



Regular Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, December 16, 2015, 5:30pm
Robert Healy Safety Center, Cambridge Police Station
125 Sixth Street
Community Room

FINAL MEETING MINUTES – approved 1.20.16

Call

CRA Chair Kathleen Born called the regular monthly meeting to order at 5:37 p.m. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Ms. Margaret Drury, Assistant Secretary Mr. Barry Zevin, Treasurer Mr. Christopher Bator, and Assistant Treasurer Mr. Conrad Crawford. Ms. Born introduced CRA staff members – Mr. Tom Evans, Ms. Ellen Shore, Mr. Jason Zogg and Ms. Kathryn Madden. Ms. Born also introduced Mr. Chuck Redmon, and City Councillor Mr. Dennis Carlone.

The Chair noted that the CRA office manager and one other in attendance are recording the meeting.

Public Comment

City Councillor Mr. Dennis Carlone explained that he is interested in the discussions regarding the petition proposal and the changes requested by City Council. He would like more clarity on the retail component. Although not critical for this month, he would like to see the architectural guidelines updated. The City Council will be getting more involved in design. He commended the CRA on the background and overall clarity of its proposal and stated that MIT and Volpe could benefit by following the CRA example.

Mr. Peter Crawley, President of the East Cambridge Planning Team (ECPT) spoke on behalf of the ECPT. He stated that several correspondences have been sent in the past seven days and an email sent today proposed specific recommendations to integrate into the zoning and urban renewal plans. He added that the level of public benefits from a project this size should be commensurate with its impact on the community. The ECPT feels that a master planning approach should be required given the number of simultaneous large projects occurring within the East Cambridge boundaries. There are many serious infrastructure issues related to mobility and public transportation that need to be addressed. Although he understands that it's not within the CRA's jurisdiction, the ECPT membership asked for a comprehensive approach. He stated the community's need for meeting flex-spaces, open spaces (indoor and outdoor) and indoor recreational facilities. He apologized for "coming to the table" late in the process. The ECPT wants to be constructive and collaborative on this project. He requested that the CRA come to the ECPT meetings more regularly.

Mr. Tom Joyce is a member of the ECPT and the East Cambridge Open Space Trust but the comments he is making tonight are his own opinions. He recalled that at the last ECPT meeting, Mr. Tim

Councillor Toomey suggested the idea of a master plan for the CRA zoning and the Volpe zoning. Mr. Joyce agrees that this is the perfect opportunity for the CRA and the City Community Development Department (CDD) to work together on a master plan and vision, especially since the sites are next to each other.

Ms. Heather Hoffman started by stating that she appreciates that the CRA meetings are informative and more relaxed than other City meetings; attendees feel like participants rather than spectators. She agrees with her neighbors about a master plan since two large abutting areas should not be treated separately for up-zoning. However, the MXD part has had a large amount planning. She recalled that after the Alexandria up-zoning was ordained (also against the ECPT wishes), then City Councillor, Sam Seidel, had said that Kendall Square needed another one million square feet. In that time, K2 justified and outlined the extra one million square feet. Anything occurring with Volpe would be “icing on the cake.” The CRA zoning proposal is based on the K2 plan and has improved it in many ways with public and City Council feedback. Although Ms. Hoffman continued to praise the way in which the CRA has handled the project, looking at things holistically would create a better overall plan. The CRA plan might improve the other plans dramatically. She encouraged BP to host community meetings and for the CRA to continue the conversations into the next Council term to avoid 11th hour votes. Ms. Hoffman likes the idea of using affordable square footage instead of the number of affordable units. In response to Ms. Hoffman’s last question, Mr. Evans explained that the 20% is of the individual project so the exemption from the GFA cap doesn’t bring down that percentage.

Ms. Born encouraged other attendees to speak.

Mr. Alan Greene stated that he feels that with the past development, the area is already at a breaking point. This proposal being separated from the Volpe development seems shortsighted. The community will be in trouble if the market changes after adding more lab, research and development space. He would prefer to see 80% residential and 20% commercial. Although a grocery store would be wonderful, he doesn’t see how it could be located within the area.

Mr. Steve Kaiser stated that the result of the City Council December 21 meeting is unpredictable because it involves Cambridge politics. A variable could be the mixed-record of Boston Properties (BP). Although in the past, BP has not had a strong housing element, in the current process, BP has been strong on planning and transit. BP also funded the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project. He warned the CRA Board that the City Council raises issues at the last minute. Mr. Kaiser feels that the City doesn’t have a good example of a master plan and that the CRA process comes close. Mr. Kaiser respects the East Cambridge resident’s concern for the need for a master plan but suggests making an exception in this case, while the CRA takes an active role in the citywide planning process. Mr. Kaiser stated his concern about the scale and architecture of the 145 Broadway building. He also feels that the Volpe process needs improvement.

Ms. Rhonda Massie agreed with Mr. Greene regarding the potential issues of putting “all the eggs in one basket.” Sufficient parking for the users of any buildings is very important so they don’t take up spaces in the neighborhood. She would appreciate as much open space as possible. She noted that placing a building up against the 6th Street walkway would turn that into an ugly undesirable alleyway. She added the need to sustain an urban ecosystem, not just for humans. Recreational indoor and outdoor spaces are necessary for family life. She would like to see one large multi-purpose sports field.

Ms. Lee Farris mentioned some of the highlights from the Cambridge Residence Alliance letter. The changes made in petition are appreciated but there are still issues and questions. The Alliance

requests that the CRA hold off on presenting the petition on December 21st. Although there has been tremendous progress on affordable housing, she would like a higher proportion of housing to commercial. The process was good but she would prefer that the CRA had asked for input in the beginning rather than making a proposal and then asking for feedback. The reaction to the MXD is being targeted because of other City processes. She stated that the Volpe process should be combined with the MXD.

Mr. Alfred D'Isidoro stated that, as a housing advocate, he would like to see more home ownership in Kendall Square since the market is turning.

Ms. Rosemarie Booth feels that the residents need more time to understand the impact of all these big developments individually and together on the neighborhood. She agrees that the residential percentage needs to be more than 40% in order to make it a viable community.

Mr. Jerry O'Leary agreed that there is a critical mass needed for a lively community and Kendall Square is short of that. He added that the transit system is saturated. He suggested that the best way to help businesses in Kendall Square is to have a goal of adding one residential unit for every employee that comes to the area so that people could walk to work and have no effect on the transit system.

Ms. Bethany Stevens agreed with all the comments made by previous speakers. She requested more time to understand the up-zoning proposed in the MXD even though it's been in progress since the Volpe situation has been so time consuming. She's encouraged by the willingness of the new administration in City Hall to listen to the concerns of the residents.

Ms. Born mentioned that the CRA has had three City Council meetings so far regarding the MXD petition. Councillor Carlone stated that he heard and understands the concerns mentioned tonight. He is concerned about the retail aspect and the City Council is interested in getting more locally-owned interesting shops that are on a smaller scale in all parts of the City.

Mr. John Hawkinson discussed a technical language concern. He passed out a spreadsheet and notes depicting the issue which deals with the ramifications of the language in Section 14.36 on page 8 of the MXD zoning petition, "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Ordinance, no less than twenty percent (20%) of the total floor area devoted to multi-family residential use shall be devoted to Affordable Units...." Mr. Hawkinson stated that if the intention is truly 20% affordable by floor area and not also in addition to the existing 15%, then the language in 14.36.a needs to change. Mr. Hawkinson explained that, as written, the benefit of merging units together into family units could not be achieved due to the stated unit count in Section 11.200 which will get worse if the unit requirements increase.

Ms. Drury stated the City has lived for years with the problem of the conflicting two paragraphs that make up the inclusionary zoning definition of units and limits. She does not want any more confusion and would be happy to see stronger language if necessary. Ms. Born said that the CRA intention is to override the inconsistency and loophole that exists. Mr. Hawkinson stated that the language as drafted does not accomplish that intention. Mr. Evans said that he has sent Mr. Hawkinson's memo to the CRA attorneys who are looking at this issue. Mr. Hawkinson is not convinced that the attorneys understand the intention. Ms. Hoffman offered to help rewrite the sentence in the petition. Mr. Evans reiterated that the metric is square footage.

There was a motion to close the public comment portion of the meeting which was unanimously approved.

Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the CRA Board on November 18, 2015

Mr. Evans passed out the set of minutes for the Special Board meeting.

Ms. Hoffman handed four minor edits of the regular board meeting minutes to Ms. Shore. Mr. Zevin gave minor edits to Ms. Shore as well.

A motion to accept the minutes of the regular meeting of the CRA Board on November 18, 2015 was unanimously approved.

A motion to suspend the rules to bring forward a second motion to accept the minutes of the Special Board meeting was unanimously approved.

Mr. Evans explained that the special meeting discussed four modifications requested from the City Council and Ordinance Committee that are related to tonight's discussion.

A motion to accept the minutes of the special meeting of the CRA Board on December 1, 2015 was unanimously approved.

Communications

2. Correspondence: December 13, 2015 Letter from the East Cambridge Planning Team regarding the MXD Zoning Petition

Mr. Evans passed out additional correspondences that came in after the board packet was created - a letter from the Cambridge Residents Alliance, an email from Mr. Mike Connolly, and an email from Boston Properties about the Ames Street development affordable housing numbers.

Ms. Hoffman stated that she is grateful for the four units but disappointed that the number isn't the ten units once promised. Ms. Born stated that the language in the current zoning is conflicting and making it clearer is one of the goals stated in the proposed MXD petition.

Ms. Drury thanked Boston Properties for doing what she feels is the right thing. Mr. Ben Lavery from Boston Properties added that the two three-bedroom units in the building are committed to inclusionary housing. The Board was pleased to hear this.

Regarding the letter from the East Cambridge Planning Team (ECPT), Mr. Evans said that more emails have been sent to him since the packet was created which reiterated the contents of this letter so these were not distributed to the Board.

Ms. Drury is glad to see ECPT members. She had no idea that there was a feeling of alienation and the desire for more contact. She noted that interesting points have been raised which will involve a longer discussion. She understands that there is a request for an exchange of ideas but doesn't think the CRA petition needs to be held up in order for those discussions to occur. She stated that the Volpe process is going to take a long time due to many unknowns including the plan of the GSA (U.S General Services Administration) plan. The CRA has been working on the MXD petition for

over a year and has 140 or so affordable housing units which the City truly needs. She would like to accommodate more discussions and more joint planning regarding the MXD with the ECPT and the community. She added that although the MIT petition for their development has been granted, discussions with them can and should continue to occur. Likewise, the vote on the CRA petition is not the end to conversations.

Mr. Crawford agreed that the absence of affordable housing can be addressed now. He added that, as a resident, although he took part in the discussions regarding retail and open space in the MIT and K2 plans, development continues to be an evolving process and continued discussions are important. Many of the concerns raised tonight have been taken into consideration.

Mr. Zevin is also a resident and understands the concern. However, the grocery store will come if there are enough residents making the housing in the MXD proposal significant. In addition, the research community, which is of world importance, needs the extra space. He added that the MXD is unlike the Volpe and MIT because there's not much open space to be had so the proposal is not building on what was once open.

Mr. Bator thanked the residents for speaking. He emphasized that a CRA goal is to be transparent and open to the community, which the CRA has done in this process. He does not want this process to be joined with Volpe since he feels that Volpe is a contentious quagmire. Without the petition, the CRA's hopes to increase housing as well as having any benefits received from Kendall Square to move city-wide will be financially constrained.

Ms. Born noted that the zoning petition and Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan are not the end of the planning and envisioning process for this district. She added that the required submission of an Infill Development Plan as well as design reviews of particular individual buildings continues the planning process. The CRA will maintain an influence over each phase in that process. The Board welcomes public input and encouraged participation. She hopes that the CRA process can inform the Volpe process by setting the benchmark for a new level of public involvement and planning. Although the "traditional" open space possibilities in the MXD district are somewhat exhausted, a major public indoor space on Broadway is part of the project proposal in the EIR and developers are required to increase the "publicness" of their existing open space or contribute to enhancements of offsite spaces. Ms. Born spoke of the enhancements made to the Grand Junction Pathway made possible by funds from MIT and the CRA.

Mr. Evans stated that Mr. Crawford needed to leave for personal reasons but he will try to come back.

The motion to place the letter from the ECPT on file was unanimously approved.

The letter from Boston Properties will also be placed on file.

Regarding the letter from the Cambridge Residents Alliance, Ms. Drury is pleased to have their input as it is very important to receive feedback from neighbors and residents.

The motion to place the letter from the Cambridge Residents Alliance on file was unanimously approved.

Regarding the email communication from Mr. Mike Connolly, Mr. Zevin stated that the geographic reality shows that a significant amount of retail ought to be in the MIT zone and that the Volpe is the last chance for a large open space. Mr. Connolly noted that his email had specific recommendations. Ms. Born stated that many of the items are to be handled in the Infill Development process.

The motion to place Mr. Mike Connolly's email on file for public record was unanimously approved.

Reports, Motions and Discussion Items

3. Report: Monthly Staff Report to the Board

Mr. Evans stated that the CRA audit process should be completed soon. It is dependent on the completion of a newly imposed audit of the Cambridge Retirement System which was just received today. The search continues to find a new location for the contents currently stored at Metropolitan Storage. Staff would like to consolidate this with the records stored at Iron Mountain as well as the no longer needed 60 boxes of records pulled by Special Council as part of the past investigation. The 2016 budget includes a line item for an archivist to help staff organize and digitize these records. After a three call solicitation, a new snow contractor has been selected. The forward calendar has the signage of the Food Court, which has opened with CRA's allowance for temporary signage. The audit should be on the agenda for January. Staff is working on an implementation plans for Parcel 6 as well as the Urban Renewal Plan. The EcoDistrict contract needs to be extended for six months. The CRA will remain the fiscal agent for the EcoDistrict and collect additional funds from the stakeholders to maintain a project manager. The governance and the financial sustainability model are not resolved. Foundry tours with the four remaining RFP responders have occurred. The fifth responder, Pilot Development, decided not to continue with the process. The Grand Junction Path is wrapping up its work for the fall. This project received six large trees that were saved from the Ames Street reconstruction project. The final item for the fall is engraving the granite stones. Staff is working out an agreement with Newport Construction which has occupied the Parcel 6 area longer than anticipated since the completion of the Main Street project has been delayed.

Mr. Bator stated that he has seen a draft of the audit's management letter and has gone through it with Mr. Evans. The CRA continues to make good progress. Mr. Evans stated that the CRA is given an opportunity to respond which is being done.

Ms. Born clarified that as a public authority, the CRA is required to have an annual financial audit which is not because of any wrongdoings.

The motion to place the Monthly Staff Report on file was unanimously approved.

4. 2016 Forward Fund Proposal

Mr. Zogg distributed a memo and summarized the Forward Fund. He explained that this was a pilot grant program started last year which reinvested redevelopment dollars received from past development projects within the urban renewal area back into the community. This is a city-wide grant program reinvesting in physical improvement projects with a wide range. Proposals were received from many types of entities - community groups, neighborhood

associations, civic organizations, artists, and inventors. The list of recipients can be found on the CRA website. Last year, a total of \$40,000 was offered.

For this upcoming round, Mr. Zogg made some tweaks based on feedback received from the jury that met in May 2015. The purpose and goals haven't changed in that it still supports physical improvement projects in Cambridge that would benefit all residents, workers and visitors. He proposed to increase the fund to \$60,000 but the Jury Group would not need to allocate all of it. The intent is to reward high quality, promising projects that meet the mission of the grant. Mr. Zogg moved up the time period so the grants would end by the December 31 fiscal year end. The application period would start in January and end in February. The jury would make decisions by April 1. The governance structure hasn't change. Employees from various City departments were part of last year's jury and they will be invited to be part of the jury again. The list of members can be found on the CRA website. The eligibility criteria will not change. Past recipients may apply again. More clarification will be made to emphasize the requirement for publically accessible projects. No changes were made to the evaluation criteria.

Based on feedback at the last Board meeting, the Planning/Design grants will increase from \$2500 to \$5000. The Capital Grants will split into two grants – an Infrastructure Capital Grant and an Innovation/Experimentation Capital Grant. The limits for these capital grants remain at \$10,000 with a 1:1 organizational match requirement. Better strategic marketing will be done starting in January to increase the outreach.

Mr. Bator explained that this was a pilot program to use the CRA's money citywide with hopes to grow this program significantly over time. Mr. Bator proposed increasing the fund to \$100,000 with the understanding that the jury allocate up to this amount on truly meritorious projects. Ms. Born added that the CRA is financially able to increase the total grant amount demonstrating a transparent allocation of funds citywide. She noted that an independent jury is making the allocation decisions, not the CRA.

Mr. Bator made a motion to approve the proposal but increase the dollar amount to \$100,000 for the second year with the provision that it need not be all spent.

Mr. Zevin suggested assessing the success of the pilot before increasing the amount to \$100,000. Mr. Bator wants the jury to be given the ability to offer more money if that greater amount would make a significant difference to a project. The Board discussed setting the total amount of the fund to \$80,000, increasing the amount of the individual capital grants, and the timing for making these decisions. Mr. Evans noted that production materials and outreach should be started soon and this number is part of the budget to be discussed later in the agenda. He agreed that a motion would be a good idea although it wasn't part of tonight's agenda. Good practice rules are required for amounts of \$10,000 or less. Staff would need to check if allocating larger grant amounts would require other procurement procedures.

The motion to amend the current motion from \$100,000 to \$80,000 was unanimously approved.

Hearing no objections, a role call was taken to approve the motion to increase the total dollar amount of the Forward Fund to \$80,000.

The motion passed with four ayes (Mr. Zevin, Ms. Born, Ms. Drury and Mr. Bator). Mr. Crawford was absent.

5. Update: Foundry RFP Evaluation Criteria

Mr. Evans explained that as portions of the RFP evolve they are being presented to the Board for discussion. The Board packet contains a draft of the chapters on evaluation criteria and submission requirements. Legal discussions with the City are occurring regarding Chapters 1-4. The RFQs provided staff with feedback on what specifics were needed in the RFP. Staff has been working on the level of financial detail required to make an informed evaluation while requiring the proposals to be fully public documents. Although the CRA is not required to follow the Chapter 30B process in its entirety, the evaluation criteria matrix on page 7 is based on the State Inspector General's desired RFP structure. A high level of "public-ness" is a major criterion in selecting a developer, in addition to capacity, experience, and being financially viable. The Foundry Advisory Committee considers the advantageous grade as good. A highly advantageous rating is exceptional but it is highly unlikely that this would occur in all categories. The rating in the experience and capacity component of a proposal will focus on program and outreach management in addition to typical building management. An evaluation will be done on the capacity and resources needed to deliver. The timeframe for delivering the project will also be evaluated. Price is one factor but this is not the main measurement like it is in a typical procurement process. Crafting the language has been time-consuming and the process is delayed. If an RFP is done in January, applicants would have six weeks to respond. A four-week period would follow to evaluate the proposals. A draft of the lease agreement will be included in the RFP. Discussions of the sublease with the City continue.

Ms. Drury is impressed with the specific language in the categories. She emphasized the need for the committee members to discuss how "creativity" can be rated. Mr. Zevin suggested adding language to express the CRA's aspiration for openness and light within all floors of the multi-storied building. Mr. Evans noted that proposals could require a special permit to be approved by the City.

Mr. Crawford rejoined the meeting at 7:50 pm.

In response to Mr. Crawley, Mr. Evans stated that the CRA would present an updated Foundry draft criteria to the ECPT Board on January 13. A copy of the current draft will be sent to the ECPT Board.

6. Update: Ames Street Housing

Mr. Ben Lavery of Boston Properties (BP) stated that fewer design meetings and more construction meetings are occurring so things are progressing. He explained that the utilities need to relocate before commencing with the physical construction of this building. The Eversource utility work on the street is completed although it took longer than expected due to the complexity of the situation. The gas relocation is complete. Verizon is mobilizing on the site to do similar relocations. BP will be commencing with the 13-foot deep sewer line down the street after the first of the year, weather permitting. BP hired general contractor John Moriarty Associates. BP will be assembling a mockup and hopefully some infrastructure to be placed behind the Whitehead around April. Mr. Lavery acknowledged the comments received from the CRA Board and BP will respond to those. Although BP is still in the design process, a set of design review documents will be sent to Mr. Evans. A large amount of behind-the-scenes utility work in the garage is occurring to remove the exit and redirect everyone to Broadway. The

inclusionary housing discussions with the City have been concluded and the resolution will be formally documented. The project schedule is still on track. Some units will be available by the second quarter of 2018 and all units will be available by the end of that quarter.

Mr. Zevin noted that the project is extraordinarily complex. Twenty-six types of units are amazing. Mr. Lavery explained that the unique floor plate forces that variety. The geometry of the space was challenging. Ms. Born stated that the urban design outcome is superb since the streetscape along Ames will be much improved. Mr. Evans added that the CRA, City Community Development Department, DPW, and BP have been discussing the coordination of the streetscapes, pedestrian walkways and bicycle pathways across projects.

7. Update: Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project and MXD Petition

Motion: To approve further revisions to the Tenth Plan Amendment to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan

Motion: To Instruct the Executive Director to submit final revisions to the zoning petition to the City of Cambridge for changes to Article 14 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance – Cambridge Center Mixed Use District (MXD)

Ms. Born referenced the memo from Mr. Evans stating the modifications to the MXD Petition and the Urban Renewal Plan Amendment in response to the three City Council ordinance hearings and further conversations with individual councillors. Mr. Evans distributed a few more text change memos relating to Councillor Carlone's concerns and Mr. Hawkinson's comments.

At the Ordinance Committee hearings, innovation space, retail planning and affordable housing were discussed. In response, Mr. Evans proposed adding a new section into the first chapter of the Urban Renewal Plan that highlights the CRA's commitment to facilitate opportunities for innovation space and retail entrepreneurship in Kendall Square to qualified individuals and small businesses. This program will need to be developed as it currently doesn't exist in the City. He also proposed modifying the affordable housing requirement from 17% to 20% of the Infill GFA and modifying the middle-income unit percentage back to 5%. Committing the 3BR units to middle income affordable housing will regulate qualified occupancy. He also proposed adding language to the retail section of the document focusing on entrepreneurial and startup opportunities. The memo outlines these changes in the Urban Renewal Plan and, where applicable, repeats the modified language into the MXD Petition.

Mr. Evans then distributed a document with proposed language relating to Councillor Carlone's desire for a stronger commitment on the urban design component. In response, Mr. Evans proposed that the CRA would provide more modernized urban design guidelines and standards than those currently on record. Another element with City Council is to ensure that the open space planning protects the 6th Street walkway. Mr. Evans also proposed to address Mr. Hawkinson's concern regarding the confusing language by referencing a previous section instead of repeating language within the same document.

Formally, the CRA Board needs to approve any proposed changes to the Urban Renewal Plan (URP) which would also need approval by the City Council since it's a major plan amendment. In contrast to the petition, there are no deadlines to approve the Urban Renewal Plan. Once the URP is approved, the plan and the EIR (Environmental Impact Report) will be taken to the State for their approval. The zoning petition gets into some specifics that do not concern MEPA (Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act).

Ms. Born explained that Monday night's Council meeting is the last night that the CRA zoning petition could move forward without starting over. Once the CRA Board votes on the proposed changes, the CRA Board cannot make any more changes to the petition and the determination is solely that of the Council. Mr. Evans explained that the CRA filed the petition in August 2015 and it expires December 22. The petition and the urban renewal plan are related so there are changes to both. The documents are traveling together but they have different administrative procedures. They are both before the City Council on the 21st. Any proposed changes tonight are changes to the petition that the Council already has. Mr. Evans said that the State has been getting updates to the urban renewal plan. Although they approved the EIR, the CRA needs to return in six months with a plan for the Kendall Square Transit Enhancement Plan (KSTEP).

In response to Mr. Crawley's question regarding "below market spaceto qualifying tenants" in the innovation space section of the December 11 memo, Section 2b on page 2, Mr. Evans stated that the program has not yet been defined. He ensured that the CRA will have a robust process in place by the time such spaces are ready to populate. He added that this will not be defined in zoning. In response to Mr. Crawley's concern about the goal of exempting innovation space from GFA, Mr. Evans explained that there are rules and definitions related to innovation space in the document. He added that companies occupying innovation space now would not necessarily meet the updated standards today.

Mr. Zevin added that once a company needs 20,000 square feet, there's no space for them in Kendall Square. Mr. Evans agreed. Regulating this office size is more difficult within Kendall Square's building stock. In response to Mr. D'Isidoro, Ms. Born noted that zoning is not a tool for regulating whether a building can be used for ownership vs. rental occupancy. This could enter into the discussions during the Infill Development Plan.

Mr. Evans will send the results of tonight's meeting to the Clerk in the morning.

Ms. Hoffman mentioned two possible typos in the December 16 memo. In the affordable housing clarification, the section number should be 14.36 rather than 14.36.2.1 and at the end of paragraph 'a' the section number should be 14.36 not 14.35.

During the meeting, Mr. Evans received an email from attorneys at Foley Hoag suggesting the use of a phrase instead of the numerical threshold in Section 11.2 regarding affordable housing. Mr. Evans will modify the text to clearly state the intent is to use square footage instead of unit count.

The Chair entertained a motion to authorize the Executive Director to communicate to the City Clerk that the CRA board has voted to approve the substitutions or amendments from the December 11 and December 16 memorandum to the most recent proposal of the MXD petition that was approved on December 1 and authorizes Mr. Evans to make further clarifications to the affordable housing calculations as discussed specifically at this Board meeting.

The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

A second motion was then made to approve Draft Amendment 10 of the Urban Renewal Plan dated December 16 and further amended to reflect additional revisions, also dated December 16 titled Urban Design Guidelines.

A roll call occurred. The motion passed unanimously with five ayes.

8. Report: Monthly Financial Update

9. Report: 2016 Budget Proposal

Motion: To Approve the 2016 Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Budget

Mr. Evans suggested grouping the financials update with the budget discussion. At the meeting, Mr. Evans distributed an update to the budget with some notable highlights. He noted that Board might want to reevaluate the size of the budget since future resources are dependent upon the results of the Council meeting.

Mr. Evans noted the EcoDistrict income in the updated budget. Mr. Evans stated that as the fiscal agent for the EcoDistrict, the CRA would collect money from all the stakeholders and forward it to Target City for the project management contract. He mentioned complexities providing addresses to CRA's insurance company for land that doesn't have addresses. Under professional services, Mr. Evans noted the additional funding in the budget for assistance in writing urban design guidelines and reviewing design proposals. Additional funding was also added to the line item for Planning, now called Planning and Policy, to help with potential projects on economic development and financial analysis of innovation space. The last highlighted line is the expenditure for the EcoDistrict funds. Although the personnel budget is more than that of 2015, the anticipated new hire would most likely focus on the Foundry. Mr. Evans said that the budget amount for the Forward Fund will be amended to \$80,000.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans explained that professional services for the EcoDistrict were hired under the City's contract with Linnean Solutions. Professional technical assistance has been provided as part of the Target Cities program. This is the second year of the project. The contract will be amended to keep Linnean Solutions under the City contract to complete the energy study.

The Board agreed to keep this budget and amend it, if necessary, depending on the results of the Council meeting. Ms. Born noted that immediate revenue was not expected from building in the MXD District. There was a role call to approve the budget.

A motion was made to adopt the final 2016 budget dated December 16, 2015.

It was seconded and a role call was taken.

The budget was unanimously approved with five ayes.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting was unanimously approved at 9:10 p.m.