said Harvard should do what they want to do in the building and it is not a bad building. The BRA has buckled so much and Harvard has not come forward with many answers or any real value to the community. It is "insulting" what Harvard has offered in exchange for putting up the building/construction. With the finances Harvard has relative to what they have delivered has been minuscule. Harvard has delivered peanuts to the community.

What has been created is a structure of mistrust on this Task Force. Harvard needs to deliver on the promise of being community neighbors. Yes, this development could create a 1,000 jobs but what about all the industries that have fallen by the wayside as a result? We talk about what Harvard should get? What about what Allston gets?

Harvard should think about what it wants to leave as its legacy? He hopes Harvard gets the building. However, he questions whether Harvard is really being a good neighbor and whether their claims are really justifiable. He questions whether public spaces are lobbies as Harvard claims and how they say there is open space but when he looks across the river and sees the quads all gated in. Questions how Harvard stalls on delivering 5 daycare spaces. To date the Task Force has not adequately discussed community benefits. It is not his goal for there to be micromanaging Harvard's construction. The community is open and welcoming to Harvard so the community needs to be delivered what they need. We want open space. Let's do it. We want daycare. Let's do it.

It is the responsibility of the Task Force to demand services and benefits. Trust is something that is earned and gained. He has no trust and no faith, but he still thinks the building should go through and should be followed with something for the community.

Brent Whelan then addresses Ray Mellone informing him that he wasn't asking his opinion to make a motion to move the resolution but rather he was asking him to ask the other Task Force members if anyone wanted to second the motion. Harry Mattison seconded the motion. Ray Mellone asks all those in favor of debating the resolution? Seven (7) to four (4) in favor of debating.

John Cusack said that if the DPIR has changed substantially and there are holes in the document it will be difficult to try to vote Representative Moran's proposal through without the changes. For example, Representative Moran's proposal calls for substantial green space improvements included Rena and Library Park and now Library Park is a definite. If the Task Force is supposed to offer an advisory opinion it's not going to be an informed opinion. He said the Task Force needs to know what has changed and what has been agreed on.

John Cusack suggested the Task Force look at the 15 points from Representative Moran's proposal and organize them into which ones are DPIR related and which ones are not. Number 6 is very specific about the areas that are affected by the construction. Number 5 may not be appropriate to include because there are areas in North Allston that may not want residential parking.

Millie Hollum McLaughlin stressed that this is not a debate but rather a discussion. She emphasized that the Task Force has an enormous responsibility and the finality of coming to a decision on the DPIR is a little nerve-wracking.

Gerald Autler clarified that the DPIR covers a certain set of issues. The DPIR serves one function and the construction management plan and cooperation agreement serve other functions. Some of the points on the resolution are more viable than others. Some will not be ready and

fleshed out by the time of the BRA Board vote and they will have to work out some of the details.

Harry Mattison asked at what point does the BRA have the greatest negotiating leverage.

Gerald Autler responds that the BRA has always typically negotiated community benefits after the BRA Board approval. The Board is usually presented with an outline of the agreement but it is negotiated afterwards. The construction management plan is signed by BTM and if they are not happy with it they're not going to sign it.

Harry asked what the outline to the Board might look like.

Gerald said it will address topic areas that have previously been discussed with the Task Force on community benefits such as education, workforce development, public realm. These are key topics and not in any order of relevance or importance and Harvard will need to provide more detail before they go to the BRA Board.

Harry Mattison: The community wants to see more on the outline. The BRA should push for a stronger set of considerations and requirements that Harvard should provide.

Gerald Autler: We have already had significant movement and that Harvard has already moved them further down the road. He said that last week Kairos Shen presented public realm community benefits the City is asking from Harvard. He said the City is expecting commitments of millions of dollars and some benefits the City wants to see right away upfront and some will come with the review of Harvard's Master Plan.

Harry Mattison asked about Rena Park and Library Park. He said Harvard was only committed to Library Park.

Gerald Autler: For Rena Park we are expecting some improvements on an interim basis. Rena Park is still in flux because Harvard's Master Plan proposes graduate housing that need more planning. On workforce development and community services, we hope to show more progress on these issues soon. Education is an ongoing discussion. At some point the BRA also has to be able to make a determination if the project is viable and ready to begin.

John Cusack suggested that for the sake of time, they continue to identify which of the points in Representative Moran's proposal can be included and clarified for the DPIR. He stated that #6 should be included in the DPIR. Section 2, numbers 2-5 should be in the construction management plan.

Brent Whelan expressed confusion because all of the topics on Representative Moran's proposal have been discussed during the review of the DPIR. For example, rodent control.

Gerald Autler said throughout the review of the DPIR they discussed the issues that Harvard was scoped on including some construction management issues. In the end the signed construction management plan will be with BTM and not the BRA and at this point it's time to start separating

out the issues. The function of the DPIR is not to lay out all the details of the construction management plan.

Brent Whelan asked if the Task Force is supposed to make a recommendation of community benefits to the BRA and the developer. He asked if the Task Force approves the DPIR as written or approves it but not as written.

Gerald Autler said it was clear that the Task Force was communicating outstanding issues with the community benefits package. He said there will be a continuing dialogue and the BRA will continue to negotiate the community benefits. He said the BRA wants the Task Force's input and the City has just as much interest in receiving community benefits from Harvard. He said the City may differ in what its ideas are to get to those community benefits but in the end the same goals and purposes are the same. He said the community benefits matrix produced by the Task Force was a huge useful step to understanding the goals and priorities of the community. He said it is clear that education is the number one priority.

Millie Hollum McLaughlin: I just want to be clear that the matrix was not just the Task Force's ideas, but rather came directly from the community's input. The matrix organized the feedback that had been gathered from various meetings.

Brent Whelan said the matrix was not voted on by the Task Force. He said there has been no process for which the Task Force and community have been able to sort out the priorities.

John Cusack referred back to Representative Moran's proposal and asked if they had addressed the rodent control issue. The discussion continued on the issue of rodent control and what they can ask Harvard to take care of. A few people say that it is unreasonable to ask Harvard to pay for all the rodent problems because we know some of it is a direct result of the Mass Pike.

John Cusack refers to point number 2 on Representative Moran's proposal. Ray said it is not financially possible because there are strict financial rules by the City's administration. He said the BRA is not going to accept this proposal.

Mary-Helen Black asked why the Task Force can't try to think outside the box to come up with a solution.

Cathi Campbell said these are recommendations and the Task Force can ask whatever they want and leave it up to the City to come up with a resolution. They are there to recommend what they think is necessary and the City can do with that what they want, but they need to give their best recommendation for the community.

Mary-Helen Black suggested then that the Task Force come up with a list of problems they want to see addressed and let Harvard and the City see what they can do for a resolution. The Task Force could identify their top concerns.

John Bruno suggested submitting the entire thing to the BRA and let the City come back to them.

Paul Berkeley said the definitions in the conditions are too strict. For example, it shouldn't be whether or not they address the rodent problem east or west of North Harvard Street, but rather if Harvard creates a rodent problem in the neighborhood, they need to fix it.

Michael Glavin, Boston Redevelopment Authority, addressed the group:

- Thanked the Task Force for the continued discussion.
- In the beginning of the meeting the Chairman started the discussion about whether the Task Force feels the project has met the threshold to move it to the next stage. He said the BRA wants to hear the Task Force's comments on this whether collectively or individually so it can make informed decisions.
- There is room for a more in depth discussion on construction mitigation and community benefits, but are they at a point where they are comfortable moving forward with the project?
- The BRA hopes that the Task Force supports the project moving forward.
- The mitigation issues will not be resolved tonight and they will have that noted as an ongoing need.
- As for community benefits they will be continuing to get feedback from the Task Force. If the DPIR process is meeting the expectation at the level it is at today, can we move forward with the project?
- The BRA welcomes discussion regarding mitigation. This will not stop tonight. This will all be part of the process moving forward.

Bruce Houghton made a motion for the Harvard Allston Task Force to recommend BRA approval of the Science Center Complex and the DPIR and the submission of a list of neighborhood concerns [as described more fully in the proposed resolution (attached) dated September 7, 2007] requesting a review and response of these concerns from the BRA and Harvard.

Brent Whelan withdrew his previous motion.

Harry Mattison seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously by a show of hands with no objections from the Task Force.

Chris Gordon said that he would be happy to respond to the list of concerns being submitted and suggested that, with the permission of the Task Force, Harvard's responses would be broadened to include other issues previously raised by the Task Force. The Task Force had no objection to this suggestion.

Representative Michael Moran said he is happy the Task Force had the discussion and open dialogue. He said we took a step in the right direction and now we need to get down to the "meat and bones" of what we want as a community. He said he thanked everyone for their efforts.

The meeting ended at 8:41 p.m.

An audience member expressed his frustration for not being able to participate in the meeting discussion and the Article 80 process calls for an open community discussion. He emphasized that the community needs to also be able to provide its input.

DRAFT

**IN SUPPORT OF, AND CONDITIONS RELATING TO, THE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY SCIENCE COMPLEX
SUBMITTED BY THE HARVARD ALLSTON TASK FORCE**

WHEREAS, the members of the Harvard Allston Task Force support Harvard's goal to redevelop a site on Western Ave for the construction of the Harvard Science Complex; and

WHEREAS, construction must minimally impact the quality of life for residents of Allston and Brighton; and

WHEREAS, Harvard's development should make a significant and positive contribution to the public realm; and

WHEREAS, the community benefits associated with this project must be appropriate for the magnitude of its development; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the members of the Harvard Allston Task Force recommend that the Boston Redevelopment Authority attach the following conditions to its approval of this project:

- Harvard will establish a university-assisted K-12 educational enrichment facility/school/community center. This center will function as a center for the entire community, providing elementary and high school education, social services, recreation, and activities for students, their parents and the community as a whole. After school and summer programs will operate with a mission to assist all Allston/Brighton children with supplemental educational assistance regardless of where they attend school, enrichment programs in art and music, and preparation for testing including MCAS, SAT, and Public Exam School entrance exams.
- 1. Harvard will fund a minimum of three full time staff for after school and summer programming.
- 2. The facility will be located on property of the St. Anthony's Parish, and in the event that the space is not available at that site, the school will be located in North Allston or North Brighton
- 3. The facility will open by September 2009.
- 4. A subcommittee of the Harvard Allston Task Force, with support from Harvard and other professional educators, will complete a Harvard-funded feasibility study and needs assessment by September 2008.
- A construction mitigation program starting when Harvard receives building permits and continuing until the certificate of occupancy is issued. This includes:
 - 1. An independent rodent and pest control company will be hired by Harvard to perform baiting and trapping throughout North Allston and North Brighton

-
2. Harvard will fund a full-time Inspectional Services inspector dedicated to North Allston and North Brighton.
 3. Harvard will provide funds to the Boston Public Works department to establish twice-weekly trash pickup in North Allston and North Brighton.
 4. Solar-powered self-compacting trash barrels and recycling receptacles will be installed in North Allston and North Brighton at all bus stops, in front of each Harvard owned building (even if not occupied), and in every playground with at least weekly pick up.
 5. Resident permit parking restrictions on all streets in North Allston and North Brighton and two full-time Boston Traffic Department employees funded by Harvard and dedicated to enforcing parking regulations.
 6. Burial of overhead utility lines and retrofitting using "green street" design strategies on all streets impacted by the construction
 7. Harvard will establish a neighborhood mitigation fund and contribute to this fund to mitigate the impact of any work on weekends or after regular construction hours
 8. Soundproofing of homes east of North Harvard St before building permits are issued
 9. No use of the former Sears property for construction worker parking or other construction-related activities
 10. Truck queuing will occur only on Harvard property
 11. Monthly exterior washing will be provided for homes and businesses east of North Harvard St
 12. Homes and businesses east of North Harvard St will be inspected by an independent home inspection firm before building permits are issued and Harvard will repair any damage to foundations, plaster walls, or other problems possibly related to vibration or groundwater changes caused by the construction
 13. Restore public space in the Science Complex to include the square footage and uses that existed in the Project Notification Form (bookstore, restaurant, 5 retail stores, coffee shop, and exhibition space)
 14. Harvard will make substantial greenspace improvements extending beyond the immediate project site, possibly including development of Rena and Library parks as well as a pedestrian and cycling corridor from the site to the river. These improvements should be completed by September 2008.
 15. Harvard will construct no buildings on Western Ave, North Harvard St, or Soldiers Field Road taller than the tallest building of the Science Complex