

Regular Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, July 20, 2016, 5:30pm
Robert Healy Public Safety Center / Cambridge Police Station / Community Room
125 Sixth Street, Cambridge, MA

APPROVED - REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Call

Vice Chair Margaret Drury was acting Chair and called the regular meeting at 5:36 p.m. CRA Chair Kathleen Born was participating remotely due to geographic distance. Other Board members present were Treasurer Christopher Bator, Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford, and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. Also present at the meeting were Executive Director Tom Evans, Office Manager Ellen Shore, and Project Manager Carlos Peralta. Program Manager Jason Zogg is arriving late. Because of the remote participation by Ms. Born, all votes will be taken by roll call.

The meeting is being recorded by the CRA Office Manager.

Public Comment

Mr. Stephen Kaiser spoke of his communication letter to the Board which outlined the serious impact on transit due to the large developments proposed at North Station, Kendall Square, North Point and Somerville. He doesn't think that the City of Boston and the MBTA understand the balance of expected development with providing sufficient transit capacity. He believes that Cambridge has a better understanding of that relationship. He added that the Kendall Square Mobility Task Force, who recently met after an 8-month lapse, is no longer being funded by the State, MassDOT. The City of Cambridge has taken over the study but he was told that capacity is no longer in the scope. He is very concerned that the issue of capacity isn't being sufficiently addressed. The next topic he discussed related to the Notice of Project Change. He said that he reads the table on page 5 to state that the gross square feet could be two million, rather than the one million, so he would like to see the traffic analysis of the impact from the increase. Under MEPA, the project is not to be segmented. However, if one phase can be independent from the second, then a 2-phase project is possible and that is what he will recommend to MEPA. He asked for a scope of the second phase along with more specific analysis. He is also concerned about increasing spaces for off-street parking as he believes there are too many spaces already and too many cars. Overall, he is disappointed that the issues of transit seem to have lost the progress made last year and he would like to see these fixed. He added that while the transit MOU has good motivations, the voluntary attendance of the meetings will affect progress. He suggested that funds be directed to the CRA Board so that it can make the expenditures. He mentioned that the Transit Control Board is back on track after settling issues with the unions but it only has two more years to do something.

There were no other requests to enter a comment.

The motion to close public comment was moved and seconded. A roll call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – yes
Mr. Crawford – yes
Ms. Drury – yes
Mr. Bator – yes
Ms. Born – yes

Public comment was unanimously closed.

Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on June 15, 2016

There were no comments or discussion.

The motion to place the minutes on file was moved and seconded. A role call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – yes
Mr. Crawford – yes
Ms. Drury – yes
Mr. Bator – yes
Ms. Born – yes

There was a unanimous decision to place the minutes on file.

Communications

2. Correspondence from East End House regarding Forward Fund, July 6, 2016

The CRA Board appreciates the positive feedback. Mr. Evans hopes to schedule a tour at some point. Mr. Crawford has seen the facility and was impressed with the programming.

3. Email from Stephen Kaiser regarding Kendall Square Transportation, July 13, 2016

Mr. Evans referred to Mr. Kaiser's public comment and stated that table S1 on page 5 of the Notice of Project Change is confusing. Table S2 on page 7 reflects the delta increase which is only 90,000; it is not another million. The increase of 90,000 is due to the exemption for ground floor retail, middle income housing and innovation space that has been part of the Infill Development Concept Plan discussions. The chart that is imposed by MEPA makes it look like there is an additional million. Mr. Kaiser didn't agree. Mr. Evans said that further clarity will be shown in a later agenda item.

Mr. Evans added that the mobility task force is back together, looking at Kendall Square as well as regional issues across the river. All elements of transit planning are being discussed. The resources that the State put forth were initially on bus capacity as that was the quickest way to make a short-term impact.

The motion to place both documents on file was moved and seconded. A role call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – yes
Mr. Crawford – yes
Ms. Drury – yes
Mr. Bator – yes
Ms. Born – yes

There was a unanimous decision to place both documents on file.

Reports, Motions and Discussion Items

Mr. Evans asked to rearrange the order of the items and move to item #6 since the group reporting on agenda item #3 is currently with City staff.

6. Presentation: Proposed Cambridge Trust Bank Branch at 415 Main Street

Motion: To approve the schematic signage package for the Cambridge Trust Branch at 415 Main Street, (7CC) Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan

Mr. Ben Lavery, now of MITIMCO, introduced the representative from Cambridge Trust Bank and Kristen Keefe of MITIMCO and gave a summary of the situation. A special permit was granted to MIT comprising

of six buildings (5 large, 1 small) and an expansion of parking spaces in a below grade garage. His Powerpoint presentation showed the location of these buildings. The utility work will be starting in August and is very involved, affecting four blocks. Construction for the below grade garage, which will be the foundation for buildings #3, #4, and #5 in the site plan, should be starting in the beginning of 2017. There is an effort to relocate the existing businesses within the district as best as possible.

Ms. Kristen Keefe, recently hired by MITIMCO, gave an overview of retail development plan. There is currently 49,000 square feet of retail within the development area, which will be doubled. She used a slide to show the placement of the new retail, which activates all building edges where possible. Although the zoning only requires 25% of active ground-floor retail space, there will be 75%. There will be 2 acres of open space, created by submerging the parking, which will be programmed. There will be a hyper-focus on strong local operators as 50% of the leasing is a requirement of the zoning. The development will be anchored by a pharmacy and an urban grocer. There will be a heavy focus on food and experiential retail that brings people together. Another slide showed a picture of the gateway to the MIT campus, which is currently the T-stop location and falls between buildings #4 and #5. As shown, the retail will be spilling onto the sidewalk creating indoor-outdoor activation. The operational hours will be extended on weekends and nights.

The next slide showed the proposed location for the Cambridge Trust Bank, on the corner of Ames Street and Main Street where Sebastians is now. Sebastians approached MITIMCO to right-size their space to make profit margins more appealing which conveniently led to a solution for the location for the bank.

Mr. Tom Johnson, Director of Consumer Banking at Cambridge Trust, spoke next. He introduced the bank's President, Mr. Denis Sheahan and Mr. Tom Chiudina, the architect from DRL Associates. The bank is 126 years old. Five of their eleven branches are in Cambridge. Their first branch was in Harvard Square. Their second branch was opened in Kendall Square and has been in the current space for 47 years. It is an important office with long-standing clients but is also the fastest growing office. Currently, they offer the use of their Harvard Square boardroom to nonprofits and local community groups and would like to do the same in Kendall Square. With this move, Cambridge Trust would like to incorporate less traditional banking concepts in the financial services and transparency in the design. Mr. Chiudina spoke about the proposed space and layout. The new entrance is on the corner of the space. The café seating from Sebastians will be extended along Ames Street. Plantings and landscapes would be added on Ames Street as well as on the Main Street side. To provide transparency and flexibility, he described three glass-moving partitions which create a vestibule containing a free-standing ATM, a small collaboration space, and a large multipurpose space. There will be waiting areas, with recharging capacity, and a coffee bar. There are rooms for offices, teller-pods, and greeters. He showed the new awnings and described the signage on Ames Street and Main Street.

Ms. Drury stated that the pictures show clear glass, which implies that the current glass windows of Sebastians would need to be replaced. Ms. Drury clarified that this Board should be shown what is intended. Mr. Lavery said that MITIMCO would look into this issue. Mr. Chiudina said that decals might be put onto the indoor glass walls for visual safety situations. A more formal signage package will come to the Board once the conceptual approval is given.

Ms. Drury stated that she is not fond of the bank product advertisements that are posted on the walls of the Harvard branch. Mr. Chiudina said those are seasonal posters that were approved. Mr. Zevin noted that the qualms with banks as retail space are that there is minimal interaction with the street. Seeing an empty conference room is not necessarily an activation of the space. He suggested showcasing items from local merchants in the windows on a rotating basis.

In response to Mr. John Hawkinson, the reduction of Sebastian's space is from 3500 square feet to just over 2000 square feet.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Lavery stated that MITIMCO is looking for an approval on the concept but that the team would come back with a proposal specific to signage. Ms. Born suggested that the planters on

Main Street and Ames Street be robust and be maintained in all seasons. Mr. Lavery agreed but stated it was undecided whose responsibility that would be. Mr. Lavery stated that MITIMCO would evaluate the glass' transparency issue and come back to the board.

In response to Mr. Zevin, a location for the clock hasn't been determined. Mr. Evans agreed to work with MITIMCO and Cambridge Trust to find a location for it.

Mr. Bator reemphasized that the CRA Board is "rendering-sensitive" but feels that the proposed design is attractive.

In response to Mr. Evans, Mr. Chiudina stated that he is envisioning LED halo lit signage. Mr. Bator was pleased that the font lettering wasn't changing.

The revised motion to approve the conceptual schematic design package for the Cambridge Trust Branch at 415 Main Street, (7CC) Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan with the expectation of further review that will include the glazing, lighting, and sign dimensions was moved and seconded. A role call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – yes
Mr. Crawford – yes
Ms. Drury – yes
Mr. Bator – yes
Ms. Born – yes

There was a unanimous decision to approve the motion.

7. Presentation: Main Street Banners

Motion: To authorize the design of the seasonal Kendall Center banner program along streetlights on Main Street replacing previous Cambridge Center median flags. (KSURP)

A presentation was handed out and Ms. Laura Sesody from Boston Properties (BP) explained that BP agreed to replace the light pole banners that existed along Main Street (on the BP side only) before the construction. The City is purchasing the banner hardware. The intent is to brand the BP project, continue the Kendall Square Association branding, and introduce #KSQ as a social media. Looking at the examples, the KSA color scheme is used. The City only allows a banner on one side of the poles. Ms. Sesody noted that option #3 is well-liked due to the larger hashtag. The 8 poles would have alternating banners.

Mr. Evans added that the banner program is linked to the Marriott Plaza maintenance agreement that the CRA has with BP. He noted that Point Park is also allowed to have banners. The banners used to change seasonally. Weathered flags are replaced so there is an opportunity for design change.

Mr. Crawford suggested having the design on the banner reflect the wrap-around nature of the KSQ sculpture as that is becoming an icon. Mr. Evans suggested bending the hashtag. Mr. Zevin pointed out that the sculpture squishes the 'S' and the "Q" into a square and suggested that the typography read that way. Mr. Zevin liked option #1 with a diagonal placement of the hashtag. Mr. Evans suggested using the corner of the banner for a wrap-around hashtag look.

Ms. Sesody noted that since the banners can only be hung on one side of the pole, the layout wouldn't look like it is depicted in the presentation. The banners will read in the same direction as traffic. The banner is opaque with both sides having a design.

Mr. Bator liked both sides of Main Street to have banners. Mr. Zevin said that it wasn't the CRA's decision but rather MIT's. Mr. Evans noted that staff could work with BP and MITIMCO to see if they would be open to participate in the same block. MIT has been very involved in the banner and branding elements of Kendall Square through the KSA. However, there is a lot of construction coming down their way so they haven't participated in the wayfinding program as of yet. They are trying to avoid impacting Main Street with their utility work. Ms. Drury likes having the banners on both sides of the street as they would have a larger

impact. In response to Mr. Crawford, Ms. Sesody said that the banners were primarily promoting Kendall Square. Mr. Michael O'Hearn from Boston Properties was open to Mr. Zevin's idea to use banners on the poles to promote the Cambridge Science Festival. Mr. Evans added that there are banners in other places within the City promoting the festival.

The motion to authorize the design of the seasonal Kendall Center banner program along streetlights on both sides of Main Street replacing previous Cambridge Center median flags was moved and seconded. A role call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

There was a unanimous decision to approve the motion.

There was a short break to allow for setup for the next agenda item.

4. Presentation: MXD Infill Development Urban Design

A large 3D model mockup of the area was brought into the meeting. Mr. Mike Tilford from Boston Properties (BP) went through a quick summary using a Powerpoint presentation. The first slide enumerated the numerous outreach meetings, which have informed much of what is being presented today. Mr. Tilford explained that Sasaki will be speaking about the entire master plan and open space, Pickard Chilton will discuss 11CC (145 Broadway), followed by SCB on the North Garage (135 Broadway) which contains all the residential in two buildings, and Perkins + Will will discuss the commercial building on 14CC (250 Main Street). He explained the four phases - starting with the 11CC building, followed by the building with the bulk of the residential, then the commercial building on Binney and lastly, the smaller residential building. BP's goal is to file in August along Article 14. The master plan and the 11CC building would be brought for special permit approval. Then each subsequent building would be brought forth for a special design review separately in the future.

He then showed a slide with the 2015 approach followed by the current approach. The latter breaks up the commercial massing, provides more active residential use in the middle, puts the two commercial buildings on the outside, and clusters all the innovation space into 1CC which is the front door to Kendall Square. He noted that the current approach is in closer alignment to the K2 Report and the Smart Blocks Study with residential at the ends of the garage and commercial at the corners.

Mr. Alan Ward from Sasaki then spoke about the ground plan and pedestrian circulation within the district. Referencing a slide from the presentation, Mr. Ward noted that the four new buildings in the northern part of the MXD district presented an opportunity to improve pedestrian connections, which were outlined in red. Based on feedback, some minor refinements are yet to come. He noted the significant street level improvements of active use and lobby space around 11CC, 14CC and near the residential buildings. The next slide showed areas for short-term bike parking, most of which is within 50 feet of a residential building. There is long-term bike parking in the nearby garages. The vehicular circulation follows the current flow. The west alley northbound is one-way and provides access to the garage as well as access to new parking below 11CC. The east alley southbound provides access to the garage and access to parking below 14CC. The next slide showed an enlarged view of the pedestrian circulation using weighted lines. There is a proposal for a new bike path, separate from a pedestrian path, along the 6th street walkway, as long as it doesn't negatively affect the tree roots. Better lighting is being proposed to this area as well as upgrades to the paving and new seating. He then spoke about the redesign of Broadway Park. Opening it up with access from multiple directions creates the feel of a larger park and makes it more usable. Enhanced plantings, various seating options, paving to delineate travel, and a water basin are included in the proposal. The park edge would be activated. A community table idea was shown in lieu of an earlier café concept. The Binney Street Park is a greener, softer space and its design is still being discussed. Mr. Ward showed some pictures of possible ideas.

Mr. Derrick Johnson from Perkins + Will spoke about the design of 14CC, a 14-story commercial building, using the model. He talked about the urban design of a building presenting itself to pedestrians from a singular mass to an interesting design. The building should have a relation to the 6th Street connector. He talked about the importance of the 6th Street corner at Binney. The building faces should relate to the parks. The building currently includes lab offices with a ground floor active space along the connector and a lobby on Binney. There is a desire to have a strong presence on Binney.

Mr. Devin Patterson from SCB spoke about the residential buildings on the North Garage. The guiding principles are the apartment units and giving the residents access to the urban environment. The residential is distributed between two towers. The larger of the two is on the south side where the height can go up to 350 feet. Condominiums will also be available. Having a tall and slender building is desirable to create more desirable views. The goal is to have an identifiable building. The shorter, smaller scale building on the north side responds to the nearby neighborhood and openspace.

Mr. Tony Markese from Pichard Chilton spoke about the office building at 11CC. He introduced his colleague, Mr. David Brown. This project will be built first. Negotiations with a tenant are close which he stressed as an important factor to the design of the building. While the initial building design had fit the guidelines, it was ordinary. He noted that the building is a gateway and should be a marker to the area. He then showed the new design with a jenga-shaped façade on Broadway and explained the possibilities. This design makes the massing more exciting. He described the other aspects of the building, relating to solar orientation and the parks. He noted that there will be a request to go over the tower separation over a certain height. The formal submission will have more detail.

Mr. Markese said that it was smart for BP to have three different architect firms since there will be three different compositions but there should be some connections. Mr. Zevin feels that it's better to have a little overlap. Mr. Markese suggested modifying guidelines if it makes a better dynamic end result. In response to Ms. Drury, the height limit for the "jenga" building is at the 250 feet. The guidelines do allow for buildings to go above that limit for mechanical elements or for creating a more interesting sky profile. Mr. Crawford likes the opportunity to add texture to Kendall Square. Mr. Crawford's questioned the programming from the street level as well as for those living in nearby buildings. Mr. Markese hopes to have the roofscapes occupiable or for them to be green spaces. Mr. Markese noted that the building itself provides a more interesting visual experience. The under surfaces would need to be detailed. The prows provide good views for the occupant.

Mr. Zevin stated that there is a dearth of bay windows in the area and he would like to see more of this dimension. He also stated that the pedestrian activity along Binney Street curving onto Galileo Way might not be as active as indicated in the presentation. Mr. Ward anticipates this to increase with the popularity of the future park. Mr. Zevin is also concerned with the proposed retail space and the possible conflict of the pedestrian activity near a bike lane. In addition, the success of the ground floor situation is hard to predict without more information regarding Volpe. Mr. Evans stated that planning for retail space on the north side of the building in the initial plan is easier than trying to bring this activity to the area later. In response to Ms. Drury's question regarding the absence of balconies in the larger residential building, Mr. Patterson stated that the design is still evolving. Mr. Zevin noted that the balconies should be placed where they make sense. In response to Mr. Evans, the placement of condo units at the top or the base is undecided. In response to Mr. Bator, the size of the condo units will be consistent with BP's Article 14 strategy and the square footage will be laid out to meet the stated thresholds in the zoning.

Mr. Tilford stated the next step will be the design review for the master plan and 11CC. Renderings will be part of the submission. Mr. Evans will work towards scheduling the presentation of the Infill Development Concept Plan to both the CRA Board and the Planning Board simultaneously. This will most likely be at a Planning Board meeting since they have a larger space and meet more often. The scheduling of this meeting might affect the timing of the September CRA Board meeting. There is also a possibility, although not an urban renewal plan requirement, to meet jointly for a second meeting with the Planning Board.

Mr. Evans noted that the feedback received along the way has been incorporated into the present design but he would take other comments to the team. Ms. Born was pleased to see the focus on design and urban experience.

There was no action required by the Board. The Board thanked the BP team who then left the meeting. Mr. Crawford took a video of the model and will send that to Ms. Born since she was participating remotely. Mr. Bator stated that he was pleased to see various building shapes in contrast to what's being built in the Seaport section of Boston. Mr. Zevin thought the BP design was rational. Mr. Evans stated that an articulated height district is a good idea since it develops more diversity in the skyline.

Mr. Evans noted that the order of the meeting is now resuming with item #5

5. Update: Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan

a. MEPA Notice of Project Change

Mr. Evans explained that when the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was filed in October, a consensus on the MOU hadn't been reached. There had been several drafts, but neither the City nor MassDOT were ready for the MOU to go public. MEPA placed a requirement in their certificate on the EIR to receive an MOU for public review by the end of June. It was assumed that the MOU would be well informed by the task force who was scheduled to conclude its work by February. In addition, over the course of the zoning conversations with City Council, 90,000 square feet over the 1 million square feet was added. The Notice of Project Change was the only way for MEPA to create a public review of the MOU. Since the project changed, although by less than 10% of square footage, a review of many of the key chapters was also included. Staff reran the numbers on traffic, water and greenhouse gas. Because the sites changed, a review of the hazardous materials and soil conditions was done, as 14CC wasn't initially included in the EIR. The new plan also recalibrates the parking, which was relocated from 3CC to the North Garage.

The scope of the MEPA document is out for public review through the end of the month. The issue with MEPA needs to be resolved before the CRA Board can make any formal approval of the plan. This doesn't affect the City review since the CRA relationship with MEPA is as a state agency. Extensive analysis has been done which helped inform the TIS which was presented to the City and certified late last week.

b. Kendall Square Transit Enhancement Program – Draft MOU

Mr. Evans noted that the MOU explains the purpose of the program and list the parties - the CRA, the City of Cambridge, MassDOT, and the MBTA. Boston Properties is stated as concurring party. The MOU identifies that the project will create a fund to commit \$6 million to transit enhancements. The CRA Board would allocate those funds with advice from the MOU parties and interested entities. The \$6 million payment comes with the first commercial project. The disbursement is divided into thirds. The first \$2 million payment would be identified and made within the first six months. This short-term improvement would mostly likely occur with buses or some rubber-tired fleet solution, but not necessarily the MBTA. The target for the other two thirds or \$4 million can be held in reserve until a target is identified. Although this amount of money won't go very far, it could leverage other funding sources for enhanced transit service within Kendall Square. Mr. Evans added that the expected assistance from the task force never occurred because they stopped meeting as a group. Therefore the working group will be the partners of the MOU and anyone else who the partners feel should be brought to the table. Another point of discussion that has not been finalized is whether the City Manager or the CRA Board is the final arbitrator for distributing the funds. This becomes a complex issue if the program expands beyond the MXD. The MOU defines a process to formulate a funding figure which is defined in Exhibit A. After a significant amount of research regarding how transit impact fees are assessed in other parts of the country, Mr. Zogg determined that there are many methods used. The MOU's fare recovery rate is based on the expected transit trip that was presented in the EIR. The burden is placed on the commercial so as not to disincentivize residential development. This is the first attempt at a methodology which MassDOT has not questioned although the fares have changed since this was drafted. This explains how the \$6 million figure was determined. At some point, the MOU will need to be signed by the CRA, the City, and the State. Foley Hoag has been

closely involved with the draft. The City solicitor has not looked at this very much but is aware of it. Mr. Evans was not sure if MassDOT has had any legal review. Staff has been working with Joe Barr and Iram Farooq. The earliest initial payment could come due in April 2017 since it is based on the permit. The payment would be on the front end. Some conversations with the BRA have occurred for a potential Red Line fund trust. Mr. Evans stated that since real estate development gains its value off transit, it should contribute to the transit infrastructure.

The task force has done its most interesting work on options for bus expansion, especially with little cost by changing bus routes. Two million dollars could make a large impact to bus transit. In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Evans said that signal prioritization is a subject being discussed for buses. Cameras or some other technology is needed to trigger signals. A discussion about signaling occurred.

Mr. Kaiser noted the subtle use of the word “may.” For the CRA Board to take action it must get the approval of the City Manager but that is not a requirement today for spending money. He also stated that there is too much talk about buses which cannot get through the traffic any better than cars. He agrees that improving the #1 bus makes sense but the idea of bus rapid transit is a waste of money. He urged the Board to spend \$5 million on the Red Line to space their trains regularly which would generate more money without the need for additional trains or personnel. He stressed that this be on the list since it’s the most cost effective. This will generate more income, which could then be used to buy more trains. He suggested using the other million dollars for analysis. Mr. Kaiser proposed using the money for display screens in the trains and monitors to speed trains up and down. He feels that the capacity would increase by 30-50% with just better spacing. All weather bike paths would also help. Mr. Kaiser thought the MOU was workable.

Mr. Evans said that the comments on the NPC were due by the 26th

Mr. Born thanked Mr. Kaiser for his informed analysis.

8. Report: Monthly Staff Report to the Board (Mr. Evans)

Mr. Evans stated that the auditor fieldwork went well. It is helpful to be working with accountant Richard Viscay. A legislative decision on the OPEB fund is expected soon. Checks are not the way of the future so there will be a need to work on controls with respect to electronic and digital transfers, other than direct deposit for the CRA payroll. In response to Ms. Drury, Mr. Evans stated that since Mr. Clark felt that the OPEB legislature would be passed soon, the need for an as-if OPEB fund should be revisited in a few months.

Although civic design projects have a different procurement process than 30B, an RFP was issued for a traffic planning and streetscape redesign for the Binney – Galileo corridor. The CRA has been working with DPW, the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department and CDD to scope out the project. One bid has been received to date. The deadline is Thursday at 4pm. A main objective is to connect the bicycle lane that goes from 3rd & Binney to the MIT-built cycle track along Vassar, creating a continuous bike corridor. This project will be accomplished with Boston Properties’ assistance but the design is being planned with the City.

The CRA also issued a house doctor RFP for a cost estimator to help staff understand construction costs of new construction or rehab projects. Three proposals were received and Mr. Evans would like to enter into a contract with Daedalus Projects. Ms. Born confirmed that they are a reputable firm. Mr. Evans stated that they had a good price-point, a wealth of experience, good references, and a diverse background of past projects. They clearly customized the submission for the RFP. At this time, there is no contract scope but rather the scope would be specified on a project-by-project basis. Per the CRA procurement policy, Mr. Evans asked for a motion since there is a potential to spend more than \$10,000 with this one contractor. When the agenda was distributed, this decision had not been made so the motion is not noted on the agenda. Mr. Evans apologized for the sudden request but he would like to move forward.

Stepping back to the streetscape RFP for the Binney–Galileo corridor, Mr. Zevin noted that the unfortunate engineering situation on the Main Street project should not be replicated. Mr. Evans stated that the City

realizes the issues and assured Mr. Zevin that the level of design will be higher for the Binney Street project. Mr. Evans added that this project will be less complicated since it is not on top of the T.

The motion to enter into a house doctor contract with Daedalus to provide construction estimator services on a project-by-project scope according to the budget, with a review of scope if a project amount is more than \$10,000, was moved and seconded. A roll call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

There was a unanimous decision to approve the motion.

Continuing with the forward calendar, Mr. Evans asked to schedule an August meeting for the fourth Wednesday, August 24. Ms. Katherine Madden is not available on the third Wednesday but Mr. Evans would like the Foundry project to proceed. Another issue to discuss at that time would be the potential selection of a streetscape contractor. The submittals for this RFP are being discussed with the City in two weeks. The date of a combined CRA – Planning Board meeting is another scheduling decision. The need for an August 24th Board meeting will be decided by Friday.

With respect to Parcel 6, the food trucks are on site and gradual improvements are being made. At this time, there is still an issue regarding shade, especially this past week. Staff has worked with CDD to add bike racks and discussions are occurring with the Arts Council for public art and/or performance elements. Mr. John Hawkinson noted that an announcement about the opportunity is out on social media.

The CIC / Graffito developer team will be presenting their Foundry proposal in a public meeting on Thursday. The Foundry Advisory Committee and the Evaluation Committee will then meet on August 2nd to put forth a recommendation to the Board. The decision will be whether to enter into the next round of negotiations with this development entity or to start a new process.

Refinements to Point Park design have gone out to bid and are due today. Mr. Evans noted that requests for contract proposals during the summer months are not ideal but there have been interesting proposals submitted. Mr. Zogg added that Boston Properties would like to start work in the first week of August. Mr. Evans explained that this is the hardscape phase and includes everything from the outer eastern edge of the circle and a few plantings on the grassy knoll area. It does not include a major reconfiguration of the grassy knoll except for a sidewalk and possibly some trees. Mr. Zogg added that wooden benches and the visual interest garden-facing Broadway were also part of this phase. This phase will not solve the “pinch point” created with the City’s newly added bike lane. Staff is working on a set of rules for Kendall Square open spaces and feedback from Boston Properties is expected soon. These rules would need to be approved by the CRA Executive Director and the City Manager. Mr. Evans would come to the CRA Board with the rules before moving forward with them. Mr. Evans noted that there are currently no rules put forth for any parks in the KSURP. In response to Ms. Drury, the City’s rules for parks were used but modified somewhat for Kendall Square.

A great deal of outreach has been done regarding the MXD Infill Development Concept Plan. Mr. Evans noted that the workshop went well but he had hoped for better attendance. He noted that it’s summer and a lot is going on in Cambridge. Intern Liz Pongratz’s presence at the farmer’s market on the plaza drew new people to the workshop. A new interactive map for receiving feedback via coUrbanize was implemented.

The punch list for the Grand Junction Park continues to be whittled down. There are currently 5 to 7 items remaining. The play spinners were lowered yesterday and the play surface will be then be re-poured. Mr. Zogg is hopeful to be done within the next 2-3 weeks. Mr. Evans noted that a more robust irrigation system was also added based on the effort spent on watering the area manually these past two months. He expects the cost to be recouped within 2 years.

9. Report: Quarterly Financial Update and Proposed Mid-Year Budget Revisions

Motion: To approve the Revised CRA Budget for 2016, providing a redistribution of anticipated professional services expenses and a staff salary cost of living adjustment of 2.4%.

Mr. Evans explained that this is the half-year report. The majority of expenses have gone to the capital costs of the Grand Junction and legal expenses for the Foundry and the MXD. Other areas are under budget. Some budget adjustments are required to reflect changes that have occurred in the past six months. The Treasurer and Assistant Treasurer saw a draft of the budget revisions last week. There are four areas of changes. The first change shows a stronger income level. Although the payment from Boston Properties for Ames Street development rights was originally scheduled for last year, CRA auditors said to book this income in 2016. More revenue is also expected from the food trucks at Parcel 6. Income from a Foundry ground lease is not expected this year.

The second change is a slight increase in salaries based on discussions with the ad hoc personnel committee, the CRA Chair and Vice Chair. The suggestion is to provide a 2.4% COLA adjustment. CRA Medicare and social security expenses are not tracking as high as projected. However, the one-time payment to the Cambridge Retirement Board was higher than expected. For a small organization, personnel changes have a great influx to the annual cost. There is an adjustment in insurance due to recalibrating the replacement cost of the galaxy structure. The printing expenditure is higher than predicted and Verizon's phone service continues to increase. In addition, there is a proposed budget increase for landscape maintenance to maintain the CRA parks and for electricity to keep the fountain running.

To keep the budget balanced, funds have been shifted within the professional services. Boston Properties and Sasaki have done more design work than predicted. A new line item, called Transportation Planning, will reflect the streetscape work with an \$80,000 budget for 2016. There wasn't as much spent on the Forward Fund as budgeted. In addition, the status of negotiations on the Foundry will not require the \$2 million in funds to be designated toward this project in 2016. The proposed budget keeps expenses flat. As discussed with the Treasurer, a \$2 million CD, maturing in 2017, can be rolled over into the Foundry Fund. If Boston Properties is successful with their special permit in the spring of next year, there will be more income due to that project's commercial development.

There was a long discussion on the topic on the relationship between construction and occupancy and payment regarding the residential and commercial buildings for Ames Street and the MXD Infill Development Concept Plan. Mr. Evans will report back to the Board with a summary. To recap, Mr. Evans stated that the budget has a slight increase in personnel costs, a major change in income, and a recalibration of professional services to have a focused line item for the work on Binney Street.

The motion to approve the revised CRA budget for 2016, providing a redistribution of anticipated professional services expenses and a staff salary cost of living adjustment of 2.4% was made and seconded. A roll call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

There was a unanimous decision to approve the motion.

Mr. Evans reminded the audience about the Foundry meeting tomorrow at City Hall that will be televised, stream-able and recorded.

Adjournment

The motion to adjourn the meeting was seconded and a role call was taken.

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

There was a unanimous decision to approve the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 pm.