

Regular Board Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday November 18, 2020 at 5:30pm
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting was held virtually via Zoom

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

At 5:34 p.m., Alex Levering read the opening statements:

In response to the current COVID-19 situation, the Governor has suspended certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law allowing government bodies to meet using remote participation. In accordance with the Order, the CRA is holding this meeting via Zoom webinar. In a webinar format, all attendees, except panelists, will have their videos suspended and be muted unless specifically unmuted by the host. There will be opportunities for public comment at the start of the meeting and at the discretion of the Chair. To provide public comment, please press the "raise hand" icon at the bottom of your screen and you will be called upon to speak. Once you are called on, you will need to press unmute. You may identify yourself but are not required to do so. After stating your comment or question, you will be re-muted. Alternatively, you can use the Q&A function to type a question or comment. If you are calling in via phone and have no access to computer or smart phone, you can call the CRA's main line at 617-492-6800 and press extension 11 to bypass the opening messages or you can email planning@CambridgeRedevelopment.org.

Board meeting materials can be found on the CRA's next meeting webpage. This meeting is being recorded by the CRA, including all video, QA, and audio.

Call

Chair Kathleen Born called the virtual meeting. A roll call of Board members and a confirmation that the meeting was audible to them was taken.

Vice Chair Conrad Crawford – present and audible
Treasurer Chris Bator - present and audible
Assistant Treasurer Barry Zevin - present and audible
Assistant Secretary Margaret Drury – present and audible

CRA staff members in attendance were Executive Director Tom Evans, Alex Levering, Carlos Peralta, Ellen Shore, Erica Schwarz, Hema Kailasam, Fabiola Alikpokou, and Kathryn Madden.

As this is a remote meeting, all votes will be taken by roll call and responses will be repeated for the record by Mr. Evans.

Public Comment

Elena Sokolow-Kaufman, spoke on behalf of the Cambridge Nonprofit Coalition. She thanked the CRA for the PPE Covid relief grants for child care and youth serving organizations. She thanked Mr. Peralta for bringing forth the concerns in an effective way. She offered to share findings of a CNC-conducted survey on the financial impact of the pandemic on Cambridge serving nonprofits and to share her suggestions for the grant process.

Erin Muirhead McCarty, new Executive Director of the Community Arts Center (CAC), spoke about its financial hardships as well as those in the community. Mr. Peralta and she have discussed the past CRA-CNC relationship. She suggested collaborating on a teen mural-painting project in the spring

Dan Marshall, Executive Artistic Director for the Brookline and Cambridge Community Center for the Arts, was interested in the future of the CRA Forward Fund and whether funds would always be restricted to capital grants.

Ms. Born acknowledged that the CRA is currently discussing this topic. Mr. Bator said that the Board has every intention to continue with the Forward Fund in some form. The program was adjusted this year due to the issues raised by the pandemic. Mr. Evans added that the Forward Fund has been in existence for five years. Ms. Born said that the Board can entertain the discussion about a broader range of activities but may be constrained by legislation in some cases. Mr. Evans said that the conversation can be continued later in the communication portion of the agenda.

There were no other requests for comment

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

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford - yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on October 21, 2020

There were no amendments or changes.

A motion was moved by Mr. Bator to accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on October 21, 2020 and place them on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford - yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

Communications

2. October 1, 2020 Correspondence from the Cambridge Nonprofit Coalition regarding the CRA Forward Fund program

Ms. Born said that the Forward Fund budget for next year has not yet been determined. She expects the amount to be coincident with any additional COVID-19 relief programs that may be implemented solely or in concert with the City of Cambridge. Mr. Evans said that the program has traditionally invested in brick-and-mortar components of nonprofit owned facilities that are serving the Cambridge Community. Staff is continuing to assess past mechanics and mission of the program. There might be additional funding for emergency relief related to COVID-19. CRA council is investigating possibilities for more flexibility in response to an emergency, economic recovery, or support as a one-time instance while keeping the Forward Fund on its focused track. There might be two programs. There is also the desire to help the City fill-in any gaps they might have regarding emergency relief.

A definition of “capital” as presented in the letter was discussed with CRA lawyer Jeffrey Mullan. While the word “capital” has been used in the Forward Fund program and other CRA strategic planning initiatives, Mr. Mullan advised that the enabling state legislation allows for investments to address or prevent blight. There might be ways to broaden that scope with respect to 21st century redevelopment. Staff is planning to bring a proposal to the Board in December. Mr. Bator said that it is the practice of the Board to aggressively push the boundaries and work imaginatively with the CRA lawyers for the good of the Cambridge community. Ms. Born restated that the CRA is a government agency and is restrained by legislation that enabled the authority to come into being. Making donations to nonprofits in an open-ended, undefined way got the old leadership of the CRA into “hot water.” Staff is working with counsel for creative ways to frame grants. The CRA is keenly aware of the extremely difficult situation that nonprofits find themselves. Ms. Drury added that the Massachusetts Anti-Aid amendment is

another consideration. Mr. Evans said that creating frameworks and defensible boundaries are critical to lessen the CRA's risk. Mr. Bator emphasized that, within the constraints, the current CRA administration has worked aggressively in its interpretation, application, and spending, and hopes that it can continue to do so.

3. Notices of the November 17 Planning Board meeting and the November 19 Ordinance Committee public hearing regarding the KSURP Amendment and MXD Zoning Ordinance Petition

Ms. Born said that both meetings were for permitting. Mr. Evans said that these notices are included as another method to communicate the proposal's status. At last night's meeting, the CRA spoke about the zoning logistics. Most of the presentation was about the challenges of the Eversource proposal and some of the urban design opportunities presented by the additional development. The discussion that followed focused on the zoning petition. Staff will work with the City on their suggested text changes. The conclusion of the Planning Board was a unanimous recommendation of the MXD zoning petition and a finding that the KSURP was in conformance with the City's plans. If the zoning moves forward, the CRA will return to the Planning Board with the Infill Development Concept Plan where more detailed site plans will be discussed, including loading, parking, etc. Tomorrow is the first Ordinance Committee meeting but Mr. Evans expects there to be more because there is a new City ordinance requiring a financial analysis of all zoning amendments. This is a new process for the City and Mr. Evans assumes that the Ordinance Committee will want to wait for that as it has not yet been produced. The CRA will be doing a presentation to the Ordinance Committee that is similar to the one given last night to the Planning Board. There will be more meetings before going to the full City Council.

In response to Ms. Drury's question about the new financial analysis requirement, Mr. Evans said that the City Council is concerned that the value of community benefits is not fully understood when up-zoning is being considered. This issue first came about with the Galleria Mall zoning amendment. The report's format will be seen when the first project report comes out for the Biomed Realty up-zoning at the Constellation Center site. He added that HR&A has been doing an analysis on the land payment calibration for the additional commercial square footage. The ordinance committee review will likely include an analysis of whether 800,000 square feet is the right amount given the Eversource infrastructure expenses and other regulatory impacts such as zoning payments to the affordable housing trust. In response to Mr. Drury, Mr. Evans confirmed that there is no statutory reference within the zoning. Mr. Evans wasn't sure if this report was included as part of the procedures. Mr. Evans read Heather Hoffman's comment in the chat portion of Zoom – the financial analysis is aimed at making sure the contract isn't too generous to developers. Some City councilors felt they were not extracting enough community benefits in comparison with the increased value of the up-zoning to the developer. Ms. Born emphasized that although there will be other community benefits, the major one to weigh against the additional 800,000 square feet is moving the Eversource substation. The land payment to the CRA is also a big benefit to the community.

4. Report of the Neighborhood & Long-Term Planning, Public Facilities, Arts & Celebration Committee

Ms. Born said that the main item is Mr. Bator's reappointment, which was met with delight. Mr. Bator said that it is an honor and privilege to serve with the other Board members. He complimented the staff. The ease of approval from the Council committee was an indication of their appreciation and trust of this Board and this staff.

5. Written communications received since the publication of the October meeting notice

Mr. Evans said that there were no other Board communications. He noted that there was a communication regarding the Rindge Avenue proposal that was written to staff. This will be discussed during that agenda item.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to place the communications discussed on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Ms. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

Reports, Motions, and Discussion Items

6. Foundry Update: Proposed Amendment to the Foundry Cooperation Agreement

Motion: To approve the first amendment of the Foundry Cooperation Agreement committing an additional \$3.5 million to the capital improvements of 101 Rogers Street and further committing an additional \$500,000 to the operational support of the Foundry directed at furnishing and equipment needs for the ground floor community uses

Mr. Evans said that this topic has been discussed in Executive Session. The original intention was to have a draft document for Board approval but that is not ready yet. He spoke about negotiations with the City and a possible amended motion for consideration. The Cooperation Agreement is an attachment to the Foundry lease with the City. It set up a number of elements regarding how the CRA and the City would get from the planning phases of a few years ago to the point of Foundry operations. The focus was how to get improvements made to the building and how to get operations up and running.

With respect to the financial component, this was anticipated to be a \$31M capital project. Originally, before the Cooperation Agreement, when a private developer was part of the project, the City had committed \$6M for capital improvements and CRA had committed \$2M for operations. Once the physical improvements to the Foundry building were made a public project, the City moved from a \$6M commitment to a \$24M commitment and the CRA added \$7M to capital. There is also another \$2M for operational support that would get the building started and function as a backstop during operations. After the design process was underway with schematic designs and design development, the cost estimate in mid-2019 came back \$5M higher. At that time, the City agreed to put in the additional capital. This was in conformance with what the Cooperation Agreement had imagined – that the risk of development costs was to be borne by the City since they were controlling the design process and the construction. The CRA would assist by contributing to the fit-outs during the design phase rather than waiting until the City's contractor was done. The 2019 appropriation then went to \$36M, although the CRA capital investment remained flat.

The project had a series of early phase components of the construction – internal demolition, some remediation and structural work, and steel delivery. Looking at the construction documents and assessing the foundation work, as well as the structure and soils, an additional \$3-\$5M was anticipated as of the spring. The project went out to bid in the summer. After assessing the contractor bids and subcontractor components, there was an \$8M funding gap. In addition, there were still several issues with unknown resolutions. The City proposed a \$2M contingency making a \$10M budget gap for the project. Mr. Evans explained that the timber framing in the building is in worse shape than anyone had thought. He then outlined some of the issues for the contingency - unknown disposal costs of excavated soil based on the level of contamination, replacement of more timber on the wings of the building, additional utilities that need to come into Roger Street, and construction delays and higher bids due to COVID-19.

There was an Executive Session which discussed terms for negotiating the City's request for additional money for the project. The Board decided that the capital investment proportionality would be maintained. In addition, a reduction of the City's construction risk could occur in exchange for softening the CRA's operational risk given the effect of COVID-19 on the office market and the sustainability of the building. Using the proportionality component of the Cooperation Agreement, the CRA would add \$3.5M toward the capital expenditure for the Foundry construction project. Separately, there have been discussions internally with the Board and the City that some of the equipment needed for the building's startup would require an additional \$500,000 from the CRA, which would come from generated investment income on the Foundry restricted account. Mr. Evans said that CRA ownership of the maker equipment would facilitate maintenance.

Mr. Evans, Kathryn Madden, and Jeff Mullan, CRA Counsel drafted a revised cooperation agreement which was sent to the City. Lisa Peterson said that most points were accepted but the terms for reducing the CRA operational risk are still being discussed. As stated before, the CRA would purchase, and thereby own, the maker equipment. However, a better understanding is needed regarding the full inventory of furnishings and equipment. There is a City line item for buying furnishings, such as desks and chairs. Furniture for the offices will be covered by the tenants. Although the CRA is not currently involved in the construction of the building, CRA staff and the Foundry Consortium should be involved as the project finishes up to confirm any punch list items. There should

also be a single point of contact within the City to facilitate communications, which will be David Kale. With respect to the operating utility costs, the City has agreed to cover recycling and composting removal. The trash is the responsibility of the operator. Mr. Evans noted that the Foundry will have some unusual trash related to the maker spaces. Another term for negotiation was a proportional share of electrical costs. The publicly accessible areas of the building would be metered separately and paid for by the City. This is a significant financial component, estimated to be over \$100,000 annually, as the building is heated (and cooled in the summer) by electricity. The office tenants would pay for their electricity via leases with the CRA. More understanding of the solar PV array is needed to decide how it fits into the pricing. Finally, plowing and snow removal for the Foundry on Rogers Street, which is a private street, would be provided by the City.

Mr. Evans said that there is no document for approval tonight but he would like to get direction via a motion to negotiate the final cooperation agreement under the terms as described. Mr. Evans said there is construction work underway but the City needs the contract and final budget to be approved and the administration needs to go back to City Council to get the full appropriation as soon as possible.

Ms. Drury said that it is amazing that the project has gotten to this point. She is glad that the City is going to take care of Rogers Street.

Mr. Bator said that there was an email this morning from Mr. Evans that changed the situation slightly. Ms. Born read an amended motion.

The motion was moved by Mr. Bator to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate an amendment to the Foundry Cooperation Agreement, committing an additional \$3.5 million from the CRA to the capital improvements of 101 Rogers Street, committing an additional \$500,000 to the operational support of the Foundry directed at furnishing and equipment needs for the ground floor community uses, and the City agreeing to utility cost-sharing arrangements during the lease term. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Ms. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously

Mr. Evans said that he would keep the Board informed as the final numbers are negotiated and the utility issue is fully resolved. The Foundry Consortium also awaits a decision. Mr. Evans read a comment from Stephanie Couch which said that the Foundry Consortium appreciates all of the CRA efforts and the CRA Board's ongoing support.

7. Presentation: 325 Main St Wayfinding and Signage Proposal (Levering)

Motion: To approve the Wayfinding and Signage Plan for 325 Main Street, subject to ongoing staff review of signage specifications, Parcel Four of the Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan

Ms. Levering said that Boston Properties (BxP) will be presenting their Wayfinding and Signage proposal, which has been reviewed several times by the Design Review Committee. The Wayfinding plan was requested of BxP by the CRA staff as part of their 325 Main Street Phase 2 CD submission. The building at 325 Main Street is in a central location within Parcel 4 and it is a critical node amongst a number of open spaces (under covenants or public easements) and retail spaces. The goal of this plan is to make the building and the public elements of the project work together. BxP is also providing about a dozen locations for public art. Ms. Levering emphasized that the CRA is tasked with specifically reviewing and approving wayfinding and signage; not necessarily to be juries for art. She introduced Eric Mo and Rebecca Stoddard, from BxP, and Kevin Parker, from Selbert Perkins Design.

Mr. Mo showed a PowerPoint presentation of the 325 Main Street public realm, which he said was previously seen by the Design Review Committee. The area is labeled as 3CC in the site plan. The Kendall Plaza is to the east, with the Porch and the MBTA station in between the two. The public roof garden is to the north and Main Street to the south. The pink dots note the art locations and the blue dots note the wayfinding signage locations. Before going into the master plan review, Ms. Stoddard reviewed the branding to be used to promote the new and

existing public realm space, Urban Park or UP. There are three areas for art and programming - the upper-level roof garden, the level 2 porch or mezzanine space, and the plaza. She went through the 11 art installations and their locations. A majority of these are murals but there are some sculptures and digital art. She showed the artwork of some of the artists being considered. Some are local and some are outside of the City. The intention is that all the installations will work together and complement each other.

Mr. Mo then described the signage and wayfinding, focusing on the critical intersections. He started with the signage on the column on the ground level near the social stair which directs the public up the stairs to get to the public roof garden, the porch, and retail tenants. There is also directional signage for accessible routes to the elevator in the public lobby that is located on the northeast part of the site. Mr. Mo described the e-ink digital display that will highlight the programming scheduled for the roof garden, the porch, and the plaza. The display is flush with the face of the terracotta. There will be a digital column on the plaza that will show all the public transportation options. Mr. Mo discussed the signage for the public lobby, which will clearly indicate that there is a public entrance in the Marriott façade, as well as showing what is on each level. At the roof garden, the entry gate will have the branding of the UP logo in addition to the Roof Garden text. The intention is to light the gate in some way to indicate when it is open beyond daylight hours during summer months. There were other views of the UP Roof Garden signage from the plaza and the porch. The frame of the gate will be used as another canvas for art. Instead of being located outside along the social stair wall, the split flap display will be placed on the north side of the public lobby and show the programming on the site, transit information, and/or some abstract art.

Mr. Zevin liked the small pylons for the accessible routes. He thought the split flaps had found a good home. He noted that displaying transit on the table leg screen would not be easy as there are a number of bus routes and the pickup spots change often. Mr. Mo said that the east and west sides of the column could have a replaceable local static transit map. Mr. Evans added that a transit screen requirement is a mitigation requirement from the EIR. There was a discussion regarding signage that the MBTA should have with respect to MBTA bus connections. Mr. Mo added that the transit signs are customizable from a transit standpoint.

Ms. Born said that these details should be discussed in another meeting. She likes the modifications that were presented. Ms. Drury liked the UP Roof Garden sign as people will see it and know it exists. In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Mo said that there will be lighting under the stairway railing up to the roof garden. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Mo said that BxP is considering artwork or colors to be applied to the metal elements of the gate. He did clarify that the gate truss design includes the gussets.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to approve the Wayfinding and Signage Plan for 325 Main Street, subject to ongoing staff review of signage specifications, Parcel Four of the Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Ms. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – had technical difficulties

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

8. 93-99 Bishop Allen Renovation Update

Motion: To approve the proposed construction bid scope with two add alternates to the project to be accepted in the following order: 1) Replace all exterior double-hung windows on the northeast and southeast facing sides of the building; and 2) Replace two large storefront windows at current first floor building entries.

Ms. Schwarz said that staff is adding an additional request tonight for the Board to approve a \$15,000 contract for Haley and Aldrich to do geotechnical work at Bishop Allen Drive to support the storm water drainage design planning. The proposal has two parts. One part is a \$10,000 task to arrange for and conduct one test boring to determine the subsurface conditions for seismic site classification, to install a well in the completed borehole to assist in stormwater design, and to produce a memo explaining the results and the recommendations. The second part is a \$5,000 task to collect one sample of soil from a depth of 0 to 5 ft for submittal to a laboratory for

the typical soil disposal acceptance parameters at Massachusetts Landfills and a memo summarizing the test results and recommendations for soil classification and disposal.

Mr. Evans added that Haley and Aldrich had done some initial phase 1 work when the building was purchased. The CRA has worked with them on numerous occasions for other hazardous material assessments. Civil engineers are exempt from procurement laws but because the contract threshold is over \$10,000, it does require a Board vote. Ms. Schwarz showed a map of the boring locations. Mr. Zevin opined that this was a rather large lump sum for a modest lump of soil. Mr. Evans said that the cost is likely due to the immediate need for the findings. The initial scope had limited soil work as it did not include building a tank but this is a DPW requirement for storm water management. It is a big risk to go into construction bidding without soil characterization.

Mr. Crawford asked if having a tank was an underlying principle or strategy of the DPW to prevent displacing stormwater runoff to surrounding properties or districts. Mr. Evans said that the building has a basement that has had past water intrusion issues. As part of the Central Square stormwater separation master plan, DPW said that a holding system is needed so that the runoff isn't dumped into the sewer system too quickly. This is standard for new construction. It seems more is being done on this project than on a typical renovation project. The footprint of the building is not increasing. The designer said that this is the right thing to do due to protect the building, considering climate change. Mr. Zevin asked if there was a possibility that the entire building would need to be upgraded to meet current seismic standards. Mr. Evans said the proposal removes some portions of the brick wall for circulation improvements. If a full re-bracing of the building was necessary, it would completely change the project.

Ms. Born asked for verification that no seismic upgrade is required by the code. Mr. Evans said that there has been a lot of structural analysis of the building. Additional steel supports were recently added at the building's opening foyer. The proposed design requires some added bracing and support where parts of masonry walls are removed, but no overall structural moves are needed. Ms. Schwarz confirmed that a code consultant is part of the design team.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract with Haley and Aldrich for geotechnical services as per the November 18, 2020 proposal. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Ms. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

Ms. Schwarz explained that the next motion involves the inclusion of add-alternates to the project scope when it goes out to bid. At the September meeting, the Board approved a total project budget of \$8.65M, which includes a \$330,000 Community Preservation Act award. Staff plans to come to the Board in January to vote on a contract with a general contractor and the actual construction budget. Filed sub-bids are expected on December 29 and the contractor bids are expected in mid-January. In the meanwhile, staff received a cost estimate that was \$300,000 higher than the number approved in September. The architects have also suggested another item to consider. Therefore, two add-alternates are being suggested in case the bids come in under budget or the CRA decides to spend extra funds and increase the scope before the contract is signed with the general contractor.

The first add-alt relates to the double hung windows. Since the third-floor dormer windows were already planned to be replaced, it was decided at a previous Board meeting, to replace all the double hung windows at the same time. However, to save about \$190,000, as well as two weeks in the construction timeline, the proposal now is to replace only the double-hung windows that face Bishop Allen Drive and Essex Street, but retain the existing windows that face the parking lot and alley next to the church. The existing windows would get repaired and be fully functional, but they would not be as energy efficient as new windows. An additional two-week buffer might be useful to meet a planned certificate of occupancy on September 20 with tenants starting to move in on October 1, 2021.

She noted that a white roof is being considered for energy purposes.

The second add-alt relates to the architect's recent suggestion to replace two large windows in the front of the building so that they are all identical. One is currently being replaced with new glazing which will be more energy efficient. Replacing the additional two windows would cost \$30,000. Ms. Schwarz said that the order of the add-alt needs to be stated in the bid and that the second one cannot be done without doing the first one.

In response to Mr. Bator, Ms. Schwarz said that eventually the CRA would want to do the all the windows but they are structurally fine, just not as energy efficient. However, considering the total cost, it is not a massive savings. Mr. Evans clarified that the windows in the back of the building are not wood. He went into the history of the window replacement decision and how the public bidding process works. The large front windows are not within any tenant space so it won't be terribly disruptive if this replacement occurs after the tenants are in the building.

In response to Ms. Drury, Mr. Evans said that the windows will need to be repaired; they aren't all perfect. He wasn't sure what happens with the discarded materials.

Mr. Evans said that the-add alts are used to give the CRA more flexibility on bid day to stay within budget. If all the bids come in over budget, staff will need to come back to the Board before finalizing the selected contractor. Ms. Schwarz recommended that the order for the alts be to replace the exterior double hung windows, followed by the two large windows. Mr. Evans clarified that replacing all the dormer windows is part of the base project. The base project also replaces the windows on Essex Street and Bishop Allen. Ms. Born read the motion but there was a discussion of the directional wording in the motion so the text was modified.

A motion was moved by Mr. Zevin to approve the proposed construction bid scope with two add alternates to the project to be accepted in the following order: 1) Replace all exterior double-hung windows on the rear-facing and alley-facing sides of the building; and 2) Replace two large storefront windows at current first floor building entries. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Ms. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

9. Design Review Committee Report

Motion: To accept the report on the Design Review Meeting on November 4, 2020

Ms. Born said that report is good and complete. The meeting was about the potential massing and arrangement of buildings on the MXD-KSURP zoning site. She confirmed that nothing is decided and the unresolved issues center around the design and orientation of the residential building.

Mr. Zevin said that Akamai claimed that the views, which were so carefully created in their new building, would be blocked. Mr. Evans said that this is not an uncommon situation in Kendall Square. Ms. Born said that these issues are not simply resolved and that the development of this site is going to involve compromise. Ms. Drury liked the idea of leaving clues of what is underneath and an explanation of the electrical substation. Mr. Zevin agreed.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to accept the report on the Design Review Meeting on November 4, 2020. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Ms. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

At this time, Ms. Born suggested taking a 5-minute break. Mr. Evans requested switching the order of the agenda to make better use of the design consultant's time. The meeting will reconvene at 8:00 p.m.

11. Presentation: Rindge Neighborhood Connectivity Study (Levering)

Ms. Levering introduced David Gamble and Tania Bronsoiler from Gamble Associates. Ms. Levering explained that the project started through the CRA's partnership with Just-A-Start (JAS). JAS asked the CRA to help them think through open space and connectivity ideas for their Rindge Commons infill development project. After meetings with JAS and participating in some of their community outreach sessions, it became apparent that there was a need to expand the connectivity look beyond the JAS parcel to the neighboring parcels. The residents in that area would benefit by having better access to the amenities in the area. The CRA brought in Gamble Associates to assist with the evaluation. Ms. Levering said that Mr. Gamble will be discussing a technical report. A broader community engagement process will occur but because of Covid, this has been delayed until next year.

Mr. Gamble said that this location is unlike any other area in Cambridge because it is a conglomeration of so many different individual parts and buildings. He showed a map of the area. It is a true study in connectivity. The magenta lines in the center of the area show barriers to leveraging all of the assets that this place has to offer. Jerry's Pond, Fresh Pond, and Danehy Park, which are immense opportunities for open space and wellness, are difficult to access. Minor modifications that could overcome the barriers in parking areas, landscape elements, or existing sidewalks were evaluated on a conceptual level. He also looked at longer-term and bolder ambitions to span over the tracks to make a direct connection between the parks. The problem complicated as there are multiple property owners involved. Talks with some of the owners occurred but a larger public engagement process is warranted. He said that there was a recent real estate transaction near Jerry's Pond. He spoke about JAS's Rindge Commons plan to build two buildings. He suggested a different block structure to foster connections.

Mr. Gamble said that the focus should be on three areas - the Fitchburg multi-use path, an East-West Connector, and a Rindge Avenue Crossing. The multi-use path would not take a lot of work to get under Route 2 and to the T station. Topography along the rail tracks indicates that making a crossing could be easier than anticipated. Even with DPW's use of space below Route 2, there is 25 feet of width for a path and a cycle track. This would make a big difference. Along the East West connector, the planted strip median could be made more pedestrian-like and less vehicle-dominated. The Rindge Crossing could be accomplished by removing fences. He discussed options for each of the focus areas. He emphasized that engineering drawings have not been done.

Ms. Born started a discussion of the path along the trail and the area under Route 2. Ms. Levering said that she has spoken with DPW about their storage space and the concepts discussed tonight. She clarified that DPW uses the land but it is owned by DCR. Mr. Evans said that elements of the bridge might be owned by MassDOT. Ms. Drury added that MassDOT does not want any more ground level crossings. Mr. Evans said that there is a clear need for connectivity so any new development should have that in mind. Ms. Drury said that the JAS project is an opportunity for some of that connectivity. Ms. Born said Rindge Common residents could use a connection to get to the T station. Mr. Evans added that it makes sense to coordinate that with the second phase of the Rindge Commons project. Very little of the areas are public right of way except for the crossing at Rindge. Mr. Zevin suggested a way to connect JAS's building B with any redevelopment of the shopping plaza's parking lots. He added that seeing the open space in tonight's presentation made a compelling argument to connect Jerry's Pond and Danehy Park. Mr. Crawford said that having worked at DCR in the past, he understands the interjurisdictional opportunities and could help to bring people together. He is interested in hearing feedback from the local residents and the local land owners. Ms. Drury raised a possibility of connecting the shopping center and the station using the service road. Mr. Zevin discussed the Yerxa Road Underpass. Mr. Evans said that the CRA owns the underpass land that is underneath the railroad tracks as it all relates to the Walden Square redevelopment projects. Ms. Born suggested another meeting on the subject. Mr. Gamble added that the next steps would be to get community feedback, cultivate conversations across agencies, and create a vision for the area. The connection would be transformational for the area. Ms. Born said that this could be an area of focus for the CRA. Mr. Evans said that staff will develop a public engagement process and schedule, with and without the ability to gather publicly. There might also be an online component.

10. Amended and Restated Internal Controls Policy

Motion: To approve the amendment of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Internal Controls Policy

Ms. Kailasam thanked Mr. Zevin and Mr. Bator for their helpful input and review. At the time of the original document in 2014, there were three CRA staff members, with the Executive Director serving all executive and financial functions, with the help of the Treasurer. There are now eight full time and part time staff; of which three are dedicated to finance and operations – Mr. Evans, Ms. Shore, and Ms. Kailasam. The CRA is able to segregate duties, which provides checks and balances for managing all of the financial and operational issues, especially as the number of projects and the size of the dollar value of the investments have both grown.

The main goals of an Internal Controls Policy (ICP) are to protect resources against waste, fraud, and inefficiency; promote accuracy and reliability in accounting records; measure compliance with local and state agency policies, evaluate the efficiency of financial operations in all projects and programs of the CRA; and provide procedures for oversight for the assets and finances by the CRA Board of Directors

Ms. Kailasam highlighted key changes to the ICP. The debit card will be replaced with a company credit card with an organizational limit of \$5000. Cards would be issued to the Executive Director and Operations Director to conduct CRA business. This is safer than a debit card and gives more financial flexibility.

Another proposed change is to add the Director of Finance as a signer on all financial accounts, including the investment accounts. Currently all checks above \$1000 that have been approved by the Executive Director, require the signature of either the Treasurer or Assistant Treasurer. The proposal raises the threshold amount to \$10,000 for the required signature of either the Treasurer or Assistant Treasurer. Checks above \$5,000 would be signed by both the Executive Director and the Director of Finance. A monthly financial package, including activity reports and reconciliations, would be sent to the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurer. The CRA will continue to draw funds from its investment account to fund operations. The Director of Finance will authorize and manage internal transfers related to cash management with the approval of the Executive Director. A business continuity plan will be added to the list of CRA policies.

Ms. Kailasam noted that the proposed ICP has been reviewed by CRA auditors. Mr. Bator said that this policy, as well as having Ms. Kailasam, is a reflection of the CRA's growth. It is entirely appropriate and will help streamline operations.

A motion was moved by Mr. Bator to approve the restated and amended Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Internal Controls Policy. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Ms. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – absent

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

12. Monthly Staff Report

Mr. Evans said that the audit has been distributed to the City and to the State. Staff is working on the issues raised in the management letter with respect to tracking retirees and benefactors. As a follow-up to last month's Board approval to open a pair of savings accounts to hold the cash assets for the Foundry and KSTEP, staff has elected to work with Cambridge Savings Bank. On the Forward calendar, there will be a continuation of the Forward Fund conversation, the 2021 budget, and the pre-development agreement to move forward with the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House project.

As part of the approval for the 145 Broadway project, Boston Properties was to develop the small space along Main Street at 255 Main Street. There have been a number of implementation challenges regarding the MBTA

rights with the proposed project so the CRA has extended the letter of credit agreement for a year to decide what contribution to public realm improvement will occur there or elsewhere.

Just this week, Mr. Peralta posted the Covid Safety Support grant to the CRA website and a number of applications have been received. This grant uses the unspent remaining funds from the original business grant allocation.

The bidding schedule for the proposal for 93-99 Bishop Allen is outlined in the staff report. The plan is to select a general contractor by January and have them start work in February.

The planning process for the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House (MFNH) has picked up with their Board focusing on their strategic plan and their physical plant in the future. After that scope is refined, the next round of design can occur with Studio G. Then, the housing component and the development pathways for that project will be evaluated. In response to Mr. Zevin, Mr. Evans said that the MFNH project could be delayed if it were to be combined with the Cherry Street lot discussion. He added that four years ago, CRA staff participated in meetings with the City to evaluate 105 Windsor, the MFNH parking lot, and the Cherry Street lot. As the CRA launched some conversations with neighborhood partners, the City halted the project. The City is looking at housing on the Cherry Street lot. The CRA can participate in those discussions but the status of the projects is too different to join the projects. There was a discussion of Windsor Street and the CRA's involvement.

Glass installation on 325 Main Street is occurring. The waterproofing on the garage is nearly done. Lastly, a draft license agreement has been sent to the City to allow them to use the 3rd & Binney parcel as a dog park. This is being review by the City's legal department and a revised agreement is expected tomorrow.

In response to Mr. Zevin, Ms. Levering explained that the City just started digging up the median on Binney Street as a temporary installation to get through spring when they will be doing the cycle track work. The City is resurfacing and putting in temporary delineators. The dirt from the median is being stored on the Porkchop. Removing the median now will help facilitate construction and relocation of cars when they are actually doing the cycle track implementation. Mr. Evans said that more contamination on the Porkchop has been determined so the dog park cannot be put there until it is cleaned up. Mr. Evans said that the City doesn't have enough funds for a park at Binney at this time.

With respect to the financial report, Ms. Kailasam reminded the Board that this is the amended budget from the previous meeting. The Expenses by Category is skewed toward redevelopment investments from the investment to the Foundry in the spring. In the Expenses by Project, the largest expenditure is the Foundry payment followed by the work on Bishop Allen.

There were no requests to comment by the public. Mr. Evans said that there was a note in the chat from Ms. Hoffman saying that she was a big fan of the split flap and was happy that it found an inside home. Mr. Evans said that staff agreed. There was a discussion of the types of information that could be displayed on the split flaps. Mr. Evans said that Boston Properties would make that decision.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to adjourn the meeting. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Ms. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – absent

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 p.m.