

Regular Board Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, December 18, 2019, 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 CRA Board meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Treasurer Christopher Bator and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford was expected shortly. Executive Director Tom Evans and CRA staff members, Alex Levering, Ellen Shore, Erica Schwarz, and Carlos Peralta were also in attendance. The meeting was recorded by the CRA.

Public Comment

Stephen Kaiser was happy to see CRA's comments about the NEPA scoping plan. He said that consultants have been hired but the I-90 project hasn't been funded. There is a consensus that transit is inadequate. He also spoke about a survey that noted a bad MBTA safety culture.

Mr. Crawford arrived at 5:45 pm.

In his work searching the CRA archives, Mr. Kaiser said that there are very good records of parcel acquisitions. The Board minutes are immaculate and have been very helpful. The CRA database has a lot of information. He spoke about some historical events regarding the CRA.

No other members of the public wished to comment.

The motion to close the public comment section of the meeting carried unanimously.

Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 18, 2019

Ms. Born asked that her reply to Mr. Kaiser in the public comment section of the minutes be clarified. The CRA was not involved in the siting of the proposed Just-A-Start building at Rindge Towers. The CRA was invited to get involved with the connectivity aspect of the project. Ms. Shore will make the change.

The motion to accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 18, 2019, edited as noted, and place them on file carried unanimously.

Communications

2. NEPA Scoping Comment Letter regarding MassDOT I-90 Project

Mr. Evans said that the CRA submitted a letter commenting on the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) scoping process. While NEPA and MEPA are closely related, Mr. Evans explained the differences between the two processes. The CRA's comments focused on needing a better study of the transit impacts and other multi-

modal opportunities, including the Grand Junction trail and rail connection. The letter referenced the MAPC transit planning work that was a requirement of the MEPA process. MAPC has just begun that process so it might not be ready in time to inform the scoping process. The KSA and MIT also wrote letters. A letter from the City noted other connectivity issues besides those in Kendall. The CRA will continue its ongoing advocacy for the use of the GJ corridor as a transportation connection to Kendall Square.

Ms. Drury thought the letter was excellent and was glad to see that it urged MassDOT to plan for the future. Ms. Born started a discussion about the City's letter, which advocated filling in and narrowing portions of the river to create more parklands. Mr. Crawford said that the Charles River Watershed Association's expertise would have a good oversight of that issue.

3. Correspondence from Cambridge Community Center regarding Forward Fund Grant

Ms. Born said that discussion of this item can move to the Forward Fund agenda item #10. Mr. Evans said that there is a letter from CEOC which can be brought up at that time as well.

4. Email transmittal from Bjorn Poonen regarding Google signage proposal

Mr. Evans said that this letter is related to agenda item #7 and can be discussed at that time

The motion to file the NEPA Scoping Comment and hold off on the other two correspondences until the appropriate points in the agenda carried unanimously.

Reports, Motions, and Discussion Items

Ms. Born ask for a suspension of rules in order to move agenda item #10 forward.

The motion to do so carried unanimously.

10. Forward Fund Update

Mr. Peralta distributed his memo regarding the December Forward Fund recommendations. He said that the selection committee meeting reviewed three proposals last Friday - a Community Infrastructure Capital Grant to the East End House and Technical Assistance Grants to the Dance Complex and to the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee. All submissions met the requirements to align with the goals and objectives of the City's Envision Cambridge and the Community Needs Assessment reports. If approved by the CRA Board, the funding for the year is just over \$236,000. He listed other grants that were awarded in previous 2019 funding cycles. The current proposals were rated the highest of all proposals this year by the selection committee.

Michael Delia, from the East End House, thanked the Board for helping them address the outdated and marginal 30-year old fire alarm system. A highly regarded vendor was chosen from three bids to replace the entire system, including the smoke detectors. Peter DiMuro, from the Dance Complex, thanked the Board for helping them replace their chair lift, removing a barrier that hinders many from participating in their programs. Mr. Peralta distributed a letter from the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee since their representative was unable to attend. Mr. Peralta explained that their food pantry needs a major redesign to continue to provide this asset to the community.

Mr. Peralta then noted the Cambridge Community Center's (CCC) correspondence letter and introduced Darrin Korte. Mr. Korte said that CCC is deeply grateful for past support from the CRA - \$5,000 four years ago for necessary upgrades, \$10,000 to support the tech lab, a larger gift towards the kitchen renovation and this year's grant to further support the totality of the project. He explained why he is asking that this year's gift be increased by \$25,000 to the full initially requested amount of \$100,000. Mr. Peralta explained that only \$75,000 of the \$100,000 was awarded because the CRA-funded kitchen project was still in progress. Mr. Korte emphasized that the \$100,000 is part of a \$2 million capital campaign. Concerns regarding the previous budgets and estimates are being analyzed and Mr. Korte is working closely with Mr. Peralta to keep the CRA updated. He spoke about other

fundraising goals for the project and committed gifts from various other organizations, although the amounts are unspecified. There was a long discussion about the project.

Mr. Evans explained that the funds for the 2019 Forward Fund have been allocated. The recommendations of the selection committee are presented to the Board for their concurrence and to maintain transparency of the recipients' requests. This discussion informs the treasurers to cut a check for this project but no motion vote is required. The sense of the Board was to move forward.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Korte said that construction is expected in Q1 or Q2 of 2020. A ribbon cutting event would occur in Q3 or Q4. The gym won't be touched so rentals and programs will continue. The goal is to have the kitchen finished in time for Thanksgiving dinner.

The motion to put the letters from the Cambridge Community Center and the Cambridge Economic Opportunity Committee on file carried unanimously.

5. Designer Selection Process for 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive Renovations

Motion: Authorizing the CRA Staff to negotiate and the CRA Chair to enter into a design services contract with Silverman Trykowski Associates for the design of building improvements for the 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive property.

Ms. Schwarz said that the project is going well. An update of the financial model from HR&A was received with more precise numbers. The current property manager was inherited from the previous owner. A full procurement process for property management will be coming before the Board in coming months. Procurement for an owner's project manager is also needed during the renovation of the building. Feedback from all the tenants regarding modifying the building and occupying the premises during construction will be passed onto the designer, once one is under contract.

The memo in the packet explains the designer procurement process. All the firms were very strong but Silverman Trykowski Associates is being recommended because of their experience with historic masonry brick buildings and renovating occupied buildings. They have experience with design, layout, interior design for various kinds of office space, public procurement, and publicly funded projects.

Mr. Evans said that the RFQ process under Article 7 requires ranking a firm. If an agreement is not reached with Silverman Trykowski Associates, the second ranked firm will be approached. Ms. Schwarz said that representatives from the firm had a schedule conflict tonight and were unable to attend.

The motion authorizing the CRA Staff to negotiate and the CRA Chair to enter into a design services contract with Silverman Trykowski Associates for the design of building improvements for the 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive property carried unanimously.

6. Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House Update

Motion: Authorizing the CRA Chair to enter into a professional services contract with the Traggorth Companies LLC and Stone Soup Collaborative for the financial consulting services related to the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House revitalization strategy.

Motion: Approving an amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding with the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House to extend the project timeline six months.

Ms. Schwarz gave an update on the project to explain the reason for the second motion. Project goals were identified. Studio G was selected as the architect and they have done some existing conditions work, some geo-tech work, 3D measurements, and a survey. During this time, the process slowed as Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House (MFNH) replaced its interim Executive Director, Selvin Chambers. Ms. Schwarz spoke about Kimberly Massenburg who was hired three weeks ago to fill that position. The MFNH is also looking to fill another significant position, Director of Development and Communications. The timeline now stretches out to

June for a feasibility phase, a determination of the scope and budget of the project, and a decision on whether to proceed into a new agreement with the MFNH. If there is a new agreement, page 5 of the memo shows what one possible schedule could be, as there are many possible alternatives.

In response to Mr. Zevin, Ms. Schwarz said that all the programs will be maintained but the exact location of each existing program will be evaluated. Those currently occurring in the historic house might not remain there. In response to Ms. Born, Michael Tilford, an MFNH Board member, who was present at the meeting, explained that the dedicated team, which includes CRA staff, MFNH, Studio G, and the financial analyst, will evaluate and limit the financially and physically feasible options which would then be presented to the CRA Board and the community. Ms. Schwarz references the financial analyst that Mr. Tilford mentioned in her CRA Board packet memo. Mr. Tilford and Mr. Evans spoke about past community engagement sessions; more will occur. Mr. Evans said that the MFNH Board needs to decide on possible land transactions. The location of the house is of historical importance, so it won't be relocated. Affordable tenancy and ownership of the housing is a primary issue. Another issue is the locations of existing programs for now and for the future. The process is not linear. Ms. Schwarz said that the existing zoning doesn't make the project feasible. In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Tilford said that there has been a lot of engagement with relevant neighborhood parties. Ms. Schwarz said that abutters have been notified and more outreach will be done.

Regarding the first motion, Ms. Schwarz explained that architects are working on the project but a real estate financial proforma is needed. Due to the complex set of uses on this site, the pool of consultant candidates is not large. Ms. Schwarz's memo discusses the procurement process and the recommendation for a team of the two respondents. She spoke about each company and read a letter from Sam Seidel that was received just before tonight's meeting supporting the selection of the team, Stone Soup Collaborative and Traggorth Companies. There will be one contract. Mr. Evans clarified that one company will be a subcontractor to the other.

The motion authorizing the CRA Chair to enter into a professional services contract with the Traggorth Companies LLC and Stone Soup Collaborative for the financial consulting services related to the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House revitalization strategy carried unanimously.

The motion approving an amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding with the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House to extend the project timeline six months to June 2020 carried unanimously.

Mr. Tilford was pleased to announce that the MFNH has recently received two grants from DPR and the Masonic Lodge of St. Andrew in Boston, totaling \$50,000.

7. 325 Main Street Design and Development Update

Ms. Levering introduced Eric Mo, from Boston Properties (BxP), who distributed a presentation showing some updates regarding the roof garden. He noted the "trellis-disguised" security gate near the social stairs that is needed to close the garden during the night. The Marriott terrace is included in the renovation which will include two public bathrooms for larger events. This is in addition to the two ground floor bathrooms. The Marriott requested outside access to a freight elevator. BxP is starting to put together a design vocabulary and material palette. The storage or restroom pavilions will look like lanterns with clerestory windows that will be lit in the evening hours. The kitchen area has an island and a grill. BxP is working with caterers to understand their basic needs. Board members discussed the gate's height, width, and general forbidding appearance when it is closed. Mr. Evans suggested moving the gate to the retail level. Ms. Born suggested a NanaWall look. Mr. Bator noted that the renderings make the staircase look like a fire escape. Ms. Drury would like to see more greenery to enhance the park-garden aspect. Mr. Bator said that any synthetic material used should be of an excellent quality. Mr. Tilford confirmed that there is a planting plan. In response to Mr. Evans, Mr. Mo said that there will be greenery on the new structures' roofs as well as existing ones such as the elevator core on the Broadway side and Pioneer Way connection. Mr. Zevin was pleased to see that the storage was pulled back from the edge which allows people to go to the edge. He added, however, that people should be able to see out as opposed to being behind tall plantings. Mr. Evans would like to see a glass guardrail along the Volpe side of the garden. Mr. Zevin suggested that the storage buildings be more whimsical. BxP will be back with the full package.

8. MXD Signage Review Update

Motion: *Approving the Google signage proposal consistent with the December 12, 2019 submission, including an upper floor building identity sign and street level wayfinding signage for 325 Main Street, within the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan – Parcel 4*

Mr. Peralta distributed Boston Properties' (BxP) presentation on the Google signage. Eric Mo, from BxP, said that the CRA design review committee met a few weeks ago. The feedback from that meeting, summarized in Mr. Peralta's Board packet memo, will be addressed tonight. Ms. Born and Mr. Evans clarified that the design review committee is composed of two of five CRA Board members, CRA staff, two City Planning Board members, and City staff. A formal vote of the CRA Board is necessary on the signage packages.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Beth Whittaker, from Merge Architects, described the penthouse "G" sign proposal. The sign will be dimmable. Pictures in the presentation showed the 'G' sign's elevation, placement, and its appearance in the daytime and nighttime, as well as various other views.

In response to Mr. Evans, Mr. Mo said that the design of the exterior lighting in the "apertures" and on the angled fritted glass is still evolving. BxP is still working through the base lighting as well. Mr. Zevin voiced a concern with the intensity of the soffit lighting. Ms. Born started a discussion regarding the placement of the "G" with respect to the projected mullion fin. Mr. Zevin said that if the projected mullion went through the "G," it might appear similar to a currency symbol. Ms. Born asked that this be discussed with the architects to ensure that they understand the placement issue. Mr. Evans said that the "G" sits within the mechanical zone so it will never have occupied lighting behind it. It sits in front of opaque spandrel glass. Mr. Evans said the façade is expected to read the same in daylight.

Mr. Mo mentioned the letter from Bjorn Poonen regarding the hours of illumination. Mr. Mo presented the results of a survey done on the lighting hours of four other corporate signs. Ms. Born reiterated the issue of having the light on all night. Mr. Evans suggested the lights turn off when the proximate restaurants/bars close. Mr. Bator added that the lighting inside the office spaces is a major consideration as well.

Mr. Mo then spoke about the Main Street public lobby entrance refinements. The opaque spandrel band between floors 1 and 2 will be replaced with vision glass so it reads as more public. He showed a rendering of the entry column wrap on Main Street and on Pioneer Way. Adding artwork and/or transit screens is being evaluated. Images of the ground floor signage were shown in white and in "Google" colors, Ms. Whittaker spoke in more detail about the sign's dimensions. Mr. Mo said that the height was decreased from four feet to three feet. Ms. Drury liked the big numbers and letters in the address. Ms. Born and Mr. Bator preferred the white lettering. The next slides showed the elevation of the Google sign in relation to samplings of retail signage on the storefronts, as well as renderings in the day and night. The exact vendors are undetermined at this time.

As Ms. Whittaker and Wade Aaron of SosoLimited explained the proposed art installation within the lobby space, a video was shown. The undulating brick structure in the lobby incorporates seating and thin video screens (tickers) that function as information exchanges. The material samples that were brought to the meeting were discussed. In response to Mr. Zevin, Ms. Whittaker said that the team is working on mock-ups. There was a discussion of the functionality of the tickers. Mr. Evans suggested that the lobby contain a museum wall text that explains the content exchange between Google and the public. Mr. Aaron said that Google technology would be used to pull topical content related to the Kendall Square area. Mr. Mo said that the vestibule is still being designed. There was a discussion regarding the flooring of the public lobby and Google's lobby.

A motion approving the Google signage proposal consistent with the December 12, 2019 submission, including an upper floor building identity sign and street level wayfinding signage for 325 Main Street, within the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan – Parcel 4 was seconded and carried unanimously.

9. Foundry Update

Ms. Schwarz spoke about design and construction items mentioned in her Board packet memo. She noted that the renderings of the building from Bent and Rogers Streets do not include any other existing buildings and

structures. The corrugated metal on the siding of the building's addition will be bright and easy to clean. There is an artistic modern structure highlighting the entryway. In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Evans said that adding a mural requires access to Verizon's property which complicates installation and future maintenance. Ms. Schwarz said that the Historical Commission was pleased with the percentage of preservation of the original building. The image of the lightning bolt, located on the transformer for the electric company, has not appeared in more current renderings. The old driveway is now flush with the street.

Final design document drawings will be done by mid-January, followed by another round of cost estimates. The City plans to go before the Planning Board in late February- early March.

With regards to governance, the CRA will administer the process to procure a search firm to help the Foundry Consortium find an Executive Director (ED). Working with the search firm, the Foundry Consortium will be selecting their ED. The CRA is also drafting a short-term MOU with the Foundry Consortium, outlining support for the search firm and for funds that will support this executive director in advance of the Foundry opening. The CRA will be drafting the actual sublease with the Foundry Consortium, to be signed this spring.

If the Board approves the budget later in tonight's meeting, the search firm would be funded with investment interest earned from the Foundry funds. It is not drawing down principal. Ms. Schwarz said that the investment interest would also pay for the first 9-12 months of an ED's salary and fringe benefits. Mr. Evans added that once the building is open, it will generate revenue. However, in order for it to open successfully, the CRA needs to add capacity. He said that there had not been a policy regarding the use of the interest gained from the money set aside for the Foundry. Mr. Bator said that using this earned money was appropriate. Ms. Schwarz expects that an ED search subcommittee would be created at the next Foundry Consortium Board meeting in January. This subcommittee would work with her to finalize the search firm and move forward with the process. Ms. Schwarz referred to page 2 of her memo which lists items for a lease with the Foundry Consortium. Mr. Evans clarified that a \$1 to \$2 per square foot ground lease payment would be a mechanism to support the building's reserve fund. If the office leases are with the CRA, the CRA would skim off this payment for the reserve fund and the rest would go towards operations. A robust capital reserve has always been in the plan. Ms. Schwarz said that the goal is to sign a lease with the Foundry Consortium Board in April or May. Mr. Evans said that it might take longer if the City wants to review it.

In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Evans spoke about discussions regarding the cost of a foundation system. Structural designs for the new floors have changed, and now include some pilings.. The City has stuck to their timetable for finishing construction. Mr. Evans said that street design is another discussion, including whether Rogers Street be a one- or two-way street. Solutions for public parking in the area and drop-off zones also need to be determined. Mr. Evans said that the next Foundry Advisory Committee (FAC) meeting is January 10th at 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive. The FAC relationship needs to be addressed. The CRA has been invited and encouraged to be part of the Foundry Consortium Board meetings. There will be a joint FAC and Foundry Consortium Board meeting in the spring.

11. 2020 Budget

Motion: Approving the proposed Cambridge Redevelopment Authority operating budget for the 2020 fiscal year.

Mr. Evans said that the budget is very similar to that shown at the November Board meeting, with a few refinements. At that meeting, two formats options were shown. One option brought out more details regarding the building at 93-99 Bishop Allen. Tonight, a third option is being presented. The actuals as of November are in the first column. The 2019 budget is in the second column. To the right of the grey line is a series of estimates of all the subcategories. Mr. Evans proposed approving the budget in a more consolidated form, the rightmost column, which rolls the subcategories into categories.

The blue colored portion of the budget shows the primary source of operating income is from proceeds from development rights. Since a check for the 325 Main Street building is expected before Christmas, after the storm water permit issue with DPW is resolved, this income amount will remain in the 2019 budget. For 2020, income is expected from the continued Proto payments and the Broad M1 project. The second major source of operating

income is from Bishop Allen rents. There will be a separate Bishop Allen budget report. Mr. Evans reminded the Board that this building will be cash negative over the course of the first 18 months because the rents are not being raised until 2021. Next year, the CRA will have capital expenses for the building. The other source of income is investment income. For the 2020 budget, interest and dividend income will be combined into one line item which will reduce subcategories in the budget.

In the orange section of the budget, the Personnel category includes the expectation for some staff expansion although the exact positions are under discussion. Interviews are currently being conducted for a Director of Finance. Based on conversations in the interviews, the new hire will likely have ideas about restructuring the budget. The Personnel category includes salary and fringe benefits. When reporting on the budget, the total Personnel budget amount of \$889,200 would be presented rather than every subcategory. The amounts of most of these expenses are not controlled by the CRA.

The Board Meeting line item (highlighted in yellow) is being moved from Office Expenses into Community Outreach as it is a public meeting. Most of the other line items are similar to where they were in the 2019 budget. Some office expenses, like internet and utilities, were eliminated since they are included in the lease with The Link. There is no longer a lease on the copier since it is now owned by the CRA. The Information Technology line item (highlighted in red) moved from Telecommunications to Professional Services since our IT person is a consultant. The roll-up of Office Expenses for 2020 is \$227,200.

The Property Management line item includes parks, Parcel 6 and now, the 93-99 Bishop Allen building. Although the subcategories are consolidated, there will be a separate report on the building. It is expected that the Director of Finance will have some opinions on other ways to report on the building and the general CRA budget. In addition, the account for the Foundry and KSTEP might both be separated out from a general CRA budget.

Regarding Professional Services (green) section of the budget, Mr. Evans said that since the Board should have close oversight on these expenses, these subcategories will continue to be included in the budget reporting. The amount of outsourcing done by the CRA is significant. Mr. Evans said that the bylaws keep the staffing compressed. In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Evans said that the Director of Finance will help analyze the investment services expense. There might still be a need for an advisor to deal with laddering of CDs and cash flow.

In the Redevelopment Investments (purple) section, there is \$300,000 allotted in the budget for the Forward Fund. This includes new 2020 grant payments as well as payments for projects in previous years that haven't been completed. In the 2020 budget, the line items for 2017 and 2018 will be combined. It is possible that not all granted projects will be completed by the end of 2020. Once a project has been granted funds, those funds are essentially committed and could be reported as spent. This is another area that the Director of Finance might report on differently, especially when projects straddle fiscal years. The auditors have spoken about changing the accounting software used to handle this situation. The same is true for the committed Foundry funds of \$7,000,000. Mr. Evans said that he expects to send the city money for the soft costs of the Foundry this spring. As Ms. Schwarz previously mentioned, the operational support to the Foundry Consortium Executive Director work is about \$200,000, over this year and part of next year when the building opens. The KSTEP fund expenditures are hard to predict as it has taken longer than expected to get the governance committee to meet and agree on things. Bus shelters will be bought to test the flow of money and procedural steps. Mr. Crawford said that there are plenty of plans but some implementation is needed. Mr. Evans said that the short-term focus is on local circulation issues that are based on EZ Ride rather than on the MBTA. With respect to the mortgage, interest payments land on the budget report but the principal payments are on the balance sheet under assets.

Without a big sale of development rights expected this year, Mr. Evans said that the net income loss is \$1.6 million, but \$2 million of that is due to the Foundry expense.

The charts show the expenses by project. Ms. Drury noted that the chart of expenses by project shows a nice balance of work on various projects. Mr. Bator was pleased to see that the website was modified to show that CRA is no longer Kendall centric but focuses on projects Cambridge-wide. Mr. Evans said that more website work will be done to reflect that.

In response to Mr. Evans, there was a consensus to use the consolidated budget report as the Board feels well informed. Mr. Evans said that this would require fewer budget amendments as the categories are broader.

A motion approving the proposed Cambridge Redevelopment Authority operating budget for the 2020 fiscal year was moved and seconded. A roll call was taken

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Bator – yes.

The motion carried unanimously.

13. Report: Monthly Staff Report

Motion: Approving the revised 2020 Calendar of Regular CRA Board Meetings and scheduled Design Review Committee Meetings

Mr. Evans reviewed the staff report memo in the Board packet. He spoke about the archiving project. Stephen Kaiser has also been looking through boxes of CRA records for his research project and has provided staff with more content detail. This detail will be incorporated into the database created by King Information Systems.

Mr. Evans spoke about the items expected to be brought to the Board in future meetings. A draft workforce development report from the City needs some editing with the U Mass team before it comes to the Board. Boston Properties was asked to come to the Board with a comprehensive retail signage plan for the Akamai building rather than piecemeal proposals. An OPM is needed soon for Bishop Allen Drive to help staff understand how to manage the public construction process of an occupied building.

Mr. Evans said that the five food trucks are still getting customers in December. The reduced daily rate of a food truck program throughout the winter does not support the cost of plowing the spaces for trucks.

The staff report summarizes some other work on the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House project.

The CRA is trying to do what can be done to keep as many trees as possible along Binney/Broadway/Galileo streets. Utilities and access for fire trucks and pedestrians make the issue very complex. Another proposal will be sent to Boston Properties and DPW to try to save at least half of the trees that were designated for removal. Mr. Evans said that the CRA will come back to ECPT once there are decisions.

The staff report summarizes work on the KSTEP project which was also brought up during the budget report agenda item.

The staff report summarizes the Broadway/Main/Third streetscape redesign project. After all the construction is done, the goal is to put the streetscape back in a way that makes more sense. Broadway and Main Street are the most heavily traveled bicycle routes in the city. The discontinuous bike lanes and previous parking plans do not meet a high standard. Mr. Evans would like to find a consultant to design a cohesive plan. In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Evans said that KSTEP is transit-oriented fund as opposed to bike or pedestrian infrastructure. Mr. Zevin said that MIT is close to doing the sidewalk reconstruction. It was agreed that it makes no sense for MIT to repave Main Street while construction at 325 Main continues.

In response to Mr. Zevin's question about the retail leasing at 145 Broadway, Mr. Evans said the Boston Properties has two tenants that are ready to talk about signage and they are looking for two more. There was a discussion about local independent vendors and international companies.

Looking at the 2020 proposed calendar, the board meetings are in red and the potential (as needed) design review meetings are in green. Rather than do both these meetings on the same Wednesday, they are being staggered. The difference between this calendar and the one shown to the Board in November was moving the

January Board meeting date and adding a Board meeting date in April. Mr. Evans noted that he now has an issue with the March Board meeting date.

A motion approving the revised 2020 Calendar of Regular CRA Board Meetings and scheduled Design Review Committee Meetings, with the possibility that the March meeting date might change, was seconded and carried unanimously.

Mr. Bator thanked the staff for their efforts and is proud of the work the CRA has done. The other Board members agreed.

At 9:02 p.m., the motion to adjourn the meeting carried unanimously.