



Regular Board Meeting  
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, March 15, 2017, 5:30pm  
Robert Healy Public Safety Center / Cambridge Police Station / Community Room  
125 Sixth Street, Cambridge, MA

---

FINAL Meeting Minutes

---

### Call

Chair Kathleen Born called the meeting at 5:42pm. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Treasurer Christopher Bator, Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. Staff members present were Thomas Evans, Carlos Peralta, and Ellen Shore. Jason Zogg will be joining the meeting shortly. Chuck Redmon, CRA design review consultant was also present.

John Hawkinson and Ellen Shore are recording the meeting.

### Public Comment

There were no members of the public who wished to comment. Ms. Born noted that she would leave this option open throughout the meeting.

### Minutes

#### **1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Board on February 15, 2017**

There were no modifications to the minutes.

A motion to accept the minutes and place them on file carried unanimously.

### Communications

#### **2. Design Review Report by Charles Redmond regarding the Design Development submittal for 145 Broadway**

Mr. Evans explained that the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure (DRDAP) states that after the schematic design review is approved by the Planning and CRA Boards, CRA staff reviews the design development documents for consistency with the schematic design. Once this is approved, the process can move forward with construction documents. This is not typically done by City staff from CDD but the CRA has arranged for their participation. Two meetings have been held. Mr. Redmon said that the proponents have come up with thorough responses to his comments, as well as from other review participants, throughout the process. Mr. Evans added that staff has met with the developer regarding Mr. Redmon's document and other minor design issues not mentioned in Mr. Redmon's report, such as the scoring pattern of the paving around the 145 Broadway building.

When asked about the decision on the bus stops, Mr. Evans noted that the streetscape design process, being done separately by Alta, affects the issue. A condition of the design review process is that Boston Properties will continue to coordinate with Alta in the design. Bus stop locations are also affected since EZ Ride is in the process of rerouting for the next few years because of the MIT construction.

Mr. Zevin asked about responses to his comments, in particular, the adhering method of the 3" horizontal aluminum channels to the glass. Mr. Evans said that he would get responses from the developer. Mr.

Evans assured Ms. Born that the issues have been communicated to CDD and the developer. He added that this does not mean that there is agreement. Mr. Evans said that there is a debate on the width of the columns. Mr. Redmon reiterated that the columns are remarkably thin compared to rest of the columns of the building and should match the columns on the other side. Mr. Zevin was not in totally agreement with Mr. Redmon's suggestion regarding the fenestration because Mr. Zevin would like to see some difference at the top of the building. Mr. Evans said this was another issue of discussion even among Boston Properties design team but the decision was made not to add more material to the top three floors.

Mr. Evans said that the process is going smoothly with the design team. They have been very responsive and more importantly, major changes to the design are not occurring.

The motion to put this report on file carried unanimously.

### **3. Public Notice from the Department of Housing & Community Development (DHCD) regarding proposed promulgation of amendments to regulations 760 CMR 12 .00 – Urban Renewal Regulations and 760 CMR 59.00 – Smart Growth Zoning Overlay**

Mr. Evans explained that there are no changes to the actual legislation of the 121B regulations. DHCD is updating their rules for smart growth overlay, which apply mainly to areas outside of Rt. 128, and urban renewal areas. The urban renewal regulations proposed would increase monitoring of financial expectations and more clarity on property transactions.

These rules are under review by CRA legal counsel, not just for the CRA, but for a strategic standpoint of redevelopment agencies throughout the state. Mr. Evans did not think that CRA property dispositions would be affected. The most pressing issue is the time constraints on the annual report which is due in January but must be presented to the Mayor or a legislative body. Ms. Drury noted that there is a statute indicating this to be the Cambridge City Manager. More clarification will be needed. The only substantive comment might be to request a February deadline, as this is when the annual report is presented to the Board.

Mr. Zevin and Ms. Born would like a better understanding of the difference between major and minor changes as stated since most changes appear to be major. Mr. Evans added that DCHD might require approval of all land dispositions. More clarification is needed regarding how this affects the development agreement as it relates to a disposition. DHCD approval might also be needed to sell Parcel 6 to MIT. Ms. Drury noted that, as stated, the transfer of the Porkchop parcel to the City seems not to require DHCD approval.

The hearing occurs on March 27 and written comments will be taken through April 7.

A motion to place the communication on file carried unanimously.

### **Reports, Motions and Discussion Items**

#### **4. Report: Technical Review of 105 Windsor Street Building**

Mr. Peralta gave a Powerpoint presentation. CRA staff has been in recent discussions with the City regarding a revitalization strategy for 105 Windsor, which has been vacant for some time. He gave a background of the building, its history, and its existing conditions. As part of CRA due diligence, staff has reviewed the existing lease with Cambridge Health Alliance and conducted a building and site survey. He showed pictures of the property as he described the issues. Staff contracted for cost estimation services to analyze the capital investment needed to rehabilitate the building to the current office format. The property would require accessibility upgrades including an elevator, it would require a new HVAC system, new electricals and plumbing, window replacements, extensive repointed brickwork, and a new roof. There is limited parking on the premises.

The total rehabilitation cost estimate from Daedalus Projects was about \$2 million. Mr. Peralta mentioned several potential sources of capital funding, including CRA revenue. He noted that discussions with various stakeholders in the community have occurred.

Mr. Evans explained that this project came up with City Manager and staff almost a year ago during discussions regarding the Vail Court property. When it was determined that the Vail Court property could be taken for affordable housing without CRA involvement, 105 Windsor was mentioned as another building that the City needed help redeveloping for purposes other than housing. Rich Rossi asked for an initial scope evaluation. It was assumed that no dramatic changes would be made to the building or to its purpose. The base structure would be made accessible and be used as community nonprofit space. Food and kitchen facilities are not included. Extra tenant fit-outs beyond basic drywall and carpeting are not included. All of this analysis work is preliminary.

Mr. Evans added that the neighborhood is bothered by this empty building and would like it to be a resource. Since staff is working on this and spending money, a status of the project is being brought to the Board. Mr. Zevin suggested incorporating 105 Windsor into discussions on the Foundry since the projects sound similar. Mr. Evans agreed that their might be a connection. This project might be part of the capital planning for the CRA. Ms. Born noted that the building might also need insulation. Mr. Evans replied that there is a debate on this topic with the historic preservation world.

Mr. Evans said that staff is contemplating working with the City to apply for a Community Preservation Act application for Windsor to repoint the brick and re-slate the historic roof shingles. Mr. Evans added that historic tax credit programs are also a potential source of funding.

Mr. Bator liked the idea of doing something for the Port neighborhood.

Mr. Evans would like the community to take the lead on what they want, which is a process that is gelling. CRA can be a technical resource. The next step for the CRA would be to bring in a designer to get a better estimate. At some point, Mr. Evans would like to know if the Board would be interested in investing in this project. Mr. Crawford suggested looking for a broader participation of institutions besides the CRA, the City, and the Cambridge Health Alliance. Mr. Evans said that he would contact the Cambridge Community Foundation and other Port leaders. He added that MIT has also been in discussions regarding their commitments to the Port.

## **5. Update: Foundry Project and Demonstration Plan**

Mr. Evans noted that an Executive Session would follow this regular CRA meeting to talk about the Foundry lease. He handed out two excerpts from the existing Demonstration Plan. One was the table of contents. The other was the vision and objectives.

The Demonstration Plan is still the CRA operating plan for the Foundry; however, it will need an amendment. Due to the interior demolition of the building, the physical condition has changed and more is known about the building including some structural issues. More information will be forthcoming about the environmental conditions based on the adjacent development by Equity Properties (Chapter 3). The project phases will need to be updated now that we are no longer pursuing a Request for Proposal (RFP) process with a private developer (Chapter 4). The financial plan will need to adjust if there are more public funds going into the project (Chapter 7). The "Citizen Participation and Public Approval Process" will also need to be updated to account for the ongoing community engagement and public approvals (Chapter 8).

No matter how the project moves forwards, there should be a confirmation that the visions and objectives of the project as stated in the Demonstration Plan have not changed and that it is still a collaborative shared center with a range of activities and uses (Chapter 2). The CRA Board and City Council will need to approve the amended Demonstration Plan. After meetings with the City administration next week, Mr. Evans hopes to roll out ideas and plans in a broader community process.

## **6. Update: Parcel Six - Third and Binney Activation Programs**

Mr. Peralta said that the food truck season is starting April 3. Eighteen proposals were received, seventeen entrée trucks and one dessert truck. Eight trucks were selected to rotate throughout the week. The hours are from 10:30am to 4:00pm although they can be on site from 7:30am to 9:00pm. The trucks are Chicken & Rice Guys, Rhythm 'N Wraps, Pennypacker's, Munch Mobile Kitchen, Mei Mei Street Kitchen, Roadies Diner, North East of the Border, and Sheherazad Food. All the trucks offer vegetarian and non-vegetarian meals. Interested vendors can still be placed on a waiting list.

Mr. Evans said that the trucks bid on their fee last year but this year, the fee was set. This made a more concrete proposal from which to bid. Mr. Peralta said that the trucks are encouraged to play music at reasonable volumes. Mr. Evans noted that there is actually a site for the vendors to see this year as opposed to seeing a construction site that was in the process of being transformed.

Mr. Peralta explained that there will also be a garden program on site provided through a partnership with the Community Charter School of Cambridge (CCSC), Boston Properties (BP) who is sponsoring the program and Green City Growers (GCG). Jessie Vanhazl, CEO and Founder of GCG, was present to explain the program. GCG does vegetable garden installations, garden maintenance and education programs with preschoolers through seniors. GCG has worked with Boston Properties in other park spaces such as the garden near the Blue Garage and on the rooftop garden. The Parcel 6 program is a weekly program with CCSC 7<sup>th</sup> graders to grow vegetables in raised garden beds. GCG will supply all the materials and upkeep. The focus is on training, food system education, and possibly selling the produce in a farmer's market. BP will help with signage.

Mr. Peralta said that Volpe has agreed to allow GCG to use their water. The plan is for the beds to be installed in the beginning of April. Cold frames on the beds will also be used to extend the growing season. As an afterschool program, this serves as an extracurricular focus rather than a core science focus for the students. Mr. Crawford noted that there is a lot of sun at the site. Ms. Vanhazl said that sun is good as long as there is water. Mr. Crawford clarified that growing taller plants could help create some shade for humans. Ms. Vanhazl was not sure that shade could be provided given the current seating arrangement relative to where the raised beds are to be placed. Mr. Peralta added that he is waiting for pricing for a shade structure.

Mr. Zevin said that he spoke with people at Mass Art regarding a shade structure and would give the contact information to Mr. Evans. Mr. Evans said that money earned from the trucks can be used to enhance the site. Mr. Bator would like to have a celebration on site. Ms. Vanhazl mentioned that GCG is also applying for a 2017 Forward Fund grant.

Mr. Peralta noted that the poster for the program was included in the Board packet. Mr. Peralta added that he is working with the Arts Commission and will report back to the Board once something is finalized. Next week, spring-cleaning will occur (weather permitting) which includes compacting the stone dust, cleaning the beds, and pruning shrubs.

## **7. Monthly Staff Report and Financial Update**

Mr. Evans said that staff is reviewing the changes in urban renewal regulations and the impact on dispositions and reporting requirements. With respect to the state law regarding access to public records, staff has been making improvements to the website, including a Search function. Staff needs to continue to ensure that the Board documents also get placed into the appropriate project's webpage. The Foundry webpage is up to date but the Ames Street webpage needs work.

The job notice for the open planner position, which has had over 80 applicants to date, should be filled by June. There is a strong applicant pool. Furniture and hardware will be needed. Staff is also evaluating the contracts for consultants that are expiring.

The future calendar includes the Forward Fund grants that are due next week. Also planned is a presentation by the City's park designer, Stoss, since they still have money to spend on Galaxy Park. They have ideas for the grassy area in the triangle and the small patch of land across Main Street. Mr. Zogg suggested that CDD is using this to focus the landscaping agenda for MIT in the future. Mr. Evans would like to bring a report to the Board regarding other implementation agendas from the Kendall Square Plan, the Volpe team, an annual requirement by Boston Properties to report on their spring/summer programming, and the formalization of the Infill Development Concept Plan's innovation space to be located in 255 Main Street, where the current CRA office is located.

Mr. Peralta said that the Forward Fund applications look good and that he's been in conversations with those that need help completing the application. He said that there has been a good level of interest.

Mr. Evans said that the Mobility Task Force is wrapping up its technical work. There was a public meeting two weeks ago and the final report will be reviewed sometime in April. The task force was created and then a funding program was created. It was thought that the task force would feed into the funding program and set that agenda. But the task force went on a hiatus so the Kendall Square Transit Enhancement Program (KSTEP) was written without the task force. Now the task force is almost done and staff is still trying to finalize the KSTEP program. The program satisfied MEPA, was signed by Kathy and City Manager Rich Rossi last summer and sent to MassDOT on October 4. Staff has heard that edits are expected from the State. Boston Properties is concerned since this is a condition of their development program to meet their MEPA requirements. Boston Properties is taking steps to move the process with DOT.

Looking at the online materials, Mr. Zevin noted that bus improvements have focused on eliminating stops and consolidating routes. He thinks the CRA should be advocating more for the neighborhoods near Kendall Square as opposed to facilitating people zooming in from the suburbs. Mr. Crawford suggested that corporate busses should allow residents to ride as a public benefit. Mr. Crawford asked about other mobility option ideas such as ride shares. Mr. Evans said that Uber gave the task force a heat map showing the origins and destinations of the most frequent trips to and from Kendall Square. Back Bay, Harvard and Central Square showed a spike but the time of day information was missing. Other thoughts are to coral Uber and Lyft pickups and drop-offs to designated areas. Once the KSTEP is executed, one third needs to be used to improve rubber tire service to the area. The second third would be used to leverage more substantial investment in the other systems. As the State has recently bought more Red line cars to theoretically improve transit reliability, it is possible that the State wants to revise the KSTEP narrative. If there are amendments, it would be brought back to the CRA Board for its consideration. Mr. Evans has a meeting with the State, Joe Barr, and Boston Properties next week.

Mr. Zogg spoke about the status of the streetscape project. Mr. Zogg continues to reach out to property owners along the corridors. There is a workshop being held in the second week of April with various City departments as well as MBTA and EZ Ride regarding the recommended decisions on bus rapid transit from the Mobility Task force report.

Mr. Zogg said that the streetscape presentation to the ECPT went well. They were very receptive and pleased about the increase in greenspace and trees. Feedback indicated that removing the medians is acceptable as long as the islands were large enough to restrict cars from going into the neighborhoods. There was concern voiced regarding through traffic if Volpe reintroduces Fifth Street. Mr. Zogg feels confident that the streetscape design can accommodate their requests. Mr. Zogg also presented to DPWs Planting Committee who also liked the project. They don't like the crabapple trees in the median because they are messy and not the right shape.

Mr. Evans stated that a revised budget will be brought to the Board sooner than usual. The income from Boston Properties was still being negotiated when the budget was first created so this needs to be included. The \$100,000 grant is federal money which seems iffy in this political climate. As for expenses, insurance is paid in full. The major professional expenses are for Alta Planning + Design for streetscape design and HMFH Architects for some scenario design work for the Foundry. The KSTEP fund will need to change

once the MOU is signed. Looking at the graphs, the major expenses are for Transportation, the Foundry and design work for the MXD.

A motion to convene in Executive Session for the purpose of discussing potential revisions to the 50-year lease of the Foundry Building at 101 Rogers Street from the City of Cambridge, to facilitate the redevelopment of the Foundry building through the Foundry Demonstration Project Plan was put forth as conducting the discussion in open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the CRA. Since the business of the CRA set forth on the agenda has been completed, the meeting will not reconvene in open session.

A role call was taken.

Mr. Bator - yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Ms. Born - yes

Mr. Crawford - yes

Mr. Zevin - yes

The motion to convene in Executive Session carried unanimously at 7:36 p.m.