

Regular Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, January 20, 2016, 5:30pm
Robert Healy Public Safety Center / Cambridge Police Station
125 Sixth Street
Community Room

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Call

CRA Chair Kathleen Born called the regular monthly meeting to order at 5:43 p.m. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin, and Treasurer Christopher Bator. Ms. Born also introduced CRA staff members – Executive Director Tom Evans, Ellen Shore and Kathryn Madden. Mr. Zogg arrived a few minutes into the meeting.

The CRA Office Manager and one other person in attendance are recording the meeting.

Public Comment

Mr. Steven Kaiser attended today's MBTA Control Board meeting and thinks that brutal cuts mentioned at the meeting will negatively affect the Green Line extension branch to Union Square. If this were true, Mr. Kaiser said that the corridor would then have room for the Grand Junction Path to connect.

Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford joined the meeting at 5:47 p.m.

Mr. Kaiser also learned that the MBTA does not have any on-time data for the Green Line. He is puzzled by the ability to analyze extension capacity to a train-line without this data. However, he feels that once the Green Line is improved, Red Line improvements can happen quickly. He also stated that the Volpe situation is on par with that of the Boston Olympic discussions and the Boston Globe circulation debacle. Mr. Kaiser apologized for leaving the CRA meeting early in order to attend a City Hall hearing on MBTA service.

Ms. Bethany Stevens thanked the CRA for attending the recent East Cambridge Planning Team meeting. She asked if the Foundry building could be redeveloped rather than renovated so that a bigger building could be built and any ceiling height limitations could be addressed. Although preserving the building structure's appearance might be desirable by some, Ms. Stevens noted that the Third Street development project is going to hide the Foundry building. She said that the occupancy distribution seems very similar to every other development project in that a large percentage of square footage is for commercial, a very small percentage is for community benefit, and the community benefits are not free. With all the up-zoning being done within the MXD and the Volpe sites, community benefit is a real concern. Ms. Born and Ms. Madden said that they would respond to these issues later in the agenda when the Foundry is being discussed.

Ms. Heather Hoffman noted that although the zoning carves out at least 10,000 square feet of the Foundry building for things that are specifically attuned to the community, the entire building to the extent possible is supposed to benefit the community. Ms. Hoffman urged the Board to keep this in mind when looking at proposals. She said that the building could be built strongly enough to aesthetically house another floor. She added that the community portion of the building was initially slated for 20,000 square feet but it was changed to 10,000 square feet at the last minute by City Council with no consultation with the neighborhood and possibly without consultation with Alexandria. The intention was not for this building to be a commercial entity.

Hearing no further requests for comment, Ms. Born entertained a motion to close the public comment portion of the meeting.

The public comment session was closed via unanimous agreement.

Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the CRA Board on December 16, 2015

Ms. Drury and Ms. Hoffman gave written edits to Ms. Shore.

A motion to accept the minutes with these edits and place them on file was unanimously approved.

Communications

2. January 14, 2016 Memorandum from Stantec Regarding Site Activities on the Grand Junction Project at Galileo Galilei Way

Mr. Zogg explained that this is a summary memo explaining the process that Stantec (formerly FST) followed when a small amount of TCE contaminant, typically used in dry-cleaning, was found in the soil on the Grand Junction site in 2014. There is no way to know how this got into the soil. The original finding was one small sample. Additional samples taken did not show any indication of the contaminant. Mr. Zogg noted the small table on page 3 which shows the testing results from the soil samples taken from the sidewalls of the hole left after removing one barrel of soil. The final report was submitted, filed with DEP, and the case is closed. A filing fee will be coming. MIT's soil experts also worked on the report since MIT owns the section of land where this contamination was found. Mr. Evans added that MIT requires all new soil to be tested upon leaving the source and again before being placed on the site.

A motion to place this communication on file was unanimously approved.

Reports, Motions and Discussion Items

2. 2014 Annual Audit

Ms. Born introduced auditor Mr. Chad Clark from Roselli, Clark and Associates. She explained an audit of a public agency is required every year and must comply with state mandated standards. The CRA audit is not due to any problems. In the past several years, the audit was

an important tool for reorganizing the financial structure of the CRA. Mr. Evans noted that the City has asked the CRA to file its audit reports with them as part of the Foundry lease agreement. The Foundry funds will be part of the 2015 audit. Mr. Clark added that as the CRA becomes significantly more active, the City will include the CRA audit into their audit report.

Mr. Clark noted some financial highlights. Looking at page 8, he explained that as of December 31, 2014, there was just under \$10.8 million in assets held by the CRA. Of that amount, a little over \$10.4 million was in cash and investments. A majority of what is owned by the CRA is liquid and can be used for programs and operations, a positive and healthy sign. The development projects held for sale represents the cost basis (not the market value) of the parcels of land within the City of Cambridge owned by CRA. Receivables were around \$21,000 indicating that the CRA is collecting monies owed to it. As for liabilities, payables were close to \$65,000 so the CRA is staying current with bills. Other noncurrent liabilities are compensated absences which are the value of employee vacation and sick time not yet taken, net pension liability, and other post-employment benefits (OPEB). OPEB reflects future obligations for health insurance for retirees.

Mr. Clark noted that governmental accounting has mandated that assets plus deferred outflows of resources now equals liabilities plus deferred inflows of resources plus net position. Deferred inflows of resources include changes in pension proportion and differences, which relates to pension calculations. Reporting on the pension liability was required as of this year but since the City and pension system fiscal year ends June 30, this liability was added to the 2014 CRA audit even though the CRA fiscal year ends December 31. This pension liability is based on an actuary's calculation of all the retirees and what is owed to them for the rest of their lives plus what is owed to any currently vested employees if they were to retire today. This is a net liability. Since the CRA's pension system (Cambridge Retirement System) is very well funded, this amount is relatively low. This audit report was delayed because the CRA numbers required numbers from the pension systems audit report, which was late. Mr. Clark added that every retirement system across the country was affected by the testing needed for the new GASB requirement. Mr. Clark does not expect this to be an issue with future audits.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Clark explained that GASB stands for Governmental Accounting Standards Board, which is a standard setting board for accounting and auditing. The CRA also follows the Yellow Book (Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards) which is the federal piece under the Comptroller General. GASB 68 pushed companies to show future liabilities on financial statements.

In response to Ms. Drury, Mr. Clark explained that with respect to municipalities, Massachusetts has a law stating that the pension system must be fully funded by 2040. The Cambridge Retirement System has a funding mechanism for this. There is no state law that requires the OPEB liability to be fully funded. However, the 2014 Management Letter suggests setting up an OPEB trust for medical insurance payments for retirees rather than a pay-as-you-go plan.

On page 9, Mr. Clark noted that this was one of the most stable years since he's been working with the CRA. In 2014, the CRA got back on track towards its purpose and goals. Payroll levels in 2014 are starting to reflect realistic staffing levels. The total operating revenues of about \$39,000 include rental income and miscellaneous income. The rental income of about \$12,000 reflects the use by developers or contractors of CRA-owned space within the City. The biggest source from income was the non-revenue income of \$80,000 from investments of the \$10.4 million of cash. The total 2014 income was \$120,000. In 2013, the total income was \$700,000

higher due to development proceeds. There were no development proceeds in 2014. The operating expenses are summarized on page 9 and are separated into projects on page 25.

In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Clark explained that the CRA's financials would be added to the City's reports as a component of the City. Although the CRA is a separate entity, the City appoints four Board members out of five so it does have some level of control over the CRA. The CRA can have its own budget but the purpose is relative to a City function. Other municipalities in Massachusetts have a redevelopment activity within a city planning department. Mr. Evans added that the State would look to the City to fulfill obligations if the CRA were to fold.

Focusing on the Management Letter, it was noted as being "thinner" than past years, which everyone considered progress. Mr. Clark was pleased to say that most of the issues in the letter are minor. The major issues have been addressed so tightening up or improving certain areas is now the focus. The overview on page 2 addresses the issues previously discussed tonight.

Page 3 addresses the OPEB scenario. Currently, the estimated liability is \$542,000, but the CRA would need \$934,000 to meet all its requirements in the future. This money is not due tomorrow but Mr. Clark encouraged the CRA to create an OPEB trust fund, although it's allowed to continue with a pay-as-you-go method. Mr. Evans said that there is a plan to make a two-year contribution for 2015 and 2016 through the CRA investment agency. Mr. Clark noted that OPEB will be revised to match the calculations for pension so this number will increase.

Mr. Clark noted a goal of implementing a purchase order system to better track the limits of project based expenses. Mr. Evans said that entering a contract would encumber the full amount of the contract so the entire amount would appear on the budget as spent. Looking at the next page, certifying a procurement officer has started since Ms. Shore has taken a course. Although it can be a 2-day commitment and the courses aren't frequently offered, Mr. Clark encouraged Mr. Evans to attend a procurement course to update his certification. Mr. Evans noted that legal counsel has been used to address procurement issues when needed. Mr. Bator added that as CRA activities grow, the goal would be for Staff to handle more of these issues. The need for a small secure location has been addressed. In addition, employee I9 forms (Employment Eligibility Verification) have been separated from other employee records and are filed securely.

Mr. Clark stated that the issue regarding development assets (land) held for sale was brought to his attention by Mr. Evans. In past audits, land assets have been tracked on the CRA balance sheet. It was determined, however, that some of these were only residual parcels of past projects so the cost basis values needed to be proportionately calculated for the 2014 audit. Since the CRA doesn't get property tax bills, this went unnoticed. Staff is currently working with the City's title examiner and the Assessor's office to correct the City's records on all CRA owned parcels including these remnant parcels. Mr. Evans stated that a decision of what to do with these parcels will then be needed. A public process would be followed.

On pages 7 and 8, Mr. Clark identified a few minor accounting items that need to be adjusted. The new accounting consultant will provide the segregation of accounting duties that are suggested for internal control improvement. The last pages states that prior year findings have been closed. He particularly noted the creation of CRA policies and procedural documentation. He suggested that clarification be added to the accrued sick and vacation time for part-time

workers in the personnel policy. He mentioned that the new sick leave law has ramifications if sick time is accrued as a lump sum or on a monthly basis.

Mr. Bator stated that he and Mr. Crawford are pleased. He thanked the auditors for their guidance and the CRA is ready to move forward.

Mr. Clark said that for the 2015 audit, he would come to the CRA office in April or May 2016 and come to the Board in September.

A motion to place the 2014 audit on file was made and unanimously approved.

3. Report: Monthly Staff Report to the Board

Mr. Evans stated that a job description for a program manager was posted on the national APA site and that applications are already being received. He distributed the description which is also on the CRA website and will be posted locally. The storage from Metropolitan Storage in Cambridge to Planet Storage in Somerville is complete. Sixty boxes from Special Council will also be moved to Planet Storage. These records and those in Iron Mountain need to be consolidated.

The annual meeting is on February 24th, a week later than usual due to school vacation week. On that agenda, there should be a follow-up on the implementation plan and the Kendall wayfinding kiosk. Forecasting into the spring, Mr. Evans plans to have conversations about the infill development concept plan, personnel policy revisions, and possibly Vail Court. Depending on the City's timeline and their ability to get a landscape architect under contract, Mr. Evans would like to bring concepts regarding Point Park to the Board.

Ames Street is poised to get a full permit soon. They should have received a demo permit for the garage. The Green Garage entrance is being closed on Monday. The staging is beginning. Entrance and exits out of garage are changing.

Mr. Evans noted that 80 Broadway got a short-term lease tenant called the Future of Food but was unsure if any signage proposals would be coming to the Board. The Kendall Square Ecodistrict is at a pivotal stage. It is either a "go-or-no-go" year as an organizing entity. Many property owners and the few businesses have invested a lot of time but getting a working governance structure is crucial. The most important and interesting element is a \$100,000 energy study funded by a Barr Foundation Grant to look at the composition of energy usage in Kendall Square and opportunities to do things as a unit. The CRA is contributing \$3,000 per year for two years for participation in the national Target Cities program and then additional money to continue the contract with Linnean Solutions as the project manager.

The City selected Stoss Design Group, a local business, to design three of the four parks that were part of the Connect Kendall Study. A public process should be rolled out around March to look at the designs, which include the Porkchop (or Binney Street Park) and Point Park. The CRA and Boston Properties (BP) own Point Park but the City would like to design it. BP owns the hardscape and the CRA owns the artwork on top of the hardscape and the softscape. The City is paying the designer with money from BP. Mr. Zogg noted that the Point Park scope is strictly limited to concept through schematic design. The CRA and BP would then jointly take it through construction drawings. He added that the landscape design services are being provided with no cost to the CRA. Mr. Evans stated that some people want the park to be different and some people want the park remaining as is but with some clean up. A public process will be

needed for input. Mr. Zogg added that although coUrbanize had a sign requesting feedback about the park, not many responses were received. Mr. Evans added that any construction issues for the Binney Street Park (Porkchop) is unknown because of the underground utilities.

A motion to place the report on file was unanimously approved.

4. Report: Quarterly Financial Update

Mr. Evans explained that the numbers in the financials are pre-audited values. He noted that liabilities such as accrued future sick and vacation time were not included in the budget so “N/A” will be seen in these line items. These added accrued liabilities put the personnel line item over budget. The revenue is lower than anticipated. The Grand Junction income only reflects two-thirds of the anticipated grant. The other third will be invoiced to MIT shortly. The permit for Ames Street wasn’t pulled in 2015 but its income will hopefully be reflected in the next few months. The rent is over budget because January 2016 rent was paid in 2015. There was a significant increase in the rent payments to Boston Properties. Mr. Evans noted that the CRA is paying a lot in rent to Boston Properties. It is a great location, the office improvements are nice, the landlord is responsive, but relocating the office should be discussed in the future. Besides legal bills, this is the largest administrative cost. Ms. Born explained that that the CRA must pay market rent prices. Mr. Evans added that historically, as the previous owner of all the land, a provision for office and storage space within Kendall Square had been written into the development agreement. However, it was interpreted that this could not be renewed again. The 2015 lease was part of a procurement process for a new office space but there were no other spaces in Kendall Square for the site size of the CRA. Mr. Crawford stated that going through the process of locating a new space would be a worthwhile learning experience regarding the landscape. Currently, the CRA office space is very traditional with lots of files but if operations were slim-lined to a more agile office structure, it could exist in a shared space environment.

Another over-budget line item is legal fees due in part to an end-of-year run-up of issues with the plan amendment, the MXD petition, the Foundry RFP and lease. A budget adjustment amendment request should have come to the Board but the extent wasn’t forecasted in time. This is a fall-out of CRA internal controls by going over the 10% increase of a budget item. Mr. Bator stated that legal fees are a reflection of CRA’s activity, which will grow. He suggested that bringing legal staff in-house should be considered in the future. Mr. Evans stated that the CRA is working with other Foley Hoag lawyers beside Mr. Mullan for more routine work. Mr. Evans stated that some of the planting capital costs on the Grand Junction pathway in 2015 would be carried into 2016.

The auditors will look at the 2015 financials in April or May of 2016.

In response to Mr. Zevin, anything over \$250K is not FDIC insured unless it’s in a bank that’s established in the Commonwealth. As CDs mature they will be moved to be fully collateralized assets and be fully covered. No money was pulled early because there are interest penalties.

A motion to place the quarterly financial report on file was unanimously approved.

5. Presentation: Signage Proposal for MIT Coop Food Court at 235 Main Street / Three Cambridge Center

Mr. Jerry Murphy from the MIT Coop brought a Powerpoint presentation on the signing plan for the Food Court. He introduced Mr. Iain Crooks, the manager of the Food Court, and Mr. Chris Sheehan from Selbert Perkins. Mr. Sheehan walked through the presentation starting with a slide that showed various exterior views of the food court where signage is proposed. The next slide showed the logo for one of the vendors, "Bytes at the Coop." Another slide showed a map of the food coop and the location of the proposed signs. The next slide showed how the three vendors' blade signs (Bytes at the Coop, Einstein Bagels and Panda Express) would look on Main Street. These blade signs are double sided internally illuminated disks. There was a discussion about a back-lit appearance. Mr. Zevin did not like the visible barriers created by the frosted glass and the black band. Mr. Drury agreed that people watching people from both ways is preferable. Mr. Crawford added that it reads like a fence.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Crooks said that although there are convenience item offerings at Bytes at the Coop (Bytes), this store also has a full salad bar with soup and hot food offerings that cannot be seen without going into the store. Mr. Zevin was disappointed that the court now feels more like a corridor. Mr. Murphy stated that the offerings in the bookstore and Bytes differ in sizing options. Mr. Crooks noted that Bytes has only been open for five weeks and is flexible to make modifications. Mr. Sheehan stated that the frosted glass was also used to hide the electrical system but he will take another look at the use of the frosted glass in the other areas.

As a point of clarification, Mr. Evans noted that although the map showed the signage location for the alleyway, the signage for this area would be part of a future proposal for the Pioneer Way design and would not be considered today. Mr. Evans suggested options for the Board to respond. Mr. Zevin accepted the blade signs at Main Street but feels that the frosted glass is a mistake, especially since there was so much of it. He also thought that there was too much repetition of the name "Bytes" on the exterior. Ms. Born said the blade logos are fitting to the types of food that are being offered.

Mr. John Hawkinson questioned the large expansive wall with nothing on it. Mr. Crooks explained that production space is behind that wall. Mr. Zevin stated that the area isn't as open as it once was. Mr. Murphy said that seating was added and the Einstein space was improved. Mr. Zevin suggested using clear glass to add transparency and if that doesn't work, come back to the Board to ask for the frosted glass. Mr. Evans suggested lowering the band and making it white with black letters instead of black with white letters. Mr. Hawkinson suggested replacing the unnecessary branding on the large expansive wall with some art. Mr. Evans suggested that Mr. Sheehan consider covering the wall with a map or some other wayfinding idea. To help MIT move forward with the production of the blades, Mr. Evans suggested approving the signage program for the street and plaza entry and subjecting any further window treatment and wall proposals to additional review.

To answer Mr. Zogg, Mr. Crooks and Mr. Murphy said that the illumination will turn off when the stores close. Currently the stores are closing at 5:30 p.m. Ms. Born suggested closing later for hotel guests but Mr. Crooks said that it's not needed now. He hopes that the signage will bring more people to the location. Ms. Hoffman feels that vendors want more signs than what is useful. People can be drawn in with art as opposed to another ugly mall food court sign. Mr. Zevin said that the idea of transparency for retail space can be applied to the restaurant business. Mr. Evans stated that the MXD zoning has a transparency guideline for retail. Ms. Born said that added visibility is required given the awkwardness of the space location and the number of pathways into it from a public way. Mr. Zevin feels that the signs at the entrance ways are crucial but not necessarily along the plaza. He stated that the best way to draw people into the space is for other people to see people eating.

A motion to approve the signage program for the street and plaza entry signs with future window and wall treatments subject to additional review was unanimously approved.

6. Update: Forward Fund Program

Mr. Zogg said that the Board packet contains a copy of a draft website and the application form. He made some last minute changes but it will be ready to be launched tomorrow. The postcard should get to the printers tomorrow as well. The applications will be due on March 11. The committee will have two weeks to review them, make a decision by March 25, and announce the grantees by April 1, which is a full month and half earlier than the last round.

Other than the total dollar amount, there are no substantial changes from when this was discussed at the last Board meeting. Mr. Bator noted the goal to further expand the outreach. Mr. Zogg concurred and will include making presentations about the Fund. Mr. Bator emphasized a balance between grants to the innovative community and to those that provide in-need programs. Mr. Bator suggested posting this to the City website or bulletin. Ms. Hoffman suggested posting on the City calendar and preparing something for the City Councillors to send to their email-lists. Mr. Zevin suggested posting this on the Robert Winter's Civic Journal website. Ms. Hoffman suggested created something that is easy to forward.

7. Update: Foundry Redevelopment

Ms. Madden stated that Staff has met with the City and the Foundry Advisory Committee (FAC) regarding the Request for Proposals (RFP.) The FAC have been very helpful as they are a diverse group with a wide range of viewpoints. February 1 is the goal date for issuing the RFP. She addressed the comments made during the Public Comment portion of the meeting. When the CRA was asked by the City to move the project forward, knocking down the building was never contemplated. To meet current zoning, the building would need to be smaller. Ms. Stevens mentioned the use of spot zoning. Ms. Madden clarified that the team selected for the Foundry will be subject to all zoning requirements. She added that the CRA holds a long-term lease for "the" building.

At 7:50 p.m., Ms. Born noted that attorney Jeff Mullan had joined the Board meeting.

Ms. Madden noted that the City and the Historic Commission considers the Foundry a significant building although it isn't designated as such. Through the entire process, the stated community goals and objectives documented in the demonstration plan, the lease, the RFQ and now the RFP, are guiding the process.

Mr. Evans noted that there are proposals that looked at adding to the building and there is some flexibility to the floor area. Mr. Bator explained that the Foundry is a wonderful building in many ways, including architecturally, and the CRA wants to make this a wonderful outcome programmatically and physically to enhance the neighborhood. Ms. Stevens restated that no one will see the building since other buildings are being built around it. Mr. Zevin feels that the historical character of the building's outside appearance is important but that the inside "makes" the building wonderful. He also mentioned his concern of whether 50,000 square feet could be usable as it stands now. Ms. Madden emphasized that the CRA has moved beyond the thought that the community just gets 10,000 square feet. This is not just a real estate transaction but a process to find someone to curate the space and deliver. Ms. Madden stressed the open communication that the CRA has done in all aspects of the process. Ms. Born stated that she is

aware that a segment of the public wants the Foundry to be a fully City-funded, fully public building. The City Council decided that a public/private enterprise was the best way to fund the building. There needs to be a private component that can fund the public use of the building. Ms. Drury added that an important part of the evaluation criteria is to have the highest public space and use of the building. Mr. Evans explained that feedback and concerns from the East Cambridge Planning Team have been heard and the message will be reflected in the final RFP. Ms. Stevens restated her concern regarding the limited uses due to ceiling height, an insufficient amount of public space relative to the money required to renovate the building, and the possibility of up-zoning at this site since up-zoning will occur nearby in the MXD and Volpe districts.

Mr. Evans stated that the Board would be discussing the lease in an Executive Session following the regular Board meeting to finalize some details before releasing the lease publically.

8. Discussion: Parcel Six Interim Design and Program

Ms. Born mentioned that Cynthia Wall is concerned about the sidewalks. Mr. Crawford thought that the 3rd and Binney sidewalks were clear. Ms. Shore will contact Ms. Wall to find out which sidewalk section is problematic.

Mr. Zogg explained that Newport Construction is finishing components of the Main Street construction in April and May and they will be vacating the CRA property at the intersection of 3rd and Binney Streets by the end of May, provided the weather cooperates. The construction site manager on the Grand Junction volunteered to create a sustainable landscaping sketch. Mr. Zevin was also involved. Mr. Zogg presented that plan for the area. The primary activation would be food trucks, although the schedule was undecided. Mr. Evans suggested putting out an RFP, which includes schedule suggestions. Mr. Crawford said that it's late in the game since lotteries and RFPs have already gone out for food trucks. Mr. Zogg thought the area would be used primarily for lunch. He is looking at unwanted cable spools to use for picnic tables and chairs. The extra granite curbing could be used to make a garden-planting zone. He pointed out space for a Hubway station although there is a cost for that. He noted an area for the octahedron, which needs to be removed from its current site. He noted all the areas for a pocket park - group seating, individual seating, a little garden area, bikes and food trucks. Two food trucks could probably fit in the area. Newport Construction agreed to pave all the hardscape with asphalt, set the curbing, and to seed the area. In summary, Mr. Zogg mentioned that the CRA would need to procure seating, arrange for the Hubway, move the octahedron (if Newport cannot do it), and hire a landscaper.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Zogg explained that there are no utilities that are needed since food trucks have self-generators. Ms. Drury wondered if a child friendly element could be added. Mr. Evans noted that a Hubway costs \$60,000 to install and \$18,000 a year to keep operating. There was a discussion of how to fund this. The goal is to keep this a low cost project by connecting with various groups for funding and/or services like a water source. Ms. Hoffman added that residents have done asphalt painting in the past at Painted Park. Mr. Evans stated that revenue from the food trucks could go into the maintenance of the park.

9. Discussion: KSURP Implementation and Community Engagement Planning (Mr. Evans)

Given the time and the need to go into Executive Session, Mr. Evans suggested pushing this agenda item to the February meeting. Basically, there are a lot of commitments in the urban renewal plan and MXD zoning for economic development programs. Sometime in the spring, modifications to the strategic plan should be made as the CRA has gained clarity in its direction over the past few years. The Board and the public will be involved in that process. Staff is also working on refreshing the coUrbanize website to continue using this as an engagement tool for the infill development plan, open space plan, a retail plan, design guidelines, transportation and street designs, etc. Rolling these out to gather early feedback will facilitate the process before final submittals. This will be a more iterative review process for the CRA, the Planning Board, and the community.

No other comments were made.

Ms. Born explained that the Board is going to convene in Executive Session for the purpose of discussing the terms of the proposed sub-lease of the Foundry Building at 101 Rogers St. to a future development entity yet to be selected. Conducting the discussion in an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the CRA with a future development entity. She added that since the Board has concluded all of its business set forth on the regular agenda, the Board would not reconvene in open session thereafter.

A role call was taken on the motion to move into Executive Session.

Ms. Zevin – yes

Mr. Crawford –yes

Ms. Born –yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Bator – yes

The motion unanimously passed.

Adjournment

The regular Board meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.