I. Attendance:

**Boston College Task Force**
Jean Woods, Chair
Paul Berkeley
John Bruno
Tim Burke
Kevin Carragee
Terry Cohen
Anabela Gomes
Rosie Hanlon
Denis Minihane
Tim Schofield
Janet Tambascio Fraher
Angela Tang
John Vitale

**Boston College**
Paul Chebator, Interim Dean of Students
Jack Dunn, Director, Office of Public Affairs
Tom Keady, VP, Governmental and Community Affairs
Evie Kuran, Institutional Master Plan Project Coordinator,
Jeanne Levesque, Director, Governmental Relations
Bill Mills, Directory, Community Affairs

**VHB**
Howard Muise

**Elected Officials**
Kevin Honan, State Representative
Sheila O’Connell, Senator Tolman’s Office

**City of Boston**
John FitzGerald, Boston Redevelopment Authority
Gerald Autler, Boston Redevelopment Authority
Katelyn Sullivan, Boston Redevelopment Authority
Paul Holloway, Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Services

II. Summary:

The meeting was called to order at 6:40 p.m. by Task Force Chair Jean Woods and Task Force members introduced themselves. Tom Keady, Vice President of Governmental and Community Affairs, introduced the BC and consultant team members in attendance.
Tom Keady announced that the Institutional Master Plan (IMP) Amendment for Bishop Peterson Hall and the Seminary Library was filed with the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) on October 12, 2007. IMP Amendment details can be viewed on BC’s IMP website (http://www.bc.edu/imp). Jeanne Levesque, Director of Governmental Relations at BC, provided an overview of the amendment.

Gerald Autler then detailed the IMP and Large Project review process and said that there would be multiple opportunities for the community to comment on the project and the IMP Amendment.

Task Force member John Bruno then asked to reinstate Tim Schofield, who had stepped down in May 2007 to run for City Council. Since Tim did not submit a formal resignation, Paul Holloway from the Mayor’s Office of Neighborhood Services said that Tim’s membership on the Task Force should be considered active and that no action was needed to reinstate him.

Community member Alex Selvig stood and read a letter that urged the BRA to ensure a full review process of the project and IMP Amendment. Gerald explained that the BRA was already planning to conduct a full review process. Since the BRA had determined that BC’s proposed amendment did not meet the criteria laid out in Article 80 for an expedited review, the amendment will undergo the standard IMP review process. However, Gerald pointed out that BC had requested a Scoping Determination Waiving Further Review for the large project review portion of the application. The BRA would make a determination about the validity of that request. Gerald explained that a waiver request for further review is an established procedure in Article 80 that can be used to avoid making the proponent file additional documents for the sake of filing documents if the proponent has filed a Project Notification Form (PNF) that already provides sufficient information about the project. He said that such a scenario is possible for this amendment given that the proposed use has already been permitted via the IMP process at a nearby building on the former Archdiocese property, and that it’s unlikely that any significant additional impacts could be attributed to the new proposal. In addition, the IMP review offers the opportunity to ask BC for any relevant information that may be deemed desirable as part of the review process, so to the extent that questions do arise there is an additional forum for input. Gerald also assured Alex that the community would have multiple chances to provide input on the project and IMP Amendment.

[The relevant section of Article 80 reads as follows:

Scoping Determination Waiving Further Review. If the Scoping Determination indicates that the PNF, together with any additional materials and comments received by the Boston Redevelopment Authority prior to the issuance of the Scoping Determination, adequately describes the impacts of the Proposed Project, the Scoping Determination may waive the requirements of both subsection 4 and subsection 5 of this Section 80B-5 for the filing and review of a Draft Project Impact Report (DPIR) and a Final Project Impact Report (FPIR).]

Task Force member Janet Tambascio Fraher asked if BC’s goal to become one of the best catholic colleges in the country would draw a large number of new students.

A Task Force member wanted to know if BC thought there were enough people interested in becoming Jesuit priests to fill the new space. Tom Keady said that the Weston Jesuit School of Theology has approximately 140 students and that BC is excited about the upcoming influx of religious people and students to their campus.

Community member Michael Pahre wanted to know if a Construction Management Plan was required for the new projects. Gerald said that a plan would be worked out with the City’s Transportation Department later on.
Resident Nick Foundas said the amendment was worthy of the community’s support because, in his opinion, a proposal for a Theological School is the most passive use that BC can propose and therefore merits their support. Another resident, Sandy Furman, agreed that BC’s proposal in the amendment is low-impact, yet he asked BC to keep in mind the concerns of the nearby Jewish Orthodox and minimize the impact on Portina Road. Gerald said that written comments should be sent to John Fitzgerald by November 14th to help the BRA with the scoping determination.

During the last half of the meeting, Bill Mills, Director of Community Affairs and Paul Chebator, Interim Dean of Students, gave a student behavior presentation that included a discussion on walking patrol incidents and repeat offenders.

Lastly, there was a discussion of the Allston-Brighton Scholarship Program which provides academically talented students from Allston/Brighton the financial support to attend Boston College.

The meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.