

Regular Board Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, August 24, 2016, 5:30pm
Robert Healy Public Safety Center / Cambridge Police Station / Community Room
125 Sixth Street, Cambridge, MA

APPROVED – SPECIAL SUMMER BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Call

CRA Chair Kathleen Born called the meeting at 5:38pm. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Treasurer Christopher Bator, Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford, and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. Also present at the meeting were Executive Director Tom Evans, Ellen Shore, and Carlos Peralta, Jason Zogg, Liz Pongratz, Kathryn Madden and Taha Jennings from the City Manager's office.

The CRA Office Manager recorded the meeting.

Public Comment

Mr. Stephen Kaiser noted that the major streets of the urban renewal plan for Kendall Square, with the exception of Main Street, are included in the urban street design document. He suggested that Binney Street needs more focus on bicycle traffic and the curb structure needs to be totally redone to bring it down to two lanes. He stated that there is no need for four travel lanes. He noted that similar street narrowing is being done at Government Center, however not as innovatively. On the NPC that was sent to MEPA, there was no new information on transit. He added that his complaint at the last meeting regarding the additional one million square feet was addressed by correcting a typographical error of an additional "zero." The number was fixed to read 92,000 square feet, rather than 920,000.

Regarding transit, he mentioned areas of progress on transit – the CRA's EIR which was approved by MEPA, the Governor's statement in December to increase capacity on the Red Line, and an agenda item on the next Control Board's meeting for short-term improvements on the Orange and Red Line. He said that bureaucracy is finally responding.

He added that Mr. Bob Kiley had died and summarized his fascinating life. Mr. Kaiser added that although this man started with no mass transit experience, he made tremendous impacts in the field.

Ms. Heather Hoffman said that the urban design states that trees will be saved. While valuing the London Plane trees, she requested that the crab apple trees on the medium also be saved, as their blooming season is a wonderful anticipated sight. The Soofa signs intrigue her. She appreciates the information that will be available but given all the existing signs (such as for-rent, menus, etc.), this is more clutter on the streets, especially on Third Street.

Regarding the Foundry, she said that the proposal misses what the zoning says which is that the whole building should be used for the community. When the decision was made to make the building a community asset rather than selling it, the arts community and other similar entities expected a higher occupancy presence in the building. The original zoning stated 20,000 square feet, not 10,000. The City Councilors changed this without any community discussion. The arts community is the reason why this building is being redeveloped. Their service should not be lost to making money.

Ms. Jess Flynn, a past Binney Street resident, is in favor of safe, environmentally sound multimodal transit with the ultimate goal of social equity in the community.

Ms. Katie Friedman, a resident and a Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA) employee, noted that the CRWA submitted a comment letter on the Notice of Project Change for the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project (KSURP) Amendment. The concerns relate to the district-wide storm water management approach and compliancy with the phosphorus and bacterial maximum daily loads. She valued using permeable pavement. She requested more information regarding the calculations used behind the engineering to see how the proposed infiltration system will reduce levels by 65%. She would also like more information on how the Sixth Street storm management system fits into the regional plan.

Mr. Evans stated that work is being done with DPW on the Binney streetscape design and the open spaces in the area. DPW, CDD and the CRA will be looking at the development proposal and how it deals with onsite mitigations. Mr. Evans encouraged all to attend the Yawkey Gallery on the Charles River exhibit at the Museum of Science.

There were no other requests to enter a comment.

The motion to close public comment was unanimously approved.

Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on July 20, 2016

Ms. Born stated that the Board is trying to expedite the meeting because a Board member needs to leave by 8 p.m.

There were no comments on the minutes.

The motion to accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on July 20, 2016 and place them on file was seconded and unanimously approved.

Communications

2. Certificate of the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs on the Notice of Project Change, Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project Amendment #10, EEA Number 1891, August 5, 2016 *

Ms. Born congratulated everyone who worked so hard on this project. Mr. Evans looks forward to working with the Board and the City on the MOU for the transit portion as well as incorporating any environmental issues in the upcoming review of the Infill Development Concept Plan.

The motion to place the letter on file was seconded and unanimously approved.

Reports, Motions and Discussion Items

3. Presentation: KS Foundry Development Partners

Motion: To tentatively designate KS Foundry Development Partners (CIC/Graffitto SP/ Hacin + Associates) as the Development Entity for the Foundry Redevelopment Project, subject to the approval of the City Manager and successful negotiation of a sublease.

Ms. Madden said that this was a big milestone in a long process.

Ms. Born noted that Deborah Ruhe, a Foundry Advisory Committee (FAC) member, was present.

Ms. Madden summarized the project. The RFQ process was worked through in 2015 and an RFP was issued to five teams. In the end, one submittal was received by CIC / Graffito / Hacin + Associates. This submittal was fully and thoroughly evaluated by the Foundry Advisory Committee and the Foundry Evaluation Committee which consists of CRA and City staff. There was a nonfinancial review, a financial review, an interview, and a public presentation by the team. CIC / Graffito /Hacin did a recap of their public presentation.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Brian Dacey, President, Cambridge Innovation Center (CIC), summarized the proposal. He said that the Foundry could be a civic gem for the City. The approach and ideas they are suggesting could become a national model for this type of facility. He definitely visions the arts in the building. The team's task is balancing the varying interests while having the building support itself financially. He said that they have brought other places to life and are up to this challenge.

He said that CIC has been in Cambridge for sixteen years building an innovation community. It has grown into Boston, and other cities nationally and internationally. CIC has created partnerships throughout. They want to activate the Foundry building and build community. Ms. Alex Sear, Property Administrator at CIC, summarized the in-depth public presentation that was done in July 2016. She spoke about managing the Foundry and bringing it to life with programs, shared spaces and high quality resources offered to the community. Mr. David Downing, speaking on behalf of Mr. Jesse Baerkahn who was unable to attend, noted that Graffito has been bringing small businesses, especially community-minded ones, to Kendall Square and other parts of Cambridge for the past decade. They are passionate about forming great relationships and partnerships in the community and focusing on creating place. Mr. David Hacin, Principal, Hacin + Associates said that his company has been in Boston for twenty-five years doing work with historic resources and adaptive reuse with an eye towards innovation. He said that the building has many beautiful attributes and it also has challenges. He mentioned other similar projects. Hacin was involved with District Hall in the Seaport, which is a truly public civic space. He noted that the Foundry has a Basilica structure with wings on either side. He mentioned creating outdoor spaces with the wings and that the right wing could be transformed into a front porch. He wants to reinvigorate the historic building with modern exciting elements. He noted dropping the Assembly Space to make it more flexible for various programming as well as inserting pods to allow simultaneous programming. Ramps and stairs will be added so that the space is accessible to all.

Mr. Downing added that the ground floor and basement are truly community oriented although all spaces are available for community usage. The Assembly Hall section is a double-height space for larger gatherings and art-oriented functions, such as theatre and musical performances. The Community Pod is 100% dedicated for community. The various sized Interior Pods are meant for meetings, workshops, informal gatherings, etc. The downstairs Maker-space changes the limited parking area into something more functional for continuing education, workshops and workforce development. The heartbeat of the ground floor is the Community Kitchen, which services the building and benefits the community. The vision for the Gathering Space and Colonnade is open space for mixers, art installations, and little carts. It is connected to the outdoor space and the Exterior Garden.

Mr. Downing noted breaking up the space allows it to be flexible and inclusive. There is the understanding that this proposal could be modified due to negotiations. He explained a formula for allocating community usage. Each space has a percentage of time that is dedicated to community use. Based on these calculations, the Foundry Building at 86,936 square feet would give 19.3% of it towards community usage. Mr. Dacey explained the financing. The City of Cambridge and the CRA have contributed \$775,000 and \$14 million is needed in equity investment. The debt financing would be \$14,683,014 and the project cost is about \$36 million. He added that the financial documents submitted support these numbers.

Mr. Dacey mentioned that although the Foundry is in East Cambridge, they believe it will be a citywide asset. There are terrific opportunities with the building but there are tremendous challenges finishing off the design and construction. Financing is an unknown until the next stage. The income level should attract investors but there are issues regarding refinancing it. For example, there's the inability to sell it and no one wants to foreclose on the City of Cambridge if this doesn't work. He thanked everyone and he would be honored to proceed.

Mr. Madden noted that Mr. Mark Tang and Ms. Folakemi Alalade, two other members of the FAC, had joined the meeting and emphasized the committee's valuable contribution to the process. She added that at this point, the goal should be to pick a Foundry development partner. The team has not been allowed to change their drawings or proposals and they cannot go forward without an approval. There are many things to discuss in the sublease, which was estimated to take at least three to four months. She emphasized that the FAC, the Foundry Evaluation Committee and CRA staff recommend that this team move forward. She added the City Manager's approval will still be needed as well as a successful sublease negotiation.

Mr. Evans asked if any FAC members would like to comment, which was declined by those present. Mr. Evans noted that a prescriptive legal protocol was followed ensuring that the FAC had its own voice into the process and that the Evaluation Committee was meeting separately to converge the decisions. This will continue to be the case with the FAC, advising the City Manager and the CRA, as the process moves forward for the programming and the design and particularly the monitoring of the project. With the shared-use concept, it is very important to create a governance structure whereby the development team's plan can be monitored and reported on thus ensuring that the community goals are met, and evolving if needed, throughout the 50-year lease. This demonstration project becomes an interesting model within the state, and nationally, for merging public interests and private development which have assets that are fluid between the two.

Mr. Crawford suggested using definite language to reflect community access and ownership. In regards to Mr. Dacey's comment on "foreclosing on the City of Cambridge," Mr. Crawford is curious to see the language used for the collateral discussions. Mr. Dacey said that there are public programs and sources that can help address that. He also thinks there are institutions that want to help so there might be untraditional underwriters involved. There are some equity sponsors with similar views and he is anxious to explore these scenarios.

Ms. Madden noted that the memo written by the Foundry Evaluation Committee embodies many questions.

Ms. Drury appreciated the video of the public presentation since she was unable to attend. She thought the explanation of the time and space formula was very helpful. Creating a governance plan and monitoring it will be a challenge but she wants to see this work. The Foundry Evaluation Committee memo was very useful. She had similar concerns regarding the use and replenishing of the CRA's Reserve Fund. She thanked everyone involved in.

Mr. Bator noted that this is a complicated project and he is grateful to all for the work that has been done. He then asked the team to describe the most complicated financial challenge in getting this project underway. Mr. Dacey noted that having CIC as a guaranteed tenant on two floors committing to a multimillion long-term lease is an important factor in underwriting the project. They are also counting on event activity and programming revenues to help support the project financially. Their model has a high ratio of equity to debt, because lenders have expressed concern and may be reluctant to finance a publicly owned building with a relatively short ground lease (30 years), since there would be no collateral. They will need to find financial partners that support the mission to make the project work.

Mr. Barry Zevin noted that the Foundry project is not only about programming but primarily exists because of the physical building. He said that the proposed scheme perpetuates the problems of the previous incarnation of the Foundry--workspaces with little light and view produced by low ceilings and very wide floor plates. He added that, while the architect stated admiration for the Basilica form of the Foundry and showed a slide containing a beautiful two-story space in Denver featuring abundant light from high clerestory windows, the actual plans do not show such a design. Mr. Dacey stated that he respects much of what is there but the volume issue affects a workable economic situation. He continued that the team wants to create a lively, light-filled building because any other way would cause the project to fail. Mr. Zevin would like to see the building opened up between floors. Mr. Hacin first noted that it is early in the planning process and that previous modifications to the building foreclosed potential possibilities from a historic renewal point of view. He suggested thinking about creating a space that has new qualities that are

surprising and exciting, rather than re-creating a previous character that existed. He added that exploration has been done to bring light to the lower floors.

Ms. Born noted that with the completion of the neighboring building on Third Street, the Foundry building will be hidden from the street view so bringing people to the building will require visual clues on Rogers Street. She suggested tying the building programmatically or thematically to the park on Rogers Street. Mr. Crawford added that improvements to Rogers Street in general would benefit the Foundry.

Mr. Cathy Watkins, of the DPW, noted that shared streets are being done in other parts of the City and doing this for the Foundry can be part of a conversation. Mr. Evans added that the CRA and City staff have been coordinating with Equity Residential, who has a project next door, regarding shared street resources on Rogers Street, which is a private street. Ms. Born stressed to Ms. Watkins the importance of a presentable appearance of the Equity building facing the Foundry. She added that the rental tenants of the Equity building must also understand that the Foundry building will have events with many people, lights and music.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans stated that as proposed, the Foundry project would need some kind of zoning relief for parking, which would be requested with a special permit. Ms. Born was pleased that the proposal came from an experienced local team. Mr. Hacin added that the City of Boston's involvement contributed to the success of District Hall which has many of the same goals as the Foundry.

The motion to tentatively designate KS Foundry Development Partners (CIC/Graffito SP/ Hacin + Associates) as the Development Entity for the Foundry Redevelopment Project, subject to the approval of the City Manager and a successful negotiation of a sublease was moved and seconded.

A role call was taken.

Ms. Bator - yes
Ms. Drury - yes
Ms. Born – yes
Mr. Crawford - yes
Mr. Zevin – no

The motion carried 4 to 1.

Mr. Evans stated that updates will be provided. Mr. Evans did note that more discussion is needed with respect to the level of CRA staff involvement in the project.

4. Update: Interim Use of Foundry Side Yard for Temporary Dog Run

Mr. Evans explained that the City Council has needed a dog park for years in East Cambridge. At some point, this might become a component of the Rogers Street Park but there is a current need for a temporary spot. The City would like to use the area next to the Foundry, basically formalizing what is already happening. The DPW would add signage and trashcans. There would be an understanding that this would end if there were issues with the dog park, the Foundry project or the Equity project next-door. The Equity project is currently undergoing soil remediation.

Mr. Taha Jennings, from the City Manager's office, emphasized that this is a temporary measure relating to a City Council's order this summer for permanent off-leash opportunities in East Cambridge which is part of the open space planning process.

The timeframe for the park would go through October. Since there is a fence already there, this would not have major costs associated with it. Ms. Drury stated that people hate when their dog parks disappear. Mr. Bator stated that the signs would need to underline that this is temporary. Mr. Jennings noted that the temporary nature at this spot would not come as a surprise since the community expects construction at Foundry. Ms. Drury said that providing multiple short lasting areas is problematic for dog owners. Mr. Hoffman suggested calling it a pop-up dog park. Ms. Madden added that people are using it already as a

dog park so there is no need to do anything. Mr. Evans added that the fenced in area on the Binney Street parcel would most likely be used for snow management so this area was not available. The CRA could be asked to find another temporary solution after October.

Mr. John Hawkinson added that communication is extremely important even when ending a temporary use for whatever reason. Mr. Crawford added that unless the notion of a pop-up dog park can be managed and communicated well when it ends, he is also skeptical of a temporary solution. Ms. Born would rather not add more complications to the Foundry project. Mr. Evans noted that closing the area based on health and safety reasons are undisputable reasons to have the area closed down. Mr. Evans emphasized that until the sublease is signed, the City is managing the Foundry. There will be no money spent by the CRA. The DPW will create signs, get a trashcan, and empty the trash. Mr. Evans summarized by stating that staff will continue discussions with DPW and the City since it is important that when the sublease is signed, the rights for using the land are clearly understood by all. At that time or before, the plan for a different temporary dog park would be clearly articulated.

5. Presentation: Proposed Soofa Community Bulletin Board

Motion: To authorize the placement of a digital community bulletin board on CRA property in front of the Marriott Plaza along Main Street. (KSURP)

Ms. Sandra Richter gave a PowerPoint presentation and proposed a Soofa sign, a new form of a bulletin board, for the Kendall Square community. The name Soofa is derived from the first letters of smart urban furniture appliance but replaced the “u” to “oo.” The formal name of the company is registered as Changing Environments, dba Soofa, and founded out of the MIT Media Lab in May 2014. She spoke of her background. She sees a need to have products in the public realm that bring technology to the streets so that people will engage in conversations about smart cities. The company is located in Kendall Square and founded by three women. The company started with solar-powered Soofa benches with the intention of people communicating about the use of solar power. They are also monitoring the solar power usage. The benches are now located in 20 states in all-sized cities. Their next product relates to people communicating ideas and is a sign that shares information in three ways – transit information in real-time, events, and advertisements for small local businesses. The latter would pay for the sign’s existence. She showed a picture of a Soofa sign. It uses E-ink technology for its display, it can be solar powered, and it can be branded and used in wayfinding. It is designed to be lightweight, easy to install, and has a small footprint. A proposed location is close to the T station. She suggested having mixed-use content with changes to transit in real-time (updated every minute) and sponsored content that changes every 10 minutes, with a total of six daily content providers. These signs will not create light pollution. The cost is estimated to be \$12 per day. In exchange for using CRA property, they would offer the CRA 25% of the content free of charge. The content would need to be approved by Soofa. She envisions it taking at most three minutes for one to enter content. Soofa would like to prototype this concept in Kendall Square since it is close to their location and close to the T. From conversations with City personnel, Ms. Richter said that the Soofa sign would not require building permits due to the small size, electrical grid connections or drilling since it runs on solar energy, nor permits for local advertisements since it falls on the CRA’s MXD property and the installation is temporary. She proposed a six-month trial period and then a reassessment with the CRA Board. A map of four proposed locations was distributed.

Mr. Evans noted that the CRA owns the sidewalk in front of the Marriott since it hasn’t yet been transferred but noted that it will be transferred at some point. Ms. Cathy Watkins from the DPW agreed. However, the transfer transaction is complicated since the CRA gave Boston Properties a signage easement over the sidewalk. The CRA has jurisdiction in the MXD district. Ms. Watkins noted that advertising for bus shelters on private property required Board of Zoning Appeals approval. Ms. Richter will be meeting with the City to request a clause in the zoning to allow a percentage of advertising due to the community benefit of the transit screen and the special announcements. She added that the information is made for pedestrian traffic, which differs from the bus shelter advertising. There was a discussion about the advertising approval process for various mediums. Mr. Evans suggested that the Soofa sign would be offered instead of allowing the local restaurants to use sandwich boards. Ms. Richter has had favorable conversations with

nearby retailers on this topic. She mentioned healthy guideline content. Mr. Evans added that the restriction would be real estate contractual agreement rather than regulatory.

Ms. Richter said that the City intends to buy signs, initially for Porter Square with only City content and transit information. When the regulations are determined, advertisers would be added. Mr. Evans said that an initial MOU has been drafted with a fixed term with some content structure that would be revisited over the next 6 months. Ms. Born requested the agreement be un-assignable so that the sign and its location cannot be sold. Ms. Richter mentioned a clause that would allow the agreement to end if both parties weren't satisfied. Ms. Richter would like to install the sign in Kendall Square within two months. Ms. Born noted that the CRA Board has spent a lot of time on the Kendall Square Association wayfinding project and wondered why the Soofa signs shouldn't be combined or used as a replacement. It was noted that the lack of digital signs in Kendall Square is an issue. The KSA wayfinding has been in process for several years. The Soofa sign would be related with branding and color. Because of the transit information, its location would be near T-stations, bus stops and Hubways. To clarify, the Soofa signs would be located on the CRA sidewalk. The goal is to have it visible but not in the way. There was a pro versus con discussion about the location choices. Ms. Richter added that, to reduce costs, only one side has the E-ink display while the other side is branding. She added that these are prototypes being tested and changes could be made in the future. The Soofa signs will be bolted down. Ms. Watkins would like to see the details before speaking on the topic. Ms. Richter said that fixing the sidewalk, if the signs are moved, will be included in the agreement. In response to Ms. Born, the solar power collected by the signs might not be sufficient to add charging stations since it's needed to run the E-ink display. This can be reevaluated when data is collected after installation. The signs are made of power-coated steel. Mr. Zevin suggested keeping the metal off the ground by adding a layer that would protect the metal from salt and snow. Mr. Zevin also suggested using some type of digital security to prevent hacking. Ms. Richter added that they are also looking into supporting wifi.

Mr. Evans proposed a revised motion *to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate an un-assignable agreement for the temporary placement of a digital community bulletin board on CRA property in front of the Marriott Plaza along Main Street, condition on further coordination with the City (DPW).*

The motion was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

6. Report: Transportation Planning and Streetscape Design for Binney Street, Galileo Galilei Way, and Broadway (Mr. Zogg)

Motion: To authorize the Chair to enter into a contract with Alta Planning + Design for transportation planning and roadway design services for Binney Street, Galileo Galilei Way, Broadway and corresponding intersections. (KSURP)

Mr. Zogg explained that a process was initiated to select an urban planning / transportation consulting firm to do a complete redesign of Binney Street/Galileo Way from the Third Street intersection, around the curve of Galileo Way to the Vassar Street intersection, including a portion of Broadway from the corner of Galileo Way to Ames Street. In agreement with DPW and TPT, a comprehensive concept plan is important for the City when dealing with multiple development projects. The goal is to have standard 25% level design drawings for all these streets to be implemented by potentially up to four different developers.

An RFP was issued on July 1st to ten transportation-specific firms. Five submissions were received and a walkthrough was done with these firms. A committee of staff from DPW, TP&T, CDD, and CRA, thoroughly reviewed the submissions. Alta Planning & Design was unanimously recommended for numerous reasons as stated on page 3 of Mr. Zogg's report, which is part of the Board's packet. Reference checks were made with favorable results. Alta's proposal is part of the Board's packet and is on the CRA website. Mr. Zogg introduced Mr. Tom Doolittle, from Alta's Cambridge office. Mr. Doolittle mentioned that Alta is partnering with McMahan Associates and HDR. Ms. Wilkins added that in addition to Alta's well-known progressive bike and pedestrian designs and planning, they also have a comprehensive team who will look at the entire realm of the public way.

Mr. Evans noted that the diagrams in the presentation are initial concepts to demonstrate the basic scope. Mr. Doolittle added that a primary goal is to create protected areas for bicyclers so that they don't get caught in vehicle turn movements. He noted that the proposal's cover shows a similar idea done in Salt Lake City. He added that the Broadway intersection is complicated by a bike path that's already been built and a railroad crossing. Ms. Watkins explained that the scope of this RFP is a 25% design, although the Alta team has the experience to go beyond that if needed. In response to Mr. Zevin, Mr. Dolittle confirmed that Alta was not involved with the contract documents of the Main Street construction project.

Mr. Evans suggested that a "not-to-exceed" number be added to the motion because the amount wasn't confirmed when the agenda was posted. Although the amount of \$295,000 is higher than expected, Alta is price-competitive with the other proposals. The Alta proposal has three add/alternates - redesign of Broadway between Ames and Galileo Galilei Way and if necessary additional survey work and traffic count. The City would like to propose a streetscape design regarding Broadway to Boston Properties for their comment as opposed to commenting on a proposal BP might present to the CRA.

The motion to authorize the Chair to enter into a contract with Alta Planning + Design for transportation planning and roadway design services for Binney Street, Galileo Galilei Way, Broadway and corresponding intersections. (KSURP), with a total contract cost not to exceed \$295,000 was seconded.

Mr. Evans said that the time period for the work is about 6.5 months.

A role call was taken.

Mr. Bator – yes
Ms. Drury – yes
Ms. Born – yes
Mr. Crawford – yes
Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried.

Mr. Kaiser fully endorsed the project. Mr. Evans noted that updates on the design would be reported in future meetings.

7. Update: KSURP Implementation Plan

Mr. Evans said that per the urban renewal plan amendment, staff agreed to create an implementation plan to notify the board and the public of what the CRA is doing in Kendall Square. This is work planned for the urban renewal project area containing projects lead by the CRA as well as those in which the CRA is involved. This is a living document that will come before the board regularly. It will be the basis for the annual report. CDD has received a version of this report.

Adjournment

The motion to adjourn the meeting was seconded and unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 PM.

The next CRA meeting will be a joint meeting with the Planning Board on September 20th, at 7 pm, to discuss the MXD Infill Development Concept Plan.