



Regular Board Meeting  
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, July 19, 2017, 5:30pm  
Robert Healy Public Safety Center / Cambridge Police Station / Community Room  
125 Sixth Street, Cambridge, MA

---

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

---

**Call**

Chair Kathleen Born called the meeting at 5:42 p.m. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Treasurer Christopher Bator, and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford was absent. Staff members present were Thomas Evans, Carlos Peralta, Jason Zogg, and Ellen Shore. Kathryn Madden will be arriving later in the meeting.

The CRA and John Hawkinson recorded the meeting.

**Public Comment**

*Stephen Kaiser* spoke on three items. Regarding the Grand Junction corridor analysis, he noted that although the consultant is knowledgeable, a good ridership study for \$50,000 might be challenging, given the uncertainty at the two ends. Getting the lights sequenced at the at-grade crossings is also difficult to prevent bunching. He speculated on the possibility of the Foundry's previous owner having knowledge of the soil contamination and structural flaws of the building. Lastly, he spoke about the Volpe zoning. He highlighted that a government agency (GSA) that is not subject to zoning is the official submitter of the zoning petition. He is disappointed in MIT's petition since it barely mentions transit, any mention of traffic saturation, or capacity analysis. In addition, it references open space but leaves out the word "public". There are very few improvements and the numbers are not all accurate. This is not a reproduction of the original zoning but rather a considerable change and the subtleties need to be scrutinized carefully. Mr. Kaiser said that he would itemize these discrepancies and send them to the CRA. He ended by commenting on the state's situation where there's been turnover in personnel. An MBTA permanent general manager is needed. He added that the control board is having fewer meetings. He is concerned that the business community and developers are not supporting the importance of transit. He urged the CRA to continue to lead on transit initiatives.

There were no others who requested to speak.

*The motion to close public comment carried unanimously.*

**Minutes**

**1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Board on June 21, 2017**

There were no modifications.

*A motion to accept the minutes and place them on file carried unanimously.*

**Communications**

**2. Letter to Lisa Peterson Requesting Community Preservation Act Funds for History Façade Restoration of 105 Windsor Street June 19, 2017**

Mr. Evans passed out a letter of support from the Health Alliance. He said that the CRA submitted an application to the City for Community Preservation Act (CPA) funds for restoration of the 105 Windsor external façade. This will preserve the asset and prepare it for future reuse when the planning process with the community determines what should go into the building. Work done by Daedalus determined a rehabilitation estimate of \$255,000 related to the shell of the building. The Community Preservation Act mandates that a percentage of funding go towards affordable housing, open space, and restoration. The CRA has been collaborating with the Health Alliance. It is unclear whether the external work will be done separately or whether this will wait until a broader redevelopment plan is in place. Mr. Peralta added that a decision should be made at the CPA September meeting.

The letter will be placed on file.

**3. Notes from the Neighborhood and Long Term Planning, Public Facilities, Arts, & Celebrations Committee Meeting of June 26, 2017 regarding the reappointment of Kathy Born to the CRA Board**

Ms. Born said that the City Council voted to reappoint her and she was sworn in for a second term on July 18. Mr. Bator noted that the comments appropriately reflected Ms. Born's contributions and that the CRA Board is grateful to have Ms. Born as a chairperson as she has given the organization valuable credibility in the community with her leadership and vision.

The letter will be placed on file.

**4. Letter from Agassiz Baldwin Community regarding the 2017 Forward Fund Grant June 30, 2017**

Mr. Evans noted that the letter expressed thanks for the funds that have allowed them to create a play structure for children.

The letter will be placed on file.

**Reports, Motions and Discussion Items**

**5. Presentation: Community Art Center My Totem Pole Project at Parcel Six**

Mr. Peralta distributed a handout. He introduced Community Arts Center (CAC) Executive Director Eryn Johnson and teaching visual artist Lionel Blaise. He explained that this project adds to the activation of Parcel 6 by beautifying the black fence. Ms. Johnson noted that the CAC is also a 2017 Forward Fund recipient who is also working on the kiosk for the Port neighborhood. The My Totem Project is entirely a preteen program. Mr. Blaise explained the process used by him, the visiting artist Stephen Hamilton, and the youths. The handout included examples of Mr. Hamilton's work. The end product will be a 50-60 foot mural consisting of a series of colorful panels hung vertically along the fence. Each panel features totems or symbols of significance expressed by the youth. The material used for the panels is light and durable so it can withstand the weather. The installation should be installed by the end of August. There will also be a celebration and everyone is invited. The CAC art truck, Vincent VAN GO, will make an appearance as well. Mr. Peralta said that there will also be a descriptive panel explaining the installation.

**6. 88 Ames Street Residential Project Exterior Signage Package**

***Motion: To Approve the Signage Proposal for the 88 Ames Street Residential Project Parcel Four of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area***

Ms. Born said that there was a Design Review meeting before tonight's Board meeting where the contents of the package were discussed. Mr. Evans asked for a synopsis since there were additional audience members present than those who were at the Design Review meeting.

David Stewart of Boston Properties explained that the submission for the exterior signage is for the residential portion of the building along 88 Ames Street and all of the signage conceptually contemplated during the Planning Board's approval for the Pioneer Way portion of the project, including the screens on the south side of 5 Cambridge Center along Pioneer Way, the bike shed, and the façade facing the open space at the northwest corner of the site.

Ms. Born said that the Design Review committee asked questions and felt that the submission was good but needed some changes with respect to the bike storage.

Mr. Stewart confirmed that the building name is Proto.

Based on the results of the Design Review meeting, Mr. Zogg drafted a new motion.

*The CRA Board approves the signage proposal for the 88 Ames Street Residential Project Parcel Four of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area presented today on the condition that Boston Properties works with CRA staff on the following refinements:*

- *Pioneer Way signage, history panel, and digitization*
- *Rescaling of the bike shed sign on the horizontal band and possible revision of wording*
- *Discuss reconsidering the use of universal bike symbol in combination with wayfinding and artwork with CDD*
- *Work to develop a more intuitive hierarchy for the bike parking wayfinding language throughout the project to help more clearly define the three types of bike parking in the zoning ordinance*

There was no discussion on the motion.

The motion was made, seconded and carried unanimously.

Mr. Evans noted that in accordance with the CRA Design Review process, there is always staff follow-up ensuring that the end result is as presented to the Board.

## **7. Presentation: Grand Junction Corridor Transit Demand Analysis (Mr. Evans)**

***Motion: To authorize the Executive Director and the Chair to enter into a sole source contract with IBI Group to conduct a transit service demand analysis of the Grand Junction Rail Corridor, building off the planning work conducted by the Kendall Square Mobility Task Force, for an amount not to exceed \$50,000.***

Mr. Evans distributed a document outlining a draft scope of services that was recently written. He explained that the Kendall Square Mobility Task Force (KSMTF) has been meeting for about 2.5 years. It was originally created by the governor and run by the state but then taken over by the City. It focused on four areas of work - the Red Line; bus circulation; increased efficiency of more informal transit such as shuttles and ride-hailing services; and the Grand Junction (GJ) Corridor. The CRA is a member of the task force. At the end of last year, IBI, who was hired by the State, published a 50-page technical report on the feasibility of transit in the Grand Junction corridor. This can be found on the City's website.

The KSMTF would like to continue to hire IBI for further needs analysis of the GJ corridor as an urban rail system as there were design challenges mentioned in the report. Mr. Evans noted that this would also require working with CTPS (Central Transportation Planning Staff), the State agency that is in charge of a regional model of growth. Although KSTEP funds would not be used for the study, the result of the study could determine if KSTEP funds would be used for implementation. A sole source contract with IBI is proposed as they have already done a considerable amount of work. The CRA is allowed to sole source with justification. Mr. Evans will research whether it is necessary to have a second, separate contract with CTPS, whose intergovernmental work is not subject to 30B. The contract with IBI might provide assistance for creating the CTPS proposal. Mr. Evans would like budgetary permission to move forward and would come back to the Board with more specifics on the contract(s).

The Grand Junction line runs from North Station to Allston-Brighton along the Mass. Pike. There was a discussion about the interplay of this and the Interstate 90 work being planned. Mr. Kaiser suggested contacting the author of the Core Capacity Study.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans said that the draft scope of work is an edited version initially written by CDD staff so the City is aware of the intention. MassDOT and MBTA were part of the task force and are aware of the study. Ms. Born mentioned that there have been heated discussions involving trains on the GJ. Mr. Evans said that the scale being discussed now is very different. He added that many cities are looking at using existing rail corridors for transit.

*A motion to authorize the Executive Director to explore sole source contracts with IBI Group and CTPS to conduct a transit service demand analysis of the Grand Junction Rail Corridor, building off the planning work conducted by the Kendall Square Mobility Task Force, for an amount not to exceed \$50,000 was seconded and carried unanimously.*

The agenda moved to item 9 since Ms. Madden had not yet arrived.

## **9. Update: Volpe Project – Transit and Community Facilities**

Mr. Evans said that there have been a number of conversations taking place regarding the community benefits that would grow out of the Volpe development. The CRA has been brought into those conversations involving transit and community facilities. The CRA crafted an MOU for the KSTEP program that was agreed upon by the City and the State as a mechanism to fund transit from the MXD development. The staff of the CRA and City expected this to be the mechanism for future transit infrastructure investments in the area rather than creating different buckets with different governing structures. However, the petition submitted does not reference the KSTEP and seems to create another funding structure.

The second item that came up in the Volpe Task Force meeting included the desire for a community facility for East Cambridge. Since the CRA is redeveloping the Foundry building, a duplication of efforts should be avoided.

The petition also affects the disposition of Parcel 6, which is included in the zoning proposal. Ms. Born said that MIT is looking for enactment by the end of the year. She listed a number of meetings as an opportunity for the CRA to weigh in as a group on the issues that affect the CRA. Ms. Born suggested that Mr. Evans represent the CRA. Mr. Evans suggested sending a letter regarding the KSTEP omission to the officials reviewing the petition. Ms. Born would like something to be drafted in time for the next Planning Board meeting to make the CRA position known on the various fronts even if all the details cannot be fully enumerated. Ms. Hoffman asked to include possible negative effects on the 6<sup>th</sup> Street corridor and any development that is planned for the top of the garage. Mr. Bator wants MITIMCO and the City to understand that the CRA Board has a concern as a public entity. Mr. Zevin expressed interest in MITIMCO offering more public open space than community facilities. Ms. Born noted that financial support of the Foundry could be a possibility. Ms. Shore suggested including coordination with the Binney streetscape design. Mr. Bator noted that other coordination issues might also arise in the future so it might not be advisable to limit concerns to just the items known today. He also suggested citing that the CRA Board authorized such a letter be written. There was a long discussion regarding zoning ordinance negotiations, the PUD approval process, the community benefits committee, and governance for transit contributions. Mr. Evans added that the CRA should be involved in the retail plan for the Volpe project as it could negatively affect regulations in the Infill Development Concept Plan that enforce a retail percentage within new buildings. Mr. Evans added that an open space versus height discussion with the community might be useful. There is also concern that the future development will diminish existing CRA open space, particularly the Sixth Street Path.

*A motion directing the Executive Director and the Chair to draft correspondence reflecting the conversation of the Board regarding the zoning proposal was seconded and carried unanimously.*

The meeting went back to talk about agenda item #8.

## **8. Update: Foundry Redevelopment Project**

Mr. Evans distributed a draft version of the Foundry Request for Information (RFI). This version includes feedback from the Foundry Advisory Committee and the City.

Ms. Madden said the schedule anticipates a procurement for the designer in the fall, and an RFP and operator selection in early 2018. The RFI is designed to encourage the submittal of ideas and input, with a low barrier to entry and minimal requirements. The RFI is not a procurement process, and there is an allowance for further one-on-one discussions with submitters. The goal is to keep the RFI brief and focused on building operations. Ms. Madden explained the seven questions in Section 3 - community engagement now and in the future, recruitment of nonprofit community tenants to meet the goals of the community while having some revenue stream, the process for leasing market-rate space, coordination of property management with program management, coordination of the various programs and tenants, measuring operational success, and the management structure.

In response to Ms. Drury, Ms. Madden said that MassDOT, federal General Services Administration (GSA), and other government agencies use RFIs. Ms. Hoffman noted that the first full paragraph on the right side of page 3 should accurately reflect that the preference for the Foundry's use be a municipal or community building and to not refer to the minimal amount of space to be set aside for educational, cultural, or institutional uses. There was a discussion of whether zoning information should be included at all since it is not pertinent to the RFI questions about operational strategies. Ms. Drury said that it is important to include the zoning language.

Mr. Hawkinson questioned withholding RFI responses for public inspection until after the Operator procurement process. Mr. Evans is concerned that potential submitters might not share their creative ideas otherwise. CRA legal counsel feels that the CRA can proceed in the manner described in the RFI.

Ms. Madden agreed that the Foundry Mission statement should be highlighted. Ms. Drury suggested emphasizing the desirable goals such as workforce development and underrepresented Cambridge organizations.

CRA staff will attend the Neighborhood and Long Term Planning, Public Facilities, Arts and Celebrations Committee hearing next Wednesday, July 26. The next step toward implementation is to amend the Demonstration Plan, which is planned for a vote of the CRA Board and City Council in September 2017.

As Chair, Ms. Born chose to discuss the CRA contribution to the Foundry in a public format rather than executive session. This discussion is in preparation for a meeting with the City Manager. Mr. Evans spoke about the CRA plans for allocating the funds from the Boston Properties development rights for 145 Broadway (\$23 million). From these funds, the CRA has committed \$3 million to the Kendall Square Transit Enhancement Program (KSTEP) fund and \$540,000 for a soft loan to Just-A-Start for its Wellington-Harrington fire recovery. For the Foundry, the CRA has been considering a contribution of \$8 million, which would be targeted for design, internal fit-out construction, and operations (capitalized initial year operating costs and an operating reserve to sustain the building over time and in unforeseen conditions). The CRA would also like to not only continue but increase the amount of the Forward Fund. The Windsor Street project is estimated to require \$2 million in addition to the funding received from the Community Preservation Act (CPA). Public art is another program that the CRA has voiced an interest in pursuing. A common allocation is one percent of total project costs. Other potential projects could be Alewife and other projects mentioned in the CRA strategic plan, as well as various economic loan programs. There is also the question of whether the CRA should invest in real estate. The CRA operational costs hover around \$1 million per year, or more if contractors are used for large design projects such as streetscape design. There is no certainty that there will be continued development in the MXD beyond the 145 Broadway building, so it is not clear if and when there would be another infusion of money. Over the next 11 years, the Ames Street project will contribute \$431,000 per year to the CRA for development rights. The CRA Board and staff discussed the financial situation if no future development occurs before the urban renewal plan expires in 2030.

Ms. Drury stated that the Windsor project fits the mission of the CRA. The City asked the CRA to work on Windsor. Ms. Born wants the Foundry contribution to fit within the long-term budgeting and financial picture for the CRA. Mr. Bator noted that the CRA Board is deeply committed to the Foundry and wants to be responsive to the City Manager; however, since the CRA does not have a predictable revenue stream, the Board doesn't want the Foundry to dominate the budget, when the CRA's long range interest is in investing the funds from Kendall Square development to benefit the rest of the City. The CRA has a 50-year obligation through the Foundry lease.

#### **10. Update: Staff Report and Quarterly Financial Report**

Mr. Evans said that the annual auditor's three-day fieldwork visit is completed. Under the law passed at the end of 2016, redevelopment authorities were able to create an OPEB account. The auditors noted that all OPEB accounts created under this new law will require a legal trust document. Staff has edited templates from other government agencies which legal counsel will need to review. CRA hired a new bookkeeping services contractor who, functioning in a comptroller role, has reviewed the first quarter financials.

There have been continued talks with multiple financial advisors regarding a more aggressive investment of CRA funds. The idea of sustaining CRA operations by using the Ames Street revenue and the revenue income from investments would require investing the entire \$23M. Mr. Bator said that he, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Evans and Ms. Shore met with Cambridge Trust who proposed a different strategy than the one that the CRA currently uses with Morgan Stanley. The end goal is for prudent but more aggressive investment.

Mr. Evans said that two high school students from the Mayor's Youth Summer Employment Program (MYSEP) have been interning at the CRA collecting data on the uses of Kendall Square open spaces. Alexandra Levering has accepted the offer for the Planner position and will be starting August 28.

On the future calendar, Mr. Evans noted that once the Demonstration Plan is amended, it will need the CRA Board's approval. Boston Properties will come to the Board to report on 145 Broadway's building identity including signage and lobby ground-level graphics. The Broad will report on the work done on its museum since the fire hazard was removed. Massive amounts of staff time have been spent dealing with Veolia and their construction on Parcel 7, the eventual Binney Street Park. Negotiations are also occurring with Veolia on the required renovations and tree replacements in the Grand Junction Park as this park is also affected. A few of the trees slated for removal will be moved to Parcel 6 before construction starts on the Grand Junction. Among items for the 145 Broadway permit approval are ensuring that the ground landscaping coordinates with the streetscape design, ongoing lighting review, and other landscape refinements in the back of the building related to the CRA easement. All reviews of all their design documents have been positive. They have been holding to the design intent.

#### **Adjournment**

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:52 p.m. was seconded and carried unanimously.