

Ledge Site Community Workshop III

REFINING & ADOPTING THE VISION

SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1994

AGENDA

12 noon Registration

12:30 Welcome & Introductions

Orientation to Today's Workshop

Architectural Presentation by Goody Clancy

Evaluation and Discussion on the Proposed Development Concepts for the
"Bowl"

Discussion and Evaluation of Concepts for the Upper Ledge

Conclusion and Summary

Adjourn

***Next Workshop: Saturday, June 18, 1994, 12 noon to 3:30 pm, at the Tobin Building, THE FINAL PLAN --
THE VISION, GOALS, VALUES AND FUTURE ACTION.***

	CONCEPT A	CONCEPT B	CONCEPT C	CONCEPT D
WE BELIEVE the Ledge Site Should acknowledge the history and natural beauty of the site along with improving and enhancing its appearance. The Ledge Site should recognize, maintain and enhance the qualities, diversity and livability of the community. The Ledge Site should be visually pleasing and enhance the image of Mission Hill as the neighborhood's gateway.				
WE BELIEVE the Ledge Site Should be the focal point, anchor and gateway to the community. The Ledge Site should unite the entire community -- residents, businesses, and Longwood Medical Area. The Ledge Site should fit into the life of the neighborhood.				
WE BELIEVE the Ledge Site Should stay an economic asset to the community. The Ledge Site should be productive, viable, and sustainable.				
THE LEDGE SITE SHALL SERVE all people in the community -- residents, businesses, workers, students, and visitors. The Ledge Site should reach out and serve people in the medical community and neighboring developments.				

At Community Workshop I, participants developed and adopted the We Believe and the Ledge Site shall serve criteria. The criteria embodying elements of successful commercial developments, open space criteria, traffic and parking criteria, and the advantages of housing have been developed by Ledge Site Task Forces and presented by the during Ledge Site Community Workshops.

Please review the criteria for each architectural and design option. Evaluate each option using the criteria listed as to:

- * Very Good
- * Good
- * Fair
- * Poor

After evaluating each option as to the criteria, please rank your answers Very Good (4); Good (3); Fair (2); Poor (1); No Data or Not Applicable (0).

Determine which option is your small groups preferred option -- the highest ranking option. What is your group's second choice?

CRITERIA FOR THE "BOWL"

	Bowl Concept A	Bowl Concept B	Bowl Concept C	Bowl Concept D
<u>SERVE COMMUNITY'S ECONOMIC NEEDS</u> Good Mix of Businesses/Uses				
<u>CUSTOMER ACCESS</u> Setback from street, but still allow browsing				
Relationship to the employees of the LMA				
MBTA Relationship to the Ledge Site				
Neighborhood Access				
<u>PARKING</u> Access for Ledge Site and Local Business Customers				
Safety for Pedestrians				
Ease for Drivers				
Delivery Considerations				
Parking for Neighborhood Businesses (who are not on the Ledge Site)				
<u>TRAFFIC</u> Easy Flow of Traffic in Brigham Circle				
Safe for Pedestrians				
Provides for Transit & Bus Access				
<u>VISUAL APPEAL</u> Increased Shopping Activity Attracts Other Shoppers				
Compatibility with Surrounding Neighborhood (Design)				
Good Signage				
<u>SAFETY</u> Lighting				
Positive Business Climate				

Please review the criteria for each architectural and design option. Evaluate each option using the criteria listed as to:

- * Very Good
- * Good
- * Fair
- * Poor

After evaluating each option as to the criteria, please rank your answers Very Good (4); Good (3); Fair (2); Poor (1); No Data or Not Applicable (0).

Determine which option is your small groups preferred option -- the highest ranking option. What is your group's second choice?

CRITERIA FOR THE UPPER LEDGE

	CONCEPT 1	CONCEPT 2	CONCEPT 3	CONCEPT 4	CONCEPT 5
WE BELIEVE the Ledge Site Should acknowledge the history and natural beauty of the site along with improving and enhancing its appearance. The Ledge Site should recognize, maintain and enhance the qualities, diversity and livability of the community. The Ledge Site should be visually pleasing and enhance the image of Mission Hill as the neighborhood's gateway.					
WE BELIEVE the Ledge Site Should be the focal point, anchor and gateway to the community. The Ledge Site should unite the entire community – residents, businesses, and Longwood Medical Area. The Ledge Site should fit into the life of the neighborhood.					
WE BELIEVE the Ledge Site Should stay an economic asset to the community. The Ledge Site should be productive, viable, and sustainable.					
THE LEDGE SITE SHALL SERVE all people in the community – residents, businesses, workers, students, and visitors. The Ledge Site should reach out and serve people in the medical community and neighboring developments.					

At Community Workshop I, participants developed and adopted the We Believe and the Ledge Site shall serve criteria.

Please review the criteria for each architectural and design concept. Evaluate each using the criteria listed as to:

- * Very Good
- * Good
- * Fair
- * Poor

After evaluating each option as to the criteria, please rank your answers Very Good (4); Good (3); Fair (2); Poor (1); No Data or Not Applicable (0). Determine which option is your small groups preferred concept – the highest ranking concept. What is your group's second choice?

CRITERIA FOR THE UPPER LEDGE

	Concept 1	Concept 2	Concept 3	Concept 4	Concept 5
OPEN SPACE Safety					
OPEN SPACE Access for all Residents					
OPEN SPACE Aesthetics & View Enhancement					
OPEN SPACE Preservation of the Environment					
OPEN SPACE Relation to Abutters					
OPEN SPACE Linkage and Interaction with Commercial and Urban Center					
HOUSING Expands the Community's Purchasing Power					
HOUSING Enhances the Gateway to Mission Hill					
HOUSING The "Watchful Eye" Strengthens Safety					
HOUSING Facilitates "Hands Across Huntington"					
OTHER CRITERIA					
Improve and enhance existing housing on site.					
TOTAL					

The criteria above was developed by the Ledge Site Task Forces, and presented at previous Ledge Site Community Workshops.

Additional criteria for Open Space and Housing include: Open Space—funding & maintenance; Open Space—broad community appeal; Housing can reinforce existing home values; Housing—owner occupancy will stabilize Mission Hill; Housing an opportunity for first time ownership. These criteria will be used at later points in the Ledge Site Community Planning process.

LEDGE SITE COMMUNITY WORKSHOP FOUR

Mission Hill Neighborhood Housing Services (NHS)
invites you to the
Fourth Ledge Site Workshop

Saturday, June 18th
12:00 (noon) - 3:30 pm

Tobin Community Building
Community Room
1481 Tremont Street

The conceptual plan for the Ledge Site continues to develop.

June 18th will mark the completion of the Community Workshops in the Second Phase of the Ledge Site Community Planning Process. The involvement and ideas at the prior meetings have helped to create conceptual plans for the Ledge Site redevelopment. We are one step closer to reality! Financial feasibility considerations will be integrated with your visions at Workshop Four. Our goal is to establish viable development plans for a revitalized commercial center at Brigham Circle.

Transportation and day care will be provided. Please call NHS at 442-5449 by Thursday, June 16, to arrange a ride or day care.

**Mission Hill Neighborhood Housing Services
1530 Tremont Street, Boston, MA 02120
442-5449**

Mission Hill Neighborhood Housing Services
1530 Tremont Street
Boston, MA 02120

LEDGE SITE WORKSHOP

JUNE 18st, SATURDAY

12:00 (noon) - 3:30

information enclosed

LEDGE SITE COMMUNITY PLANNING PROCESS

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 4

TESTING THE REALITY OF OUR VISION

THE FINAL PLAN: VISION, GOALS AND FUTURE ACTIONS

Saturday, June 18, 1994

Tobin Building

12 noon to 3:30 pm

12 noon	Registration
12:30	Welcome and Introductions
	Orientation to Today's Agenda and Goals
	The Architectural Vision <i>Refined as directed by Community Workshop 3</i>
	The Real Estate Economic Feasibility of the Ledge Site
	Small Group Discussion and Questions
	Group Decision: The Desired Vision for the Ledge Site
	Next Steps
3:30	Adjournment

Announcement: Natural Areas Field tour of the Ledge Site at 4 pm, today, meet at Osco.

LEDGE SITE DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS

GROUP _____

	PROGRAM OPTIONS				DESIGN OPTIONS							FINANCING OPTIONS				
	30% Low Rent Retail	30% <u>Less</u> Office Space	15% <u>More</u> Retail Space	Other Specify	Denser Office Scheme Over Garage	Road to St Alphn's Street	Parking Roof Deck	Decora- tive Deck Surface	30% Under Ground Parking	Public Parking for MH/BC Stores-- Customer	Other Specify	Public Parking With Low Cost Finance	Open Space Grant for Basics	Open Space Grant for Land- scape Passive Park	Overall Project Low Cost Finance	Other Specify
DESIRED																
If this is a desired option, is it: Very Important																
Somewhat Important																
NOT IMPORTANT																
COMMENTS																

LEDGE SITE COMMUNITY PLANNING PROCESS

Handout: Financial Feasibility Analysis - Ledge Site Development Options

Prepared For: Mission Hill Neighborhood Housing Services
Ledge Site Community Planning Process

Prepared By: Byrne McKinney & Associates, Inc.

Date: June 18, 1994

Draft: For Review & Comment

**FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS
BASELINE PROGRAM OPTION**

DEVELOPMENT REVENUE ANALYSIS			
GROSS POTENTIAL INCOME	Sq Ft	Rent/Sq Ft	Total Rent
New Office Space	100,000	\$ 24.00	\$ 2,400,000
New 1st Floor Retail Space	45,000	\$ 17.00	\$ 765,000
New 2nd Floor Restaurant Space	10,000	\$ 15.00	\$ 150,000
Parking	0	\$0.00	\$0
Total Income	155,000	\$ 21.39	\$ 3,315,000
VACANCY/CREDIT LOSS		5.0%	\$ (165,750)
EFFECTIVE GROSS INCOME			\$ 3,149,250
OPERATING EXPENSES	Sq Ft	Op Ex/Sq Ft	Total Expense
Office Area Operating Expenses	100,000	\$ 6.50	\$ (650,000)
Retail Area Unreimbursed Expense	55,000	\$ 1.00	\$ (55,000)
Garage Expenses	100,000	\$ 0.50	\$ (50,000)
Management	\$3,149,250	5.00%	\$ (157,463)
Total Operating Expenses	155,000	\$ (5.89)	\$ (912,463)
NET OPERATING INCOME			\$ 2,236,788
Per SF			\$14.43
CAPITALIZATION RATE			9.00%
VALUE ON COMPLETION			\$ 24,853,194
Per SF			\$160.34

**FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS
BASELINE PROGRAM OPTION**

DEVELOPMENT COST				
Code	Description	Unit (SF/%)	Unit Cost	Total Cost
A	SITE COSTS			
	Demolition (2 stage)	22,283	\$8.98	\$200,000
	Plaza Improvements	10,000	\$10.00	\$100,000
	Upper Ledge Site Improvements	261,360	\$2.00	\$522,720
	St Alphonsus R-O-W	0	\$0.00	\$0
	Other			\$0
	Subtotal			\$822,720
B	BUILDING IMPROVEMENTS			
	Disbursed Construction	155,000	\$60.00	\$9,300,000
	Concentrated Construction	0	\$75.00	\$0
	Tenant Space Improvements	100,000	\$15.00	\$1,500,000
	Subtotal	255,000	\$42.35	\$10,800,000
C	PARKING			
	Above Grade Parking - Surface	55	\$1,000	\$55,000
	Above Grade Parking - Mid Ledge	275	\$15,000	\$4,125,000
	Below Grade Parking	0	\$25,000	\$0
	Extra Public Parking	0	\$16,000	\$0
	Garage Roof Deck	0	\$0	\$0
	Subtotal	330	\$12,667	\$4,180,000
D	SOFT COSTS			
	Legal/Audit/Appraisal Fees	\$15,802,720	2.00% \$	316,054
	Design/Engineering Fees	\$15,802,720	10.00% \$	1,580,272
	Development Costs	\$15,802,720	2.50% \$	395,068
	Marketing Costs	\$3,315,000	18.00% \$	596,700
	Financing Costs (incl. legal)	\$19,882,556	4.00% \$	795,302
	Lease-Up Losses	\$ 572,069	50.00% \$	286,034
	Construction Interest	\$19,882,556	9.50% \$	1,133,306
	Subtotal		\$	5,102,737
E	CONTINGENCY			
	Construction	\$15,802,720	5.00% \$	790,136
	Other	\$ 5,102,737	0.50% \$	25,514
	Subtotal	\$20,905,457	3.90% \$	815,650
G	DEVELOPER PROFIT	\$15,802,720	10.00% \$	1,580,272
H	LAND COST (Per Building Sq Ft)	155,000	\$10.00 \$	1,550,000
TOTAL COST				\$24,851,378

NET DEVELOPMENT BENEFITS (rounded)	PSF	\$0.00	\$0
---	------------	---------------	------------

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS		BASELINE	PROGRAM OPTIONS			DESIGN OPTIONS						FINANCING OPTIONS			
Summary		As Drawn	30% Low Rent Retail	30% Less Office Space	15% More Retail Space	Denser Office Over Garage	Road To St. Alphonsus Street	Parking Roof Deck	Decorative Deck Surface	30% Underground Parking	Public Parking for MH/BC Stores	Public Parking with Low Cost Finance	Open Space Grant for Basic Improvements	Open Space Grant for Landscaped Passive Park	Overall Project Low Cost Finance
Key Program Features															
Uses															
Office Sq Ft		100,000	100,000	70,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Retail Sq Ft		45,000	45,000	45,000	53,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000	45,000
Restaurant Sq Ft		10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Total		155,000	155,000	125,000	163,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Massing															
Disbursed SF		155,000	155,000	125,000	163,000	0	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
Denser SF		0	0	0	0	155,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Parking															
Surface Spaces		55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55	55
Mid-Ledge Spaces		275	275	230	303	275	275	275	275	193	275	275	275	275	275
Underground Spaces		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	0	0	0	0	0
Extra Public Spaces		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	163	0	0	0
Total		330	330	285	358	330	330	330	330	330	350	493	330	330	330
Key Financial Features															
Average Retail Rents		\$17.00	\$14.90	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00	\$17.00
Building Cost		\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$7,500,000	\$9,780,000	\$12,350,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000	\$10,800,000
Road to St Alphonsus St		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Parking Roof Deck		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$775,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Decorative Deck Surface		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Parking Cost to Serve Site		\$4,180,000	\$4,180,000	\$3,505,000	\$4,600,000	\$4,180,000	\$4,180,000	\$4,955,000	\$4,380,000	\$5,005,000	\$4,480,000	\$6,618,060	\$4,180,000	\$4,180,000	\$4,180,000
Extra Public Parking Cost		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300,000	\$2,438,060	\$0	\$0	\$0
Upper Ledge Impvts		\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	\$522,720	(\$522,720)	(\$2,000,000)	\$522,720
Net Development Gain/Loss		\$0	(\$800,000)	(\$300,000)	(\$100,000)	(\$2,000,000)	(\$2,600,000)	(\$1,000,000)	(\$300,000)	(\$1,100,000)	(\$400,000)	(\$1,000,000)	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$500,000
Comments		Breakeven	Deficit	Deficit	Deficit	Deficit	Deficit	Deficit	Deficit	Deficit	Deficit	Deficit	Gain	Gain (same as prior option)	Gain

CED Project Update
Glen Ohlund
12 April 1994
C. CLAMP, Advisor

The Ledge Site Community Planning Process has been building steady momentum since the first Community Workshop held March 5th. The goal of the first Workshop was to develop a shared understanding. This included not only information about the actual site, but a sharing of historical facts related to the community of Mission Hill.

On March 23, The Ledge Site Committee of Mission Hill NHS sponsored two tours of the site. The goal of these tours was to give people a real sense of the site's unusual characteristics. There were different stopping points along the tour where people involved with various use-related task forces gave relevant information. The tours were attended by over forty residents and we were also fortunate enough to have Marisa Lago, Director of the Boston Redevelopment Authority on hand in the afternoon. This was the first time a high ranking BRA official has ever been involved in a public tour of the site.

On a less positive note, Harvard continues to stall on an environmental assessment of the site. The most recent agreement we have with them indicated that a 21E Assessment would occur in the later stages of the Community Planning Process. The information contained in a site assessment is critical in developing a viable plan and also addressing potential cleanup responses. Harvards latest offer is to do a 21E, retain the findings, and fold the costs of doing the 21E into the purchase price. They also want to be absolved of any liability for the remediation. I am presently researching the recent 21E revisions to determine if any of this is legal. We certainly agree that allowing Harvard to control the data makes absolutely no sense for NHS acting on behalf of the neighborhood. There still may be an opportunity to put some direct action organizing to use here, somewhere. More on this later.

We have hired the architectural firm of Goody Clancy to do conceptual designs for the Ledge Site development. The RFP process gave us responses from 12 of 16 firms that received the RFP. The calibre of firms responding was quite impressive. For any of you in the Boston area, Stull & Lee; Bergmeyer; Finegold & Alexander, Inc., and many others submitted proposals. Goody Clancy also agreed to do the work with a significant reduction in the price originally submitted.

At the NHS Annual Meeting April 4th, I continued to hear good things about the Community Planning Process. Longer-term residents appear to be losing some of their cynicism about the Ledge Site being developed in their lifetimes. One resident who became involved in the process has been elected to the NHS Board of Directors. Mayor Menino was the keynote speaker and focused his discussion on the Ledge Site and another neighborhood stabilization

project NHS is spearheading. I am usually a little reluctant to let politicians grandstand on local issues, but in this case, I feel that the Mayor's office can only help us in dealing with Harvard to get what we need to finish this planning process and move forward with a community defined development.

The next Workshop in this process will start to define future visions for the site. Goody Clancy will be on hand to listen to the comments of participants. The goal is for them to gather enough information at this workshop to start developing 3-5 conceptual designs for the Ledge Site.

Project in CED
Glen Ohlund
4/23/94
C. Clamp

Enclosed please find the information you requested on my project. I also have some additional information to report due to our second Community Workshop of the Ledge Site Community Planning Process held earlier today. The process is on schedule according to the timeline enclosed with the original contract.

This Wednesday we will have our first informational meeting with the institutions in the Longwood Medical Area (LMA). This meeting will be an informational meeting with a minor plug for any financial support that they would like to make. If we could commit something to the institutions in terms of uses in our planning process they might be willing to lend financial support. Since this process is community based, and the residents have not yet agreed on any benefits of having institutional tenants, we cannot make any deals with them. We have not yet sent out a RFP for financial consultants. Goody Clancy were on hand today at the workshop.

We have a good basis of understanding to start the trade-off process. At today's Workshop, people were working in groups of six to determine a site plan. This began the community having to look at potential compromises. I beleive it was a successful meeting. There were a few less people at this meeting than at the Workshop in March. I am glad we are on schedule to complete the Workshops before July. I cannot imagine getting a large group of people together for four to five hours on a Saturday in July or August. The goal of involving residents, merchants and other interested parties in this planning process continues. The task forces have identified numerous leaders from the community. Two task force members have become NHS Board Members. They were previously not active voices in community development issues. I believe this process will continue to encourage citizen involvement, which is an essential element of a plan that works. An overall sense of enthusiasm for the project has become apparent in the community.

We are at the point where we are expecting
Harvard to allow us to do environmental

assessments of the site. They are waffling on
this point and additional time and energy will
need to be exerted on this point. The NHS
Ledge Site Committee has been strategizing and
will need to decide on a plan before the next
private meeting we hold with Harvard slated
for May 4. I hope to have additional
information before next class on this subject.

TO: Chris Clamp & Project Group
FROM: Glen Ohlund
DATE: June 6, 1994
RE: Project Update

MAY 4TH MEETING WITH HARVARD

The Ledge Site Committee met with Harvard on May 4th to discuss issues and report on progress. Harvard has agreed to proceed with the preliminary site assessment. Harvard also agreed to assist with additional funding of \$28,000. The NHS Ledge Site Committee is expected to match this amount through other sources.

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 3

On May 21st, sixty people attended the Third Community Workshop. They responded to development plans produced by Goody, Clancy & Associates that were based on earlier community input. Those in attendance May 21st narrowed the development plans for the "Bowl" down to two conceptual plans that included additional retail, office, and structured parking. The majority of those in attendance viewed the "Top" of the Ledge Site as valuable open space that should be preserved. People of Mission Hill have committed many hours during this process in the effort to revitalize the Brigham Circle commercial district.

FINANCIAL CONSULTANT HIRED

The Ledge Site Committee has retained the services of Byrne-McKinney to determine financial feasibility for the different development options. The Ledge Site Committee interviewed three firms from the ten that submitted proposals. Additionally, the firm has recently completed market studies of the Mission Hill community that will prove useful.

INSTITUTIONAL EMPLOYEE SURVEY

A survey will be conducted through area institutions in the Longwood Medical Area to determine information about employee spending patterns and perceptions in the Brigham Circle Commercial District. The New England Baptist Hospital has also expressed an interest in participating in an Employee Survey.

GROUP TASK FORCE/LEDGE SITE COMMITTEE/CONSULTANT MEETING

On June 8th, a meeting will be held to summarize Workshop Three, get at issues and questions task forces might be dealing with, and introduce financial consultant Pamela McKinney. There will not be any development decisions made at this meeting, these will occur at Community Workshop 4. The idea is to get the task forces together to start working on how this might all fit in one development plan that has broad-based community support.

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 4

The final Workshop in the Second Phase of The Ledge Site Community Planning Process will be held Saturday June 18th from 12:00 until 3:30 at the Tobin Community Building. Issues of massing, density, and parking will be discussed at this Workshop. If you haven't been to one of the Workshops, it's not too late to get involved. If you have been attending, be sure to be on hand as we continue to build a redevelopment plan for the Ledge Site that will transform Brigham Circle!

QUESTIONS FOR CHUCK TURNER:

It appears that there will be a lull in this planning process over July and August. Financial proformas need to be developed and meetings in the Summer will not bring as many people together. I would also like to take some time off in July to regroup. My question is this: How do we maintain momentum if staff hours are decreased and resident participation is at a lull. We need the support of the community in order to proceed with any development plans. Maybe we have a party on the site in August to thank those who have been involved and logged many hours during this process???

I am also concerned about the lack of participation by Mission Main and Alice Hayward Taylor Apartment residents. We don't seem to get much assistance through the Tenant Task Force Members (I believe they are overcommitted with development issues). Do you have any individual contacts or ideas for getting residents of these areas involved???

The Ledge Site Committee has some very strong personalities involved. I feel some of these people are already becoming fearful that things are out of their sole control. We don't want to lose them, nor do we want to alienate newcomers. You know Mission Hill Chuck, what would you suggest???

TO: Chris Clamp & Project Group Members
FR: Glen Ohlund
Date: 7/7/94
RE: Project Update

I am enclosing an article from the community newspaper about our last workshop. We have a plan for the 9.3 acre "Ledge Site" that has broad community support and is financially viable. The Ledge Site Committee was planning to take the Summer off but has discovered just how much work needs to occur between now and the fall. The biggest question appears to be around what the development entity will look like and how NHS, acting on behalf of the community, maintains the design integrity developed over the last two years.

Additionally, we need to raise additional funds to acquire the services of consultants for Traffic/Parking, Landscape Design, Marketing, and, of course, staff.

Needless to say the summer is heating up. We will give residents some break from the 3 Hour workshops over the Summer since there is no air conditioning in Mission Hill meeting places. The final conceptual plan will be presented to the community in Mid-September at a celebratory event.

To: CED Project Group FR: Glen Ohlund
RE: End of Summer Project Update DATE: 9/9/94

It seems like it's been months since I've been On-Line. The Summer has involved alot of behind the scenes work on the Ledge Site Community Planning Process: Grantwriting, Meetings with City Officials and Ledge Site Committee discussions about what role NHS will play in the development team.

On September 7, we hosted Congressman Joe Kennedy on a walking tour of the site. We need all of the political ducks working for us to make this development a reality. Last week we met with the Director of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, Marisa Lago. She had been on a tour of the site in the Spring but acted as if she didn't know us or anything about the process. I will use some type to vent here rather than class time.... I am amazed at how slow the City is to respond to this development plan. There is hardly any neighborhood development happening in Boston. I would expect that the City would want to be on board at this stage in the game. One Committee member suggested that if Ray Flynn were still Mayor, the City would not only be involved, they would have attempted to co-opt the process and program. I think I would rather have that problem to deal with rather than no support from City Hall.

The principal Task Forces that have been meeting over the summer are the Open Space and Traffic & Parking groups. Based on community design, the entire top of the site (approx. 6 acres) will be maintained as passive open space. This group of 5-6 energetic members have been the most active of all the Task Forces. I am convinced that this is because they were already open space advocates and a significant number are abutters to the area planned for this use.

The Traffic & Parking Task Force has developed as more of a review committee. They have made many sound suggestions for issues that need to be addressed. These points will be a good foundation for the RFP for a traffic and parking consultant to go out this fall.

Harvard is expected to begin their environmental testing this week. I believe that this was one hurdle that we would never get over. The results will determine what needs to be done at the site for clean-up. The possibilities range from nothing to expenses of soil removal and monitoring equipment. These expenses will be folded into the land costs for whoever is the land owner. More and more it looks like this won't be NHS. I would like to see NHS secure UDAG or other public monies that

TO: Project Group and Chris Clamp
FR: Glen Ohlund
RE: Monthly Update
Date:10/11/94

Well, I survived another month at NHS. No good news on the grants front, but NHS is paying me through the month out of the General Account. Aside from financial difficulties, we got our first positive piece from the Boston Globe last week. It has had a real positive effect on the Ledge Site Committee and staff. My concern is that we capitalize on this Editorial with City Government or it is just another feel good story. It did expedite a meeting with Mayor Menino, now scheduled for Tuesday, 10/18. We will be asking him to make solid commitments to help us get this project through predevelopment and into construction. The City is probably our best key to equity in the project.

2 Task Forces continue to meet. The Open Space Task Force is working to develop scenarios for the open space components of this concept plan. The Commercial Use Task Force is working to organize local business owners in support of the site design. I have met with some reservations from the Ledge Site Committee about this strategy. They feel that it ends up doing more for the business owners than us. I believe one of the reasons Mission Hill gets ignored so often by City Hall is that there is no organization of political forces. Once convinced of the project's merits, business owners can become a power to reckon with at the city level.

**BRIGHT
CIRCLE**

TREMONT STREET

CALLIMET STREET

STREET

TORRIS

WHITNEY STREET

ALLEGH







