

Brookline Place Advisory Committee

DRAFT Meeting Notes

February 25, 2014

Committee Members Present: Co-Chair Neil Wishinsky, Co-Chair Ken Goldstein, Edie Brickman, Arlene Mattison, John Bassett, Ken Lewis (by Remote Participation), Linda Olson Pehlke, Mark Zarrillo, Cynthia Gunadi, Linda Hamlin, Steve Lacker. Guus Driessen, Debbie Anderson.

Committee Members not able to attend: Ali Mahajer.

Staff & Town Consultants: Kara Brewton, Jennifer Dopazo Gilbert, Jason Schrieber (Nelson – Nygaard)

Guests: George Cole (Stantec), Tim Talun (Elkus-Manfredi), Merelice, Paul Saner (EDAB Co-Chair), Hugh Mattison, Robbie Burgess (Howard –Stein-Hudson), Charles Weinstein (Boston Children’s Hospital)

At 8:20 am, Ken Goldstein called the meeting to order.

Prior to the start of the agenda topics, it was established that there was a quorum of committee members physically present. Co-Chair Ken Goldstein then announced that Ken Lewis was unable to physically attend the meeting due to geographic distance and has asked to do so by remote participation. Co-Chair Goldstein stated for the record that the Committee has secured a room in a public building with a town/school-issued speaker phone capability in accordance to the remote participation policy provided by the Selectmen. The phone was tested and deemed to be in working order and the participant is clearly audible to those present in the meeting.

1. Meeting minutes from 2/12/14 were voted to be amended as noted on the agenda; minutes from 2/14/14 were approved as amended – by roll call vote:

Neil Wishinsky: Yes

Ken Goldstein: Yes

Edie Brickman: Yes

Arlene Mattison: Yes

John Bassett: Yes

Ken Lewis: Yes

Linda Olson Pehlke: Yes

Mark Zarrillo: Yes

Cynthia Gunadi: Yes

Linda Hamlin: Yes

Steve Lacker: Yes

Guus Driessen: Yes

Debbie Anderson: Yes

2. BCH made a presentation showing a now 6.5-story parking garage. It was clarified that the height as measured to the top of the rail is 55’ towards Village Way, and 65’ on the side facing

10 and 1 Brookline Place. The headhouse is 75' tall. This proposal also includes reusing the existing half level of parking garage partially below ground at the current 1 BP garage.

3. Jason Schrieber from Nelson Nygaard (NN) joined the Committee by phone. Linda Olson Pehlke led the discussion, going through the questions that were asked at the 2/14/14 meeting, forwarded to NN by Kara Brewton, and which Linda wrote up on 2/22/14 meeting, also forwarded to NN by Kara Brewton.
 - a. Regarding the methodology used by NN (who was recommended by Linda to be the Town's consultant), Ken Goldstein asked Linda Olson Pehlke whether she agreed. Linda responded yes, as NN took the ULI shared parking methodology, and further reduced ITE data on trips by utilizing the URBEMIS model for various factors including residential density, jobs-housing balance, transportation network reductions, parking supply and market pricing parking, and TDM reductions.
 - b. Regarding Trip Reductions – Jason explained to the Committee that the potential reductions in the URBEMIS model were not additive. For example, if reductions in a certain subcategory maxxed out reductions that were possible in that category, then the output page would show a maximum reduction in that first subcategory and then no further reductions in a second subcategory, even though the inputs would have had reductions in both subcategories. The 39 bus was included, and Jason would double-check that the Huntington line was included in the model, but was fairly sure that it was. The potential bus stop move in front of 2 BP rather than 10 BP would not affect the model. The Gateway East improvements were factored in. He would double-check that The Ride was already factored in to the model as a reduction. The presence of Hubway shared bikes works into the easy access to bike trips, and he would double check on whether the presence of bike facilities was included in the assumptions of the model. Jason confirmed that presumed use of the Longwood Medical Area shuttles was included in the TDM reductions. The telecommuting factor Jason stated that all of these tests of the model would not change the recommended parking amount by more than a half percent, but he would get back to the Committee on those specific questions.
 - c. In response to the question about whether ULI and ITE double-counts supply factors in their base parking ratios, Jason clarified that this was an old question in the industry that has been settled. ULI and ITE are observed rates that vehicles occupy spaces, not based on the amount of parking supply available. Therefore, the observed rates are observed cars that are connected with a particular use.
 - d. With regards to visitor/employee split of parking demand, Linda asked how the existing utilization of the garage at 1 BP with approximately 27% visitor/73% employee on-site parking use should be factored or change the data taken from the ULI base ratios, which is flipped. Jason said he would look at this again, but didn't think it would change the overall recommendation of parking spaces.
 - e. With regards to the two peaks shown at 10 am and 2pm in Figure 10 of the Shared Parking Analysis memo hitting 683, Arlene asked whether this model was leading to

building parking to accommodate peak employee needs. Jason clarified that the sharp drop that is shown on that figure between 11 and 1 may be misleading, and may not reflect the reality of behavior in New England or this site. The URBEMIS time-of-day demand was created in California for air pollution modeling, and the lunch-time dip likely reflects people driving to lunch more than typical here in New England. He clarified that the URBEMIS model is built to predict parking demand, not to predict accurate time-of-day changes in that demand. He imagined that once in operation, the parking curve would likely be much flatter towards the top.

- f. Hugh Mattison suggested that a 650-space garage might be adequate – for example, if even accommodation for 700 cars was needed, 30 of those could be via valet/tandem parking, Children’s could lease 10 parking spaces off-site like at the BrookHouse, and that 12 spaces on Pearl Street could be utilized exclusively for Children’s. With regards to NN’s recommendation, he reiterated that he did not recommend any maximum parking at this site. He was recommending 683 constructed spaces on-site, and that further management policies (such as providing off-site and/or public parking spaces exclusively to Children’s or maximums) should be considered only if and when the Town is willing to deal with the potential externalities of those decisions.
- g. Finally, Jason again stressed to the Committee that the best way to control cars coming to the site was not by restricting supply, but rather by having an enforceable monitoring plan for the TDM plan, including ability to adjust once the development is up and operating (see NN TDM memo).

[Jason Schrieber had to leave the discussion].

- h. George pointed out to the Committee that the current proposal was approximately the same sized development as permitted in 2009, with similar ratios of medical/regular office, and with 35% less parking spaces. John Bassett noted that even a removal of an additional 60 spaces would have a negligible effect on the shadow impacts.
- i. Linda, Hugh, and Arlene noted that they were interested in reducing parking to the maximum extent feasible for three reasons: to minimize the built environment dedicated to parking; efficient use of parking structures; and to provide motivation for people to not use vehicles to access the site whenever possible. Arlene noted that we all want this project to move forward, but limiting the traffic impacts in any way possible had to be pushed, and that their potential tenants wouldn’t want gridlock either.
- j. Ken Lewis noted that the same mindset and shift of people utilizing less cars today is also shifting people to more efficiently using office space. The industry is seeing across the board more employees per square foot of built space. Lower use of automobiles cannot be taken in isolation of other trends like this. Charles Weinstein noted that Children’s buildings (excluding doctor’s offices) are averaging approximately one employee per 84 square feet.

- k. Hugh Mattison noted that the retail parking should be incidental, and Committee members confirmed for him that NN's memo of the recommended 683 spaces in fact does not allocate additional spaces for either retail or daycare use.

[Steve Lacker had to leave the meeting].

4. Linda Olson Pehlke asked whether the open space near the circulation and drop-off area could be further refined. Cynthia noted that the existing trees shown in the graphics adjacent to the garage would be removed during construction, replanted, and *eventually* grow back to existing height. Linda Hamlin thought some of the treatments of the parking garage should be further refined during permitting, and pointed to the Museum of Fine Arts new garage as a good prototype.
5. With regards to zoning, the Committee felt that there should be a setback from the curbing, whether or not the measurement was taken from the curbing or the property line.

Next Steps:

February 27th meeting with BCH's Environmental/LSP to attend again; BPLAC vote on recommendations to Board of Selectmen; draft of zoning for Zoning Bylaw Committee

Next meetings: March 6th and March 11th , 8:15 am.

The meeting adjourned at about 10:15 am.

Handouts: 1-page Agenda with notes from 2/14/14 meeting; Questions for Nelson/Nygaard (Linda Olson Pehlke, 2/22/14); Nelson Nygaard 3-page packet including Trip Generation Analysis, URBEMIS Model Outputs, and Summary Chart showing reductions from ITE Trip Data due to Site Context, Transit, Parking, and Other TDM Reductions 2/21/14)

Presentation slides: BCH 6.5-story parking garage scenario and shadow impacts (2/25/14).