

## Results from Session #1 (challenging assumptions)

|   |                           |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| 1 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>MIT's undergraduate student population will remain at roughly its current levels</b>  |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amount of undergrad housing is definable and stable</li> <li>• Could be shifted if FSILGs change</li> <li>• Even with no change, good students will come to MIT</li> </ul>  |
|   | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>The size of MIT's undergrad population will change substantially</b>  |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less demand for undergrad housing</li> <li>• Possibly empty buildings</li> <li>• Less faculty</li> <li>• Less TAs</li> <li>• Less tuition \$</li> </ul>   |
|   | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Assumption holds</b>  |
| 2 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>MIT's graduate student population will continue to grow</b>   |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Price of development will remain high</li> <li>• More demand for research space</li> <li>• More demand for flex space</li> <li>• More Cambridge housing crunch</li> <li>• More demand for parking</li> <li>• Decentralization</li> <li>• No relaxing of "search for better campus"</li> </ul> |
|   | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>MIT's grad student population will not increase</b>   |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demand for housing</li> <li>• Changes development scenarios for MIT-owned land (less uncertainty)</li> </ul>  |
|   | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Assumption holds</b>  |
| 3 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>MIT will locate its future development on or near its current campus in Cambridge</b>   |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Price of development will remain high</li> <li>• Continuing need to maintain good town-gown relations</li> <li>• MIT needs an attractive Cambridge to bring students</li> <li>• MIT's fate is tied to that of the Boston region</li> </ul>  |
|   | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>MIT will build a substantial portion of its future development away from its current campus</b>   |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in focus of residential campus</li> <li>• Sign of major change in MIT's M.O.</li> <li>• Massive capital investment in land &amp; buildings outside of Cambridge</li> </ul>   |
|   | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Assumption holds</b>  |

|   |                           |   |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| 4 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>MIT will continue to guarantee housing for four years to all undergraduate students that request it</b>  |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for maintenance and upgrades (land, \$, etc.)</li> </ul>  |
|   | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>MIT will no longer guarantee housing for four years to all undergraduate students that request it</b>  |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibility of shifting current undergrad housing to grad housing</li> <li>• Need for subsidy of off-campus undergrad housing</li> <li>• More pressure on local housing mkt./rents</li> <li>• Drastic change in MIT's mission</li> <li>• Impact on admissions (particularly intl. students)</li> </ul> |
|   | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Assumption holds (though mechanics could change)</b>   |

|   |                           |   |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| 7 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>The FSILG system will remain viable and provide housing for some significant percentage of undergraduate students</b>  |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pressure to provide sites for FSILGs on or near campus</li> <li>• Reduced need for undergrad dorm housing</li> <li>• MIT will continue to receive negative attention from the outside community (broadly defined)</li> </ul> |
|   | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>The FSILG system will not provide housing for any substantial percentage of undergraduate students</b>   |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more on-campus undergrad housing</li> <li>• Less undergrad housing options</li> <li>• Need more structured academic support for undergrads</li> <li>• Loss of strong campus social force</li> </ul>                     |
|   | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>FSILGs are valuable and studio's design interventions should take them into account</b>  |

|   |                           |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| 8 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>A sizable percentage of graduate students – particularly those with families – will continue to seek housing on or near campus</b>  |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for some provision of quality education/child care for children of grad students</li> <li>• Demand for more on- or near-campus grad housing, particularly for families</li> <li>• Need for more amenities (grocery store, parks, play spaces, transportation, etc.)</li> </ul> |
|   | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>Far fewer graduate students will seek on- or near-campus housing</b>  |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less demand for on-campus housing</li> <li>• More pressure on local housing market</li> <li>• More commuting, traffic, and parking issues</li> <li>• Less probability of interaction (harder to build community)</li> </ul>   |
|   | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Assumption holds / take into account</b>  |

|   |                           |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| 9 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>Both home sales prices and apartment rental rates in Cambridge will remain high, continuing Cambridge's affordable housing crisis</b>   |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incoming MIT students, faculty, and staff will have difficulty in affording to live near campus</li> <li>• Strong demand for MIT-subsidized housing</li> <li>• MIT in better negotiating position w/ city re: housing development</li> <li>• Strong outside pressure for more affordable housing and MIT-built student housing</li> </ul> |
|   | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>Cambridge rents/housing prices start to decline</b>   |
|   | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More students looking for off-campus housing</li> <li>• Easier to find affordable housing</li> </ul>  |
|   | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Assumption holds</b>  |

|    |                           |  |
|----|---------------------------|--|
| 10 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>The existing small-grain housing will continue in its current amount and density</b>  |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little room to meet market demand for housing within Cambridgeport</li> <li>• Land values kept artificially low</li> <li>• Objections to dramatic differences in scale between neighboring properties</li> <li>• Continuity of neighborhood character</li> </ul>  |
|    | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>Changes in the density and character of Cambridgeport housing</b>   |
|    | Implications              | <p>If density goes up</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property values would soar; business would move in</li> <li>• Change in character of neighborhood</li> <li>• Possibility of more housing through incremental infill development</li> <li>• Heavy local opposition to "institutional encroachment"</li> </ul> <p>If density goes down</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible "suburbanization of city"</li> </ul> |
|    | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>If zoning holds, this assumption holds</b>  |

|    |                           |   |
|----|---------------------------|---|
| 11 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>Research industries will continue to grow and seek lab space in the vicinity of MIT</b>  |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land values in area will be high and increase</li> <li>• Housing crunch will get worse</li> <li>• More econ. Development (jobs, workers, etc.)</li> <li>• Difficulties for start-ups in area; big companies take over</li> </ul>   |
|    | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>Less demand for lab space around MIT</b>   |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If vacancy goes up, prices go down</li> <li>• Huge blow to Cambridge economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Taxes go down, services go down</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Damage to MIT's rep. and research endeavors</li> <li>• Opportunities for other types of development</li> <li>• Effect on housing market?</li> </ul> |

|  |                   |  |
|--|-------------------|--|
|  | <b>Resolution</b> | <b>Assumption holds for our studio</b> |
|--|-------------------|--|

|    |                           |  |
|----|---------------------------|--|
| 12 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>The urban ring will come to Cambridge by 2020</b>   |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retail activity becomes much more economically feasible (near Ft. Washington)</li> <li>• Densities near Ft. Washington increase</li> <li>• Land values go up -&gt; zoning changes</li> <li>• Stealing business from Central Sq. (?)</li> <li>• New stakeholder group: region/commuters</li> </ul> |
|    | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>No urban ring</b>   |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If MIT expands, it will have to provide services (recreation, dining, etc.)</li> <li>• Increased demand for parking will lead to increases in congestion</li> <li>• Difficulty to get enough density to support much retail</li> </ul>  |
|    | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Develop interventions that will work w/ or w/o urban ring (but hope it comes)</b>   |

|    |                           |   |
|----|---------------------------|---|
| 14 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>The CSX railroad right-of-way must be preserved in some fashion to accommodate future commercial and/or commuter rail traffic</b>  |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Circus can keep coming to town</li> <li>• “Track as barrier” issues will continue</li> <li>• Hard to develop on or over track</li> <li>• Limited # of at-grade crossings (w/o creative design solutions)</li> </ul>  |
|    | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>Don’t preserve railroad right-of-way</b>   |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Harder to build urban ring</li> <li>• Potential for another street or greenway</li> <li>• More connection to MIT and the river</li> <li>• Lots more development potential for MIT (more land, bigger parcels, etc.)</li> <li>• More fear of encroachment for Cambridgeport</li> <li>• Less potential for freight transport</li> <li>• Potential increase in area truck traffic</li> <li>• Land values near track would increase</li> </ul> |
|    | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Assume strip will remain transportation-oriented</b>   |

|    |                           |   |
|----|---------------------------|---|
| 15 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>To meet its future athletic needs, MIT will require an amount of playing fields equal to or greater than its current facilities</b>  |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any development on current fields will spur a need for new fields</li> <li>• Potential for shared facilities (BU, neighborhood, etc.)</li> <li>• Pressure/tendency for MIT to build out, rather than in</li> <li>• Potential to use current fields more intensively</li> <li>• Difficult to connect ends of campus or build community</li> </ul> |
|    | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>Could get by with less fields</b>  |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of large space and its versatility</li> <li>• Greater potential to connect campus and build community</li> </ul>  |

|    |                           |   |
|----|---------------------------|---|
|    |                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More room for development for MIT (chance to densify)</li> </ul>   |
|    | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Challenge assumption</b>   |
| 17 | <b>Assumption</b>         | <b>The parkland adjacent to the Charles River is reserved for open space and complimentary recreational uses</b>  |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Another reason to build in Cambridgeport</li> <li>• Continuous green space is maintained</li> <li>• Easier to maintain running/bike path</li> <li>• Geese stay happy</li> <li>• Potential for recreation activity ctr. (community gardens, etc.)</li> <li>• More room for viewing Head of Charles, etc.</li> </ul> |
|    | <b>Counter-assumption</b> | <b>Parkland could be used for other types of development</b>  |
|    | Implications              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More development space (high \$ value, unique draw)</li> <li>• Loss of water view for MIT dorms</li> <li>• Could fundamentally alter public character of river</li> <li>• Ecological impact</li> </ul>   |
|    | <b>Resolution</b>         | <b>Keep it green, but potentially program</b>   |