



Regular Board Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday December 15, 2021 at 5:30pm
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting was held virtually via Zoom

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

At 5:35 PM, Ellen Shore, CRA Operations Director, said that CRA board meetings are being held remotely in accordance with section 20 of chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, signed into law on June 16 2021. There will be opportunities for public comment at the start of this meeting and at the discretion of the chair. Ms. Shore explained the steps to take to provide public comment. Board meeting materials can be found on the CRA's next meeting webpage. This meeting is being recorded, including all video audio and QA messages

Call Roll

Chair Kathleen Born called the regular meeting of CRA Board. A roll call of Board members and the Executive Director was taken.

Vice Chair Conrad Crawford - present
Treasurer Christopher Bator – absent, will be arriving around 6:00pm
Asst. Treasurer Barry Zevin - present
Asst. Secretary Margaret Drury - present
Executive Director Tom Evans – present

Because this is a remote meeting, all votes will be taken by roll call and Mr. Evans will repeat the response of each member.

Public Comment

No requests for public comment were offered. Ms. Born said that, if time permits, there will be other opportunities for the public to offer comments.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to close public comment. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – absent

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

Minutes

1. Motion: *To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 17, 2021*

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 17, 2021. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – absent

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

2. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Design Review Meeting on November 10, 2021

Ms. Born said that she and Mr. Zevin had made edits to these minutes previously.

A motion was moved Mr. Zevin, to accept the minutes of the Design Review Meeting on November 10, 2021. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – absent

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

3. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Executive Sessions related to the Cambridge Center Development Agreement and Residential Development on November 18, 2018 and January 16, 2019

Ms. Born said that there are a number of minutes from Executive Sessions that dealt with matters having to do with the revised MXD project during the last three plus years. Ms. Born remembers, back in pre-pandemic times, when a group gathered together to discuss a version of the development for the MXD site, before the concept of having Eversource on the site. Mr. Evans said that the first set of minutes was the first round of discussions about modifications that might be made relative to residential GFA, which in the end, was not pursued, so those minutes could have been presented at an earlier date. This was related to a proposal from Boston Properties to adjust the pricing related to the condominium component of the residential project. Some evaluation was done and counter proposals were made. The issue got tabled at that point in time, partially because shortly thereafter, the Eversource issue was presented and that removed the condominium requirement from the zoning.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to accept the minutes of the Executive Sessions related to the Cambridge Center Development Agreement and Residential Development on November 18, 2018 and January 16, 2019. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – absent

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

Ms. Born said that she is proud and gratified that the staff and Board take conscientiously thorough notes in executive sessions and always release them to the public in a timely fashion. That being said, these took longer because the project had changed drastically in nature.

4. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Executive Sessions related to the Cambridge Center Development Agreement Amendment, Expanded Development Rights and Commercial GFA Purchase Price on October 16, 2019, April 15, 2020, June 17, 2020, December 16, 2020, and January 20, 2021

It was decided to table these minutes until the related agenda item is discussed.

Communications

5. Letter of Support from CRA to Board of Zoning Appeals regarding 50 Norfolk Street Application

Mr. Evans said that this project received a 2019 Forward Fund grant. Just-A-Start owns a very small building that has been vacant for a while. It is connected in its original sale to an affordable housing project next door. Just-A-Start's plan is to convert it into usable office space with a focus on financial counseling and other support services for their residents, and possibly the broader community at large. That project had been put on hold for a couple of reasons, including COVID. At this point in time, it needs some minor variances that are being considered by the BZA tomorrow evening. The CRA sent a letter of support stating that this is a very important project and it was

consistent with the kinds of services that were shown to be of the highest priority in the community in the City's assessment that was done about three years ago. The address is actually 55 Norfolk Street.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to place the letter of support from CRA to the Board of Zoning Appeals regarding 55 Norfolk Street Application on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – absent

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

6. City Council Order #258 adopted on November 22, 2021 regarding Central Square

Ms. Born said that this recent City Council order was adopted unanimously. This is in regards to a potential involvement or invitation to the CRA for collaboration with the City, in discovering creative projects that would benefit cultural facilities and public services. Mr. Evans noted that it could include small business development and nonprofits support.

Mr. Evans said that based on the recent track record of the CRA, with its execution of a vision for the Foundry and its role in preserving and revitalizing 99 Bishop Allen, some members of the Central Square community were interested in getting the CRA involved in other potential projects. The CRA was involved in some initial startup work for the Central Square Business Improvement District, which included providing staff level technical assistance, grant funding through the Forward Fund for murals, capital support for Starlight, and some graphic support in the beginning of their branding process. Even in the C2 plan from 2012, there had been some implementation questions about whether there was a role for the CRA on some of the underutilized parcels in Central Square. This order was introduced by Vice Mayor Mallon. Before COVID, she and Mr. Evans had walked around Central Square discussing the loss of art facilities. Those conversations then evolved to this council order. There are no specific project ideas in mind. He added that the CRA was approached by Raffi Mardirosian with a proposal for a Central Square cultural facility at the Middle East location. In considering that proposal, members of the board and HRA said that while there were merits to the goals of that proposal, a broader perspective on the Central Square neighborhood would be a better way to address those goals. For the CRA to get involved, a council order needed to go to the City Manager. CRA staff are currently reviewing the C2 plan. There have been no direct conversations with City staff yet, except for an initial conversation with Melissa Peters at CDD. Mr. Evans expects this to be a conversation with the Strategic Advisory Group.

Ms. Born started a discussion regarding the need and timing for declaring a project to be a demonstration project. Mr. Evans explained that the reason for a demonstration plan is to utilize some tools outside of standard state real estate procurement laws. For the Foundry, the demonstration plan provided flexibility in leasing. Other jurisdictions have used demonstration plans for small parcel assembly projects. If a full suite of real estate transaction flexibility was desired, the state now issues a full community revitalization plan.

Mr. Crawford said that the recent announcements of dark stores that are being used to activate empty retail spaces was an interesting concept. While the CRA is looking to maintain the vitality of the arts district, the general vitality of the community through active uses is also important. There was a discussion about "dark stores:" Mr. Evans said that another level of support could be an expanded small business program similar to what was done during the Covid emergency.

Chris Bator joined the meeting at 6:00 PM.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to place the City Council Order #258 adopted on November 22, 2021 regarding Central Square on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – yes

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

*Margaret Drury - yes
Barry Zevin – yes
The motion carried.*

7. Written communications received since the publication of this meeting notice.

No other written communications were received.

Reports, Motions, and Discussion Items

8. Monthly Staff Report

To expand its staffing capacity, the CRA made an offer, which was accepted by, Hendrik Karriem van Leesten. Mr. van Leesten will be helping with project management for real estate and development projects, such as the Margaret Fuller project. He has a significant amount of real estate experience, both locally and nationally. He will start around the new year. The 2022 budget has accounted for this in the personnel salaries line item.

Staff issued a procurement for outside assistance for an insurance risk advisor. A contract will be entered into with KFDA to help with complexities regarding the Foundry and other projects. There is also a new exploration round for landscape services for CRA parks.

The first KSTEP project has been completed and there are now conversations with the KSTEP working group about the next project, which might involve bus rapid transit or bus priority management on some of the local streets. Staff have also been in many discussions regarding some of the infrastructure work that is happening on Broadway, which has created an interim closure of the Sixth Street Walkway. Staff's goal was to minimize impacts on both the bikeway and the walkway. Mr. Evans was pleased to report that a pedestrian detour has been negotiated to run through a portion of the Volpe parcel so that one can walk on the Sixth Street walkway and get to Broadway. Hopefully, that will be in place in January. There has been some other construction work along the Kitty Knox bike path as well which will probably end up involving some new paving materials because there has been some deterioration of that path over the past couple of winters.

The 325 Main Street project is moving along. Most of the public improvements along Main Street are completed but facade work is still underway and the sidewalk is still closed. The furnishings are being finalized. Most of the big parts for the roof garden landscaping have been installed.

Two final 2021 Forward Fund capital grants were submitted. One is for the Brattle Film Foundation which operates the Brattle Theater and the other is for the Cambridge Center for Adult Education.

CRA continues to work in partnerships by facilitating ongoing implementation strategy sessions with human services programs and the KSA to look to build off of the workforce development report that was done over the past few years. The goal is to stitch together better employer connections to the large array of workforce development programs in Cambridge and nearby locations.

There has been a lot of work on the Foundry. Active negotiations for all of the office areas are occurring. The lottery process for the below-market nonprofit office space yielded three applicants. The lottery will be held on Friday. The Foundry Consortium has submitted a property management plan. Work is still be done on a reservation system that would facilitate how people use the ground floor. The Foundry Advisory Committee has four new members who were appointed this fall. The next meeting of that group is in January.

Margaret Drury started a discussion about Healthpeak, which is an organization that is buying up lots of properties in Cambridge.

Mr. Zevin asked if it would be okay for the CRA to directly contact owners of abandoned lots for places that might be viable to hold the required affordable housing units. Mr. Evans said that the official process was to publish an ad and wait for people who want to enter into negotiations with the CRA to respond. Asking people to respond to that RFP would be appropriate. Since the CRA has engaged a broker to help facilitate this, he also suggested sending potential addresses to the broker. Ms. Born added that this contract was voted on last month with HR&A

and Cushman Wakefield. Mr. Evans said that Cushman Wakefield would be looking into what is available, and then HRA would help figure out if it was feasible for the CRA in order to meet its affordable homeownership component objective, whether it's housing or mixed use or something else. He added that Cushman Wakefield are also reviewing a scope of exactly how they would go about exploring options, including looking creatively at getting a portion of a bigger parcel rather than just looking for a standalone parcel. Mr. Bator said that there's nothing legally precluding the CRA from informally approaching a landowner, but doing that through a broker is entirely appropriate.

Hema Kailasam, Director of Finance and Operations, spoke about the October financial report. In October, there was a big bounce back in the markets. After the September losses, there was a gain of about \$460,000 in investment income. The S&P was down almost 5% in September and went up 7% in October. Another source of income received in October was the first loan repayments of the amortized five-year zero interest loan. There was a one-year grace period until September 30. To date, almost \$200,000 has been collected. Several people have repaid their loans entirely. Repeated outreach is occurring with about 17 borrowers who have not paid this first payment. The next payments are in March and September. Operational expenses continue to be on track and below budget. Because much of the planned runway money has been delayed for various reasons, the professional expenses have been fairly low compared to the yearly budget. With respect to Bishop Allen, \$7 million has been paid in both hard and soft costs. The project is close to finishing. Relative to other projects, Bishop Allen is where most of the CRA money has been spent.

The audit reports were finalized and sent to the City of Cambridge and to the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development.

In summary, there is a cumulative deficit of \$7 million through October 31, which is the money spent on Bishop Allen. Because of the strong market performance, the operational obligations of the CRA were basically covered with that income.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to place the staff report on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – yes

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

9. Second Amendment of the Infill Development Concept Plan

Motion: Approving, with conditions, the second amendment to the Infill Development Concept Plan, Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Evans said that although a substantial amount of financial resources has been spent on the Bishop Allen project, this project has probably consumed a parallel amount of staff time resources. Tonight, Boston Properties (BXP) will do a presentation on the update. It is the same presentation, perhaps a little briefer, that went to Planning Board last night. Alex Levering, CRA Project Manager, will then follow up with some of the recommendations that the CRA put forth in a memo. The special permit was voted unanimously by the Planning Board to move forward. The actual writing of the special permit will be completed at the end of January.

Ms. Levering added that this is the second hearing to discuss the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP). The board initially reviewed this proposal jointly with the Planning Board on September 28. A lot has been done since that hearing. On November 8th, the CRA and BXP received a certificate of approval from the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs for the MEPA Notice of Project Change submission. This was a requirement through the KSURP plan. Having received this certificate, the CRA Board is now able to vote on the IDCP Amendment #2.

BXP has also submitted supplemental materials to respond to comments during the September 28th joint hearing. The CRA has also hosted two design review meetings with Planning Board representatives to discuss the

commercial building, the open space constraints, and designs for the project. The Planning Board voted to approve the special permit unanimously last night.

Ian Hatch, from BXP, said that he is joined by other BXP colleagues, Mike Tilford and Susannah Shaw, members of the Eversource team, and representatives from the multidisciplinary design team. Tonight's discussion will start with an introduction of where the proposal stands today and then move into an analysis of the primary piece of feedback received at the joint board hearing on September 28, 2021. In the course of walking through the various project components to which those pieces of feedback apply, he will discuss responses that have been made.

A timeline was shown that underscored how far this project has come, from an initial community driven conversation starting in 2017, moving through 2018, and 2019, to then being put on the city's agenda, to engagement from the city manager, the CRA, and the city council. One of key reasons that the proposal is before the CRA Board tonight is the 2028 Eversource substation in-service date. Atypical of commercial development, this proposal is supplying a critical piece of energy infrastructure that itself has its own timeline. Mr. Hatch showed a list of the public meetings associated with this project. He noted that the meetings highlighted in green were meetings where the proposal was refined based on feedback received in the joint meeting on the 28th.

Mr. Hatch showed a brief contextual map illustrating the site and the proposed development components outlined in yellow. Another slide showed an introduction to the baseline massing of the concept plan. The intent behind this initial submission was to make broad statements about program distribution and the siting of that program rather than dive into architecture. This slide showed the rendered context with the adjacent Volpe development. The next slide was an updated phasing plan that reflected updates or modifications to the forecast for construction activities, as well as some updates relative to the provision or enhancement of open space. Another slide showed a summary axonometric view that illustrated the points of interface between the heavy infrastructure associated with this project, namely the substation, associated transmission distribution lines, and ventilation facilities.

A summary of the key components of the special permit application was given. This included the incremental addition of 800,000 net new square feet of commercial development distributed in two buildings on the north end of the site, consolidation of previously planned residential square footage into a single building at the south end of the site (135 Broadway), demolition of the existing blue garage, construction of below grade parking to serve that campus, as well as creation of a new center plaza, open space, and the accommodation of an underground electrical substation into the MXD below the center plaza. The other genre of the special permit application involved enabling conditions. These are changes to how campus bicycle parking was provided and a mechanism for adjusting the green roof area required for this project.

Mr. Hatch spoke in more detail about the campus bicycle parking plan. During the joint board meeting, there was a request for clarity on what this innovative method meant relative to the typical norms required by the ordinance, as well as how this innovative system was going to work, and what major parameters could be used to assess its efficacy. He showed a slide that broke out the physical supply of bicycle parking by building component and by long-term and short-term bicycle parking use. By increasing the number of conforming self-park, short-term racks, like those stands outside the buildings as part of the baseline plans, in combination with the blue bike station that will be provided as part of this proposal, the quantitative requirements for short term parking set out by the zoning ordinance will actually be exceeded.

A clarification was made on the use of a key tool in the zoning ordinance. As part of this valet, BXP is proposing to pool commercial and residential demand into a single facility. The use patterns of these two different users are sufficiently different that a commercial space can be used for a resident when that commercial tenant has gone home. BXP was able to show that, together with the 20 conforming self-park spaces within the residential building, the valet was able to exceed the minimum quantity requirements for the long-term spaces by quite a margin.

With regards to concerns about accessibility, Mr. Hatch showed a slide that listed qualitative commitments based on numerous comments. There is a commitment to staff the valet 24/7, to have a monitoring plan to ensure that the valet service is meeting the objectives of the plan, to provide electric charging to 10% of the spaces within that valet, and that the valet will be complimentary for residents and commercial tenants.

With respect to the green roof ordinance, BXP is seeking to replicate an approach that was approved by the Planning Board relative to the MIT Volpe development whereby payments to the Affordable Housing Trust can

substitute for a reduction in green roof area that is necessitated by developments in the design. At a concept plan level, the substance of the ordinance might actually be met but it is not guaranteed at this juncture. By having this flexible mechanism in place, it allows the project to move along and meet timelines with confidence, despite that lack of foreknowledge.

Mr. Hatch said that the feedback regarding open space was divided into two genres. The first being square footage - just raw provision of open space by area. The second had to do with the quality of that space - the square footage of green space, specifically within that broader category of open space. At a baseline, this proposal offered a fairly robust contribution to open space by the numbers. Relative to amendment #1, this proposal increases the open space available by approximately 17,000 square feet. If this project is approved, it would also create an opportunity on 135 Fulkerson Street, which represents approximately 40,000 square feet of potential area. A public process of some kind will define that future use but one of those uses has already been suggested to be open space. Thus, both the direct and indirect contributions associated with this proposal, should not be underestimated in the way of square footage. BXP has made modifications to the phasing plan in response to feedback received, which includes two new measures. One is the inclusion of enhancements to Danny Lewin Park as part of Phase Three, which is the most accelerated phase that this open space could be delivered because it is in an area that will be protected from the construction work. The second element is to bring the East-West connector southeast during Phase Three as well which includes the children's play area.

With respect to green space, the vision for the center plaza in the initial submission in the summer was met with some consternation because it leaned heavily on hardscape. This approach was initially chosen because it ensured that the infrastructure beneath the center plaza was protected and it provided access to the vertical intake elements that might require operational maintenance. In response to the feedback, the center plaza has been modified by increasing the amount of green space by 5,000 square feet through use of a lawn concept on the plaza. This provision of green space does not jeopardize the station's integrity long-term with problematic root systems. The vertical components that are visible above grade are largely consistent with the initial plan in terms of position. However, there is a new approach to dealing with the exhaust structure as a retail pavilion. There are advantages in lowering the stance of the exhaust as well as creating an activation opportunity. If key performance parameters are met and the locations aren't shifted, optimization of both the exhaust and the intake structure is possible.

Mr. Hatch spoke about the vertical components. When BXP introduced the baseline massing for the residential building, BXP was asked to show that there was a latent potential within the baseline massing to resolve the architectural challenges present at the south end of that site. The refined building mass for the residential building was shown in one of the slides of the presentation. The site constraints and challenges include the transmission duct banks for the Eversource infrastructure, the adjacent buildings (notably 145) building efficiency, access, loading, and respecting the open space plan of the proposal. He noted a key feature of the massing was the potential to create a more direct pedestrian connection from Danny Lewin Park.

Similar to the proposal for residential, Mr. Hatch said that the strategy for the commercial buildings was to advance a baseline massing concept that afforded flexibility and made a definitive statement about program distribution and siting, but stopped short of engagement with architecture. At the joint hearing on the 28th, BXP was again asked to show that the baseline massings work at this end of the site with its unique challenges and that they can work programmatically. The baseline massings have been refined with a contraction in the footprint that came from further sculpting.

In conclusion, Mr. Hatch noted that while the developments to date and the responses to comments may not have yielded a perfect product yet, BXP hopes to have iterated towards a mutually workable foundation for a design review process that would continue to be productive for exploring the nature of the plaza further as well as the residential and commercial buildings.

Mr. Zevin said that he is worried that BXP's response to comments has been generally acquiescence and thinks that some of the comments actually deserve rebuttal. In general, tremendous progress has been made. The form of the residential building is wonderful. Green is wonderful but there is a letter from Bob Simha making a rather powerful case for a hardscape plaza with really beautiful paving. Mr. Zevin wasn't sure which is right, but he doesn't think BXP should automatically throw away one or the other. He is not sure retail will survive at the back near the exhaust stack. At Termeer Square on the other end of Kendall, there's a similar structure that has

struggled to keep any sort of small retail food service alive. Also, it was an interesting idea to have bike parking on every floor of the residential but that will not work if one looks at the plans and there are probably a lot of reasons why it's not a good idea. He suggested that BXP be clear about the really important goals and stick with them.

Ms. Born agreed with Mr. Zevin. Some of the comments at the joint hearing seemed questionable. If the vent shafts could be made smaller, they would have been proposed to be smaller. Having a patch of grass in the middle of an urban space by itself isn't necessarily a wonderful thing. Looking at the sun and shade diagram, there doesn't seem to be a need for shade structures regardless of whether there are trees or not.

Mr. Zevin was happy to hear that BXP has a stake in making this place pleasant and not obnoxiously full of noise or hot air. Mr. Tilford said that a natural stone-type hardscape might be a possibility to discuss in design review. Mr. Zevin suggested thinking about kinds of open space that are not found in Kendall Square since all parks need not be green, for example the new MIT Plaza south of Main Street.

Ms. Born said that the tall new housing project must be a thing of beauty and wonder because it will be one of the tallest buildings in Cambridge. Mr. Crawford agreed with Ms. Born. He had a pleasant reaction to the triangle shape of the building. He added that he doesn't mind hardscape. He appreciates the integration of play and joy by proposing the children's play structure in one of the other adjacent interstitial spaces. The opportunity in the district is to continue to knit together features in a way that creates something distinct in the urban redevelopment zone versus trying to get everything done in one space, whether it is for green space or bike parking. He is impressed by the ongoing improvements and refinements that were presented. He voiced his appreciation for the BXP development team and their work

Ms. Levering spoke about the CRA's review and conditions that were put forth. All of these are written in more detail in the Board packet staff memo. The important condition, which is already codified in the Design Review and Document Approval Process, is that each of the buildings and the center plaza will be conditioned upon further building design review with the Planning Board. For open space phasing, staff recommends that BXP strive to facilitate early completion of open space where and when possible, specifically noting that the connector with the child play area be completed with the residential building in Phase Three. For 105 Broadway's sidewalk, staff recommends consideration of the removal of existing planters to widen the sidewalk at that location. For open space access, staff recommends a plan be submitted to the CRA clarifying how the plaza will be managed during regular Eversource non-emergency maintenance work. There currently exists a pedestrian easement through the blue garage connecting the two service drives and staff requests that although it might need to shift, the easement be maintained across the plaza, connecting the two drives, understanding that construction might also need to interrupt that for a period of time. Staff would like an improved Parcel Four connection, which was a previous Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) commitment to construct a new or improved passageway through Parcel Four. The CRA expects that commitment be maintained in Phase Three of the IDCP. Privately owned public space (POPS) signage was presented this past fall. The CRA and CDD worked on POPS open- to-all signage. Staff requests that all POPS spaces under development in this IDCP include this signage. Staff requests public programming updates, similar to requests for all open spaces in the IDCP, as well as loading and access plans for each of the buildings. For the CRA's annual transportation data report. BXP has always been very helpful in providing parking data in the past, and staff requests data for the new garage and data usage from the bike valet. Staff requests an updated innovation space update plan, which staff already expects next spring, as well as implementation of a real time parking system, which is a requirement and condition in the previous IDCP approval letters. Staff is looking to collaborate on that with BXP and TP&T to inform the availability of visitor parking.

Mr. Evans said that the CRA will invite the City to join in discussions regarding the final design of the Central Plaza open space in relation to the Volpe open space and other open spaces coming online so that parks are viewed in context. Activation and active recreation are really important to attract people to this park. Mr. Evans noted another condition for the water feature to migrate away from the substation and closer to Broadway.

Mr. Zevin was pleased to see the request for a wider sidewalk at 105 Broadway and hopes that this streetscape design is consistent in the Volpe development. Mr. Evans said that the CRA has put forth a conceptual design, with work with Sasaki that does have a wider sidewalk and push back on the MITIMCO porch concepts that were sliding into that space. The CRA is trying to emulate the sidewalk width that is in front of 145 Broadway all the way to Third Street. With the entanglement of the cables for Eversource, the setbacks are coming together to make sure that can be accomplished along the Volpe stretch.

Ms. Born invited City Councilor Dennis Carlone, and other members of the public to comment. Mr. Carlone said that he appreciates the evolution of the general massing. He emphasized that the Plaza is the key. He doesn't have a problem with a paved plaza as discussed. It is odd to include a grass area just by itself. The key to the plaza's success needs to focus on what would bring people to the plaza. He suggested putting an active children-oriented structure and/or spray fountain. He feels that there is too much glass in the city and buildings. Ms. Born said that the CRA will strive to make the plaza as interesting and as vibrant a place as possible.

Ms. Born read a comment in the chat from Nicola Williams, who is a member of the recently formed CRA Strategic Advisory Committee. Ms. Williams asked the team to consider permeable ground materials to avoid heat islands. There were no other requests for comment.

A motion was moved by Mr. Crawford to approve, with conditions outlined in the staff memo to the Board, the second amendment to the Infill Development Concept Plan, Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.
Chris Bator – yes
Kathy Born – yes
Conrad Crawford – yes
Margaret Drury - yes
Barry Zevin – yes
The motion carried.

10. Amendment of the Cambridge Center Development Agreements

Motion: Approving the amendment to the Cambridge Center Development Agreement, Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan

Mr. Evans said that, originally, there were two separate development agreements. One was the original scope of development for Boston Properties (BXP) for Parcels Three and Four, which are the parcels between Broadway and Main Street. There was also a second development agreement established for Parcel Two that came three years later. Over the course of time, as the project changed and evolved, there was a series of amendments to these documents, either together or sometimes separately. When the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) was created, the two documents were merged together into one Cambridge Center Development Agreement. At that time, the GFA price formula was reaffirmed as it had originally been established in the Parcel Two Development Agreement.

The development agreement sets the procedures for ongoing development review. The merged amendment clarified that design review process, calling it the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure (DRDAP). That process remains set in the amendment being voted on tonight. This amendment also increases the commercial allocation for the 800,000 square feet and reaffirms the commitment to the housing delivery of 400,000 square feet. For the housing portion, the letter of intent, that was agreed to in 2020, had set a price at the time when a 135 Broadway proposal came before the CRA under the earlier IDCP. Because BXP had undertaken the consideration of the Eversource project, that project was delayed. It seemed fair to set the price to that point in time. The development agreement affirms that letter of intent.

The other GFA price component turns off the 10% appreciation on the price level, which had been in place since 1982 and freezes the GFA price for five years to stabilize the conditions for implementing the Eversource plan. When it turns back on, it will not be an arbitrary 10% but rather set to the consumer price index (CPI) for inflationary values starting in 2027.

The MEPA proposal certified funding of a KSTEP plan, which was originally created in the merger agreement. The development agreement will continue the 50-50 funding profile - 50% by BXP directly and 50% by the CRA through the funds that come in from the development.

Two other MEPA mitigation elements that are wrapped up into the development agreement relate to transportation. One is funding the next level of design and planning process for a transit solution for the Grand Junction corridor. A solution is needed to address the concern about levels of traffic in the area and the capacity of the MBTA to carry

commuters to the area. Although there is no strong commitment from the state, the CRA wants to advance the conversation on how to use that rail corridor to provide another strong option for transit in the area such as connections from the Allston landing area to North Station, potentially supplementing the EZRide bus shuttle route. The other mitigation written into the development agreement would be a funding contribution towards the final segment of the Alta streetscape design. The actual construction project would be implemented by another entity, potentially MITIMCO or the city. He added that the streetscape work on Binney has to be thoughtfully planned for execution with the Eversource distribution lines that come out of the north end of the substation.

The agreement also puts forth a budget for additional design work and creates a contribution to physical improvements to the Danny Lewin Park to open it up and preserve the trees, double check the circulation, and create a plan that integrates the two parcels that are owned by BXP with a third of the park that is owned by Residence Inn. BXP has agreed to commit up to approximately million dollars to make those improvements, at least on their parcels.

Most of the other conditions of the development agreement are kept in place. If the project moves forward, Mr. Evans expects there to be many design review meetings over the next couple of years to follow the DRDAP process. To document the many conversations about the development agreement over the past couple years, there are executive session minutes for review and approval tonight. These include some of the initial conversations about the commercial square footage, initial thoughts about pricing this, the affordable homeownership component, and some analysis that HR&A had done to quantify variables about the value of the commercial development and the cost of the infrastructure. HR&A's recommendations aligned with the development agreement which is that the price of \$111 per square foot was in the right space and that the CPI index made sense for the future.

Ms. Drury said that she is glad that the CRA has gotten this far and she is excited to vote in favor of it.

There was a discussion to clarify the dates of the five-year moratorium. Mr. Evans said that the price for residential and the price for commercial and lab are set and will remain in effect, with no escalation, until May 21, 2027. Mr. Bator stressed the importance of clarity in documents where big money is at stake. Mr. Evans said that the amendment as proposed was initially written by himself and CRA lawyer Jeff Mullan. This was then passed onto BXP for their legal review. Mr. Bator was satisfied that the general formulation was done by the CRA and their legal counsel. Ms. Born said that this document is probably one of the most important contracts that the CRA has. Mr. Evans said that the term GFA was carefully defined to align with the GFA defined in the zoning and is specifically set to the utility project GFA, which is the 800,000 square feet related to this project. There is still a small amount of "leftover" GFA, about 11,000 square feet from the original development pre-2015 rezoning that still continues with the old escalation formula.

There were no comments from the public.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury approving the amendment to the Cambridge Center Development Agreement, Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – yes

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

11. Margaret Fuller Update / Designer Contract

Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director and Chair to enter into a new and revised contract with Studio G to provide design services from schematic design through construction of the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House renovation and development.

Erica Schwarz, CRA Project Director, said the Margaret Fuller House Board substantially approved the amendment to the agreement that the CRA Board approved last month. There will be an official vote this Friday to

allow their board members to send language tweaks or other comments. This now enables the CRA and the Margaret Fuller House to move into the schematic design phase. Getting to this point has been a long process. Staff would like to enter into a contract with Studio G, the same designer who was selected in 2019 for schematic design through project close-out. The prior iteration of the contract focused on the feasibility study, although when Studio G was selected in 2019, that vote was taken with the intention of taking them on for feasibility through project close out. Last month, the Board also approved the selection of CBI-Socotec as the owner's project manager who will be helping CRA staff negotiate the contract.

The exhibit for this memo is now on the webpage under the presentation section. Ms. Schwarz presented a draft proposal of a fee and scope for schematic design that Studio G provided. Multiple aspects of this will change. There is an agreement on a fee for schematic design but the total project design fee will be a set dollar amount rather than a percentage of a future estimated construction cost. A specific dollar amount will be decided before a full design contract is signed. CBI will advise staff on this process. Ms. Schwarz said that the CRA is ready to negotiate with Studio G over the next few weeks if the Board affirms this choice.

Mr. Crawford asked Ms. Schwarz to explain Studio G's model, their unique set of skills and experience as a designer of affordable housing, and why they were initially selected. Ms. Schwarz said that the full scope of the project is to upgrade the facility of the Margaret Fuller House in order for them to run their social services programs, which have been expanded by the executive director who was hired right before the pandemic. The CRA would develop some affordable ownership housing, which would partially meet the obligation that the CRA has to create 20,000 square feet of affordable ownership housing. Studio G remains a really good fit for multiple reasons. They have extensive experience developing affordable housing, they are frequently used by community development corporations in Greater Boston and beyond. They have developed a lot of schools, including childcare spaces. They have done a lot of historic preservation in the course of their affordable housing work. She noted that the "G" in Studio G stands for "green" as they have a focus in being a green designer. They have worked extensively with nonprofits and have done design work for other social service entities.

In response to Ms. Born, Ms. Schwarz said that the estimated \$8 million for construction costs noted in the scope document was an amount proposed in August. The estimate is now around \$10 million for construction costs of three components. One is the historic preservation of the Margaret Fuller House which would involve a lot of code compliance but there is no intent to do extra reworking of the building. The second component is a new addition next to the Margaret Fuller House. The third component is affordable housing in the rear. The first two parts are estimated to cost around \$5 million in construction costs and the third component would be another \$5 million. She emphasized that formal cost estimates have not been done yet. The schematic design phase hasn't started yet.

Ms. Schwarz confirmed that the contract with Studio G will be a fixed fee, although a percentage of estimated construction costs might be used to set the fixed fee. Ms. Schwarz said that the design contract will be based on the language used for the Bishop Allen design contract. The CRA had a prior contract with Studio G that was a basic services contract for a feasibility study. The language for this new design contract is being finalized by CRA and Margaret Fuller attorneys.

Mr. Evans explained that in the designer selection procurement process, an RFQ is posted and a qualified entity is selected. That selection is brought to the Board. If the Board votes to approve, a scope with the selected entity is negotiated. However, due to Covid and project changes, Mr. Evans felt that it was important to reaffirm the contract selection because it is past the standard three-year length of engagement. Ms. Schwarz said that the fixed price fee might be more than the 6.9% of the construction cost. CBI has told staff that 6.9% is on the low end.

Mr. Zevin questioned the word "refusal" in the last bullet item of the scope document referring to the permitting process.

Mr. Evans said that the intent is for the housing to utilize the affordable housing overlay. It is unknown whether other permitting processes will be necessary for the historic building, which actually sits partially in the City's right-of-way or whether the addition will require any setback relief. The goal is to design this project as clean from an entitlement process as possible. Other cities may use the term "refusal" in their zoning relief processes, but it's not a term used in Cambridge.

Mr. Bator asked Ms. Schwarz to confirm that when the fixed fee is brought to the Board for approval, it will be a hard number that won't be subject to changes in construction costs, barring any necessary amendments and renegotiations. Ms. Schwarz confirmed that there will be a dollar amount for the entire design services. Mr. Evans said dollar amounts are usually approved through the budget. Mr. Bator said that given this amount is apt to turn into a large dollar amount, he would prefer to be advised of the amount with a recommendation on going forward before it is set in stone. Mr. Evans said that until more work is done on the project, everything that the project needs is unknown. He asked if staff could go forth with the fixed fee for the schematic design process that is written in this document and then come back to the Board once there is a total project design fee amount based on the schematic design estimate. This would also be the time when staff would come back to the Board to execute a development agreement with Margaret Fuller. Staff needs this initial pulse of design work.

Ms. Born said that a figure should be able to be put on the schematic design. The contract has defined schematic design. Schematic design is not enough to build it but it is enough to submit it for a building permit. There is an expectation that it will need other permits and/or reliefs.

Mr. Evans said that there is a natural check point once the schematic design is done. Staff will then come to the Board and explain the work done to date, and how it fits within the MOU. Staff will explain the next phase, what it physically looks like, the financials, including the total project budget and design fee, the soft costs, and the construction costs. The CRA can then enter into a legal development agreement with the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House through construction close out.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director and Chair to enter into a new and revised contract with Studio G to provide design services from schematic design through construction of the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House renovation and development. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – yes

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

At 8:10 PM, the Board took a 10-minute recess. The meeting resumed at 8:20 PM.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to accept the minutes of the executive sessions related to the Cambridge center development agreement, expanded development rights and commercialized GFA purchase price. These executive sessions were held on October 16 2019, April 15 2020, June 17, 2020, December 16, 2020, and January 20, 2021. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – yes

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – absent

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

12. 99 Bishop Allen Drive – Project Update

Ms. Schwarz said that the contract date for completion was November 30 but the building is not ready yet. The CRA will be collecting liquidated damages at \$2,500 a day, likely from November 30. This will help to cover the costs of extending swing space, particularly to BARCC as they have a contractual arrangement to provide counseling services. The work is very close to being complete but awaits a final electrical inspection, sign off, and the building inspection. There might be some work that is needed to meet the electrical inspection requirements. A lot of time has been spent coordinating these issues and communicating with TSNE and tenants.

There are still items remaining that will still need to be completed that don't impact code, such as the completion of the main entry canopy. The whereabouts or delivery date of the permanent "smart" lighting is unknown due to

COVID supply chain issues. In the meantime, the building has temporary lighting installed. There are also various punch list items that will be continuing through December. Staff is still planning a public celebration ribbon cutting for March. Ms. Schwarz showed photos of the building.

Carlos Peralta, CRA Project Manager, spoke about the operations of the building. Obviously, the construction delays rippled into delays in operations. The move back into the building, that was scheduled for early November, was pushed back to the first week of December. However, the tenant's belongings that were in storage were able to be moved into their spaces. Where they can, many tenants have been able to start setting up their spaces. Many of the tenants are having new furniture delivered.

There has been some interest in leasing the available spaces in the building. An RFP has been posted for over two months. Some current tenants are looking to expand their footprint in the building. TSNE, the property manager is orchestrating these requests. Mr. Peralta expects to see more interest in leasing space once the Foundry lottery has selected its entity. Once the CRA has full control of the building and tenants are in full operations, a tenant advisory committee will be created with quarterly meetings.

Mr. Peralta said that he and representatives from TSNE are scheduled to train on the HVAC system and other mechanicals in the building. The systems are very futuristic and can be accessed remotely.

Ms. Schwarz added that with the construction substantially completed, Resonant, the solar contractor will come do a site visit and finalize the solar design. This project should be completed by this spring or summer depending on the timing for delivery of the panels.

In response to Mr. Bator, the tenants were amazed with the amount of light and the welcoming spaces. They are looking forward to getting back into the building. Ms. Schwarz read a comment in the chat from Nicola Williams, who is on the Sustainable Business Network board, who confirmed that they are excited.

13. Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Proposal

Motion: Approving the 2022 CRA Budget

Hema Kailasam, Director of Finance and Operations, walked through the main parts of the proposed 2022 budget. From a revenue perspective, the CRA is expecting \$1.5 million in the spring of 2022 for the Broad's M1 project that didn't occur in 2021. In addition to that, a modest \$100,000 is expected for licensing fees. This results in operating revenues to be about \$1.6 million. With a conservative return of \$500,000 in the CRA investment portfolio, the total expected revenue is \$2.1 million. Ms. Kailasam noted that the income from 145 has not been included as a revenue item until there is more clarity on the timing.

The largest area of increase in expenses next year is going to be in personnel. The CRA just hired a new employee. In addition, in light of the anticipated design work related to the Eversource project, Mr. Evans anticipates the need to hire another person in either the first or second quarter, perhaps a recent grad in design and architecture to help the design review process because there will be a lot of it. A 4% COLA increase for current staff has been included in the 2022 proposed budget. Related to personnel is the need to add some additional office space plus equipment which boosted the office expenses as well.

The professional services section relates to the project initiatives that are underway and expected. The Board packet memo gives more details for these expenses.

At this time, there is no budget allocation for the Forward Fund. Staff will come back to the Board with a plan and an amount after a re-think of how changes to the program can improve the outreach results. That work is going to happen in the early part of 2022.

About \$4 million is expected to leave the restricted funds for the Foundry with the completion of the building, the continued operator support, and the purchase of FF&E.

Ms. Kailasam presented a Bishop Allen pro forma for next year. Based on the rents and projected expenses. A small excess in income is expected to be generated.

Looking at the operating expenses in the next year, and a net income of \$1.6 million, there is about \$3 million worth of spending. The deficit from CRA operations is about \$1.1 million. In addition to that revenue, there is an installment of the Ames Street development fee, which is \$431,000, and two loan repayments, conservatively estimated at about \$275,000. This leaves the difference of about \$431,182 that would be drawn down from the investment account to close that gap. Mr. Bator said that the 2% return on investment is likely to be low so actually, there might not be a deficit.

Mr. Bator said that the CRA is in remarkably strong financial shape, even give the significant activities and significant expenditures. The purpose of all this money is to do good things with it, as well as hopefully behave in a way to preserve the ability to do more good things in the future.

A motion was moved by Mr. Crawford to approve the 2022 CRA Budget. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – yes

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – yes

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

14. 2022 Proposed CRA Meeting Calendar

Motion: Adopting the Meeting Calendar for 2022 with an anticipated use of remote / hybrid meetings in conformance with open meeting law and future legislative accommodations to adapt to COVID-19 and encourage broad community participation.

Ellen Shore, CRA Operations Director, said that the selected dates for Board meetings avoid school vacations and holidays of major religions. Each month has a meeting date, including August which in some years has been canceled.

Mr. Bator asked to move the December 21 date to December 14 so that it is not close to Christmas. There were no objections.

At this time, the Governor's order that allows remote public meetings expires on April 1, 2022. It is possible that the order might be extended. If it does not get extended, hybrid meetings will be held in the Link so that the public can attend either in person or virtually. A quorum of Board members would need to be physically present. Mr. Evans is concerned about the timeliness of the legislature to actually deliver on rule changes so it is more likely to see a temporary extension.

Ms. Shore said that if the Foundry is open, summer meetings might be held in that location instead of the Link. Mr. Evans added that holding CRA Board meetings in the Foundry has been written into the draft lease language.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to adopt the Meeting Calendar for 2022, as amended, with an anticipated use of remote / hybrid meetings in conformance with open meeting law and future legislative accommodations to adapt to COVID-19 and encourage broad community participation. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – yes

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – absent

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

Mr. Bator recognized and acknowledge the staff and the Board for their work. He is pleased and proud with the work that the CRA has done and the credibility it has earned, especially considering where the agency was in 2012. He wished everyone a happy holiday season.

The motion was made by Mr. Crawford to adjourn the meeting. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Chris Bator – yes

Kathy Born – yes

Conrad Crawford – absent

Margaret Drury - yes

Barry Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM.

