CAMBRIDGE
REDEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY

P 617-492-6800 | F 617-492-6804
255 Main Street | 4th Floor | Cambridge, MA 02142
cambridgeredevelopment.org

Regular Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, March 16, 2016, 5:30pm
Robert Healy Public Safety Center / Cambridge Police Station
125 Sixth Street
Community Room

FINAL - REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Call

CRA Chair Kathleen Born called the Annual Meeting to order at 5:38 p.m. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Treasurer Christopher Bator, Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford, and State Appointee Barry Zevin. Ms. Born also introduced CRA staff members – Executive Director Tom Evans, Office Manager Ellen Shore, and Program Manager Jason Zogg.

The meeting is being recorded by the CRA Office Manager and another attendee.

Public Comment

Ms. Heather Hoffman stated that she welcomes the return of food trucks to Parcel 6. When asked to elaborate, she said that food trucks had been at the location a while ago.

No other people asked to comment.

A motion to close the public comment portion of the meeting was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

Minutes

1. **Motion:** ***To accept the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Board on February 24, 2016***

Ms. Born gave Ms. Shore a small typographical correction.

The motion to accept the minutes and place them on file was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

2. **Motion:** ***To accept the minutes of the Executive Session held on January 20, 2016***

Mr. Evans clarified that the sublease, as attached, includes some legal corrections to the sublease discussed at the meeting.

The motion to accept the minutes and place them on file was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

Communications

(None)

Reports, Motions and Discussion Items

As requested by Mr. Evans, the board agreed the switch of the order of agenda items 3 and 4.

4. Presentation: MXD Infill Development Open Space Concepts

Mr. Michael Tilford from Boston Properties (BP) introduced himself as well as Mr. Victor Vizgaitis, Mr. Alan Ward, and Mr. Ben Kou from Sasaki. Mr Tilford said that BP recognizes that open space and landscaping are important to the public. BP wants to use the Infill Development open space concept as an opportunity to gather feedback regarding the uses of the public spaces. Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Ward, explained that BP wants to initially focus on the programming of the area around the North garage. There are several categories of open space to address for possible improvements. There are major connectors, such as the Sixth Street connector. There are secondary pedestrian connectors which are the east-west links between the buildings. There is street level open space along Broadway, Binney and alleyways. Finally, there are potential rooftop open spaces in new buildings or on top of the garage. He added that research has shown that characteristics of successful urban spaces include but are not limited to a relationship to the street, visibility, various seating options, and active edges.

With regard to the Sixth Street walkway, Mr. Ward proposed having an arborist evaluate the health of the trees and how to protect them, looking at the direction of the current seating, separating the bicyclists from the pedestrians with a two-way bikeway, enhancing the paving, and updating the lighting. He noted that improving the secondary pedestrian walkways would be more challenging because of the mechanical requirements of the buildings. In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Ward stated that these areas are not appealing and thus underutilized. Covered bike storage, enhanced plantings, a dog park, social spaces, recreational opportunities, possible sculptural play spaces were possible ideas to investigate for the area.

Ms. Hoffman suggested that BP speak with the Community Charter School of Cambridge since their students are heavy users of the connector.

Regarding street level spaces, better programming could be brought to the park on Broadway and the one on Binney Street. He showed a picture of an all-season space where the doors fold up or roll up to open up the space. He stressed that small parks can be well designed to create visually more interesting spaces. Mr. Zevin mentioned that the parking garage building edge makes it difficult to activate the space. With respect to activating rooftop spaces, Mr. Ward suggested examples that have worked elsewhere such as cafes, yoga classes, movies, markets, etc. Also providing more interesting plantings or a growing zone for residents and neighbors could help activate the space.

Ms. Drury thought that a dog park is great idea. She added that the winter garden looks fabulous. She would like to include the history of the canal's existence. Mr. Crawford would like to incorporate the fact that the walkway is named after the first police officer who died in the line of duty. He added that the area should remain flexible to accent whatever happens to the Volpe open space area near the walkway. In response to Mr. Crawford's request for bike counts along the bikeway, Mr. Evans said that the new Soofa smart benches were designed to count Bluetooth activity and can distinguish between bikers and pedestrians. He added that the nearby Hubway

might provide some information on bike activity. Mr. Crawford mentioned porosity, permeability, accessibility, and breaking up the blocks to move people around better. Mr. Zevin stated that increasing any exchange between the inside and outside of the buildings along the pedestrian ways would help activate the space.

Ms. Born liked all the ideas. She noted improving existing open spaces is just one way to fulfill the open space requirement of the MXD Infill Development open space requirement. Mr. Evans stated that the square footage for open space leveled the open space requirement for residential and commercial. There is flexibility for the residential requirement to use private open spaces. Ms. Born added that there are also provisions that allow for the opportunity to fulfill the open space requirement offsite. Mr. Evans stated that contributions to the Grand Junctional corridor could satisfy this requirement.

Mr. Ward emphasized that this is just the start of an open exchange. Mr. Zevin mentioned that the winning entry of the Open Space Competition, which occurred just about a year ago, incorporated the 6th Street Walkway Connector within a larger framework. Mr. Evans stated that discussions about the future of the Sixth Street Walkway affect decisions being made now, especially on the Ames Street project, so there is a need to get some feedback. Ms. Born noted that there is a fine line between the improvement of open space creation and expected property-owner stewardship of existing open spaces. Mr. Crawford suggested addressing operational challenges of getting people up to roof gardens. Mr. Evans noted that calm areas can be as beneficial as fully-programmed areas. Mr. Zevin stated that the east-west spaces are surprisingly quiet from traffic noise but there is the issue of fan noise. Mr. Zogg suggested artistic lighting and projection technologies and that unique art can also make a space iconic. It was noted that changing the programming can also keep a space active. Mr. Bator stated that a peaceful passive space without a fancy draw can be of significant value in a frantic stressful environment. Mr. Evans noted that water features can mitigate background noises. He stressed the importance of evaluating sound issues, especially as you move upwards vertically. Reflective spaces might not work if there are noise issues with generators from surrounding buildings. Ms. Born added to be mindful that noisy programming has an impact on the nearby offices and residents.

In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Ward said that he would like to have another round of feedback from the public. The coUrbanize tool has been very helpful. BP will be looking more closely at the spaces and any restrictions and then come back with refinements due to any findings. Mr. Evans stated that the public process with respect to these spaces overlaps CDD's launch of a similar process. The CRA needs to build off the Open Space Competition concept of how the 3 or 4 parks connect as a system since the spaces that connect them are the spaces being discussed tonight. More conversations with the east Cambridge community will occur. Mr. Crawford noted that this is an opportunity for the CRA to provide a catalytic role to demonstrate proof of concept. Mr. Bator stressed the importance of doing things right over doing them quick.

In response to Ms. Bethany Stevens, all the areas outlined will be evaluated and prioritized together but tonight's presentation just focuses on one area. Mr. Evans clarified that in the zoning, there is a requirement for 100,000 square feet of public open space with public ownership. There is an additional layer of 15% of the developable area to remain as open space. The requirement for 8 square feet of open space for every 100 square feet of development is where there's flexibility for opportunities for offsite open space, reprogramming of open space or making contributions to open space. Beyond these square footage calculations, there is also a requirement to show that the open space is qualitatively good open space for the area. Ms. Born assured that there will be lots of public process with the CRA and with the Planning Board. Mr. Zevin reiterated that the CRA cannot manufacture new open space, except for potential roof-top spaces. In response to Mr.

Hawkinson, this BP/Sasaki presentation simply offers examples of program and uses of space, not design.

3. 88 Ames Street Update

Mr. Evans explained that there will be technical pieces to discuss over the next few months but that Mr. David Steward from Boston Properties will provide an update.

Mr. Steward noted that he is back on the project after a year. He explained that BP got a full building permit at the end of February. Previous to that, some utility relocation in the street took place. BP purchased square footage on Ames Street to prepare the site for the building. The intent is to take down parts of the garage in April. The demo will happen this summer and they will start the foundation elements. The loading dock will temporarily be in Pioneer Way. The goal is to open in March 2018, but a phased opening is being discussed. Mr. Steward was unable to answer the Board's concerns about any changes. The construction documents were just made available so Mr. Chuck Redmon and Mr. Zevin can now look at the design documents. There will be a mockup on site sometime in June. Mr. Steward was not sure if there were any retail interest as of yet. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Steward stated that a ground breaking event will occur and that invitations will go out to a broad audience.

Mr. Evans added that there are streetscape conversations occurring now with the City to resolve issues with the intersections of the cycle track. The decision will affect how the Sixth Street Walkway/Connector ties into the project. There was a long discussion about bicycle, pedestrian and traffic flow and control signaling.

5. Report: Monthly Staff Report to the Board

The CRA received over 70 applicants for the Project Manager job posting and staff are currently in the process of phone screenings. Construction work on the Grand Junction has resumed and staff is discussing an RFP process to find an entity to maintain it. In the meantime, staff proposes that the short-term need for mowing the lawn on the Porkchop be fulfilled by extending the existing contract with Greenscape Landscaping. The budget with Greenscape hasn't been reached since their maintenance workload was cut when construction started on the Grand Junction area. Staff continues to work with Richard Viscay on bookkeeping issues. Through Telos Analysis, an organization which connects professionals who want to volunteer their time and expertise with nonprofits, Stephen Lee, a senior compensation analyst will be reviewing the CRA personnel policy.

Urban design elements of the Infill Development Concept Plan will be discussed over the next few months including real estate transaction concepts that BP is developing, open space frameworks, and then actual building layouts to come. Mr. Steward will continue to update the Board with Ames Street developments. In addition to the wayfinding kiosks, other branding elements will be coming to the Board such as melding the historic Cambridge Center branding with the Kendall Square branding. There was a discussion about building addresses using Kendall Square in their street name but not necessarily located in Kendall Square. Mr. Evans agreed that name repetition is an issue to examine.

Mattuchio Construction restarted work on the Grand Junction this week. The trees have been selected and will be delivered with soil next week. Honey locust, river birch, lindens, bayberries and dogwoods are among the tree types selected. Halvorsen Design is doing the oversight. According to the schedule, the work should be done by late April – early May. Once the grass has

been establish per the agreement, the CRA would take control of the site which might be sometime around Memorial Day. The irrigation situation evolved during the course of construction. The City arborist said that the FST design would have destroyed the trees. Alternative designs were pricey and their efforts prohibitive. Since the landscaping plan includes trees that are designed for low water needs, the decision was made to provide a hose spigot on the backside of the drinking fountain for manual watering. Mattuchio will water the trees initially. Once the CRA takes control of the site, its new landscape maintenance contractor will take over watering as needed. Mattuchio's workmanship and plantings have a one-year warranty. A discussion about tree warranties occurred. Plans for a ribbon cutting grand opening event for the park are being discussed. Ms. Born said that Councillor Tim Toomey be included. Mr. Evans added that MIT will also be involved in the opening event. Mr. Evans explained that the Grand Junction railroad runs the whole corridor of east Cambridge through MIT. The park section that's being discussed runs along Galileo Galilei Way between Broadway and Main Street, and more prominently, sits kitty-corner from the Sean Collier memorial sculpture at MIT. Mr. Zogg said that the words "Grand Junction" will be engraved on large stones placed at the Main Street corner. The engraving will take place under a tent to contain dust.

Mr. Evans stated that Foundry RFP submittals are due on April 27. An addendum containing answers to the questions at the March bidder information session as well as any emailed questions will be issued to the teams and posted on the CRA website within the next week. Since the RFQ, more inquiries have been received from non-profits interested in the project. There were initially three letters of interest from potential tenants but due to this renewed interest, the opportunity to provide a letter was reopened. The CRA passes these onto the teams while urging direct conversations with the developer teams.

With respect to the EcoDistrict, two projects are being investigated. The first project focuses o bicycle parking in Kendall Square. Mr. Evans explained that Cambridge has very aggressive bike parking requirements. When space is tight, meeting those requirements is challenging. For example, 800 spaces are required from the north parcel development as envisioned. Ames Street is building a 3-story bike garage which is expensive. A high density bicycle parking design competition conducted with the MIT Climate Lab received 16 submittals. The second project is a district energy study which, to date, has collected data to find a district-wide solution to the high energy needs, both thermal and electrical, rather than on a property-by-property basis. The Veolia steam system is a district energy system in the area but the question is demand with respect to future development in the area. The result of these projects will affect the decision for future EcoDistrict governance.

Newport Construction has begun working on Main Street again. They expect to have the paving and most of the heavy work done in May with a completion date around the end of June. When they are off the sidewalks, the CRA can begin work on Point Park. Boston Property has a maintenance agreement to keep the park as is, but slight modifications to improve the park seem worthwhile to CRA staff. A short-term design is being evaluated. In tandem to this, the City has a contract for a longer term (around 10-years) improvement design for Point Park with Stoss Landscape. This will be a public process but these design ideas are not being taken to construction drawings. The CRA hopes to have Point Park construction done by the fall of 2016. Mr. Crawford suggested looking at a charrette which possibly included Point Park done by the Charles River Watershed Association and someone at MIT a few years ago, before the Sloan School renovation project. Mr. Evans added that the condition at Point Park is at a hazardous level and waiting to improve the park is not an option. At the same time, it is expensive to repave and reset bricks so BP doesn't want to invest in work that will be redone. Mr. Evans is not convinced that the community wants Point Park to be fully redesigned from scratch as intended by

the City. People like the landmark sculpture as well as trees remaining on Main Street. Ms. Born sees similarities to when the CRA Board contemplated a short-term versus long-term solution for the Grand Junction path. Ms. Born would like the result to be a proud accomplishment for the CRA. Mr. Evans agreed. BP is funding the improvements but CRA funding might be needed for some additions, like moveable furniture. Mr. Evans restated that redoing Point Park from scratch would involve a major undertaking and shouldn't be taken lightly. Boston Properties and the CRA own Point Park. The City owns portions of the sidewalk on Broadway. Ms. Born would like to restore the park to its former condition. Mr. Evans stated that the CRA has asked BP to provide a spec for a steam generator to create steam for the site. The issue of steam continues to be complicated. MITIMCO is discussing whether either side of Broadway will be steam served which might provide an opportunity for a steam connection through Third Street. From a regulatory standpoint, it is unclear if MIT can not function as a utility and serve commercial purposes. The economic and ecological issues to generate steam versus the sculptural integrity need to be considered. Ms. Born wondered if BP could fund this as a component of the Infill Development open space contribution. Mr. Bator suggested that a contribution might be part of the later phases of park development from Stoss. Mr. Zogg added that Boston Properties would like to spend its money for restoration in 2016. Mr. Evans added that BP has been holding Point Park capital improvement money since the Main Street construction project started in 2014. Mr. Evans envisions coming to the Board with a plan within the next two months.

In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Zogg stated that the Forward Fund received six capital grant and ten planning/design proposals. The selection committee is meeting on Friday, March 25, to discuss the projects and would announce winners in April. Most of the capital grants were from nonprofits requesting money for infrastructure improvements. There were more applications for planning & design grants than last year as people might be getting the concept that they could apply for a planning and design grant one year and then apply for a design grant next year. There were new people and a few repeats from last year. Some entities from last year became fiscal sponsors to other organizations. In response to Mr. Zevin, final documentation from 2015 winners is still expected from EMW Bookstore, the Community Arts Center, and the Little Free Libraries before final funds are released to these organizations.

Mr. Evans stated that the KSA would like to use the design of the wayfinding kiosks to create little free libraries around Kendall Square as temporary installations. The CRA is contemplating the placement of some of these, possibly one on the Parcel 6 site. The design work and manufacturing of the kits are being done pro-bono. The Kendall Cleanup Day is being replaced by an "assemble-a-library-kit" day. There was a discussion about the possible presence of inappropriate materials.

Mr. Zogg continued with the update on the Forward Fund. He stated that there was a total of $105,000 in requests and that the applications were more complete than last year. He added that the applications were from many different Cambridge neighborhoods. In contrast to last year, many of the projects could be funded in full with a grant as opposed to the grant being only a portion of a larger project. Mr. Zogg assured Mr. Bator that if there weren't enough money to fund a wonderful project, Mr. Zogg would come back to the Board in April requesting more money.

The motion to file the report was seconded and unanimously approved to be placed on file.

6. Report: Monthly Financial Update

The CRA has received the remaining portion of the MIT funding for the Grand Junction. A check from Ames Street is expected shortly. The amount depends on the final retail square footage which

depends on whether a tenant can be found for the second floor. Mr. Evans expects the amount of retail space to be about 8,000 square feet.

Most of the insurance expenses have been paid up-front. Depending on the developer selected for the Foundry, the premium might be affected if a bridge policy for the Foundry is needed for environmental liability insurance. The entire rental for offsite storage space was also paid in advance to take advantage of a free month. The other expenses are tracking on target for a two month period. Legal expenses prove more difficult to predict. At some point, the budget will reflect the $2 million Foundry commitment.

The motion to place the financial report on file was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

7. Update: Third and Binney – KSURP Parcel Six - Food Truck RFP

Mr. Zogg stated that an RFP for food trucks was distributed and posted on the CRA website around March 1. The RFP kept many details open-ended, such as number of days/week, fee structure, etc. A requirement was to being present during lunchtime hours. There haven't been any submissions yet. The deadline is March 29. The Rose Kennedy Food Truck manager sent Mr. Zogg a food truck list which includes many trucks that are already licensed to operate in Cambridge. For the actual parcel design, Mr. Zogg will be working with architects on a charrette next week to develop a workable plan. As part of the agreement to use the site during the Main Street project, Newport Construction agreed to hardscape the parcel and set the granite. In response to Mr. Zogg, Ms. Born said that the Board could consider allocating CRA money. Mr. Crawford suggested that sponsorships from nearby companies and developers be explored. Mr. Zogg noted that any past issues with having food trucks at this site were resolved with the License Commission, CDD and ISD over the summer. He added that he is discussing the project with the three nearby restaurants. Ms. Born started a discussion regarding the allure of the parcel during summertime weekend evenings, especially if there were low key lighting, the ability for people to bring their own chairs, maybe having a food truck or other food sources, musical performances, etc. The implications of allowing alcohol consumption on the site were also discussed.

In response to Mr. Zevin, Mr. Evans explained that the light pole on the parcel is still above ground because it hasn't been developed yet so there's no requirement to place the utilities underground. This corner parcel, and pole, will be affected by the Volpe zoning.

The Board was pleased with the Food Truck RFP.

8. Discussion: KSURP Implementation and Community Engagement Planning

Mr. Evans stated that since the Strategic Plan, the CRA has tried many ways to get public input including workshops, public forums, the coUrbanize site, a messaging poster campaign, board meetings, etc. Staff has been discussing new outreach methods for the CRA planning with and without Boston Properties on Kendall Square items. He noted that the City is undergoing a large public feedback campaign for its master planning and that City park planning is also looking for public feedback. Staff has encouraged Boston Properties to do outreach for its open space planning which was evident in their presentation tonight. They are also sponsoring the couUrbanize website.

Mr. Evans stated CRA social media presence needs to be addressed. Looking at the data presented in the report, he noted that all levels and types of engagement are important but it's hard

to say which would have the most effect. Mr. Evans solicited the Board's opinions on outreach methods.

Ms. Drury was slightly disappointed that only a few members of the public came tonight to hear the open BP presentation and suggested personal invitations. Ms. Carole Bellew said that BP agreed to come to an East Cambridge Planning Team meeting. Mr. Crawford added that BP's relationship with Sasaki should improve their public outreach process. Mr. Evans explained that the current focus is Kendall wide but doesn't want to intrude on the citywide planning efforts being done by the City.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans explained that the CRA is facilitating as well as regulating the process with regards to the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) permitting process. The CRA needs to make sure that the ideas and proposals reach the public and the City. Mr. Zevin stated that the CRA has a big responsibility to regulate the design since it owns the zoning that enabled the IDCP. Ms. Born wants the CRA to be clear that it is not the entity seeking the permit. Mr. Evans added that if the CRA felt strongly towards a certain project, it would help the project finds its way to a permit. The CRA will regulate through the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Evans stated that, via the zoning, there will be at least one joint meeting with the Planning Board which is a public forum. However, Mr. Evans would like to present subsets of a packet before the entire packet goes to that joint forum. Smaller packets would be easier to comprehend and discuss. Ms. Born mentioned that new Planning Board rules, expected to be adopted, state that a community engagement plan must be presented to the Planning Board before the project can be brought to the Planning Board.

Mr. Zevin said that of the items on list, he feels that newspapers and the poster campaign might be the best ways to expose people to a major project. Although not mandated, Mr. Evans stressed the importance for the CRA to promote the opportunity for input. Mr. Zevin wondered how to regulate on items when it's unclear what the public wants. Mr. Shore suggested enhancing the agenda with captivating titles to elicit participation. Mr. Zogg added that good marketing can enhance participation. Beyond the legal requirement of public notice, Mr. Bator feels that motivated and interested people will come on their own regards but that if the Board is truly undecided about a design decision, a special meeting should be held and significant public attendance should be sought.

Mr. Hawkinson stated that 99% of the public input on open space will come from the East Cambridge Planning Team membership so outreach to them seems sufficient. Mr. Evans suggested contacting the East Cambridge Kendall Square Open Space (ECKOS) committee although he wasn't sure if they still convened as a group. Mr. Crawford replied that a membership list exists so the CRA could approach them individually, dending on staff capacity. Mr. Evans agreed with Mr. Zogg about having a general informational event before a building design decision needs to be made. Mr. Zogg suggested splitting our contingency groups into smaller focus groups and meeting them at times that are convenient for them such as after work for residents or during lunchtime (with lunch included) for businesses.

Ms. Born and Mr. Bator made it very clear that the Board wants to remain distinct from Boston Properties. Presenting at meetings together with BP about their open space fulfillment towards the IDCP or other topics should not be the CRA's role. The roles of BP and the CRA are different and although we might agree with them on certain ideas, it's important that the public understand the distinction. Mr. Evans said that depending on the project, it might be difficult to separate. Staff is actively working with BP to drive public policy components with regards to transportation, subsidized innovation office space, retail space, etc.

Mr. Zogg agreed with Mr. Zevin and said that staff will make efforts to avoid the situation when someone from the public says “We didn’t know about that.” Mr. Evans added that the CRA is an urban renewal plan steward and the Implementation Plan is a list of things we are doing and tracking and people should know.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the regular Board meeting was made, seconded and approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.