

Regular Board Meeting  
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, August 8, 2018 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 regular meeting to order at 5:36 p.m. The meeting is being recorded by CRA staff. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Treasurer Christopher Bator, Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford, and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. Executive Director Tom Evans and other CRA staff members, Ellen Shore, Jason Zogg, Carlos Peralta, Alex Levering.

### Public Comment

Ms. Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street, said that the Bank of America trailers are sad-looking, especially given the wealth of the company. She also said that there is too much of the garish red signature color and hopes for a more tasteful appearance. Regarding the open space survey, she said that there should be more feedback and would be if the survey takers were present during commuting hours rather than just during lunchtime. She also cautioned that the single interest in sports is misleading because she has seen many people who use the basketball court and athletic facilities during the day.

There were no other comments.

*The motion to close public comment was seconded and carried unanimously.*

### Minutes

#### **1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular the Board meeting on July 18, 2018**

Mr. Evans said that the last Board meeting was a Special Board meeting with the Planning Board and those minutes are not included.

There were no other comments.

*The motion to accept the minutes of the Regular the Board meeting on July 18, 2018 and to place them on file was moved and carried unanimously.*

### Communications

### Reports, Motions, and Discussion Items

#### **2. Presentation: Innovation Space Program Plan proposal for 255 Main Street, MXD Infill Development Concept Plan, Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project Area**

Mr. Tilford, from Boston Properties (BXP), showed a different presentation than the presentation in the Board packet. He said that the Article 14 Innovation Space bonus required that a portion of the innovation space,

market-rate and below-market-rate, be made available with the release of each of the commercial buildings. BXP is partnering with the Cambridge Innovation Center (CIC) to operate the market rate portion.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans said that the material being presented is different packaging but did have some added clarification that was requested by CRA staff.

Brian Dacey, from CIC, said that there is a need for more innovation space in Kendall Square. He explained how the CIC operations meet the definition in the zoning and is actually providing more innovation space than required. He hopes to be open in the fall with phase 1 in October and phase 2 in the November/December timeframe.

He introduced Brendan Sullivan, the project manager. Mr. Sullivan, using a PowerPoint presentation, said that CIC believes that innovation is the key to fix the world, that it is largely driven by entrepreneurs, that concentrating impactful entrepreneurs in one place leads to impressive outcomes, and that CIC creates innovation communities that support impactful entrepreneurs to fix the world. CIC has built the world's largest science/tech focused innovation hub in Cambridge, MA, has built hubs in 5 cities with six more under development, and are creating the first global network of such hubs, initially covering 50 major cities. His slides noted how CIC will fulfill the five requirements of the Innovation Space. To show that CIC is meeting requirement #1 - durations of lease agreements (or other similar occupancy agreements) with individual office tenants shall be for periods of approximately one (1) month - he showed 30-day contract wording in their standard service agreement that all clients must sign.

To meet requirement #2 - no single business entity may occupy more than two thousand (2,000) square feet or ten percent (10%) of the entire Innovation Space provided in the District, whichever is greater - he said that although 255 Main Street hasn't opened and therefore no specific 255 Main Street client data exists, this will be fulfilled as evident based on data from CIC's average client occupied square footage across all CIC sites.

He stated that requirement #3 - the average size of separately contracted private office suites may not exceed two hundred (200) square feet of GFA - will be met. Based on a review of offices in the defined Innovation Space, the average size of separately contracted private offices was 169 square feet.

In regards to requirement #4 - Innovation Space shall include shared resources available to all tenants and must occupy at least fifty percent of the Innovation Space - more than 50% of CIC's space will be shared space. He showed a sample floor plan depicting shared resource space. CIC's mission is met by bringing people together. The presentation had various renderings of the space.

With respect to requirement #5 - individual entities occupying Innovation Space may include small businesses, incubators, small research laboratories, office space for investors and entrepreneurs, facilities for teaching and for theoretical, basic and applied research, product development and testing and prototype fabrication or production of experimental products - Mr. Sullivan said that CIC's current clients are in life sciences, technology, health, and/or other business to business services.

Mr. Evans clarified that this presentation only addresses the market rate component.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Dacey said that the 255 Main Street floors offer the same concepts as their current space at One Broadway. Mr. Dacey emphasized that the service agreement contract is a license to occupy the space, rather than a lease agreement. Mr. Dacey said that the average stay is three to four years, although some clients stay for six months and several clients have stayed for ten years. He added that a one-month contract provides flexibility for clients to easily grow or decrease their staff.

Ms. Born focused on the rendering that showed the current two-story lobby space. Mr. Dacey explained that the entrance is the glass box on the ground level and then an elevator is taken to the second floor to a major reception area. He confirmed that the entrance space is entirely CIC space as mentioned in lease. Because of its size, it is challenging to animate it. He expects the proposal to be ready next month for a design review of their blade sign that will have the same dimensions as the Microsoft blade sign, as well as ideas for the monitor. He wants the area to be special and celebrate Kendall without advertising products.

Mr. Zevin said that the current CIC building is a densely populated space and asked for confirmation that bike parking and common facilities, like showers, would be provided. Mr. Dacey said that CIC is working with the landlords on those aspects. There was a discussion of Mr. Zevin's observation of the mazelike floor plan and how that helps collaboration. Mr. Dacey said that the building has a unique shape so planned intersections and the availability of light are used to create special places.

Ms. Born said that the lobby area could be iconic for Kendall Square if done right. She would also like to see the ground floor glass box as a public area. Mr. Dacey wasn't sure this would be possible. It is going to be a heavily traveled area as the main entrance into the Innovation Space. However, the monitor would have a civic aspect to it. Ms. Born noted that the Akamai lobby is a public space.

Mr. Bator commented on CIC's belief that innovation is largely driven by entrepreneur as there are many people who do innovation without an economic drive. The other members of the Board agreed.

Ms. Drury said that she envisions long lines when events are held due to the small space. Mr. Dacey said that the other entrance would be available for large crowds. Mr. Dacey mentioned that the old CIC space will be changing to have only one reception check-in area.

Mr. Tilford then moved to the presentation in the packet with respect to the below market component or the Opportunity Space. This will be a hub for nonprofits that focus on science and technology education for underserved populations. He said that this model isn't as well developed as the CIC market-rate model. The bonus innovation space component of Article 14 triggered this initially unplanned below market rate portion as a way to address a different part of the economic ecosystem and serve an educational mission. With this new proposal, BPX will be exceeding the required amount of market-rate and below-market rate space being delivered with the first commercial building A. Mr. Tilford explained that there is not a lot of precedent regarding this program. BXP does not have the expertise but is enthusiastically embracing the ideas, many of which came from CRA staff. BPX will retain the building. The eighth floor at 255 Main Street will be occupied by these tech-education organizations. BPX is looking for a licensing operator for a short-term period so as to try out and assess the program. Similar to the CIC market rate space, the Opportunity Space will also have short term licenses to nonprofits. The classroom and event spaces will be available to both below-market rate and to the market-rate entities during off hours. The goal is to have this program delivered in 2019. Mr. Tilford said that BPX has spoken to some nonprofit tech-education organizations and welcomes discussions with other well qualified entities. Complementary, non-redundant, and non-competing groups will be targeted in the request for qualification process. BPX would like to form an advisory board with the three major stakeholders – BPX, CIC, and the CRA. Mr. Tilford said that although there were hundreds of nonprofits in Cambridge which might like to participate in this space, the focus is on 501c3 organizations focused on tech education which have established operational histories and missions that would benefit from a proximity to the Kendall Square tech environment. As the concepts are developed, additional criteria might be considered.

Mr. Tilford showed a stacking diagram of the 255 Main Street building. The market-rate Innovation Space will exist on floors 2, 3, 4, 11 and 12. The CRA and the below market-rate Opportunity Space will be on floor 8. There is also a ground floor retail component of the building. Mr. Tilford said that the layout of floor 8 is still being designed. The space can't be overly prescriptive since there are lots of variables with a mix of programs that might be offered. There will be some hard-walled areas within the space but there will also be flexible sized areas and open spaces for changing classroom and office needs.

Mr. Tilford said that the next steps will focus on the selecting specific tech-education focused organizations and the development of the layout. Mr. Evans added that the CRA is currently drafting an RFQ for release within the next few weeks for tech-education and workforce development organizations.

Mr. Crawford noted that non-STEAM oriented organizations that focus on civic engagement or governmental activities should also be considered as these entities could contribute to the Kendall Square ecosystem. He suggested that BXP also explore innovative ways to encourage modes of transportation, other than cars, when these innovation spaces are delivered. Mr. Zevin said that the lobby at 255 Main Street should be more welcoming. Mr. Evans said that an increased level of signage and wayfinding would be explored. In response to

Ms. Born, Mr. Tilford explained that the licensee operator would provide facility scheduling and management. In response to Ms. Drury, the advisory board would be the entity responsible for selecting the organizations and turning this into a cohesive program. In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Tilford did not yet have a specific BXP employee who would be responsible for the program. Mr. Evans added that the CRA is going through a hiring process now to find someone to oversee CRA's participation in the program.

Mr. Evans said that the CRA Board would need to vote to approve an operations plan per the approval of 145 Broadway. A monitoring and possibly annual reporting process needs to be decided and included in the approval letter. Mr. Evans said that the required 60,000 square foot space needs to be offered and operational when the 145 Broadway building is occupied by Akamai. CIC plans to have people in its space by the fall and the Opportunity Space could be ready in January.

Ms. Hoffman was pleased to see the word STEAM, rather than STEM, being used and will be watchful that the arts is truly a component of the program. It is very important to have someone who knows what's going on to find ways to bring people together in this space, as well as the other spaces within Kendall Square.

Ms. Born said that the Board looks forward to hearing more on the subject.

### **3. Proposal: Temporary Bank Trailer on Parcel 3**

#### ***Motion: Approving the placement of a temporary structure for an interim Bank of America branch location on Ames Place within Parcel 3 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area.***

Mr. Evans said that this is a continuation of a discussion that began at the design review committee meeting in July when there were operational and design questions asked by the design review committee. Because of the nature of the temporary use on open space, the committee wanted the full board to hear the proposal.

Matthew Murphy, project manager for Bank of America (BoA), said that the current lease with MIT at 226 Main Street is expiring in November 28 and will not be extended. However, construction at its new location at 88 Ames isn't scheduled to be complete until Q1 2019. In order to serve their existing Kendall Square customers, they are in need of a temporary location from October through the first quarter. Mr. Murphy relayed various statistics with respect to its customer base in Kendall Square. Mr. Murphy noted that trailers for the 88 Ames Street project are currently located in this space.

Julie Reker, from Gensler, spoke about the proposal for a temporary trailer on Parcel 3 to maintain business continuity. Ms. Reker presented a map showing BoA's current location, its future location (92 Ames Street), and the temporary location (Ames Place). BoA's trailer will be smaller than the current construction trailers. She showed the position of the BoA trailer on a site map. The fully functioning banking center trailer being proposed has been used by BoA in other cities. She then discussed the wayfinding plan for their customers. She proposed temporary dots painted on the ground in various places to lead people down Ames Place and the pedestrian pathway, as well as small flags on existing light poles around the trailer. She showed a picture of a BoA trailer along with an enhanced version to better fit the area since it will be on location for several months. She also mentioned vinyl wayfinding signage on the windows at the future 92 Ames Street location.

Ms. Born confirmed that the proposal is for six months including set-up and take-down. Ms. Reker said that BoA can take advantage of the existing water, power, and data connections used now by the constructions trailers. Mr. Murphy said that Jack Albert, Deputy Superintendent of the Cambridge Police Department, verified that the trailer location is an acceptable location and would be monitored 24/7, along with other banks in the area. There is also a security representative who does after-hours roaming for all the Cambridge locations. The armored car parking for delivery and pickup has been addressed. Ms. Reker said that there are regular security methods with trailers, including cameras.

Mr. Crawford said that this location is technically an open space parcel and was interested in hearing how the site could be made more cosmetically accommodating. Mr. Murphy said that there are limitations with the winter months. Ms. Reker said that there isn't much space and BoA is trying to make a minimal impact. Ms. Born confirmed that the location is designated as open space under the covenant. Mr. Evans noted that the space is

owned by BXP. Under the current arrangement with the 88 Ames Street contractors, they are obligated to leave the site the way it was before they came, which includes a path, some benches, some trees, and grass. David Stewart, from BXP, said that BXP would pass the obligation being impacted onto the bank. JMA would be obligated to fix what BoA isn't using. Ms. Born was not comfortable with the arrangement. Mr. Evans said that restoration in October might not be successful. Mr. Stewart said that BXP's obligation under the covenant is to maintain the open space parcel so BXP would be responsible in the long term for anything that wasn't successful or restored properly. The Board discussed the long-term goal for this small open space. Mr. Zogg added that the Board recently authorized hiring two landscape architects for on-call contract designs. This Ames Place bank location is part of the Parcel 3 interstitial design. Mr. Evans clarified that Parcel 3 has a complex arrangement of property ownership. There is an MOU with each of the property owners to participate in a conceptual design study to explore issues and opportunities to stitch together the open spaces. The CRA cannot do a full design since the CRA does not own the property.

In response to Mr. Zevin's legal concern, Mr. Evans said that counsel did not make an interpretation of whether construction trailers were allowed to be on the site. He added that the existence of trailers does not make it a permitted land use in the future. Also, allowing a bank trailer now would not set a precedent. In other words, an agency's lack of enforcement of a public obligation does not create a prescriptive easement. Mr. Evans said the City could enforce a public open space covenant.

Ms. Born opened a discussion on a missed opportunity to get some mitigation that is better than simply planting grass. BXP is not charging a fee to the bank. Mr. Stewart was open to contributing financially. Ms. Drury would prefer that BXP agree to contribute when the trailer is gone and be responsible for a nicer design. Mr. Bator said that the end result of 88 Ames Street was worth having ugly trailers on the site. He was very disappointed in the appearance of BoA's trailer and expected more from a profitable big entity. There was a discussion of the ramp grade and the position of the door. Mr. Evans said that there are goals for the winter and goals for the finished space in April. Ms. Born is more interested in the long term plan. Since BXP is making provisions for BoA, and the CRA is making an extension of the open space consideration for BXP, she thinks that the CRA should gain something too. Mr. Bator agreed. She would like a confirmation of the expectations for April. Mr. Stewart suggested that BXP provide a financial contribution toward the design process, for the public inconvenience. He said that Area B is under an open space covenant that BXP maintains. BXP maintained whatever was there before the 88 Ames Street trailers. The covenant is not specific about maintaining capital improvements over time. Mr. Evans said that the MOU does not include any financial commitment by the property owners. Mr. Evans suggested using a precedent value equal to the price point used by the DPW when streets or parks are occupied by construction. There was a discussion to amend the motion to include the temporary signage and wayfinding as well as the financial contribution. Mr. Zevin noted that the flags should be as small as possible as the lamp posts won't withstand anything large and there is a lot of wind in that area.

Mr. Evans added that one of the goals of the design effort is to be prepared for the possibility of a Whitehead proposal to permanently build on a 10,000 square foot covenanted open space. In the letter of agreement in the zoning, Whitehead has agreed to make an arrangement for an open space contribution.

Mr. Evans suggesting a hold on the motion until he can wordsmith it. The Board can move to the next agenda item during this time.

#### **4. Update: 88 Ames Street Residential (Mr. Zogg)**

##### **Motion: Approving the conceptual signage proposal for Cava Restaurant at 88 Ames Street on Parcel 4 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area**

Ms. Born explained that the Design Review Committee met with Boston Properties (BXP) before tonight's Board meeting and recommends option B. Mr. Keir Evans, from BXP, explained that this is the conceptual submission by Cava for the signage at the retail space at 88 Ames that borders Pioneer Way, the south end of the building. Cava had proposed two options and the one being proposed is what the committee felt was the best approach. There are two lit Cava signs appearing within their interior space; one is over their Main Street entrance and the second sits along the portion of the storefront along Pioneer Way. These signs are lit to present a 3D appearance. There are two flagged banners on columns that flank the Ames Street entrance and two flagged banners that

flank the interior lit sign on Pioneer Way. He explained how the flags are attached to the columns. BXP's tenant agreements mandate that the columns are repaired if the flags are removed. He showed various renderings of the signage from various street views and explained that the location zones for the signs were part of the Planning Board's approval of the building in 2015. As discussed in the design review meeting, the flags will not impact the security cameras and the fire beacons located on the columns. An existing conditions document will be submitted to the CRA noting the elevation of the flags.

*A motion to approve the conceptual signage proposal Option B for Cava Restaurant at 88 Ames Street on Parcel 4 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area was seconded and carried unanimously.*

## **5. Proposal: Temporary Signage Proposal from Biogen for Science Day 2018**

***Motion: Approving the installation of temporary banners upon the Blue Garage within Parcel 2 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area.***

Mr. Zogg said that Biogen requested more time to make modification so this item will be tabled.

At 7:29 p.m., a motion was moved to hold a short recess.

The meeting reconvened at 7:43 p.m.

As members of the public might be present for item #3, Mr. Evans suggested completing that agenda item with a motion including a financial contribution calculated by the City of Cambridge standard fee estimate rate multiplied by the area of impacted open space. Although the dimensions of the open space will need to be calculated based on the final dimensions and location of the trailer, the standard fee of two dollars per square foot per month would result in an amount between \$10,000 and \$20,000.

*The motion to approve the placement of a temporary structure and temporary signage and wayfinding for an interim Bank of America branch location at Ames Place within Parcel 3 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area for a period of time from October 2018 to March 31, 2019, subject to financial contribution calculated by the City of Cambridge standard fee estimate rate multiplied by the area of impacted open space was seconded and carried unanimously.*

## **6. Update: Infill Development Concept Plan – Phase Two (Mr. Tilford)**

Mike Tilford, from Boston Properties, said that the feedback received from the recent joint meeting of the CRA and PB regarding the master plan and commercial building B is being processed. Tonight, he hopes to get feedback on the complicated phase 2 of the Infill Development Concept plan. Phase 2 includes commercial building B, the south residential tower which will have about 355 housing units of which 84 are income restricted, Broadway Park, the East-West connectors, the raised cycle track, and an opportunity to reconceive the Kendall Square Plaza and its connection to the rooftop garden. Stantec and Lemon Brooke are helping with the design. David Stewart, George Needs, Melissa Schrock, Eric Mo, and Ian Hatch, from BXP, are all working on the project.

Mr. Needs, Project Manager for 135 Broadway, noted that this large residential building is tied to the commercial building and, with up to 400 units, it is a significant component of the Phase 2 deliverables. One public benefit is that out of the 35,000 square feet of GFA being delivered, 25% will be income restricted. This is the highest commitment that has been made by a private developer for a high rise construction delivered on site. Mr. Needs introduced Eric Wyant, Tim Reagan, and Brett Lambert, from Stantec, which is the lead architect for the project. Christian Lemon, Lemon Brook Architects principal, will be working on the public realm open spaces.

Mr. Needs said that nothing has significantly changed since the initially approved Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP). Today is a kick-off of the design review. In addition to the income restricted component, this building needs to deliver 5% for 3 bedroom units and 20% for condominiums. The building exists on top of an existing garage which constrains the ground floor plan and lobby design. The goal is to submit a design review package by end of the year while using this public forum over the next months for updates to design evolutions.

Mr. Needs showed a map of the 135 Broadway massing with respect to Broadway, Galileo Galilei Way, and Binney Street. This is a 350,000 square foot GFA building that focuses density on the southern portion of the garage to take advantage of the 350-foot height limit. The full 80,000 square foot condo requirement will be in this one building. Then in Phase 3, on the north side of the garage, there will be a smaller residential building, which is more consistent with the adjacent neighborhood on the other side of Binney Street. This building is respectful of the K2 guidelines and has a setback to separate it from the 145 Broadway building.

A stacking chart showed the first 17 floors as rentals and 9 condos floors above that to the top of the building. The number of condo floors might increase slightly. The performance of 88 Ames Street has helped develop the final unit mix for 135 Broadway. There is a big demand for lower priced smaller units if there is a strong amenity package and shared social spaces. Therefore the initial unit mix was reallocated with a reduction in the number of 1 and 2 bedroom units and an increase in the number of micros and studios. This provided a greater range of price points. By reducing the unit size, more units could be added so instead of 70 condos and 285 rentals, the mix is now 100 condos and 300 rentals.

Mr. Needs spoke about demoing the southern section of the garage and building it back. The alternative is to keep the garage in place, thread a structure through it, and then build over it. He spoke about the structural and seismic challenges to upgrading the garage. Demoing the garage would provide an earlier delivery, an efficient means to add more parking, and would give more room to the lobby area. Research continues but the team is leaning towards demoing it. This decision is crucial to the entire design since the column grid carries through the tower.

Mr. Needs spoke about the changes to the lobbies given the restraints. By flipping the core to face the east, there are can still be two lobbies but the modification results in a more intimate condo lobby and a larger rental lobby which allows for more programming room. There will be two separate entrances.

Christian Lemon introduced his two colleagues, Josh Burgel and Samantha Stewart, and some of Lemon Brooke Architects' recent work in Cambridge. Mr. Lemon spoke about Broadway Park's redesign and the east portion of the East-West connector. The components of the original plan of Broadway Park included a larger plaza with paving that stretched from East Service Drive to West Service Drive, a small grass area, a large community table, permanent seating, temporary bike parking, and a transition zone between the building and the plaza. The new plan has a plaza from East Service Drive to West Service Drive, a curb system, a large grass area in the middle, a raised sculptural bench, umbrellas, a focal tree, and a plaza in front of each of the two entries. From the viewpoint of circulation and flexibility, Mr. Lemon felt that the previous design was too prescriptive. Although the new design is traditional, it provides better circulation throughout the park and the open space. The round seating provides various seating positions depending on the sun and shade desired. Umbrellas can come and go seasonally and can be dynamic to add a touch of fun to the space. The outside is a pure form, which helps with the active circulation expected, while the bench seating provides a more intimate internal grouping character. There is a current drop-off along the border with 145 Broadway and an additional layby along East Service Drive which could also be used for food trucks. There is temporary bike parking on the East-West connector closest to the building as well some spots in the plaza. The idea is to keep the connector as a garden space with bike parking and benches. He noted that the current temporary crosswalk on Broadway seems to work as an important connection to Danny Lewin Park so he suggested a crosswalk on the more active retail edge of the park. He also suggested moving the bike share parking closer to the park and relocating the bus stops. Street trees should be added on both edges to frame the park so as not to block eye-level visibility. He advocated for the main focal tree as a destination, adding shade, and softening the building's site lines. He mentioned the various choices for seating.

Ms. Drury voiced concern about pedestrians and vehicles using East Service Drive and West Service Drive without clear demarcations of the pavement. Mr. Tilford said that the enlarged bump outs are a visual cue to slow down. Mr. Zevin suggested that the pedestrian-friendly paving be stopped at the truck docks for both 145 Broadway and the new building so that pedestrians are encouraged to use the sidewalks before they interact with the trucks. Mr. Lemon confirmed that East Service Drive and West Service Drive will continue to be one-way roads and are not going to be widened. There was a discussion of the narrowing of Broadway. Mr. Zogg said that although the road is being narrowed the Fire Department said that emergency vehicles could use the opposing lane in emergencies.

In response to Ms. Drury, Mr. Stewart said that the water feature between the residential building and the park in the previous design was concerning due to its maintenance and appearance during winter. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Tilford said that the design changed because a new designer was selected who had a different vision of the park; however, the programmatic aspect remains the same. The former design was more edgy, contemporary and had an urban look. Galaxy Park, Danny Lewin, and the Plaza all have the same round concept. Mr. Needs said that the circle maximizes functionality and efficient movement. Ms. Born noted a concern that a curb cut will eventually show up to ease deliveries to the building and it will become a roundabout.

In response to Mr. Bator's concern regarding the amount of pavement and the lack of a water component in the summer, Mr. Lemon said that the trees and the umbrellas will mitigate the heat. There was a discussion of pavement colors. Mr. Lemon said that the round space is easier and more flexible to program. Mr. Crawford said that the once the buildings are populated, the connector to the Sixth Street Walkway through the Park up to Broadway might change in ways that haven't been anticipated so flexibility in the design is important. There was a discussion of the proportions of the grassy area.

Ms. Hoffman suggested that it might not be necessary to have two entries since there's only one at 303 Third Street which also has condos and rentals in the same building. She also said that if there's something interesting on the side streets, people will walk through to see it. She would like to see flowers in the design as opposed to another boring corporate space. She suggested using art for any element, including furniture, to make it a better space.

Mr. Tilford pointed out the three lay-by spaces for pickups and drop-offs, but Ms. Born didn't think that was enough for 400 units. Mr. Stewart said that these should be in the current bus stop locations. The area in front of 325 Broad is covenant open space so a road in front of that building is not possible. There was a discussion of how to solve this layby space issue. Since the building is 120 feet from the street, visual cues and connections to the building are challenging to the design of the building.

Mr. Lemon spoke about the other open space components - the Main Street streetscape, Kendall Plaza, the roof garden and Pioneer Way. With respect to the streetscape, all the street elements – brick paving, star and steel benches, trees, vehicle and pedestrian street lights, bike racks, trash and recycling receptacles, bus shelters, etc. - would be removed during construction and put back to the same state after construction. With regards to the Kendall Plaza, there will be the addition of a second floor terrace with a view of the plaza and the street, a stairway to the terrace, and retail on first and second floors. The glass canopy will be removed. There will be a more visible connection to the roof garden via an elevator from the second floor. The roof garden would have minimal intervention near the new elevator, as well as a bridge connection on the fourth floor to the tenant building. Both of these entrances would have accessible paths into the garden. More shade tolerant plantings will be added or used to replace existing plantings as needed.

Mr. Zevin said that the new elevator location would unfortunately occupy the best space of the garden to view the plaza and the skyline and suggested moving it. He also suggested that a stairway go all the way to the fourth floor garden even though it is a steep climb. Mr. Lemon said that many people enjoy the park as it is. It is not designed for a lot of people so bringing more people to it would change its character. Mr. Bator emphasized the need to accentuate the public nature because it is not a Google employee park.

Ms. Born said that there needs to be a meaningful visible connection to the roof garden from the head houses and the plaza. This is the opportunity of building this building from the point of view of the public realm. Mr. Crawford agreed that the roof garden is a quiet space but it cannot be exclusive. Mr. Bator said that it is underutilized. Ms. Schrock said that the building will cut back somewhat on the upper levels. She said that her team is working on placing the elevator in a spot that can bridge over as well as creating some terracing elements to give visual cues. A full stairway might be a bigger visual block. Ms. Born suggested that the landscape architects and designers should be using perspective with a 3D walkthrough program. Mr. Bator agreed that the active character of the plaza is different from the contemplative nature of the roof garden but overuse of the garden will not be a problem. Mr. Evans suggested integrating the elevator into the 3CC building structure.



Mr. Zogg added that the programming of this space should be discussed at some point since the current layout doesn't allow for various programs. Ms. Shrock said that not all parks need to do everything. Mr. Zogg suggested coming up with a program plan for the parks in the area and then the parks could be designed to accommodate those particular programs.

## **7. Staff Report and Monthly Financial Update**

Mr. Evans said that a hiring process is underway. Regarding the food truck program, the Cup Cake City food truck needed to drop out and Zaaki food truck took their place. The restoration work at the Grand Junction Park is completed and one last reimbursement payment is expected from Veolia. The 6th Street Walkway is also under construction. Its concrete sidewalk was removed and the flexi-pave material installation is beginning. There have been numerous conversations with the abutting companies with respect to the path not being compromised by adjacent construction projects in the near future. Boston Properties had a community workshop on the massing changes to the Infill Development Concept Plan the night after the joint CRA and Planning Board pre-application meeting. There is a coUrbanize site related to the project that is getting a lot of traffic. From the multiple comments about the need for a pharmacy, Mr. Evans noted the need to publicize a comprehensive district-wide retail plan for all the development projects. Mr. Zogg said that the same is true for an open space district-wide program plan. Mr. Zevin noted that there were not many coUrbanize comments regarding the building itself.

Mr. Evans spoke about the open space analysis that staff had done this summer which will also be used in the Kendall Square Implementation Plan Report. Due to the late hour, Mr. Bator asked for this topic to be moved to the September meeting. There was an agreement to table discussion. Ms. Levering mentioned that the survey is on the CRA website. There was a discussion of the other social media outlets used. Regarding the budget, Mr. Evans noted that the landscaping maintenance budget line item mistakenly included all the repair work done on the Grand Junction but that this expense was actually a redevelopment investment expense and would be posted correctly for the next month's report.

Mr. Evans spoke to Ms. Hoffman's suggestion to reopen the survey. Ms. Levering noted that most of the 102 responses were collected via an intercept survey during lunch-time at various Kendall Square parks. There were also 25 online responses. The various distribution channels were discussed. Ms. Levering will reopen and redistribute the survey link. Ms. Born stated that this report will be first on September's agenda.

## **Adjournment**

The motion to adjourn was seconded and carried unanimously at 9:42 p.m.