

# DRAFT PROJECT IMPACT REPORT / DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT



## MASSACHUSETTS TURNPIKE PARCEL 7 AIR RIGHTS KENMORE / FENWAY AREA

*Submitted to:*  
**MEPA Office**  
**Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs**  
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900  
Boston, Massachusetts 02114

**Boston Redevelopment Authority**  
One City Hall Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02201

*Submitted by:*  
**MK Parcel 7 Development LLC**



*Prepared by:*  
**Epsilon Associates, Inc.**  
3 Clock Tower Place, Suite 250  
Maynard, Massachusetts 01754

*In Association with:*  
**Carlos Zapata Studios • Goulston & Storrs**  
**Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.**  
**Copley Wolff Design Group • Bovis**  
**Leslie E. Robertson Associates**  
**Haley & Aldrich • Harry R. Feldman, Inc.**  
**HMMH, Inc.**

*August 15, 2008*

DRAFT PROJECT IMPACT REPORT/  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

MASSACHUSETTS TURNPIKE  
PARCEL 7 AIR RIGHTS

KENMORE/FENWAY AREA

*Submitted to the:*

**BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**  
One City Hall Square  
Boston, MA 02201  
and the

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS**  
**MEPA OFFICE**  
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900  
BOSTON, MA 02114

*Submitted by:*

**MK PARCEL 7 DEVELOPMENT LLC**

*Prepared by:*

**EPSILON ASSOCIATES, INC.**  
3 Clock Tower Place  
Suite 250  
Maynard, MA 01754

*In Association with:*

**Carlos Zapata Studios, Vanasse Hangen  
Brustlin, Inc., Goulston & Storrs, LLP, Copley  
Wolff Design Group, Bovis Lend Lease, Haley  
& Aldrich, Inc., Leslie E. Robertson Associates,  
HMMH, Inc., and  
Harry R. Feldman, Inc.**

**August 15, 2008**

# Table of Contents

---

<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1	Project Summary	1-1
1.1.1	Proposed Development	1-1
1.1.2	Project Background	1-1
1.1.3	Project Permitting History	1-4
1.1.3.1	City of Boston Review	1-4
1.1.3.2	Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Review	1-4
1.1.4	Changes to the Project Since Submission of the PNF and ENF	1-5
1.1.5	Next Steps	1-6
1.2	Development Team	1-10
1.3	Legal Information	1-12
1.3.1	Legal Judgments Adverse to the Proposed Project	1-12
1.3.2	History of Tax Arrears on Property Owned in Boston by the Proponent	1-12
1.3.3	Site Control/Public Easements	1-12
1.4	Regulatory Controls and Permits	1-13
1.4.1	Memorandum of Understanding Between the City of Boston and the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority	1-13
1.4.2	Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act	1-13
1.4.3	Zoning	1-15
1.4.4	Anticipated Permits	1-15
1.5	Public Participation	1-17
1.5.1	BRA Public Involvement and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)	1-17
1.6	Summary of Impacts and Proposed Mitigation	1-17
1.7	Project Benefits	1-21
1.7.1	Public Realm Improvements	1-21
1.7.2	Environmental Benefits	1-21
1.7.3	Transportation Benefits	1-22
1.7.4	Economic Benefits	1-24
1.7.5	Quality of Life Benefits	1-24
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1	Project Site	2-1
2.1.1	Site Context	2-1

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

2.1.2	Zoning	2-1
2.1.3	Legal Description	2-4
2.2	Project Description	2-4
2.2.1	Proposed Program	2-4
2.2.2	Site Improvements/Roadways/Open Space	2-6
2.2.3	Yawkey Station Improvements	2-7
2.3	Consistency with Planning	2-8
2.3.1	Civic Vision for Turnpike Air Rights in Boston	2-8
2.3.2	Executive Order 385	2-11
2.3.3	Metropolitan Area Planning Council Planning	2-11
2.3.4	Consistency with Urban Ring Planning	2-12
2.3.5	Consistency with Open Space Planning	2-13
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVES</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1	Earlier Alternatives	3-1
3.1.1	RFP Alternative	3-1
3.1.2	PNF/ENF Alternative	3-4
3.1.3	Environmental Impacts of Previous Designs Compared to Draft PIR/EIR Alternative	3-4
3.3	Draft PIR/EIR Alternatives	3-7
3.3.1	No Action Alternative	3-7
3.3.2	No-Garage Alternative	3-8
3.3.2.1	Urban Design	3-9
3.3.2.2	Traffic Impacts	3-9
3.3.2.3	Density and Massing	3-9
3.3.2.4	Economic Infeasibility	3-10
3.3.3	Preferred Alternative	3-10
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1	Project Overview	4-1
4.1.1	Project Site	4-1
4.1.2	Proposed Development	4-1
4.1.3	Transportation Study Area	4-2
4.2	Methodology	4-2
4.3	Existing Conditions	4-4
4.3.1	Study Area Roadway Networks	4-4
4.3.2	Traffic Volumes	4-6
4.3.3	Vehicular Crash History	4-6
4.3.4	Public Transportation	4-13
4.3.5	Pedestrian Environment	4-16

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

4.3.6	Bicycle Amenities	4-18
4.3.7	Parking	4-18
4.3.8	Loading	4-18
4.4	Future Conditions	4-20
4.4.1	No Build Conditions	4-20
4.4.2	Project Generated Trips	4-24
4.4.3	Mode Share	4-24
4.4.4	Auto Trip Distribution	4-26
4.4.5	Site Access	4-27
4.4.6	Loading	4-32
4.4.7	Pedestrian Environment	4-34
4.4.8	Public Transportation	4-38
4.4.9	Bicycle Environment	4-46
4.4.10	Parking	4-48
	4.4.10.1 On-site Private Parking	4-48
	4.4.10.2 Shared-use Parking Garage	4-49
	4.4.10.3 Need for Future Parking Supply	4-49
4.5	Transportation Operations Analysis	4-55
4.5.1	Methodology	4-55
4.5.2	2007 Existing Conditions Results	4-57
4.5.3	2012 No Build Conditions Results	4-63
4.5.4	2012 Build Conditions Results	4-65
4.5.5	Red Sox Game Day Operations	4-67
4.6	Proposed Transportation Actions	4-71
4.6.1	Transportation Demand Management (TDM)	4-71
4.6.2	Other Area Improvements	4-72
4.6.3	Other Planning Considerations	4-75
4.6.4	Build with Mitigation Operations	4-77
4.7	Project Consistency with Area Transportation Planning	4-80
4.8	Construction Management	4-80
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMPONENT</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1	Wind	5-1
5.1.1	Summary	5-1
5.1.2	Overview	5-4
5.1.3	Methodology	5-4
5.1.4	Pedestrian Wind Comfort Criteria	5-6
5.1.5	Results	5-6
5.2	Shadow Analysis	5-8
5.2.1	Introduction and Methodology	5-8

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

5.2.2	Results	5-9
5.2.3	Conclusions	5-12
5.3	Daylight Analysis	5-30
5.3.1	Introduction and Summary of Analysis	5-30
5.3.2	Methodology	5-30
5.3.3	Daylight Analysis Results	5-31
5.3.4	Conclusions	5-33
5.4	Solar Glare and Heat Loading	5-41
5.4.1	Solar Glare	5-41
5.4.1.1	Solar Glare Analysis Methodology	5-41
5.4.1.2	Reflective Glare Analysis	5-42
5.4.2	Heat Loading on Nearby Buildings	5-46
5.4.3	Conclusions	5-46
5.5	Nighttime Lighting and Light Pollution	5-53
5.6	Air Quality Analysis	5-54
5.6.1	Introduction	5-54
5.6.2	Microscale Analysis	5-55
5.6.2.1	Intersection Selection	5-56
5.6.2.2	Receptors Evaluated	5-56
5.6.2.3	Emissions Calculations (MOBILE6.2)	5-63
5.6.2.4	Impact Calculations (CAL3QHC)	5-63
5.6.2.5	SCREEN3 Modeling	5-63
5.6.3	Loading Dock	5-64
5.6.4	Stationary Source Analysis	5-65
5.6.4.1	Emission Sources	5-65
5.6.5	Background Concentrations	5-66
5.6.6	Air Quality Results	5-67
5.6.7	Mesoscale Analysis	5-70
5.6.7.1	Mesoscale Methodology	5-71
5.6.7.2	Intersection Selection	5-71
5.6.7.3	Emissions Calculations (MOBILE6.2)	5-72
5.6.7.4	Mesoscale Conclusion	5-72
5.6.7.5	Mitigation Measures and Conclusions	5-73
5.6.7.6	Tunnel Ventilation	5-73
5.6.8	Odors	5-74
5.6.8.1	Locomotive Exhaust Odor Strength	5-74
5.6.8.2	Existing Odor	5-75
5.6.8.3	Future Odor Conditions	5-76
5.6.8.4	Potential Odor Mitigation Measures	5-76
5.6.9	Health Concerns	5-76

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

5.7	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis	5-77
5.7.1	Introduction	5-77
5.7.2	Methodology	5-78
5.7.3	Direct emissions from Stationary Sources	5-80
5.7.4	Indirect Emissions from Energy Usage	5-80
5.7.5	GHG Estimates for Direct and Indirect Emissions from Energy Usage	5-81
5.7.6	Direct GHG Emissions from Stationary Sources	5-82
5.7.7	Indirect GHG Emissions from Energy Consumption	5-82
5.7.8	Indirect Emissions from Transportation	5-83
	5.7.8.1 Baseline Conditions	5-83
	5.7.8.2 Future Conditions	5-83
5.7.9	Total Project Impacts	5-85
5.7.10	Proposed Mitigation Measures	5-85
	5.7.10.1 Siting and Site Design	5-86
	5.7.10.2 Building Design and Operation	5-86
	5.7.10.3 Transportation	5-87
5.7.11	Conclusion	5-88
5.8	Noise Impacts	5-88
5.8.1	Introduction	5-88
5.8.2	Noise Terminology	5-89
5.8.3	Noise Regulations and Criteria	5-90
5.8.4	Existing Conditions	5-92
	5.8.4.1 Baseline Noise Environment	5-92
	5.8.4.2 Noise Measurement Locations	5-92
	5.8.4.4 Measurement Equipment	5-94
	5.8.4.5 Baseline Ambient Noise Levels	5-94
5.8.5	Overview of Potential Project Noise Sources	5-96
5.8.6	Modeling Methodology	5-98
5.8.7	Future Sound Levels From Project	5-98
5.8.8	Emergency Generators	5-99
5.8.9	Parking Garage Fans	5-100
5.8.10	Conclusions	5-100
5.9	Flood Hazard Zones/Wetlands	5-101
5.10	Stormwater Management	5-101
	5.10.1 Existing Conditions	5-101
	5.10.2 Proposed Conditions	5-101
	5.10.3 Compliance with DEP Stormwater Management Policy	5-102
5.11	Geotechnical Impacts/Groundwater	5-105
	5.11.1 Existing Site Conditions	5-105
	5.11.2 Subsurface Soil and Bedrock Conditions	5-105

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

5.11.3	Existing Groundwater Conditions	5-105
5.11.4	Proposed Foundation and Below Ground Construction	5-106
5.11.5	Potential Impacts During Excavation and Foundation Construction	5-107
5.11.6	Construction Vibration and Ground Movements	5-108
5.12	Solid and Hazardous Wastes	5-108
5.12.1	Solid Waste	5-108
5.12.1.1	Solid Waste Handling During Construction	5-108
5.12.1.2	Solid Waste From Operations	5-109
5.12.2	Hazardous Contamination	5-109
5.12.2.1	Site History	5-109
5.12.2.2	Review of Regulatory Records	5-110
5.12.2.3	Hazardous Materials Summary and Recommendations	5-110
5.13	Construction Impacts	5-111
5.13.1	Introduction	5-111
5.13.2	Construction Schedule and Phasing	5-112
5.13.3	Construction Staging Areas/Public Safety	5-112
5.13.4	Signage	5-112
5.13.5	Construction Program	5-113
5.13.6	Construction Waste	5-114
5.13.7	Construction Traffic Impacts	5-114
5.13.8	Construction Air Quality	5-115
5.13.8.1	Transportation Demand Management	5-115
5.13.8.2	Construction Equipment Emissions	5-115
5.13.8.3	Dust Control	5-115
5.13.9	Construction Noise	5-116
5.13.10	Vibrations	5-116
5.13.11	Rodent Control	5-117
5.13.12	Utilities	5-117
5.13.13	Snow Removal	5-117
5.13.14	Cleaning	5-118
5.13.15	Coordination	5-118
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	<b>SUSTAINABLE DESIGN</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	Sustainability	6-1
6.2	Green Building Certification	6-2
6.3	Sustainable Design Elements	6-2
6.3.1	Sustainable Sites	6-2
6.3.1.1	Siting	6-2
6.3.1.2	Alternative Transportation	6-3
6.3.1.3	Stormwater and Rainwater Harvesting	6-3

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

	6.3.1.4	Urban Heat Island Effect	6-4
6.3.2		Water Management	6-4
6.3.3		Energy Performance	6-5
	6.3.3.1	Building Envelope	6-5
	6.3.3.2	Green Roofs	6-6
	6.3.3.3	Green Screens	6-6
	6.3.3.4	Lighting	6-7
	6.3.3.5	Central Plant	6-7
	6.3.3.6	Solar	6-7
	6.3.3.7	Geothermal	6-8
	6.3.3.8	Wind	6-8
	6.3.3.9	Energy Efficient Elevators	6-9
6..3.4		Materials and Resources	6-9
	6.3.4.1	Construction Waste	6-10
	6.3.4.2	Recycling	6-10
6.3.4		Indoor Environmental Quality	6-10
6.3.6		Innovation in Design	6-10
6.4		Summary	6-11
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>		<b>URBAN DESIGN</b>	<b>7-1</b>
7.1		Project Setting	7-1
7.2		Project Buildings	7-1
	7.2.1	Building 1	7-2
	7.2.2	Building 2 and Open Space	7-2
	7.2.3	Building 3	7-3
	7.2.4	Building 4	7-3
	7.2.5	Shared-Use Garage	7-3
	7.2.6	Yawkey Station, Public Ground Transportation, and Pedestrian Links	7-4
<b>8.0</b>		<b>HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>	<b>8-1</b>
8.1		Introduction	8-1
8.2		Historic Resources	8-1
8.3		Potential Project Impacts on Historic Resources	8-5
	8.3.1	Design and Visual Impacts	8-5
	8.3.2	Shadow Impacts	8-6
	8.3.3	Wind Impacts	8-7
8.4		Cornerstone	8-7
8.5		Archaeological Resources	8-7
8.6		Coordination of Design Review	8-8

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

<b>CHAPTER 9</b>	<b>INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS COMPONENT</b>	<b>9-1</b>
9.1	Introduction	9-1
9.2	Wastewater	9-1
9.2.1	Existing Wastewater System	9-1
9.2.2	Proposed Conditions	9-3
9.2.3	Measures to Reduce Inflow/Infiltration	9-3
9.3	Domestic Water and Fire Protection	9-3
9.3.1	Existing Water Supply System	9-3
9.3.2	Proposed Connection	9-4
9.4	Fire Prevention and Control	9-5
9.5	Utilities	9-5
9.5.1	Natural Gas Service	9-5
9.5.2	Electrical Service	9-6
9.5.3	Telecommunications	9-6
9.5.4	Tunnel Washing System	9-6
9.6	Protection of Utilities	9-6
9.7	Construction Coordination	9-6
9.8	Sustainable Design and Energy Conservation	9-6
9.9	Conclusion	9-7
<b>CHAPTER 10</b>	<b>MITIGATION MEASURES</b>	<b>10-1</b>
10.1	Introduction	10-1
10.2	Transportation	10-1
10.2.1	Construction	10-1
10.2.2	Operation	10-1
10.3	Environmental Impacts	10-3
10.3.1	Wind	10-3
10.3.2	Shadow	10-3
10.3.3	Daylight	10-3
10.3.4	Solar Glare and Heat Loading	10-3
10.3.4.1	Solar Glare	10-3
10.3.4.2	Heat Loading	10-4
10.3.5	Nighttime Lighting and Light Pollution	10-4
10.3.6	Air Quality	10-5
10.3.6.1	Construction	10-5
10.3.6.2	Operation	10-5
10.3.7	Noise	10-5
10.3.7.1	Construction	10-5
10.3.7.2	Operation	10-6

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

10.3.8	Stormwater Quantity and Quality	10-6
	10.3.8.1 Construction	10-6
	10.3.8.2 Operation	10-6
10.3.9	Geotechnical & Groundwater	10-7
	10.3.9.1 Construction	10-7
	10.3.9.2 Operation	10-7
10.3.10	Hazardous Materials and Solid Waste	10-8
	10.3.10.1 Construction	10-8
	10.3.10.2 Operation	10-8
10.3.11	Sustainable Design	10-8
10.3.12	Historic Resources	10-9
10.3.13	Water Generation	10-9
10.3.14	Wastewater Generation	10-10
10.3.15	Energy Consumption	10-10
10.4	Draft Section 61 Findings	10-10
	10.4.1 Proposed Section 61 Finding	10-11
<b>CHAPTER 11</b>	<b>RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON THE ENF AND PNF</b>	<b>11-1</b>
11.1	State Agencies	11-3
	Department of Environmental Protection – Northeast Regional Office, February 12, 2008	11-3
	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, February 12, 2008	11-6
	Massachusetts Historical Commission, February 12, 2008	11-7
	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, February 12, 2008	11-8
11.2	City Agencies	11-10
	Boston Transportation Department, March 28, 2008	11-10
	Boston Environment Department, February 21, 2008	11-19
	Boston Fire Department, January 30, 2008	11-27
11.3	Elected Officials	11-29
	State Senator Steven A. Tolman and State Representative Michael J. Moran, March 3, 2008	11-29
	State Senator Byron Rushing and State Representative Martha M. Walz, March 3, 2008	11-31
11.4	Organizations	11-34
	Boston Groundwater Trust, February 7, 2008	11-34
	Fenway Civic Association, March 2, 2008	11-36
	Walk Boston, February 12, 2008	11-38
	Metropolitan Area Planning Council, February 14, 2008	11-41
	Audubon Circle Neighborhood Association, March 3, 2008	11-44

## Table of Contents (Continued)

---

	Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization, Inc. (MASCO), March 3, 2008	11-45
	Fenway CDC, February 29, 2008	11-50
	Friends of the Muddy River, March 3, 2008	11-57
	Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay, March 2, 2008	11-58
11.5	Private Citizens	11-61
	Katherine L. Greenough, March 3, 2008	11-61
	Lauren Dewey Platt, February 29, 2008	11-65
	Peter G. Hill, January 20, 2008	11-66
	HRPT Properties Trust, March 4, 2008	11-67
	Ned Flaherty, undated	11-68
	Sandra Lewis, March 3, 2008	11-70

### APPENDICES

Appendix A	BRA Scoping Determination and Secretary's Certificate on the ENF
Appendix B	Potential Future Massing
Appendix C	Site Legal Description and ALTA Survey
Appendix D	Transportation (Bound Separately)
Appendix E	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Appendix F	Noise
Appendix G	MEPA Circulation List

## List of Figures

---

Figure 1-1	USGS Locus Map	1-2
Figure 1-2	Aerial Photo	1-3
Figure 1-3	Comparison of the PNF and ENF Plan to the Current Preferred Alternative	1-7
Figure 1-4	Property Ownership	1-14
Figure 2-1	Yawkey Platform Level Plan	2-14
Figure 2-2	Beacon Street Level Plan	2-15
Figure 2-3	Upper Level Plan 1	2-16
Figure 2-4	Upper Level Plan 2	2-17
Figure 2-5	Upper Level Plan 3	2-18
Figure 2-6	Roof Plan	2-19
Figure 2-7	North Site Elevation	2-20
Figure 2-8	South Site Elevation	2-21
Figure 2-9	Site Section A	2-22
Figure 2-10	Site Section B	2-23
Figure 2-11	Lower Level Plan	2-24
Figure 2-12	1st Level Plan, Building One	2-25
Figure 2-13	5th Level Plan, Building One	2-26
Figure 2-14	1st Level Plan, Building Two	2-27
Figure 2-15	3rd Level Plan, Building Two	2-28
Figure 2-16	1st Level Plan, Building Three	2-29
Figure 2-17	7th Level Plan, Building Three	2-30
Figure 2-18	9th Level Plan, Building Three	2-31
Figure 2-19	23rd Level Plan, Building Three	2-32
Figure 2-20	1st Level Plan, Building Four	2-33
Figure 2-21	3rd Level Plan, Building Four	2-34
Figure 2-22	Entry Level Plan, Shared-Use Parking Garage	2-35
Figure 2-23	Typical Floor Plan, Shared-Use Parking Garage	2-36
Figure 2-24	Preliminary Landscape Plan	2-37
Figure 2-25	Massing Study	2-38
Figure 2-26	Massing Study	2-39
Figure 2-27	Massing Study	2-40
Figure 2-28	Massing Study	2-41
Figure 3-1	RFP Alternative Plan View	3-2
Figure 3-2	RFP Alternative Building Sections	3-3
Figure 3-3	PNF/ENF Alternative Plan View	3-5
Figure 3-4	PNF/ENF Alternative North Elevation View	3-6

## List of Figures (Continued)

---

Figure 4-1	Transportation Analysis Locations	4-3
Figure 4-2	Existing 2007 Condition Morning Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-7
Figure 4-3	Existing 2007 Condition Evening Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-8
Figure 4-4	Existing 2007 Condition Morning Peak Hour Pedestrian Volumes	4-9
Figure 4-5	Existing 2007 Condition Evening Peak Hour Pedestrian Volumes	4-10
Figure 4-6	Existing 2007 Condition Morning Peak Hour Bicycle Volumes	4-11
Figure 4-7	Existing 2007 Condition Evening Peak Hour Bicycle Volumes	4-12
Figure 4-8	MBTA Public Transportation in Study Area	4-14
Figure 4-9	LMA Institutes and Private Shuttle Routes Serving the Site	4-17
Figure 4-10	Inventory of On-site and Adjacent Parking Lots	4-19
Figure 4-11	No Build 2012 Condition Morning Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-22
Figure 4-12	No Build 2012 Condition Evening Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-23
Figure 4-13	New Project Generated Vehicle Trips	4-28
Figure 4-14	Build 2012 Condition Morning Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-29
Figure 4-15	Build 2012 Condition Evening Peak Hour Traffic Volumes	4-30
Figure 4-16	Site Access and Circulation	4-31
Figure 4-17	Pedestrian Transit and Bicycle Connections	4-35
Figure 4-18	Fenway Park Area Patron Parking Inventory (Spring 2008)	4-50
Figure 4-19	Fenway-Kenmore Area Business Generated Demand for Public Parking	4-52
Figure 4-20	Parking Impacted by Potential Fenway-Kenmore Area Redevelopment	4-54
Figure 4-21	Pre-Game Garage Traffic Management	4-69
Figure 4-22	Post-Game Garage Traffic Management	4-70
Figure 4-23	Beacon St. at Maitland St. and Mountfort St. Conceptual Signal Plan	4-73
Figure 5.1-1	Pedestrian Wind Conditions – No-Build Configuration	5-2
Figure 5.1-2	Pedestrian Wind Conditions – Build Configuration	5-3
Figure 5.2-1	March 21, 10:00 AM	5-14
Figure 5.2-2	March 21, 1:00 PM	5-15
Figure 5.2-3	March 21, 4:00 PM	5-16
Figure 5.2-4	June 21, 9:00 AM	5-17
Figure 5.2-5	June 21, 12:00 PM	5-18
Figure 5.2-6	June 21, 3:00 PM	5-19
Figure 5.2-7	June 21, 6:00 PM	5-20
Figure 5.2-8	September 21, 9:00 AM	5-21
Figure 5.2-9	September 21, 12:00 PM	5-22
Figure 5.2-10	September 21, 3:00 PM	5-23
Figure 5.2-11	September 21, 6:00 PM	5-24
Figure 5.2-12	October 21, 11:00 AM	5-25
Figure 5.2-13	October 21, 1:00 PM	5-26
Figure 5.2-14	December 21, 9:00 AM	5-27

## List of Figures (Continued)

---

Figure 5.2-15	December 21, 12:00 PM	5-28
Figure 5.2-16	December 21, 3:00 PM	5-29
Figure 5.3-1	Viewpoint Locations	5-34
Figure 5.3-2	Viewpoint 1 - Beacon Street looking south at Building 1	5-35
Figure 5.3-3	Viewpoint 2 – Beacon Street looking south at Building 2	5-36
Figure 5.3-4	Viewpoint 3 – Beacon Street looking south at Building 3	5-37
Figure 5.3-5	Viewpoint 4 – Brookline Avenue looking northwest at Building 4 and the Parking Garage	5-38
Figure 5.3-6	Viewpoint 5 – Yawkey Way Extension looking north at Building 2	5-39
Figure 5.3-7	Area Context	5-40
Figure 5.6-1	Sensitive Receptors Locations	5-57
Figure 5.6-2	Receptors Locations	5-58
Figure 5.6-3	Receptors Locations	5-59
Figure 5.6-4	Receptors Locations	5-60
Figure 5.6-5	Receptors Locations	5-61
Figure 5.6-6	Receptors Locations	5-62
Figure 5.8-1	Sound Level Measurement Locations	5-93
Figure 8-1	Historic Resources	8-2
Figure 9-1	Existing Utilities Plan	9-2

## List of Tables

---

Table 1-1	Changes to the Project Since the PNF & ENF	1-5
Table 1-2	Impacts Associated with Future Evolution of Project Massing	1-8
Table 1-3	Anticipated Permits and Approvals	1-16
Table 1-4	Summary of Expected Environmental Impacts and Mitigation	1-18
Table 2-1	Project Dimensions and Table of Uses	2-5
Table 2-2	Building Use Summary	2-6
Table 3-1	Environmental Impacts of Previous Alternatives Compared to Current Preferred Alternative	3-7
Table 4-1	Rapid Transit Service within the Study Area	4-15

## List of Tables (Continued)

---

Table 4-2	MBTA Bus Service Within the Study Area	4-16
Table 4-3	Trip Generation Land Use Codes	4-24
Table 4-4	Mode Split by Land Use Category	4-25
Table 4-5	Total Project Trip Generation	4-25
Table 4-6	Net New Vehicle Trip Generation	4-26
Table 4-7	Expected Geographic Distribution of Site Related Traffic	4-26
Table 4-8	Service and Loading Activity	4-33
Table 4-9	Total Project Pedestrian Trip Generation	4-37
Table 4-10	Peak Hour Pedestrian Sidewalk LOS	4-38
Table 4-11	Project Transit Trip Distribution and Mode	4-40
Table 4-12	Project Transit Trips by Mode	4-41
Table 4-13	Project Transit Trip Assignment – Bus Mode	4-42
Table 4-14	Project Transit Trip Assignment – Commuter Rail Mode	4-43
Table 4-15	Project Transit Trip Assignment – Light Rail Mode	4-44
Table 4-16	MBTA Green Line Capacity Assessment	4-45
Table 4-17	Total Project Bicycle Trip Generation	4-47
Table 4-18	Vehicle Level of Service Criteria	4-56
Table 4-19	Pedestrian and Bicycle Level of Service Criteria	4-57
Table 4-20	2007 Existing Signalized Intersection Operations	4-58
Table 4-21	2007 Existing Unsignalized Intersection	4-59
Table 4-22	2007 Existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Level of Service Summary	4-60
Table 4-23	Signalized Intersection 2012 No Build Conditions Operations	4-63
Table 4-24	Unsignalized Intersection 2012 No Build Conditions Level of Service	4-64
Table 4-25	2012 Build Signalized Intersection Operations	4-66
Table 4-26	2012 Build Unsignalized Intersection Operations	4-67
Table 4-27	Day of Game Boston Police Officer Traffic Control	4-68
Table 4-28	Summary of Transportation Actions	4-76
Table 4-29	2012 Build Conditions (with Mitigation) Signalized Intersection Level of Service Summary	4-78
Table 4-30	2012 Build Conditions (with Mitigation) Unsignalized Intersection Level of Service Summary	4-78
Table 4-31	Build Conditions (with Mitigation) Pedestrian and Bicycle Level of Service Summary	4-79
Table 4-32	Area Transportation Goals and Project's Response	4-81
Table 5.1-1	Boston Redevelopment Authority Mean Wind Criteria*	5-6
Table 5.2-1	Shadow Impact Analysis	5-9
Table 5.3-1	Daylight Obstruction Values	5-31

## List of Tables (Continued)

---

Table 5.6-1	Summary of Microscale Modeling Analysis	5-68
Table 5.6-2	Comparison of SCREEN3 Predicted Concentrations from Mechanical Equipment and Loading Dock Louver plus Monitored Background Values Compared to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards	5-70
Table 5.6-3	2012 Buildout Mesoscale Analysis Summary	5-73
Table 5.7-1	GHG Study Baseline Case Modeling Assumptions	5-79
Table 5.7-2	GHG Study Energy Requirements for Indirect and Direct Emissions	5-81
Table 5.7-3	GHG Indirect Emissions from Transportation	5-84
Table 5.7-4	Results of the GHG Analysis	5-85
Table 5.8-1	City of Boston Zoning District Noise Standards, Maximum Allowable Sound Pressure Levels	5-91
Table 5.8-2	Baseline Ambient Noise Measurements – Parcel 7	5-95
Table 5.8-3	Expected Primary Noise Sources – One Kenmore Parcel 7	5-97
Table 5.8-4	Attenuation Values Used for Sound Level Modeling (dB)	5-98
Table 5.8-5	Comparison of Future Predicted Nighttime Sound Levels Incorporating Appropriate Mitigation with Existing Background – MA DEP Criteria	5-99
Table 5.8-6	Comparison of Future Predicted Nighttime Sound Levels Incorporating Appropriate Mitigation to City of Boston Criteria	5-99
Table 5.8-7	Predicted Emergency Generator Noise Levels Incorporating Appropriate Mitigation (Generators Operate During Daytime Only)	5-100
Table 5-10.1	Stormwater Runoff	5-102
Table 5.11-1	Subsurface Soil Conditions	5-105
Table 5.12-1	Solid Waste Generation	5-109
Table 8-1	Historic Resources in the Vicinity of the Parcel 7 Project Area	8-3
Table 9-1	Sewerage Generation Calculations	9-3
Table 9-2	Hydrant Flow Results	9-4
Table 10-1	State Permits	10-11
Table 10-2	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	10-13
Table 11-1	Comment Letters on the ENF and PNF	11-1

# CHAPTER 1 GENERAL INFORMATION

---

## 1.1 Project Summary

### *1.1.1 Proposed Development*

Meredith Kenmore/Fenway Development Group, LLC, (the “Proponent”) proposes to construct an approximately 1.3-million square-foot mixed use development on the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority (“MTA”) Air Rights Parcel 7 (the “Project”). Parcel 7 comprises approximately 3.63 acres, including the area over Interstate 90 (the “Turnpike”) between the Beacon Street overpass to the west and the Brookline Avenue overpass to the east, as well as an area on the east side of Beacon Street between the Turnpike and Maitland Street that is currently used for surface parking. The Project site is shown in Figure 1-1 on a USGS locus map, and in Figure 1-2 on an aerial photo.

The proposed Project is a smart-growth, transit-oriented development that locates housing, offices, retail, and parking directly adjacent to a new and improved Yawkey Commuter Rail Station and just one block from the MBTA’s Kenmore Square and Fenway Green Line Stations. It has been designed to transform a surface parking lot, long bridge expanses, unutilized air space, and a broken urban grid into a vibrant mixed-use residential and commercial community. At the center of the Project will be the renovated, full service Yawkey Commuter Rail Station and new public open space, which will be surrounded by a shared-use public parking garage, retail shops, and four buildings, ranging from seven to 23 stories. Several new and inviting pedestrian connections through the Project site will tie together Audubon Circle and Boston University to Kenmore Square, Fenway Park, and the Lansdowne Entertainment District. A detailed description of the Project is presented in Section 2.2.

### *1.1.2 Project Background*

Private development of air rights over the Boston Extension of the Turnpike was first authorized by the Massachusetts Legislature in 1963. An Air Rights Study undertaken by the MTA in 1993 identified individual disposition parcels along the Turnpike Extension and discussed their development potential. The MTA and the City of Boston entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), dated June 1, 1997, establishing a public review process for air rights development over the Turnpike. As provided for in the MOU, air rights development is subject to design review by the BRA. Project review is similar to that required under Article 80 of the Boston Zoning Code, and includes review by the project-specific Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) appointed by the Mayor of the City of Boston and the MTA.

In mid-1998, the Mayor appointed a Strategic Development Study Committee (SDSC) to assist the BRA in studying the parameters for air rights development over the Turnpike from Chinatown to the Allston toll plaza.





In June of 2000, following almost two years of planning, analysis, and public meetings, the BRA and the SDSC issued *A Civic Vision for Turnpike Air Rights in Boston* (the Civic Vision). On December 21, 2000, the BRA Board of Directors formally voted to adopt the Civic Vision report “as the plan and development guidelines which will be the framework for the Boston Redevelopment Authority and future Citizens Advisory Committees to review proposed development projects over the Turnpike Air Rights in Boston.” The proposed Project’s consistency with the Civic Vision is discussed in Section 2.3.1.

### **1.1.3 Project Permitting History**

#### **1.1.3.1 City of Boston Review**

On January 17, 2008, the Proponent filed a Project Notification Form (PNF) with the BRA to begin the Project’s review in compliance with the terms of the June 1, 1997 MOU, as described in the previous section. The BRA held a city agency scoping meeting on February 6, 2008 and a public meeting to accept comment on the Project on February 13, 2008. The written comment period ended on March 3, 2008.

On April 11, 2008, the BRA issued a Scoping Determination outlining the issues to be studied in a Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR). A copy of the BRA’s Scoping Determination is included in Appendix A. Copies of the written comments received on the PNF are included in Chapter 11.

#### **1.1.3.2 Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Review**

The proposed Project is also subject to MEPA. The MTA’s granting of the Parcel 7 Air Rights to the Proponent constitutes a “Land Transfer” as defined in the MEPA Regulations (301 CMR 11.02(2)) and therefore establishes MEPA jurisdiction. The Project also exceeds MEPA review thresholds related to traffic. Because it is expected to generate greater than 3,000 new average daily trips (unadjusted), it is subject to a Mandatory Environmental Impact Report. The Project also requires a number of state permits including a Sewer Connection/Extension Permit from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

On January 16, 2008, the Proponent filed an Environmental Notification Form (ENF) to begin the Project’s review under MEPA. The MEPA Office held a consultation session to accept public comments on the Project on February 5, 2008. Written comments were accepted until February 12, 2008. On February 22, 2008, the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) issued a Certificate on the ENF, outlining the issues to be studied in a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). A copy of the MEPA Certificate is included in Appendix A. Copies of the written comments received on the ENF are included in Chapter 11.

This joint Draft PIR/EIR is being prepared in response to both the BRA Scoping Determination and the MEPA Certificate.

**1.1.4 Changes to the Project Since Submission of the PNF and ENF**

Since the publication of the PNF and ENF, the Proponent has continued to meet with the BRA, the CAC, and other members of the community to further refine the proposed Project and address concerns that have been raised.

Overall the Project remains similar to that proposed in the PNF and ENF; however, there have been some refinements made to the size and massing of the proposed buildings. Specifically, the shape of Building 1 has been made narrower; Building 2 has been reconfigured so that it rests entirely on terra firma and not on the decking to be built over the Turnpike; a canopy extending over the Yawkey Station entrance has been added to the south façade of Building 3, and the shape of the upper floors expanded slightly; Building 4 has not been altered substantially, but has been made slightly larger. The heights of Buildings 1 and 4 have remained the same, while one floor has been added to Buildings 2 and 3. Table 1-1 lists changes to the Project’s dimensions and program that have occurred since the PNF and ENF. Figure 1-3 compares the Beacon Street Level Site Plans for the PNF and ENF with the current site plan proposed in this Draft PIR/EIR to show the changes that have occurred.

**Table 1-1 Changes to the Project Since the PNF & ENF**

	PNF and ENF	Current Draft PIR/EIR	Net Change
Total Square Footage (not including parking garages)	771,338	803,770	32,432
Building 1 Square-Footage (not including underground garage)	153,321	120,037	-33,284
Building 1 Height	80 feet	80 feet	0
Building 2 Square-Footage	235,230	258,217	22,987
Building 2 Height	146 feet	160	14
Building 3 Square-Footage	287,707	314,873	27,166
Building 3 Height (feet)	276	299.5	23.5
Building 4 Square-Footage	106,420	110,643	4,223
Building 4 Height	80	80	0

**Table 1-1 Changes to the Project Since the PNF & ENF (Continued)**

	PNF and ENF	Current Draft PIR/EIR	Net Change
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)**	6.5	5.58**	-0.92
On-site Residential Units	282	308	+ 26
Residential Square-Footage	331,734	313,558	-18,176
Commercial Square-Footage	338,919	387,047	48,128
Retail Square-Footage	100,685	92,461	-8,224
Total Number of Parking Spaces (Shared-Use and Private)	1,360	1,290	-70
Private Parking Spaces	660	590	-70
Shared-Use Parking Spaces	700	700	0

\*\* Note that the FAR reported for the current Draft PIR/EIR proposal is based on the inclusion of the approximately 35,000-square foot CSX parcel immediately south of the Project site that the Proponent intends to acquire in the calculation of the parcel's square footage. The FAR reported in the PNF and ENF did not include the CSX parcel area because at the time the PNF and ENF were filed, it was not anticipated that the Proponent would become the owner of the CSX parcel. Discussions with CSX regarding the exact boundaries of the CSX property to be acquired are ongoing.

### **1.1.5 Next Steps**

Following review of this Draft PIR/EIR, the Proponent will prepare subsequent filings that respond to the BRA's Preliminary Adequacy Determination (PAD) and the EEA Secretary's Certificate as well as to comments from other City departments, State agencies, organizations, and the public. As is typical of projects of this size and complexity, the Proponent expects that the Project will have further evolved by the time the subsequent filings are made. Subsequent filings will present the most up-to-date information concerning the Project.



Based upon feedback received at the July 22, 2008 CAC meeting, the Proponent expects there will likely be further refinements made to the Project's architectural massing. The CAC expressed strong support for the concept of lowering Building 2 by one floor and increasing the height of Building 3 with the upper floors narrowed to create a more slender profile in the skyline. The Proponent is comfortable with these changes and is currently studying them. A figure depicting preliminary views of these potential refinements to the massing are included in Appendix B. The Proponent anticipates that one of the massing alternatives will be selected by the CAC and the BRA during the public comment period, and the Proponent will present the new massing in the subsequent filings.

The Proponent does not expect that the changes to the massing that are being considered would result in substantive changes to the Project's impacts. The total program square footage would not change substantially; therefore impacts to water/sewer and traffic are expected to be minor. Nor would adjusting the massing be likely to result in any substantive changes to architecturally related impacts, such as wind, shadow, daylight obstruction, or solar glare. Table 1-2 lists, by impact category, the likely effects that would occur as a result of the continued evolution of the Project's massing as it is currently envisioned.

**Table 1-2 Impacts Associated with Future Evolution of Project Massing**

Impact Category	Likely Result of Future Refinements to Project Massing*
Traffic	Impacts would be extremely minor or beneficial depending on the massing option. Option 1 would result in less than ten additional daily trips and one additional trip during the peak hour. Due to the shift from commercial to residential space, Option 2 would result in about 30 fewer daily trips and four fewer trips during the peak hours.
Wind	Changes would be expected to be minor. While winds along Beacon Street could potentially increase because of increased downwash from Building 3, they are not likely to increase substantially and the use of mitigation measures such as canopies could be employed if needed.
Shadow	Shadows cast by Building 3 would extend slightly farther, but would not be expected to adversely affect public open space or parkland. Most additional shadow would land on roof tops.
Daylight Obstruction	Changes would be expected to be very minor. The increase in height of Building 3 will be offset by the proposed narrowing of its upper floors and the lowering of Building 2.

**Table 1-2 Impacts Associated with Future Evolution of Project Massing (Continued)**

Impact Category	Likely Result of Future Refinements to Project Massing*
Solar Glare	Any changes would be expected to be very minor. The narrower profile of the upper floor of Building 3 would likely result in lesser impacts.
Air Quality	No substantial change would be expected. Because the program will remain very similar, so will traffic emissions and emissions from the buildings' mechanical equipment. There would be no exceedence of the NAAQS.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	No substantial change would be expected. Because the program will remain very similar, so will traffic emissions and emissions from the buildings' mechanical equipment.
Noise	No substantial change would be expected. Mechanical equipment will still be located very high above street level and the Project would still comply with Boston's strictest standards for residential areas.
Flood Hazard	No change would be expected.
Stormwater	No change would be expected.
Geotechnical	No change would be expected.
Solid Waste	Little to no change would be expected. Because the program will change very little overall, there will be little change in the amount of solid waste generated.
Hazardous Waste	No change would be expected.
Sustainability	No change would be expected.
Urban Design	The changes considered would likely enhance the Project's appearance and the goal of creating an iconic symbol for Yawkey Station and a gateway to Kenmore Square.
Historic Resources	No change would be expected.
Infrastructure	No substantial change would be expected. Because the program will change very little overall, there will little change in water demand or sewage generation.

\* Based on an assumed lowering of Building 2 by one floor and an increase to Building 3 of three floors.

## 1.2 Development Team

Project Name	Massachusetts Turnpike Parcel 7 Air Rights Kenmore/Fenway Area
Location	The proposed Project will occupy the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority's (MTA) Parcel 7, which includes the air rights over the Turnpike between the Brookline Avenue and Beacon Street overpasses and the area of what are now parking lots along the south side of Beacon Street between the Turnpike and Maitland Street.
Proponent	MK Parcel 7 Development LLC One Bridge Street, Suite 300 Newton, MA 02458-1101 (617) 965-2200 ext. 150 John Rosenthal Jerry Belair
Architects	Carlos Zapata Studios 444 Broadway, 3rd Floor New York, NY 10013 (212) 966 9292 Carlos Zapata Anthony Montalto Matthew Stofen
Landscape Architect	Copley Wolff Design Group 160 Boylston Street, 3rd Floor Boston, MA 02116 (617) 654-9000 Lynn Wolff
Legal Counsel	Goulston & Storrs 400 Atlantic Avenue Boston, MA 02110-3333 (617) 482-1776 Paul McDonough Adam Hundley
Permitting Consultants	Epsilon Associates, Inc. 3 Clock Tower Place, Suite 250 Maynard, MA 01754 (978) 897-7100 Cindy Schlessinger David Hewett

Transportation, Civil Engineering Consultants, and LEED® Consultant	<p>Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.  101 Walnut Street  Watertown, MA 02471  (617) 924-1770  Ruth Bonsignore  Michael Regan  Mark Junghans  Tristan Cooke  Leo P. Roy</p>
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<p>Harris Miller Miller &amp; Hanson, Inc.  77 South Bedford Street  Burlington, MA 01803  (781) 229-0707  Philip M. DeVita</p>
Parking Operations Consultant	<p>Pilgrim Parking, Inc.  160 North Washington Street  Boston, MA 02114  (617) 723-1448  Michael Gery</p>
Structural Engineer	<p>Leslie E. Robertson Associates, RLLP  30 Broad Street, 47-48th Floor  New York, NY 10004-2304  (212) 750-9000  William Faschan</p>
MEP	<p>DSA Engineering  77-79 Farringdon Road  London, England EC1M3JU  + 44 (0) 20 7242 7272  David Stillman</p> <p>Cosentini Associates  One Broadway, 10th Floor  Cambridge, MA 02142  (617) 494-9090  Robert Leber</p>
Geotechnical Engineer	<p>Haley &amp; Aldrich  465 Medford Street  Suite 2200  Boston, MA 02129  (617) 886-7400  Mark Haley</p>

Survey	Harry R. Feldman, Inc 112 Shawmut Avenue, 4th floor Boston, MA 02118 (617) 357-9740 Michael Feldman
Construction Manager	Bovis/Lend Lease LMB Inc. 99 Chauncy Street Boston, MA 02111 (617) 598-4300 Jon Dunsford

### 1.3 Legal Information

#### *1.3.1 Legal Judgments Adverse to the Proposed Project*

The Proponent is not aware of any legal judgments in effect or legal actions pending that are adverse to the Project.

#### *1.3.2 History of Tax Arrears on Property Owned in Boston by the Proponent*

There are no tax arrears on the site.

#### *1.3.3 Site Control/Public Easements*

The Project site consists of air rights and land owned by the MTA. The Proponent has been designated by the Authority as the developer of the site, and the parties have entered into a Development Agreement describing this arrangement. The Proponent or its nominee will enter into a long-term lease agreement with the Authority for the Project.

Various transportation/railroad companies operate in the vicinity of the Project site. The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) operates the commuter rail below a portion of the Project site. The Proponent continues to work closely with the MTA and MBTA to design and construct a new Regional Yawkey Commuter Rail Station. In addition, railroad companies including CSX Transportation and Amtrak operate pursuant to easements or similar arrangements on the rail tracks beneath the site (at the level of the Massachusetts Turnpike). The Proponent will obtain any required consents from the railroad companies for construction above the rail tracks. CSX Transportation and other private parties own land adjacent to the site that will be used for new roads and sidewalks that will be built by the City to access Yawkey Station and the site. See Figure 1-4. The Proponent or the City will either obtain in fee or obtain rights from such landowners for such access or landscaping. In particular, discussions with CSX regarding acquisition of a

portion of the inactive rail spur immediately south of the site are ongoing as are discussions with HRPT regarding proposed crossings of their property, replacement parking, and related matters.

Certain easement areas from the late 1800's and early 1900's, as well as existing utility lines, cross the site. The Proponent will properly extinguish or accommodate such rights, and will grant easements to public utility companies to provide new services to the site.

## **1.4 Regulatory Controls and Permits**

### ***1.4.1 Memorandum of Understanding Between the City of Boston and the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority***

As discussed above in Section 1.1.2, the MTA and the City of Boston have entered into a MOU which sets out a public review process for air rights development over the Turnpike. By virtue of the MOU, air rights development is subject to design review by the BRA via a process similar to that required under Article 80 of the Boston Zoning Code. This joint Draft PIR/EIR responds to the BRA's April 11, 2008 Scoping Determination on the Proponent's PNF. Following public review of this document, the BRA will issue a determination that is functionally equivalent to a Preliminary Adequacy Determination (PAD). The PAD will state which environmental studies are complete and which, if any, require further information and analysis to be included in a Final PIR or Supplemental Information Document (SID). Following preparation of the Final PIR or SID by the Proponent, the BRA will issue a determination that is functionally equivalent to a Final Adequacy Determination.

### ***1.4.2 Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act***

As discussed in Section 1.1.2.2., the Project is subject to review under MEPA. This joint Draft PIR/EIR responds to the Secretary of EEA's February 22, 2008 Certificate on the ENF. Following public review of this document, the MEPA Office will issue a Certificate that will state which environmental studies are complete and which, if any, require further information and analysis to be included in a Final EIR. Following review of the Final EIR, the Secretary of EEA will issue a Final Certificate



### **1.4.3        *Zoning***

The project site is located in multiple zoning districts. The northern portion of the site (*i.e.*, the portion of the site directly above the Turnpike) is located in the B-4 Subdistrict within Boston Proper. The southern portion of the site is in the MFR Subdistrict of the Audubon Circle Neighborhood District (and is also within a Neighborhood Design Overlay District and Special Study Area within that District). A small area of land immediately south of the site which will be used for access to or landscaping for the site is located in the Brookline Avenue Community Commercial subdistrict of the Fenway Neighborhood District. The entire site is within the Restricted Parking Overlay District.

The Proponent intends to develop the Project as a Planned Development Area (PDA) in compliance with the provisions of the Zoning Code. The site contains more than one acre, and PDAs are permitted in all zoning districts in which the site is located.

PDAs are overlay districts that may be designated by the Boston Zoning Commission to provide greater flexibility for large project development while preserving City and public review of projects features and impacts. In general, uses and project dimensions of projects are set forth in a PDA Development Plan reviewed and approved by the BRA and Boston Zoning Commission.

Section 61-16 of the Zoning Code lists height and floor area ratio (FAR) limits for PDAs within the Audubon Circle Neighborhood District. Portions of the Project will exceed these limits, and accordingly the Proponent, with the BRA's support, will seek approval of a limited text amendment to the Zoning Code to permit the height and FAR of the Project. It is anticipated that this process will proceed concurrently with the PDA review process.

### **1.4.4        *Anticipated Permits***

Table 1-3 lists the federal, state and local agencies from which permits or other actions are expected to be required.

**Table 1-3 Anticipated Permits and Approvals**

<b>Agency Name</b>	<b>Permit / Approval</b>
<b>FEDERAL</b>	
United States Environmental Protection Agency	NPDES General Permit for Discharge from Small Construction Activity
Federal Aviation Administration	FAA Height Restriction Notice
Federal Highway Administration (if required)	Review and Approval
<b>STATE</b>	
Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Water Pollution Control	Sewer Connection and Extension Permit Groundwater Discharge Permit (if required)
Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Air Quality Control	Air Quality Plan Approval; review of tunnel ventilation; Pre-Construction Notice
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (MEPA Unit)	Secretary's Certificate
Executive Office of Transportation	Approval for construction on former railroad land; disposition of railroad land
Massachusetts Water Resources Authority	Sewer Use Discharge Permit; Construction Dewatering Permit
Massachusetts Historical Commission	Determination of No Adverse Effect or Memorandum of Understanding
Massachusetts Turnpike Authority	Access Agreements and Air Rights Leases
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	Development Agreement regarding construction of Yawkey Station
Department of Public Safety	Building Permit
<b>LOCAL</b>	
Boston Air Pollution Control Commission	Approval for parking spaces
Boston Civic Design Commission	Review and Approval
Boston Redevelopment Authority	80B Large Project Review ( <i>i.e.</i> , MOU); 80C Planned Development Area Review Cooperation Agreement and other ancillary documents
Boston Transportation Department	Transportation Access Plan Agreement (TAPA); Construction Management Plan
Boston Water and Sewer Commission	Sewer Use Discharge Permit; Site Plan Approval; Construction Dewatering Permit; Sewer Extension/ Connection Permit
City of Boston Committee on Licenses	Parking Garage Permit

**Table 1-3 Anticipated Permits and Approvals (Continued)**

Agency Name	Permit / Approval
City of Boston Inspectional Services Department	Building and Occupancy Permits
Boston Fire Department	Fuel Storage License Approval of Fire Safety Equipment
Boston Public Improvement Commission/Department of Public Works	Street and Sidewalk Occupation Permits; Tieback/Earth Retention Permit; Specific Repair Plan License for installation of groundwater monitoring well
Boston Zoning Commission	Planned Development Area Approval; Zoning Code Amendment

## 1.5 Public Participation

### 1.5.1 *BRA Public Involvement and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)*

Since January 2007 when the Proponent received MTA Developer Designation for Parcel 7, the Proponent has met regularly with the BRA, BTD, MBTA and the CAC established for the Project. To date there have been four public CAC meetings, and numerous working sessions with the CAC and the BRA. Feedback from these meetings has positively influenced the design, including the massing and placement of the proposed buildings, and the program presented in this Draft PIR/EIR. The Proponent will continue to meet with the CAC throughout the remainder of the City review and MEPA review process, and is committed to being responsive to the CAC's concerns.

As noted previously, the MEPA Office held a consultation session at Fenway Park on the morning of February 5, 2008 during the public review comment period on the ENF, and the BRA held its Scoping Meeting on February 13, 2008.

## 1.6 Summary of Impacts and Proposed Mitigation

Table 1-4 summarizes the proposed Project's expected impacts and the mitigation measures that the Proponent will implement to minimize the impacts to the extent practicable.

**Table 1-4 Summary of Expected Environmental Impacts and Mitigation**

Impact Category	Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Refer to Section
Transportation	Minor. While the Project will add traffic to the surrounding roadway network, the projected increases will not trigger a reduction in LOS at any of the study area intersections.	In addition to a robust Transportation Demand Management Program, the Proponent will also contribute to the Beacon Street Corridor Enhancement by creating bicycle lanes on Beacon Street.	Chapter 4
Wind	Similar to the No-Build. Will remain the same or improve in the majority of locations studied.	Plantings and the use of wind screens.	5.1
Shadow	Shadows typical of densely built urban areas with very little impact to open spaces and historic buildings.	Slender profile of the upper floors of Building 3 helps to reduce shadow impacts.	5.2
Daylight	Similar to daylight obstruction values within the surrounding area and typical of densely built urban areas.	Slender profile of the upper floors of Building 3 help to reduce shadow impacts.	5.3
Solar Glare	Some solar glare will be reflected onto roadways during limited times of the day at certain times of the year.	The use of window walls and glass having only 50 percent reflectivity will help to substantially reduce the amount of glare reflected.	5.4.1
Light Pollution	Minor increase in the amount of nighttime lighting compared to No-Build.	All lighting equipment used will be standardized for energy efficiency, low glare and light pollution features, and the effective operation and maintenance of the lighting system. They will be shielded and directed downward to provide the best lighting public safety.	5.5
Air Quality	The proposed Build with Mitigation when compared to the No-Build condition results in only a 0.13 percent increase or a 2.99 percent reduction when compared to the Build condition without mitigation. Project is in compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).	Proposed traffic improvements at Audubon Circle, Kenmore Square and Beacon Street at Mountfort Street will improve traffic flow and reduce overall traffic emissions area-wide. In addition, the Project includes a robust TDM Program to reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by the Project.	5.6
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Project will reduce total CO2 emissions by 3,346 tons per year compared to Baseline Condition.	Numerous sustainable design principles and TDM measures will reduce both direct and indirect emissions of CO2.	5.7

**Table 1-4 Summary of Expected Environmental Impacts and Mitigation (Continued)**

Impact Category	Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Refer to Section
Noise	Minor. Predicted noise levels from Project's mechanical equipment with appropriate noise mitigation will be below the most stringent City of Boston Noise Zoning requirements for nighttime and daytime residential zones, and well-below existing measured baseline noise levels in the area.	Sound proof enclosures for cooling towers and mechanical penthouses. Parking garage fans will be enclosed and the exhaust shafts/plenums will be designed to slow down air flow velocities	5.8
Stormwater Runoff	Positive. The Project will reduce peak runoff rates and improve water quality of runoff.	The proposed drainage collection system will use control structures, such as hooded deep-sump catch basins, to reduce total suspended solids to the maximum extent practicable.	5.10
Groundwater	Minor. Project will be designed and constructed so as not to lower groundwater levels.	The substantially watertight excavation support walls, which will also serve as the new building's below grade foundation walls will prevent any significant withdrawal of groundwater from beyond the below-grade limits of the Project.	5.11
Solid Waste	The Project will generate solid waste typical of other residential/mixed-use projects. Solid waste generated by the Project is estimated to be approximately 885 tons per year	The Proponent will provide space throughout the Project for recycling in the residential spaces, as well as for the commercial and retail tenants.	5.12.1
Hazardous Materials	Some potential to encounter contaminate soils. Because of the historic use of portions of the site as a railroad corridor, it is possible that the track ballast and underlying soils may contain residues of lubricating oils, petroleum, hydraulic oils, PCBs, polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and metals.	The Proponent will pre-characterize the soils and dispose of any contaminated soils in full compliance with applicable regulations.	5.12.2

**Table 1-4 Summary of Expected Environmental Impacts and Mitigation (Continued)**

Impact Category	Impact	Proposed Mitigation	Refer to Section
Historic Resources	No direct impacts. Very minor indirect impacts, such as shadows.	The Project has been designed to create an architectural statement which strives to serve as an iconic symbol for Yawkey Station and as a gateway to the City from the west; while at the same time, the siting, design, and materials of the Project's components have been planned to minimize visual impacts on the nearby historic properties.	Chapter 8
Sewage Generation	Minor. The Project will generate an estimated 94,636 gallons per day (gpd) of new wastewater flows.	The Proponent will develop an Inflow/Infiltration (I/I) management program in consultation with the BWSC to reduce extraneous water from entering the municipal sewer system.	9.2
Water Use	Minor. The Project is expected to have a total demand of 114,600 gpd.	Several measures will also be undertaken to reduce water consumption, including the installation of low-flow plumbing fixtures, and the use of a rainwater harvesting system to reduce the amount of potable water needed for irrigation.	9.3
Construction Impacts	Construction impacts will be typical for a large urban project, and include temporary increases in traffic, dust, noise, etc.	A Construction Management Plan ("CMP") in compliance with the City of Boston's Construction Management Program will be submitted to the Boston Transportation Department ("BTD"). The CMP will include routing plans for trucking and deliveries, plans for the protection of existing utilities, and control of noise and dust.	5.13

## 1.7 Project Benefits

The proposed Project will provide a great many benefits for city residents and workers, and for the citizens of the Commonwealth. They are briefly summarized below by category.

### 1.7.1 *Public Realm Improvements*

The Project will greatly benefit the public realm by covering the turnpike with high quality, new, mixed-use development. Specific benefits include the following

- ◆ Activating an area of surface parking lots and approximately 85,000 square feet of unutilized space over the Turnpike and rail corridor and transforming it into active housing, office, retail and green space;
- ◆ Creating a year-round mixed-use community that will help transform the existing neighborhood away from its primarily seasonal economy;
- ◆ Constructing an exciting architecturally interesting project that responds to the BRA's directive to create a compelling architectural statement and gateway building on the site;
- ◆ Creating approximately 92,500 square feet of neighborhood retail, including a neighborhood grocery store, restaurants, cafes, and community-oriented retail;
- ◆ Creating two new city blocks and activating the street edges and wind-swept bridges bordering Beacon Street, Brookline Avenue, Maitland Street, and along the new Yawkey Way Extension;
- ◆ Creating new pedestrian connections and a substantial amount of new open space including a pedestrian park adjacent to Beacon Street and Yawkey Station; and
- ◆ Improving the sidewalks bordering the site along Beacon Street, Brookline Avenue, and Yawkey Way Extension;

### 1.7.2 *Environmental Benefits*

The proposed Project incorporates a number of smart growth and transit-oriented features to make the Project pedestrian-friendly and help to restore community and vitality to the neighborhood. These features include locating housing in a downtown location adjacent to a variety of public transportation options and mixed uses, as well as providing for walkable venues for residents and office workers.

The Project will be LEED™ certifiable as required by Article 37 of the Boston Zoning Code.<sup>1</sup> As discussed in Chapter 6, LEED credits will be achieved through the building design and by carefully reviewing and selecting sustainable site components including storm water management, landscape, exterior design and material selection, surface paving, and alternative transportation opportunities such as bike storage and shared vehicles such as ZipCar®.

The Project will help to reduce traffic noise levels on portions of Brookline Avenue and Beacon Street by decking-over the Turnpike and rail lines.

### **1.7.3            *Transportation Benefits***

The Project is a transit oriented development centered around the MBTA's major upgrade of the Yawkey Commuter Rail Station, which will become a multi-modal center with pedestrian connections to buses and the MBTA's Green Line at the Fenway, Kenmore, and Blandford Street Stations. As such it will help to minimize auto trip generation and auto ownership levels for residents.

The Project has evolved after years of continued and iterative comprehensive transportation planning to ensure that the Project addresses citywide plans such as the Urban Ring, Civic Vision, BTD's Access Boston 2000-2010 plan, and district-level and neighborhood plans.

A system of new public roadways and inviting pedestrian walkways will support the Yawkey Station redevelopment and better connect the Audubon Circle neighborhood with Brookline Avenue. These connections effectively break the street block and better manage public transit and site-related traffic and reduce impacts to Audubon Circle and Kenmore Square.

An enhanced pedestrian environment is created through new inviting walkways, streetscaping, building setbacks, wider sidewalks, as well as greatly enhanced connections between Audubon Circle, Boston University, Kenmore Square, Fenway Park, the Lansdowne Entertainment District and large green space abutting Yawkey Station.

---

<sup>1</sup> LEED™ stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, and is a trademark of the United States Green Building Council (USGBC).

The Project will provide a shared-use public parking facility that replaces surface lots in the area and covers a large expanse of the Turnpike. In addition to dramatically improving the public realm, this is desirable from a transportation planning standpoint for a number of reasons:

- ◆ It is consistent with the Civic Vision, which encourages reuse of surface parking lots for other more desirable uses;
- ◆ It will help to intercept area parking demands before they spread onto residential streets and will reduce the current problem of recirculating traffic through the Sears Rotary, Audubon Circle, and Kenmore Square from drivers who are searching for a parking space or traveling to one of the smaller lots located in the surrounding neighborhoods;
- ◆ It will provide much needed parking for Kenmore businesses and residents; and
- ◆ It will make possible the consolidation of the numerous shuttle bus routes through the area, many of which rely on an already busy Brookline Avenue.

The Project will also provide a number of other transportation related benefits including the following:

- ◆ Car-sharing services (*e.g.* ZipCar) with preferential parking would be provided on-site and available to residents of surrounding neighborhoods;
- ◆ New secure bicycle storage areas will be provided as well as changing and shower facilities;
- ◆ An MBTA pass program will be offered that facilitates sales and subsidies to Project employees and residents for a limited period of time;
- ◆ Entry/exit monitors will be installed in the parking garages to monitor and manage garage occupancy and turnover;
- ◆ Shared-use parking for MASCO, the Red Sox and Kenmore Square businesses and neighborhood residents will be accommodated to replace existing lots and intercept traffic to help reduce transient parking in adjacent neighborhoods; and
- ◆ Short-term parking will be provided for neighborhood local businesses and Entertainment District uses, thus reducing demand for surface parking in the neighborhoods and freeing-up parcels for higher and better use.

#### **1.7.4 Economic Benefits**

The proposed Project will have numerous neighborhood, city, and regional economic benefits, including the following

- ◆ As a Development Impact Project under the Zoning Code, the Project will contribute approximately \$2,987,000 Housing Exaction and \$596,000 Jobs Contribution Exaction to the Neighborhood Housing Trust and Neighborhood Jobs Trust.
- ◆ Substantial new annual real estate taxes, estimated to be in the millions, which will support City fire, police, schools, and other services;
- ◆ Approximately 200 new permanent jobs within the City (retail, maintenance, parking, restaurant, etc.);
- ◆ Development will bring new year-round residents and business which will help stabilize Kenmore Square and mature the Lansdowne Entertainment District by generating a more diversified 7-day a week, year-round economy (versus seasonal university, night club and baseball dependant economy);
- ◆ Approximately 1,200 total construction jobs created, with stabilized construction work-force of approximately 350 (construction hiring will be in accordance with the City's guidelines for Resident/Minority/Women employment);
- ◆ Fifteen percent affordable housing component, consisting of a total of 46 units, including 31 on-site and 15 off-site units; and
- ◆ Substantial new Sales and Food & Beverage Taxes from retail and restaurant uses.

#### **1.7.5 Quality of Life Benefits**

The Project will provide many benefits to help improve the quality of life in the neighborhood, including

- ◆ Inclusion of a community center in the Project to provide much needed meeting space for neighborhood residents.
- ◆ Improved access to public transportation;
- ◆ Improved public safety through new residents and new neighborhood businesses in the area, as well as new and improved pedestrian walkways, emergency evacuation routes for Fenway Park and the Entertainment District uses;
- ◆ Covering large expanses and bridges over the Turnpike;

- ◆ Increasing the amount of more stable, non-student residents in the area, which currently has one of the lowest percentages of homeownership in the City;
- ◆ Providing new, large green spaces and tree-lined pedestrian ways between Audubon Circle, Boston University, Kenmore Square, Fenway Park, the Lansdowne Entertainment District and Yawkey Station;
- ◆ Redeveloping large surface parking lots with better and more pedestrian friendly uses; and
- ◆ Increasing adjacent property values/taxes and property improvements as a result of the Project and its streetscape and public realm improvements.