



Regular Board Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, January 16, 2019, 5:30pm
Robert Healy Public Safety Center / Cambridge Police Station / Community Room
125 Sixth Street, Cambridge, MA

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

Before the regular Board Meeting, a Design Review Committee meeting was held to discuss the signage proposal for the MIT Coop that is being relocated to 80 Broadway. Besides CRA representatives, there were attendees from the MIT Coop and members of the public.

Call

After the Design Review Committee meeting ended, Chair Kathleen Born called the regular CRA Board meeting to order at 5:49 p.m. The meeting was recorded by the CRA and John Hawkinson. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford, and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. Treasurer Christopher Bator was unable to attend. Executive Director Tom Evans and other CRA staff members, Ellen Shore, Jason Zogg, Carlos Peralta, Alex Levering, and Erica Schwarz were also in attendance.

Public Comment

Heather Hoffman said that she had comments related to the agenda item regarding signage. Ms. Born said that Ms. Hoffman could comment during the agenda item's discussion.

There were no other comments.

The motion to close public comment carried unanimously.

Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Joint Planning Board and CRA Board Meeting on December 4, 2018

Mr. Zevin requested that a note be made to review these minutes after five to ten years to compare what was built with what was said.

There were no other comments.

The motion to accept these minutes and place them on file carried unanimously.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans said that Boston Properties has not selected between the two February dates they were given by the Planning Board. The next joint meeting of the CRA and Planning Boards will be either February 12 or February 26.

2. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular CRA Board Meeting on December 19, 2018

There were no comments.

The motion to accept these minutes and place them on file carried unanimously.

Communications

There were no communications.

Reports, Motions, and Discussion Items

3. Grand Junction Path

Jason Zogg said that Alexandria Real Estate (ARE) is here tonight to present their plans related to a new office / lab building on Little Binney Street as well as an extension of the Grand Junction (GJ) Path north to Cambridge Street. The extension of the GJ Path has been a CRA interest. Mr. Evans added that this project also touches the CRA's streetscape design work along Binney, Galileo, and Little Binney. The CRA has met with ARE regarding possible bicycle facility and traffic options based on the entrance of the future garage.

Attorney Jim Rafferty introduced himself and Joseph Maguire (ARE Senior Vice President of Development and Asset Services). ARE is mindful of CRA's role in advancing the GJ Path. ARE acquired the Metropolitan Pipe property at the corner of Fulkerson and Little Binney. In anticipation of ARE's need to file a zoning petition to allow for greater density at that location, ARE has identified areas for community benefits. A special permit hearing with the Planning Board is scheduled for January 29. He explained what that the project would advance the Grand Junction Path from Binney Street to Cambridge Street. ARE has met with CDD staff regarding an effective portal on Cambridge Street; as a private company, ARE may be more agile at assembling the land needed.

Mr. Maguire said that ARE has spent over a year on this process. His presentation listed past and future meetings with the East Cambridge and Wellington-Harrington communities, as well as various bicycling groups. In addition to going to the Planning Board on the 29th, ARE is going to the ordinance committee on the 30th. ARE is proposing a Grand Junction Overlay District, shown as a hashed area on the map in the presentation. He spoke about the future portal at Cambridge Street using the 3,000 square foot building that ARE acquired for a substantial amount of money. He noted that there is a public park across the street. Once the acquisition of land currently owned by St. Anthony's church has been finalized, ARE will own a strip of land along the rail track from Binney to Cambridge Street which will accommodate a path 14 to 17 feet wide. This project will help connect the Somerville Community Path to the river. The massing of the lab building continues to evolve as ARE works with the City and the neighboring communities. ARE is looking for a height of 120 feet on Binney, which is similar to the Amgen building. However, the building height may need to step down near the residential area west of the tracks. The building site is commercially zoned. The tallest part of the parking garage (the elevator head house) is 90 feet. An acoustic barrier is being considered to minimize loading dock noise. The parking entry would be off of Little Binney Street. Trucks won't be able to go into the neighborhood since Fulkerson is one-way southbound north of Charles Street. The Alta streetscape design for Little Binney had only one lane heading towards the intersection but after conversations with the CRA, it was determined that two lanes would be needed. As part of the special permit criteria that is dependent on the Traffic Department's approval, ARE has proposed to convey land on their side of the street for an expanded public way for a wider road which also includes a cycle track and a pull-in area for shuttle buses or ride-sharing vehicles.

In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Zogg said that the streetscape design for Binney Street does not include a cycle track crossing over the railroad tracks; it continues from Big Binney onto Galileo. Mr. Maguire confirmed that there would be a marked bike lane on Little Binney to get people safely to the GJ Path.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Rafferty said that there is an opportunity for a wider path if MassDOT and the City agreed to add to the 14-foot width of land that ARE is conveying to the City. The City's minimal requirement is for a 10-foot path with a buffer on either side. The existing path is wide enough for two rails but Mr. Evans noted that the current rail would need to be repositioned to fit a second rail. Since the State does not want to give up its rail-right-of-way for a two-track option for the path, work on the path will be done outside of the MassDOT right-of-way. There was a discussion regarding the possibilities.

Mr. Rafferty explained that the ultimate path would go from the river to the Somerville Community path on the other side of McGrath/O'Brien Highway, which then goes right to North Point or left to Lexington Center. Mr. Rafferty emphasized that the proposed path near Linden Park is along a public way and does not abut private

backyards. The proposed path's location on the west side of the tracks affects only one single land owner, the church. ARE is working with the church on a series of site improvements in light of the arrangement made with the Cambridge Street property owner. The bike path will cross the tracks at Little Binney. Mr. Rafferty said that there are possibilities for additional crossings but they depend on MassDOT. Mr. Rafferty emphasized that the right-of-way land along the Linden Park neighborhood came with the past purchase of One Kendall Square. Mr. Maguire added that there was a commitment in the special permit for 399 Binney Street for that land to be available for a rail trail in the future but that was only 6 feet in width. ARE has rearranged the garage entrance to get to 14 feet. Mr. Rafferty said that the zoning petition talks about the conveyance of land. However, ARE expects to be asked to contribute to the cost of Binney Street Park, in much the same way that ARE contributed to Rogers Street Park. ARE is open to building the park but would not want to maintain it.

In response to Mr. Hawkinson, Mr. Maguire said that the Eversource substation project is not part of this ARE project. In response to Mr. Zevin's question of a potential land swap, Mr. Maguire said that he couldn't comment on the subject but that there have been discussions about the adjacent one-acre area owned by Eversource. Mr. Evans said that the residential project had made a commitment to leave some space for a future connection from Fulkerson towards the GJ Path right-of-way. Mr. Maguire said that the final shape of the building might leave some land to the north which could be put to various uses. There was a discussion of improving the tree canopy in the area. Mr. Evans said that there needs to be two feet from the edge of a path to any hard objects so the buffer zone needs to be clear of tree trunks. Mr. Maguire said that ARE has done shadow studies which will be updated to reflect any massing changes. Mr. Maguire confirmed that the building is a research and development building. ARE would like to increase the FAR from 1.25 to 2.5, with just over 400,000 square feet of GFA, a 120-foot height, and a penthouse of 38-40 feet above the building. He continued that although there is no tenant lined up, there won't be a problem getting one with the 0.7% vacancy rate. There was a discussion about community feedback with regards to adjacency to the path and access to the path.

Mr. Evans reminded the group that this project is just outside CRA jurisdiction. He thanked ARE for coming to the meeting and extending the bicycle path project launched by the CRA.

4. Foundry Update

Erica Schwarz said that the City is close to finalizing the feasibility study with Cambridge 7, trying to balance the budget with the mission. In the next few weeks, that should be completed and publicly accepted so that they can move on to the schematic design process. The schedule is about a month behind what was originally intended. In the next few weeks, the Lemelson-MIT/Lesley University led Foundry Consortium is embarking on a new round of public engagement work with a goal for more input on specific programs and building ownership.

Under the MOU with Lemelson-MIT (L-MIT), the CRA is providing support for selecting a property management entity. Copies of the Property Management RFP were distributed. This RFP is on the CRA website, as well advertised in the State's Goods and Services section of the Central Register and a few other places. It seeks someone to come into a contract that has two phases. The first phase would start once the entity is selected, and would provide professional advice and consulting services during the design and construction phases. This contract would be directly with the CRA and the feedback would be brought to the City to be incorporated into the designs and construction plans. The second part would come into play once the building was operational, currently planned for early 2021. In this role, the entity would be the actual property manager for the building. The goal is to find someone for both parts while leaving room to seek a different entity for the second part if needed. The RFP is left somewhat broad and open to get a wide range of responses. Responses are due on February 14 and Lemelson-MIT will be involved in the selection.

Ms. Schwarz distributed another document that was discussed at length at this past Friday's Foundry Advisory Committee. This document listed various considerations that the operator might use to decide who gets to use the space and for what cost. The process needs to be as simple as possible. The CRA will work with the Foundry Consortium to create a set of guidelines that align with the values for the building. The operator might need to decide on the specific policy that gets implemented. In response to Ms. Born, Ms. Schwarz said that the nonprofit operator will be making these decisions as they are running the Foundry day-to-day. Mr. Evans added that the Foundry Consortium will create a nonprofit which will have a board. That board will hire staff to run the building. Ms. Schwarz said that the property manager would focus on facility maintenance and management, while the

nonprofit operator will decide who rents the spaces, with the exception of the office spaces. In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Evans said that having such a specific policy in the CRA's lease agreement with the nonprofit operator could be limiting. There was a discussion of how a lease could provide structure and guidance so that if the building was not being used as intended, the CRA could start a process for remedy. The CRA committed to crafting a lease.

In response to Ms. Born, Ms. Shore said that the Memorandum of Understanding to be signed is with Lemelson-MIT, on behalf of the Foundry Consortium, who is the Foundry operator at this time. Ms. Schwarz said that over the next several months, Lemelson-MIT is creating a nonprofit with the members of the Foundry Consortium. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans said that he had created a Foundry Operations Flow Chart diagram. Ms. Schwarz said that the RFP also has a list of all the parties involved.

There was a discussion of recent outreach meetings. Ms. Schwarz said that there have not been community meetings other than the arts meeting and the Foundry Advisory Committee meetings. The members of the Foundry Consortium met to discuss design considerations for each of the different spaces. There is now a focus on individual residents via a survey that Ms. Schwarz developed.

Mr. Zevin is skeptical about the actual need for space because he thinks spaces exist elsewhere within the City but are managed in a way that makes them inaccessible. Changing the management might be easier than building new spaces. Ms. Schwarz said that there is a need to link the Foundry to locations that already exist.

Mr. Evans located the Foundry Operations Flow Chart diagram that he had previously mentioned. This diagram was put together mid last year. The Foundry building is owned by the City and leased to the CRA. The City and CRA have a relationship with the Foundry Advisory Committee. The RFP Respondent noted on the diagram is the selected Foundry Consortium. They will create a nonprofit and become the operator with their own board of directors. The Foundry Consortium is operating the building but the programs in the building are run by tenants of the building. Mr. Evans did note that the Foundry Consortium could be tenants of the building. Mr. Evans said that the diagram would be updated.

5. Report: Signage Review

Motion: Approving the Signage Proposal from the MIT Coop for 80 Broadway within the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area, Parcel Four

Mr. Peralta said that there was a design review of the MIT Coop signage this afternoon before this Board meeting. The committee had no major concerns but did mention that people would likely be interacting with the ground monument's lettering, much like the KSQ lettering on the Marriott plaza. The wall signage is very similar to what is currently at the Coop's 325 Main Street location. The banners are similar to those at the neighboring Mead Hall establishment. The monument will not be illuminated internally but it might have a spotlight at its base, which should be reviewed by staff.

Ms. Born said she and Mr. Zevin participated in the design review meeting and agreed that there were no major concerns. Mr. Zevin said that it is an exemplary proposal that respects and improves the building in various ways. In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Zevin said that the Coop is planning to remain in the vicinity during construction. With respect to future retail plans, Mr. Hawkinson said that the Coop had implied they would move back within five years. Mr. Evans noted that 80 Broadway had been the location for the supply of innovation space required by Boston Properties from the 75 Ames development. Once Phase 2 of the commercial project is occupied, Boston Properties will need to restore that commitment to innovation space somewhere within the MXD, in addition to making up the commercial space that they need for the new office building. The Coop is a valued retail element, so temporarily accommodating it here is desirable. Mr. Evans said that a review of temporary signage and wayfinding will come to the Board for the 325 Main Street construction project.

The motion to approve the signage proposal from the MIT Coop for 80 Broadway within the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area, Parcel Four carried unanimously.

6. Update: Kendall Square MXD Signage Guidelines and Review Policy Draft Amendment

Mr. Zogg said that, after tonight, responsibility for signage will move to Mr. Peralta. Without getting into too much detail about each individual change, he spoke about modifications to the current policy. On page one, additional exempted signage was added to the list. On page 2, additions were made to the list of strongly discouraged signage types. On page 4, signage location was clarified, which was prompted by the second-floor retail space at 88 Ames. Page 5 clarified façade transparency requirements during construction of ground floor retail spaces, and a note was added requiring all signage to be dimmable since this was already part of the approval letters. On page 6, a section was added for temporary and construction site signage to help the public understand what is happening. Mr. Crawford agreed that this is an important component of urban livability. Although not signage, Mr. Zogg said that Mr. Zevin requested that construction fencing have windows to allow the public to see what is happening. On page 7, signage submission requirements were clarified so the Board will receive more complete submissions. As implemented today, Mr. Zogg suggested that all signage should first go to the Design Review Committee before going to the Board. If there is a clear consensus, both reviews can happen on the same night. On page 8, references were added to the CRA Design Review Committee. On page 10, there is a new enforcement section modeled on language used by Cambridge's Community Development Department, as suggested by Mr. Zevin and Charles Redmon. Mr. Zogg noted one current situation where this section would have been helpful. More work is needed in Appendix A and Appendix B. Ms. Levering is creating a graphic operations flow chart. As suggested by Mr. Zevin and Charles Redmon, Mr. Peralta is creating an image library of examples of signage that is discouraged and encouraged since images can be more helpful than words. Mr. Zogg said that a timeline should also be added so that people understand when things need to be submitted to the various Board and committees.

Mr. Zevin noted that section 2.0 has two paragraphs labeled "a." The last sentence in section 2.2 should read "might" rather than "may," (this sentence does not grant permission). Section 2.3, item k, might need some rewording. There was a discussion regarding the pros and cons of signage variability or consistency. Mr. Evans suggested rewording the phrase to explain the goal of a thoughtful relationship rather than specifying what is prohibited. Mr. Zogg explained that the phrase "color codes" in section 5.2 refers to Pantone Matching System color codes. Mr. Zevin also noted that section 5.2 requests examples of similar existing signs, in possible conflict with another part of the document that encourages "innovative" signage. Mr. Zevin suggested getting counsel to look at the document. Mr. Zevin started a discussion about fees and enforcement for signage violations. Mr. Evans said that the CRA can flag violations of the CRA signage approval letter and notify the City's Inspectional Services Department (ISD). Ms. Drury confirmed that coordination with ISD needs to occur for citing violations. Mr. Crawford started a discussion regarding the word "citizen" in section 6.0. Ms. Born would prefer not to include an enforcement section. Mr. Evans said that, at one time, BP centrally managed all the properties making it easier for compliance. However, now there are more property owners who need to know that there are restrictions on signage. Some level of clarity is important and although it could be softened, it should be stated. Ms. Born suggested saying that violations will be enforced but not stating how. In agreement with Ms. Hoffman, Mr. Peralta confirmed that the \$300/day fine came from the state law zoning ordinance. Mr. Evans restated that in the CRA's enforcement of the Urban Renewal Plan, the CRA Board gives approvals to signs. This document should only be a guideline. Ms. Drury said that the enforcement authority needs to be determined. Ms. Shore said that staff should understand the enforcement process even if it isn't included in the guidelines.

Mr. Hawkinson noted that there was a space before the first word in section 6.2, not seen in other sections. Regarding the language in section 6.0, he noted that stating explicit fees could be helpful to prevent a violation or the violator might feel that the fee is worth the violation and not comply with the requirements. In response to Mr. Hawkinson's third comment, Ms. Hoffman noted that repeated use of temporary signage is stated as a strongly discouraged signage type. Mr. Evans said that this section is part of authorization for staff review. Ms. Hoffman requested that "passersby" not just "drivers" be used in section 2.3.m and to also change "drivers or bicyclists" to "passersby."

Mr. Evans said that staff will make the revisions and bring the document back to the Board. Mr. Zevin suggested that a flow chart will be a nice addition.

7. Presentation: Outline for CRA Housing and Community Improvement Plan

Mr. Evans said that in a previous Board meeting, staff had alluded to the need to create a statement of intentions for a plan to encapsulate several one-off current or future CRA projects which all have a mission of helping nonprofits with their capital needs. Legal counsel advised staff to get Board approval for such a plan to provide legal jurisdictional clarity and authorization to pursue a certain set of tools and implementation actions. Kathryn Madden and Foley Hoag have been assisting with the drafting of this Housing and Community Improvement Plan, referencing state law.

Given the strong economy and the high desirability of Cambridge real estate, access to housing and office space is too costly for many within the community. Many nonprofits do not have access to capital for asset improvements or real estate security. CRA projects that fall under this umbrella include a more robust 2019 Forward Fund which is focused on community infrastructure improvements, the loan to Just-A-Start for enhancements to the open space at their Squirrelwood project, the mortgage loan agreement with the Margaret Fuller Neighborhood House, and staff's research into the possibility of repositioning the land at 99 Bishop Allen Drive to enable the Cambridge Community Foundation to continue their mission of providing affordable office space to nonprofits.

The scope of the plan is citywide and addresses critical needs. This plan will tie into the needs specified in other City policy documents, like the Envision document or the Community Needs Assessment, such as housing, income stability, public health, food security, and workforce development. The City's Community Benefit Fund, which is primarily funded by MITIMCO's development fees, funds only operational programs. This CRA plan is creating a capital investment counterpart tied to affordable housing sites and/or community facilities related to them. There was a discussion of the types of projects and organizations that could apply. The facility would have to be fully accessible to all members of the public and the issue of separation of church and state could come into play. CRA funds could be used for technical assistance with real estate design, or provided as a grant or loan. CRA assistance could also involve a CRA partnership which is more deeply involved with managing rehabilitation, dealing with property transactions, and with building ownership and management. The scope could range from basic code updates, such as sprinklers, to major expansion or modernization of facilities.

The next steps are to finalize the plan with legal review and adopt a policy, while continuing to do initial feasibility work on some of the projects. The goal is to standardize intake of new projects and broaden the outreach for partners and projects. The timeframe for the plan has not been decided.

In response to Ms. Drury, Mr. Evans said that the City documents should give enough structure to decide what fits within this Housing and Community Improvement Plan's umbrella. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans agreed that this plan does not touch on gaining new assets. It uses funds that the CRA already has or expects.

8. Staff Report and End of Year Financial Update

Ms. Born reminded everyone that there is an executive session following this regular Board meeting. She asked the Board if they had any questions on the staff report or the financials.

In response to Mr. Zevin, Mr. Peralta said that the Flexetail trailer will use the electricity at Galaxy Park but also has solar power. Arrangements have been made with Boston Properties to move bollards so that the trailer can park.

Mr. Evans said the 145 Streetscape is being finalized and will probably go to the Planning Board (PB) next Tuesday. The CRA has written a letter approving the plan. If the PB doesn't approve the plan, Boston Properties will need to restore the sidewalk to its previous condition and then tear it up again to build the cycle track. The timeframe for turning the sidewalk back to the City is most likely this summer.

At this time, Ms. Born asked for a motion to convene in executive session for the purpose of discussing a potential amendment to the Cambridge Center Development Agreement with Boston Properties related to multi-family residential development within the MXD District of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. The Board has concluded all of the business set forth on the regular agenda and will not reconvene in open session thereafter. The motion was moved and seconded. A role call was taken.

Mr. Zevin - yes
Ms. Born - yes
Ms. Drury - yes
Mr. Crawford -yes

The motion carried unanimously at 7:54 p.m.