

Regular Board Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, June 26, 2019, 5:30pm
Robert Healy Public Safety Center / Cambridge Police Station / Community Room
125 Sixth Street, Cambridge, MA

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

Call

Chair Kathleen Born called the regular CRA Board meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. The meeting was recorded by the CRA. Other Board members present were Vice Chair Margaret Drury, Treasurer Christopher Bator, Assistant Treasurer Conrad Crawford, and Assistant Secretary Barry Zevin. Executive Director Tom Evans and other CRA staff members, Carlos Peralta, Alex Levering, and Erica Schwarz were also in attendance.

Public Comment

No members of the public wished to comment.

The motion to close the public comment section of the meeting carried unanimously.

Minutes

1. The meeting minutes from May 15th, 2019 were not found in the board packet. The board took a motion to place the matter of the minutes on the table to be approved at the following board meeting. It was noted that the Executive Session minutes will be brought to the next board meeting as well.

The motion to table the minutes carried unanimously.

Communications

2. June 20, 2019 CRA Letter to the City Council regarding the proposed Binney Street Curb-Cut for the future Volpe Transportation Center

Tom Evans noted the CRA Letter to the City Council regarding the proposed Binney Street Curb-Cut for the future Volpe Transportation Center did not appear in the City Council packet at their last meeting. Mr. Evans noted he is unsure why, except that he did get a vacation response from one of the people he sent the communication to. He noted he is not sure if it matters, as one of the council members used their charter right to postpone the discussion until next meeting. Ms. Born asked if the CRA Letter regarding the curb cut will appear in the communications section at the next city council meeting. Ms. Born then asked if the letter was directed to the Clerk's Office or to the City Council Office. Mr. Evans noted it was directed to the City Council's office. Ms. Born explained that is the issue why it was never received. Ms. Born noted there is plenty of time before the next City Council meeting, as it isn't until mid-July. Ms. Born asked Mr. Evans to give a brief synopsis of the letter.

Mr. Evans noted the curb-cut had been a topic at the May Board meeting, and that the CRA had let MITIMCO know, who is applying for the curb-cut on behalf of the federal government, that the CRA wasn't happy with their design due to the conflicts with the CRA's streetscape design. MITIMCO responded that this is the design the are under contract to produce for the federal government. The CRA's response was that we would like to see a design solution that incorporates the streetscape design. CRA Staff also explained to MITIMCO that they do not

believe a three-way curb cut is necessary. Mr. Evans noted that VHB is both the consultant for MITIMCO's streetscape and curb-cut design, as well as Boston Properties consultant for their part of the streetscape design. He noted the CRA received some verbal ideas from VHB, and feedback that VHB's engineers are working on it from both sides, though the federal government does have a fire wall. Tom Evans continued that they had an off the cuff conversation with Boston Properties after the VMU meeting earlier that day, and that there may be a better way to address the 6th street Walkway and Binney Street intersection, and all the various pedestrian, vehicle and bike movements at that location. Mr. Evans explained it won't resolve the curb-cut width, but it may help reduce the speed of the bicycles that go flying across the curb-cut area. Ms. Born wondered if it was possible to communicate directly with Volpe. Mr. Evans noted that the CRA has not been given access. He also explained that Volpe is not just Volpe, but the Government Services Administration (GSA) which has regional and national involvement, Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, and the Department of Transportation, which are all different. He also noted they each have their own review and approval process, so there is not one person who speaks for the federal government.

Ms. Born noted that it strikes her as ironic that this is an alternative transportation mode safety issue for the Department of Transportation building, and Volpe. The irony she noted is not lost. Mr. Evans noted his agreement, and explained that it is also ironic that Volpe has the highest parking ratio in the area compared to the other office buildings, though that does speak to its date. He also commented that their parking lot is almost never full, and that they are reducing their parking footprint in their new building. He also noted it is ironic as they also do a lot of consulting work for multi-modal facilities throughout the country. Mr. Evans reiterated that he does not have a direct line to the GSA. He explained they know people locally, but they are just tenants of the GSA. Ms. Born noted it is unfortunate, and that Mr. Evans wrote a great letter.

Mr. Crawford asked if the GSA has any involvement in Watertown and the Arsenal work. Mr. Evans noted he is not sure if that project is a direct military base reuse, and if that is a disposition of property then the military can do that directly. The military is the only department of federal government that can facilitate real estate transfers directly. Mr. Bator confirmed that unless it is a Department of Defense project, the GSA would be involved in the transaction. Mr. Evans agreed and noted that even the FBI headquarters in Chelsea involved the GSA. Mr. Bator followed that sometimes properties are transferred from the military to the GSA as well. Mr. Crawford noted that he'd follow up with Mr. Evans regarding his idea.

Ms. Drury asked to confirm that the City Council needs to approve a curb-cut. Mr. Evans confirmed MITIMCO's curb-cut does need approval in front of the City Council. He also noted at time that it sounds like two curb-cuts are being requested based on MITIMCO's application, and that they would vacate the curb-cut they have now on Binney Street, though for a period of time they will want both open. He explained that as far as he knows the City Council grants access to the street and design follows. Mr. Evans noted what's interesting is that we are working actively with the city to redesign the street in front of the curb-cut, so exactly what constraints this curb-cut puts on the future Binney Street is a little bit of a quandary, or perhaps MITIMCO may have an obligation to design their curb-cut to the constraints of the streetscape such as a median. Ms. Drury asked if the City is paying for the streetscape redesign. Mr. Evans noted that the assumption is that the presumed redeveloper of the Volpe site would be in charge of the Binney Street and Broadway redesign. That's a condition of a special permit that has not been given yet, so that's an item for the City to negotiate later. He noted the trend in Kendall Square is that developers rebuild the street in front of their property. In the CRA's streetscape phasing plan, Boston Properties is responsible for a streetscape section, the redevelopers of Met Pipe would be responsible for their section, and MITIMCO would be responsible for theirs. The one streetscape area that remains unclear is the section from Broadway down Main street Mr. Evans noted, which the City now has put in their five-year capital plan, because there is no timeline for immediate development happening there, with the exception of the Whitehead, though that has no timeline.

Ms. Drury asked if the CRA letter does not work, if we could ask the City Council to hold off on approving MITIMCO's curb-cut, and assist on some negotiated solution. Something, that works for all parties would be preferred, she stated. Mr. Evans replied that he was able to watch some of the session, and that he thinks the whole discussion was shut-down, which may be a procedural error by a City Councilor at the time, because he requested a charter right, which means the conversation stops. He explained it's now hard to know what the rest of City Council thinks. He did note that the first City Councilor that spoke seemed to have some concerns.

Ms. Born noted that she thought there was some noise about the federal government being exempt from all zoning and that perhaps that included curb-cuts. Mr. Evans explained it is unclear legal water if the federal government can take what it wants from a public right away. Mr. Evans thinks the way the government's transfer agreement to MITIMCO is structured is that all of the site is MITIMCO's responsibility, and that includes the application to apply for the curb-cut. MITIMCO themselves cannot take the curb-cut. The question is if MITIMCO could build them a building and once it's handed over to the federal government if they can just take the curb-cut, he's really not sure. He explained no one has wanted to explore that legally yet. Ms. Born noted to stay tuned to the next City Council meeting.

Mr. Zevin asked if MITIMCO is going to want to blast through the median. Mr. Evans noted the plan is for right-in, right-out. Mr. Zevin noted some surprise that MITIMCO was OK with that. Mr. Evans replied affirmatively. He also noted that he is unsure what MITIMCO is going to want for construction. He noted the CRA has not seen the CMP plan, which needs to go through DPW. Mr. Evans explained that the CRA should receive the CMP plan as an abutter. Ms. Bator asked to be posted about what happens in response to our letter. Mr. Evans confirmed, and noted that in discussing the CMP, it is a good reminder for staff to ask DPW to be in the construction planning meetings.

Ms. Born noted the next City Council's meeting will be right after the CRA's next Board Meeting on July 17th, so the Board will get another chance to talk about the curb-cut.

Ms. Born asked for the communication to be placed on file.

3. MXD Signage Review

Mr. Evans noted the agenda for signage review is slightly new, as all the signage items have been bundled as one item for the Board.

3.1 Motion: To approve the replacement building signage for the Marriott Residence Inn at 120 Broadway, Parcel 3 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project

Mr. Peralta noted that this is a continuation of Marriott Residence Inn's signage request.

Jason Parillo from FAC Signs, introduced himself as the signage consultant on behalf of Residence Inn by Marriott. He presented imagery of the new signage being requested. Mr. Parillo noted the base of the monument sign is already there, and that the previous signage has been removed. Mr. Parillo explained the aluminum face is routed out with acrylic letters so only the lettering illuminates. He noted there will be two new plaques for the pillars on either side of the entrance that will have signage. Previously he explained, Residence Inn had the same address sign on both sides. After comments in Design Review he noted, they have changed the signs to state Residence Inn on one side and 120 Broadway on the other. Those address signs he noted are not illuminated. Ms. Born asked for questions. Mr. Peralta asked about the installation date. Mr. Parillo stated FAC Signs can begin fabrication of the signs the following day and install them within the month. Mr. Evans asked about the flagpole holes in the sidewalk near the monument sign. Mr. Parillo noted the holes had not been filled satisfactorily, and that Residence Inn is aware of that, and that they will be filled in tomorrow.

A motion approving the replacement building signage for the Marriott Residence Inn at 120 Broadway carried unanimously.

3.2 Motion: To approve the replacement building signage for the Thermo Fisher Company at 250 Binney Street, Parcel 2 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project

Mr. Peralta introduced Sharon Stanley representing Thermo Fisher, who is the new owner of Brammer Bio. He noted they are requesting replacement signs as well.

Mr. Evans asked if Thermo Fisher, as new tenants in the KSURP, would be able to introduce themselves for the Board.

Sharon Stanley noted that she is actually from Brammer Bio, and stated that due to the recent transition, that she will introduce Mark Watkins from Thermo Fisher to speak on behalf of the company.

Mr. Watkins greeted the Board and introduced their signage vendor Jeff Newman who manages Thermo Fisher's signage on a global basis. Mr. Watkins noted he is the Director of Global Real Estate for Thermo Fisher. He asked how much the Board knows about Thermo Fisher, and Mr. Evans stated just that the company recently gave a lot of money to MIT. Mr. Watkins explained that George Hatsopoulos the founder recently gave 5 million dollars to MIT. Mr. Bator asked what the previous name was of the company. Mr. Watkins noted it was Thermo Electron.

Mr. Watkins explained Thermo Fisher is based in Waltham, and is the world leader in serving science. He noted there is approximately 20 divisions in the company that can provide scientists with anything they need in a lab, Bunsen burners used in schools, beaker tubes, to mass spectrometers used to solve crimes. Mr. Watkins noted Thermo Fisher acquired Brammer Bio on June 1st 2019. Ms. Born asked if the company provides equipment or service. Mr. Watkins noted they provide both, equipment, services and consumables. Ms. Born asked if they provide contracting service. Mr. Watkins noted that is what Brammer Bio does, and that acquiring Brammer Bio is allowing Thermo Fisher to expand into that business. Ms. Stanley noted Patheon and Brammer Bio are two entities that are part of the pharma division in Thermo Fisher. Thermo Fisher is looking to diversify he stated, and saw Brammer's industry of gene therapy as a good way to do it. Ms. Stanley noted you will find Thermo Fisher products in Biogen, but that they have a lot of other entities as well. Ms. Born clarified that the Board is asking their questions out interest to learn what new companies are coming into Kendall Square, especially if they are a different model. Mr. Watkins expressed that Thermo Fisher serves the scientific community. Mr. Evans noted that 250 Binney has recently been outfitted to accommodate more production, and asked if that will be the building's continued future use. Ms. Stanley confirmed that is the plan. Mr. Watkins noted Thermo Fisher is investing a significant amount in the pharma service division, about 150 million dollars in capital investment. Ms. Stanley, noted that Thermo Fisher sees the industry going in this direction, and they see returns, so they are interested. Mr. Watkins also expressed their excitement to be in Kendall Square, especially since a lot of their employees spend a good amount of their time here already. In fact, Mr. Watkins noted, Thermo Fisher has been a tenant in CIC for years, but they have grown to a few hundred people in Kendall so they needed more space.

Ms. Born asked where their corporate headquarters was. Mr. Watkins noted they are based in Waltham, and that Thermo Fisher was founded in 1956 by George Hatsopoulos and his brother John, who were immigrants from Greece who attended MIT. They first founded the company in their garage in Belmont. Ms. Stanley added that the acquisition has also been great for Brammer Bio, as the company is far more stable than they were before, and that they are no longer dependent on venture capital money.

Mr. Crawford asked if Brammer Bio still has their buildings on Medford Street. Ms. Stanley noted they still have the warehouse buildings at 61 and they are staying in their 105 space as they outgrew 250 Binney Street, so they are moving administrative offices down the street. Ms. Drury noted that the only change in the sign request is wordage, that size and shape were not changing. Mr. Newman confirmed that the proposed Thermo Fisher replacement sign is like Brammer Bio's existing routed face and acrylic sign on the corner of the building. He explained it is routed so only the letters will light up. The sign on the entrance with the words "Gene therapy manufacturing" will also be removed. The tall monument sign will just have a new laminate over the existing sign, so it will not light up. Ms. Born asked for questions. No questions were asked. Ms. Born asked to approve the signage at 250 Binney Street.

A motion approving the replacement building signage for Thermo Fisher at 250 Binney Street carried unanimously.

3.3 Motion: To approve a second extension of the Proto temporary leasing signage at 88 Ames Street for an additional three months, Parcel 4 of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project

Mr. Peralta announced that David Stewart was in the room on behalf of Boston Properties (BP), who is asking for a temporary leasing wrap sign at 88 Ames.

Mr. Stewart introduced himself, and explained that TCC used to be BP's leasing agent, but that Greystar their property manager has taken over the leasing function, so TCC had to be removed from the bottom and top band of the wrap. Mr. Stewart noted they are seeking a column wrap sign extension for three months, as they need to find people for 60 leases. He explained summer is a busy time for leasing. Mr. Zevin noted he wished the signs were not there as the building would look better without them, and thinks you might lease it faster. Ms. Born said she is fine with the signs. Mr. Zevin stated that at 88 Ames things look great and that he is waiting for the photograph without the signage on it. Mr. Stewart noted the landscaping is done, and that the striping on the road is finishing. Ms. Born asked to entertain a motion to approve the temporary signage request.

A motion approving the second extension of the Proto temporary leasing signage at 88 Ames for an additional three months carried unanimously.

4. Update: 135 Broadway – MXD Phase Two Residential Development

George Needs, Senior Project Manager at Boston Properties (BP) introduced the presentation for 135 Broadway. Mr. Needs noted that last month BP gave a presentation on the public realm design that was well received. Christian Lemon the landscape architect on the 135 Broadway project is reflecting on the Board's comments. Last month Stantec the lead architects of the 135 Broadway building design gave the Board a preview of the building. The presentation today will give a bit more detail of that design. Mr. Needs introduced Eric Weyant, Principle at Stantec to give the rest of the presentation.

Mr. Weyant, walked the Board through the floor plans of the building starting with the master plan slide, which he noted the Board was familiar with. He explained the ground floor programming and how the Broadway Park greenspace (known by them as the guitar pick), and the building's front door for the residential component interacts. Mr. Weyant described how the trees on Broadway Park create a pedestrian path that brings you to the front of the building, with Uber and Lyft drop off locations on the East Service drive allowing quick access to the front door. He also stated they would like to tuck the service space needed in the building to the back of the house, with the loading dock located on the West Service Drive opposite from Akamai's loading dock. The building he explained is primarily stacked around the vertical circulation of the elevators. The eastern two elevators would be for condo users he noted, and the other three elevators for renters. There will be one large common lobby everyone can use, and then the condo users tucked around the corner will feel a bit more special and private. Condo owners and renters have separate mail and package rooms. The loading dock on the service drive Mr. Weyant noted has a large back of house area for move-ins. Mr. Weyant explained that the project will require BP to rebuild a third of the garage, and that that reconstruction allows for the creation of this loading dock design, and for bike parking to be provided at-grade. The bike parking requirements he noted was one space per unit for the first twenty units, and 1.05 spaces per unit for the rest of the project. In total he noted bike parking takes up 8,000 square feet of space on the ground floor, and accommodates approximately 400 bikes. Mr. Crawford asked if projects with these bike parking requirements are in practice anywhere. Mr. Evans noted 88 Ames Street has these requirements. Mr. Zevin agreed, and noted Proto's bike cage is empty. Mr. Evans also stated that 303 Third Street might have been the first project built with this bike parking ratio of this dense product type. Alexandria's buildings on Binney Street also would have had to use this ratio, as would Mass and Main, which may be the biggest tower besides Proto for bike parking. Mr. Evans noted that the CRA is having discussions with the City, in the post blue-bike era if this ratio is necessary or not.

Mr. Weyant explained their bike parking design is feasible because they can change the ramping with the reconstruction of the garage, and that these bikes are located under the ramp area. Mr. Weyant then showed the Board a section plan showing all building levels. He explained above the lobby there were five-levels of what they are calling "liner-level" units that essentially mask the Broadway side of the parking garage. The amenity level, he noted, is located on the top of the garage, and that in total there will be sixteen floors of rental and ten floors of condo, though that ratio may change. Mr. Weyant noted the amenity level floor has a series of spaces that will be focused toward the rental program, but that there will be some overlap between condo and rental use. The amenity floor he explained has doors to an outdoor terrace that gets afternoon light with some private terraces. Mr. Weyant then showed the Board a typical rental floor plan, with fifteen units per floor. Larger units he explained are located at the corners, and a series of balconies and bay windows are being proposed. The building unit type he explained contain a mix, ranging from studios to three-bedroom units. In total Mr. Weyant explained that there are twenty-six three-bedroom units in the building. Mr. Evans noted that that is a zoning requirement. Mr. Needs

agreed that 5% is the requirement, but that 26 units is over and above that. Condos, Mr. Weyant followed, want to be a bit bigger than the rental units, so to keep it simple they've only changed a few walls between the rental and condo units, which also helps to keep the plumbing and other infrastructure simple.

On the penthouse level woven in the mechanical space, there will also be condo amenity space, including some top-level outdoor space. Mr. Weyant then walked through the exterior façade design. He noted that from a sustainability perspective the sun moves around the building in the wrong orientation, but from a marketability perspective, having east and west units means the units get sunlight all times of the day. Mr. Weyant noted the building will be 350 feet high, so it will have good skyline views. He also stated Stantec tested the building view from different perspectives down Broadway and Binney Street, and explored how the building will look with 250 feet tall lab buildings nearby on Volpe. They explored the idea of the building acting like a magnet, like the experiment everyone did in third grade with metal filings. He noted they thought it to be an interesting metaphor, with the building having movement across the long facades, and the glass and the more visible portions of the buildings having more privileged end caps.

Mr. Weyant showed an aerial view of the building's glass facade coming to an aggregation at the end. He noted in their design there is some relationship with 145 Broadway, as they've included some datum lines in their design from that project. He explained the design includes more glass on the bottom of the building and at the corner, and that they are tying in the glass to the podium level. Mr. Weyant noted at the upper condo levels they are trying to get more glass in the design for support the incredible views.

Regarding facade details, he noted they likely will use precast paneling façade and do something interesting at the pilasters. The design has v-tipped panels to catch the light accented by a smooth pattern. Above and below the windows they have a darker tone so they create a 4-story illusion. He noted they are taking the panels and flipping where the v-shaped panels are every few floors. He explained they are looking at the concept of residential bay windows and a series of balconies on the corner and ends of the buildings. Mr. Weyant showed the balconies staggered every two stories. Mr. Weyant noted there will be more glass turning the corner at the top of the building. He then showed a view of the building from the west side, and described how they bumped the tower footprint over by 15-feet to accommodate more depth for an amenity area space. He also noted they are looking at some options for residential terraces on top of that. He then explained the concept that the corners do not quite turn equally so you get a bit of longer expression of glass on the upper levels. He then showed a rendering of the building from a park level perspective, illustrating the interaction of the tower to the ground floor. He explained they are exploring ideas to enhance the long sides of the garage with architectural screening.

Ms. Drury commented that she likes the balconies and the bay windows. Mr. Evans asked if the middle third of the garage is still planned for a solar array. Mr. Needs noted they had explored it, but the challenge is that the area does not get the sun it needs because it is on the north side of the building. Mr. Zevin asked what will happen with it, and asked if it is still structurally impossible to have open space or a green roof. Mr. Needs noted they had studied that idea extensively, and that it was structurally infeasible. Mr. Needs noted they had presented the previous study at a joint CRA Planning Board meeting. Ms. Born asked if they are saying the garage has nothing it can be used for. Mr. Needs noted the challenge of it is that it requires structural and code upgrades that means it would essentially need to be demoed and built back up. Mr. Zevin asked if it was an actual loading problem, or a change of use. Mr. Weyant noted it was two issues, the first related to egress, and the second issue related to stress due to added loads and seismic issues. Mr. Needs added that changing the garage to anything else would require the building to be significantly updated. Ms. Born asked that even putting a green roof on it would cause issues. Mr. Weyant noted that any modification would cause issues. Ms. Born asked if leasing it to a basil farm would require an upgrade. Mr. Needs confirmed yes, if it will be accessible. Ms. Drury noted that there are green roofs that don't actually get used by people. Mr. Zevin joked you could park junk trucks on it with plants in the back. Mr. Needs noted it will still be used for cars, and that the building has two expansion joints, and that they will upgrade that third section. He noted for other two sections, if they were to touch it, would need to be seismically upgraded, and that it would be more cost effective to demo it and rebuild it back. Mr. Zevin noted that it did not hit home to him that the space would be for cars. Mr. Crawford asked if you could temporarily permit it like they do in Assembly Row. Mr. Evans noted that is a new garage. Mr. Weyant noted that the garage would need to have a second deck put on the top of the garage as the top deck needs to be still used for cars. Mr. Zevin asked how this plays into the phase three IDCP building on the north side. Ms. Born noted you could treat the building base structure as an exoskeleton. Mr. Weyant noted you could either needle through the other side of the

garage, straddle over it, or simply rebuild it. Ms. Born noted it would be a big distance to straddle. Mr. Evans noted the current IDCP plan for the phase 3 building is to needle through it.

Mr. Zevin commenting on the exterior of the building noted he is not at all happy with it, and in fact is quite allergic. He explained he is unhappy about the framed grouped floors and the slip and slid façade walls. He stated now, especially looking at the MIT dorm on Main Street, that the splayed-out walls of precast lends your view sideways, and that BP does not want that. He noted texture on the precast is good. He explained the precast on Proto demanded a level of smoothness which was not achieved. Mr. Zevin stated the building is trying too hard to do all this stuff, and that Stantec's work at Mass Art and the UMass Lowell building are good designs. This building has more windows than the Mass Art building, which is good, but the other two references have a simple geometry that explain the structure without extraneous elements messing them up. Mr. Zevin noted that the glazed corners are good, but that inverting the glass at the bottom gives a lie to the reason. He also questioned the balcony use as they are high up and might be affected by the wind. Mr. Born asked about the safety. Mr. Zevin noted it may be unsafe due to the wind.

Mr. Bator asked if it was purposeful in 145 Broadway to have lines that were uniform, and followed noting that in contrast 135 Broadway is busier and broken up into boxes. He asked Mr. Weyant if it was purposeful to contrast the two buildings. Mr. Weyant noted it was not the purpose, and stated that from a residential perspective that the articulation of windows across a tower façade, and that bedroom windows are smaller than living room windows, and bay windows, because of the combo of these types of components, generally the building seems more residential. Mr. Bator noted it reads to him as busier than he would like, but that in a way the contrast to the 145 Broadway building is interesting. Mr. Bator asked if there was a wall in the elevator lobby between the condo and rental elevators. Mr. Weyant confirmed there was a wall, and that they still have a common lobby, but wanted to separate the elevator space. Ms. Drury commented that without the wall it would help get you to your own floor faster. Ms. Drury also agreed with Mr. Bator that the building may be a little much and that there could be less, but she was intrigued about making a connection or referring to the 4-story grouping of floors. Mr. Bator explained that sometimes architectural elements at first glance can be fun and lively, but that you need to look at this in a 50-year perspective and if it would wear well. City Hall Plaza had uniform approval initially, but it didn't wear well and he worries about the business in that respect. Mr. Evans asked if the fourth-floor module syncs up with the Jenga modules. Mr. Weyant noted that that was not intentional. He explained he wanted to reference the 250-foot height of the Akamai building. Mr. Evans noted he isn't sure if you want to have the floors line up or not, but that he should look at it. Mr. Weyant confirmed it is a near miss with the floors. Mr. Zevin asked what material the building will be made out of. Mr. Weyant confirmed it will be concrete.

Ms. Born concurred with Mr. Zevin that there is something about the multi-floor groupings that she's never liked, as it's trying to tricking your eye to something smaller. The MIT dorm she explained gives her a very strong negative reaction. The way Mr. Weyant has drawn the building in white she noted, it looks like an exoskeleton that's applied as a picture frame, that is much better in her mind than the MIT building which is not that. She said this could look like a trick of a building, and she would rather to stick with something simple here, and something that is very vertical because 145 Broadway has such horizontal lines. All Board members agreed. Mr. Crawford noted that his intuition of the building is that it is uncomfortable next to 145 Broadway. He asked if their thinking has changed at all for transportation due to ride hailing and micro-mobility. He brought up ideas such as charging stations for scooters, notwithstanding the lack of policy governing that, or allowing for flexibility of space in the service area and Broadway Park space due to the changing nature of micro-mobility. There's a lot going on with Broadway and the front door he stated, and he wondered if there could be a more coherent narrative with how all the movements and modes interact. Mr. Evans noted that the bike circulation accessing that would be interesting to look at. Ms. Born asked to look at the concept plan, she noted the building has the groupings of the floors, but she noted they are not repetitive but staggered, and that she likes how the glass breaks through. It is like she noted, the tall skinny buildings in New York City where you get a masonry three-sided building with a multistory glass projection. Mr. Weyant noted there is clarity to a building with glass on the end and solid on the side but still interesting. Mr. Zevin noted the magnet analogy is what professors also explained to be a dog bone. He stated he liked the orange and gray inspirational image building, but that the masonry used in the design is perverse.

Mr. Bator noted that in contrast to the other building in the area is that it has wit, but that with wit it loses elegance, and that wit in 2020 may fade. The other version Ms. Born referenced, he said, has more elegance in the shape of the building. Mr. Weyant noted it may be nice to have a quieter backdrop on the Jenga corner, and that it

should become gentler. Mr. Zevin explained the argument isn't against complexity but against arbitrariness. He noted there is always a grey area because he's always loved a building at the University of Levain which has every material known to man thrown on its façade, and somehow it works, perhaps he thinks it's because it starts with masonry and builds its way up with lighter material. Mr. Weyant noted that ironically, they were trying to keep 135 Broadway simple, and it was part of their thinking since they are taking on the garage and not wanting to take on too many inventions, but that it may have wrapped around itself. Another example of this, Mr. Zevin noted is the Pierce building in Fenway, which has terracotta. The structure itself he said is gorgeous.

Mr. Evans noted that one thing to think through for the south façade is that 145 Broadway is very reflective, and that 135 Broadway will be reflected in that. He noted Stantec should study how that works. He also asked about the condo vs. rental breakdown. Mr. Needs noted that they are studying that, but currently they have 120 condo units and 260 rental which is above the required condo amount. He noted if they want to change that, they could take the condo vs. rental floor line up or down. Mr. Evans asked how late into the process they can switch the floors. Mr. Weyant noted the only issue is that they want to hold a little extra dimension in floor height for condo floors, though you could rent units with higher heights or sell condos with lower ceilings. Mr. Zevin noted that at some point you also need to change the elevator division. Mr. Evans commented that the biggest bike challenge in Kendall is restocking the bike share, and noted that the City would love an area that could have Bluebikes stored to be restocked. Perhaps a space could even be rented or subleased he noted. Mr. Evans also asked about the timeline. Mr. Needs noted they are still moving, and that they will decide the condo vs. rental percentage in August, and that they can go ahead with the submission package after that which would be in a couple of months. Mr. Evans noted it would be a good idea to have a CDD and staff level discussion ahead of that submission.

5. Report. 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive

Ms. Schwarz noted how exciting it is that the CRA can talk about Bishop Allen Drive out in the open. She noted the Board has the resolution, so she won't go through the document word for word. She also stated that there was an article in the Cambridge Day, but that it does not have a ton of detail. For the resolution Ms. Schwarz explained the front page has information the Board already knows, as it used the legal language from the CRA's disclosure to the state. The front page of the resolution explains why the CRA is making a legal offer on the property, and the back has the items the Board will be voting on. In the paragraph starting with therefore, it notes the CRA will purchase the property for \$8,790,000, \$10,000 less than the \$8,800,000 offer initially because of due diligence, as a result of some observation of asbestos tiles in the building. The CRA's Purchase and Sale, Ms. Schwarz explained, allowed the CRA to negotiate for the \$10,000. Next, she noted the CRA will pursue a loan for up to \$7,000,000, so the CRA can support the building and maintain rents, she noted the loan will likely be lower than that, but that MassDevelopment has asked for CRA staff to request an approval for more than likely needed. Mr. Bator noted that you never want to be too low in your request. Ms. Schwarz then explained that at the time of sale the CRA will put in up to \$2,225,000 cash for closing. The next bullet she explained, notes that \$2,000,000 will be allocated for construction work to upgrade the building, which wouldn't start until the CRA can procure a designer and construction manager. The work she noted, will include remediation costs and other life safety improvements, new bathrooms, sprinklers, and elevator. The final two bullets Ms. Schwarz explained are logistical. She noted the CRA will need to open a new bank account with Cambridge Trust and that the CRA will want to move forward with a sole source contract for up to \$40,000 to continue property management work with the existing management firm for a few months. This she noted, would get the CRA safely through six months, but maybe longer. Mr. Evans explained it takes approximately four months for a procurement process and to staff up. Mr. Bator noted this is a continuity protection. Mr. Evans confirmed that it was, as there is no way for the CRA to do fair procurement before the closing day. The leases carry on, which Mr. Evans noted, though he's not sure why, but property management contracts stop. Mr. Bator explained that tenant-landlord law is very much its own animal and tends to be treated differently than business contractual relations. Mr. Evans noted it had just occurred to him that they need to add into the resolution that Enroot will be able to stay in the building, as they don't currently have a lease, something they negotiated into the Purchase and Sale agreement. The Board would need to authorize for the CRA to give Enroot a lease up to July 2021, with a right to extend with provisions that will need to be negotiated. Mr. Evans also noted that Enroot negotiated to get a favorable discount for the next two years. Ms. Schwarz noted the CRA is well on their way with Cambridge Trust and MassDevelopment, and that everything is moving in a timely manner. Mr. Bator expressed that he was glad the CRA get a better deal from

Cambridge Trust, by saying that the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurer was pushing that. Mr. Bator noted his congratulations, and Ms. Born noted this is a whole new chapter for the CRA being a property owner.

Mr. Evans also noted that the one of the legal notices is the unique property acquisition notice that the CRA has put forth to notify the state that this is a very unique property. The notice has to be posted for 30-days before closing. Mr. Bator confirmed that that is based on Foley Hoag's advice. Mr. Evans said yes, and that any government agency can buy property under the unique property title. We don't anticipate, he noted, that being an issue at all. Ms. Schwarz also noted that the language of the disclosure is available on the CRA's website. Mr. Evans stated there are two other disclosures that are required by Enroot to complete as well, because they are a non-profit and because they are selling property to a public entity. Essentially the documents need to confirm they don't have any conflict of interest.

Ms. Born asked when the actual transaction takes place. Ms. Schwarz noted it is currently scheduled for 10:00 am on Monday, July 29th 2019. Ms. Schwarz commented that they could add that to the resolution, but Ms. Born commented that they may want some flexibility. Mr. Bator asked if Ms. Born needs to be present to sign. Ms. Born noted that with closings today you can do it beforehand. Mr. Evans noted that one thing they did negotiate was for the closing to be at Foley Hoag's office in Boston rather than at Enroot's lawyer's office on the south shore. Ms. Schwarz also noted that the 30 days is actually up that Sunday before, so they may try to do the closing that Friday. Mr. Evans added that the title examination was complete and everything was clean. Mr. Evans also confirmed that the legal document currently has himself and Ms. Born as signatories.

Mr. Bator confirmed that the resolution should include the Chair and the Executive Director to enter into a lease with Enroot Inc. in accordance with the terms of the Purchase and Sale agreement. John Hawkinson from the public noted that carry out should not be hyphenated. Ms. Drury commented that the colon after that, in the resolution's sentence that starts with therefore should be removed. Mr. Bator quoted Churchill, saying "old words are best and short words are better". Mr. Zevin noted that in the third paragraph from the bottom on the first page, that there should be an and before "people overcoming". Mr. Hawkinson from the public commented that an oxford comma should also be used in the first bullet point after governance. Ms. Drury noted that in the third bullet from the bottom include should have an s. Ms. Born commented that in that bullet, the building provides a location, and serves amenities, and that that and vital are subordinate clauses. Mr. Bator noted subject to the notations and amendments they should approve the motion. Mr. Evans noted they would need a roll call.

A motion to adopt the resolution (see attached document) for 93-99 Bishop Allen with the proposed notations and amendments dated June 26th, 2019.

Mr. Zevin - Yes
Mr. Crawford - Yes
Ms. Born - Yes
Ms. Drury - Yes
Mr. Bator – Yes

Mr. Evans noted MassDevelopment has a board meeting on July 11th that will either approve or not approve the CRA loan request. It may be the case therefore that at the July CRA Board meeting, the Board may need to approve MassDevelopment's board decision. Ms. Born confirmed the next CRA board meeting will be on July 17, 2019.

6. Update: 325 Main Street – MXD Phase Two Commercial Building Design

Ms. Levering noted the review of 325 Main Street has been separated, as the board is aware, into two phases. Phase I she explained involves the approval of the building tower, and the façade elements. As part of the Phase I review, this afternoon a design review meeting was held with Planning Board members, BP and PCA to review the tower mock-up located behind 75 Ames Street. All, Ms. Levering noted, are welcome to go and see it. The main point of discussion she noted involved frit and mullion coloring, as the VMU shows two pallet options, Graphite Gray and Venetian Red. Ms. Levering noted that if anyone is interested in checking out the colors, there is a VMU review guide PCA put together which can be found on the CRA website. The CRA she noted also received Construction Drawing Sets for Phase I which are currently under review. For Phase II, which is to

approve the public realm elements of the 325 Main Street project, including the second level terrace, MBTA headhouse and the roof top garden, she noted last week on June 19th the CRA met for another design review meeting to review the new plans for the roof garden. The plans she explained, showed a complete overhaul of the design, influenced by board discussions and additional public meetings. Those designs she noted also can be found on the CRA website. For demolition and construction, Ms. Levering stated she has been told that interior demolition is well underway, and that asbestos abatement is approved and ongoing for the limited asbestos found in the building. The MBTA she noted, does need to approve some elements of the demolition process which likely will slow some demolition timelines. For construction screening, Ms. Levering explained, the CRA has been in contact with Boston Properties, and that the CRA has been told that the signs are in production, and will likely be installed in two weeks. During the CRA's next Board Meeting on July 17th, the CRA will also be inviting Boston Properties to give a general update on 325 Main Street.

Mr. Crawford asked about the MBTA and other issues that might shift their priorities lately, and asked what might help to maintain their visibility. Ms. Levering noted that the main reason for a phased approval of the project is due to MBTA approval. She noted she has been sitting in on construction meetings to understand their process. She also noted that she and Mr. Evans attended the MBTA's 30% PDG meeting, which was interesting, and that that was the first time that the MBTA met all different departments to discuss the project. Mr. Evans noted that the tricky issue is elevators, and that the issue involves closing the headhouse for even a little bit. There are exceptions, like North Station, but because closing the Kendall Square headhouse would require the elevator to shut-down, the MBTA is pushing back. Mr. Evans also added that because the Central Square elevator is so behind schedule, they do not want have an elevator detouring to be more than one stop. Some ideas involved building a temporary elevator, which is what MIT is doing. Ms. Born asked if the T just backed out, and said they cannot offer Boston Property anything, then the design reverts to one of the earlier schemes. Ms. Levering noted that the base design is to not make the headhouse accessible, but that the rest of the terrace design would remain the same. Mr. Evans noted that he's not even sure if they could even do the simplest option, because Boston Properties needs to rebuild most of the headhouse and area around it. Mr. Evans noted that in order to get to the first option of even the most basic design, you likely will still need to close the headhouse. Mr. Zevin asked about the elevator, and if it could be built at the other entrance in the Adaptor space. Mr. Evans noted that was discussed, and it would take the place of the Adaptor. Mr. Zevin said it would be worth it, as it wouldn't take up that much space. Mr. Evans also explained that during the expansion of the Red Line, there was another staircase that they are seeing if they could use.

7. Update: Foundry Demonstration Project

Ms. Schwarz provided an update on how Lemelson MIT is doing on their Foundry work per their contract. She noted they have made a lot of headway on the creation of their non-profit, that their bylaws are done and that they are finalizing who their board will be so they can send their non-profit application to their attorney and the IRS. She also noted other documents are starting to be developed like their contract documents. Ms. Schwarz noted Lemelson MIT also continues to do very extensive outreach, including one on one outreach groups with churches and civic groups, nonprofits and others, and that they have over 100 surveys about specific program needs. That also attended an all-day table event at the River Arts Festival. She noted Lemelson MIT will start to analyze their results, and that they are also working on a fund-raising plan which they will deliver to the CRA in the next couple of weeks. She explained Lemelson MIT is starting to look at grants to fund staff before the Foundry opens. The CRA, she noted, has been working with them to finalize their operating and staffing budgets, and to support their search for property management consultants. Ms. Schwarz noted the CRA has been honing what would be the appropriate staffing. She noted the CRA received a recent invoice from Lemelson MIT, and that Lemelson has spent about half of their \$200,000 budget thus far, and that they need to figure out how they can support and pay for an Executive Director ahead of the building opening.

Ms. Schwartz noted the CRA has received a draft set of schematic designs the CRA has been looking at with Third Sector New England, Artisan Asylum consultants, and Lemelson MIT and that the CRA is developing feedback to give to the City. The City she noted, is still working on cost estimates. The CRA has a standing meeting in July with the City, where they will discuss the budget. The next Foundry Advisory Committee meeting she noted is on July 10th 2019. The City also received forty applications for two available Foundry Advisory Council seats. Ms. Schwarz stated the City and CRA will be interviewing ten people for the positions. Ms. Schwarz noted she thought a few people would be good for a Foundry Board position, and that she would like to

contact the City Manager's office to see if the applicants would be willing to give their contact information to apply for the Foundry Board. Ms. Born asked if the CRA has given any money to the City. Mr. Evans noted that the CRA has not, but that they plan to give the \$2,000,000 the CRA has reserved to the project to the City in September. Mr. Crawford asked when the resident building will open. Mr. Peralta stated that the Equity Building will open in the fall.

8. Update: 2019 Budget and Amendment

Motion: Approving the proposed amendment to the 2019 CRA budget.

Mr. Evans noted the CRA is making a few adjustments mid-year, and that the biggest change in the income relates to license agreements, as the CRA is renting a portion of the CRA sidewalk out to Boston Properties for construction, which is income the CRA was not expecting. He noted there are also reimbursements from the City for the workforce development project the CRA is working on with them. Mr. Evans noted they have trimmed down some expenses as the CRA has not been carrying a position for part of the year due to Jason Zogg's departure. There also has been some adjustments to the pension contribution he noted. Mr. Evans said he's not sure if that is because someone unsubscribed in the pension or not, he noted it is always a guess what GIC will ask for. Mr. Evans stated they are fine-tuning some of the other budget items, such as professional services, and that they are asking for a more robust budget for architectural services and transportation planning, and to add more money into graphic design and record management line items.

Mr. Evans noted the biggest thing is that the CRA has two projects we were not sure we would be working on, including design work for the Margaret Fuller House, doing a feasibility study for housing on the parking lot, which they are in the process of hiring an architect for, and for the rehabilitation of 93-99 Bishop Allen. Mr. Evans noted that the rehabilitation of 93-99 Bishop Allen likely will be a two-phase design process, as there will be things the CRA will want to do sooner, and reconfiguring work for some of the leased spaces to function more as a shared nonprofit center which could be done in a phase two. Mr. Evans stated that that nonprofit center could be imagined like a CIC coworking environment for one-person nonprofits for instance. He noted the CRA needs a designer to come in to look at that, but that the first item of work is for life safety improvements. For those two reasons, Mr. Evans stated, the CRA is asking for more money in the architectural budget. The biggest change in the budget is in redevelopment investments, as they want to add \$2,750,000 into the budget to pay for the cash contribution into the sale of the closing costs. He noted the CRA has some wiggle-room there, just in case the MassDevelopment loan does not get approved for the full \$7,000,000. Another small item, is a change to the line item title, Housing Community Loan, to the Housing Community Investments. Mr. Evans noted this is due to the concept they presented about a Housing Community Investment program, that included the loan with Just-A-Start. Mr. Evans noted he would like to put the closing costs of 93-99 Bishop Allen in that line item. He then stated that that line item was held for money that was earmarked for landscaping work for Just-A-Start's project, but that they have asked to not receive that until January of 2022. Mr. Evans noted that they need to add to the insurance line item due to the new purchase. He then noted that outside of the CRA's insurance and staff costs, that the CRA is opening a new bank account for 93-99 Bishop Allen, and that they will be running the building on a separate set of books. Mr. Bator noted this is the CRA's "Landlord Account". Mr. Evans noted the CRA will start having rent collected, and that the CRA will set that up separately.

A motion approving the proposed amendment to the 2019 CRA budget carried unanimously.

Mr. Zevin - Yes
Mr. Crawford - Yes
Ms. Born - Yes
Ms. Drury - Yes
Mr. Bator - Yes

9. Report: Monthly Staff Report

Mr. Evans noted the CRA started this somewhat by accident, but that staff would like to separate the Design Review meetings from Board meetings to make the meetings shorter, and so if someone comes to a design meeting, and need to make changes, that they can modify their work and present it at the next Board Meeting

without having to wait a month. Mr. Evans also noted that they would like to formulate a Financial Committee. He noted he would like to think the committee through, but perhaps they could have offsite meetings. Ms. Born stated she had talked with Mr. Bator earlier in the day and that they were both impressed with the new Planning Board members who were alternates. She stated she wished there was a way that the CRA could get a couple of people, particularly younger people, involved in the Redevelopment Authority with the notion that as there are board vacancies, that there is someone who will be a new member who will be up to speed. She then noted it may be a possibility using the Financial Committee as a way to involve that member. Mr. Evans noted that that idea is worth exploring. Ms. Born noted they would likely need to talk to the City Manager about it. Mr. Evans noted that the state law says the Redevelopment Authority needs a board of five, but that staff will ask Jeff Mullen if it is possible to include alternates. Mr. Evans noted the other idea is that the Design Review committee earlier in CRA history, was a committee of a few board members, and architects from the community, along with planning staff members. Mr. Bator asked if the Planning Board has advisory members. Ms. Born confirmed they do not, but instead two alternates, as does the historic commission, and the BZA, which is allowed by statute. Mr. Hawkinson from the public noted that each committee treats alternates in a different way. Mr. Bator noted his reaction is that as the CRA Board is so small, it makes sub-committees tricky, and burdensome, especially for the Design Review committee. He noted given the new size of CRA projects, he thinks if there was a way to expand in size, whether by alternates to have some younger people who are excited and up to speed, makes a lot of sense. Mr. Bator jokingly noted he thinks the pay to the design review committee should be doubled. Mr. Evans stated staff will look at that, and see if it may need us to make some changes to CRA bylaws. Mr. Evans noted in the meantime, the CRA will implement the Design Review change.

Mr. Evans noted earlier that day, the CRA released an RFP for urban design review consultants to continue the work Chuck Redmon has done and Larry Bluestone has done in the past. Mr. Evans noted they have extended Mr. Redmon's contract to cover 325 Main Street's approval, but that the CRA needs a new contract for future services.

Mr. Evans noted the CRA has scheduled audit field-work for July. He noted the CRA is doing an interesting audit dance between the Cambridge Retirement System, and the City. He stated he believes everything has been coordinated, and that the CRA's auditors have gotten very engaged in that coordination. He noted the CRA has already received the reports the CRA needs, which is much earlier than the CRA has received them in the past.

Mr. Evans noted the CRA was about to roll out a paid family leave program run by the state, but that two weeks before it was rolled out the state noted it needed three more months. He noted by referendum, Massachusetts passed a paid family leave, which is set up where employers and employees pay into the system using a formula, so when a person goes on family leave, you apply to the state to get a portion of your salary. He noted employees get up to 60% of their income up to a certain point, and that employers under a certain size do not have to pay the employer portion, but instead the employees still would have to pay their portion. As the CRA is so small, the CRA applied for the non-employee payment, but noted they will pay for the employee's portions. He noted it is not much money, but it is a lot of administration.

In May, Mr. Evans noted The Link's ribbon cutting ceremony occurred, which was well attended, and that Ms. Schwarz and he attended the Per Scholas graduation in Boston the night before. He noted it was a very inspirational night, and that his roommate from college was the keynote speaker. Robin Nadeau from Per Scholas organized the event which went very well. He noted it is great Per Scholas is in Cambridge, and that he believes they are going to have rippling effects in workforce and technology training. Ms. Born noted that there had been some issue with Cambridge folks that there were not as many Cambridge residents in the Per Scholas program. Mr. Evans noted that all candidates need to take a test, and that a number of Cambridge residents did not pass the remedial math classes. Per Scholas also acknowledged that they need to expand their outreach connections to nonprofits in the area. Mr. Evans noted the first class also only had eleven students, who were from various places in the area. None, he noted however, was from Cambridge. He also stated that a few were recent immigrants, and that it is hard to move to the United States and live in Cambridge. He did state however that Per Scholas is talking through a new cohort, and that they are starting to run 100 students through the Link this year, and that the goal is for 50% Cambridge residents to be in the system. First however, he noted, they need to find people and make the connections. Mr. Evans noted the CRA is trying to strengthen the connection between Per Scholas and the Kendall Square community. Mr. Bator asked if they have fairly strict income requirements. Mr. Evans stated he assumes so, as Per Scholas's training is likely worth \$16,000, and for all students it's free. Ms.

Born asked what the age range was. Mr. Evans noted he was not sure, but that they are not all young. Ms. Evans noted Per Scholas is working with the housing authority, and with Just-A-Start who runs a similar program. He noted the workforce relationship with Just-A-Start has gone through turn over not only because of Deborah Ruhe leaving but also because the head of the workforce development program has also left. Ms. Born noted that another suggestion is the group Friends of Cambridge Rindge and Latin who embodies the school's alumni network. Mr. Evans noted they have also been in contact with the superintendent of schools, and that they also have reached out to the Adult Community Learning Center. Mr. Evans noted the CRA is also working expand other organizations in The Link, such as Just-A-Start, who will be starting to some of their programs soon there as well.

Mr. Evans noted last week the Board had an Open Space walk, and that the Parcel 3 Open Space project is underway to redesign the space the Board knows as where the mock-ups go. As he was just out there earlier that day, he noted that there is actually a lot of space behind the Whitehead, and that it would be good to connect that to Danny Lewin Park. They are now planning for what should happen to that space once the mock-ups are removed. Mr. Hawkinson noted that next summer there likely will be a generator there. He noted that Eversource's alternative plan to a substation is to located 30 generators in utility easements around Kendall Square. Mr. Evans noted the Open Space tour concluded with the Looking Glass ribbon cutting by Innovators for Purpose.

Mr. Evans noted that they have finished conducting interviews for the Margaret Fuller project. In total they received fifteen responses, and they interviewed six firms. He noted it is a joint interview committee consisting of Ms. Schwarz, himself, and Board and Staff members of the Margaret Fuller House. He also noted they attended Sweet Soul Supper for Margaret Fuller House which was attended by the Governor. He noted it was a great event. He also noted that the CRA has a revolving line of credit with them, but it looks like they will not need to draw it down as much as they thought because they are doing better with fundraising.

Mr. Evans noted that tomorrow is the ribbon cutting at 50 York Street, which the CRA helped to fund for the fire suppression systems for the consolidated Just-A-Start housing portfolio. He noted the CRA has been involved in the York Street work, though their funding did not go directly to 50 York Street, but that the CRA did help with their public relations outreach when they were first working on it. He noted the CRA's sprinklers are everywhere but in the 50 York building.

Mr. Evans noted that Mr. Peralta facilitated getting three new Honey Locus Trees planted on Parcel Six to provide shade but not to cover up the artwork. At first Mr. Evans noted they did not want to plant them because it is a temporary space, but then they decided they needed shade. Mr. Zevin noted that once they get to 7 inches you cannot move them. Mr. Evans noted they will not get that big in a year.

Meeting adjourned at 8:25PM.

**Resolution regarding the purchase of property at 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive
in Cambridge Massachusetts
June 26, 2019**

The Board of Directors of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (“CRA”) make this resolution to authorize the Executive Director to proceed in the purchase the property at 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive from Enroot, Inc.

- Whereas, the CRA entered into an MOU with the Cambridge Community Foundation (“CCF”) in December, 2018 in order to explore ownership, financing, on-going governance, and management options for the Property at 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive, with a goal of preserving the property as a hub for nonprofit services for Cambridge residents and beyond.
- Whereas, the success of historical redevelopment initiatives and other factors have contributed to continually rising real estate costs that threaten to push out nonprofit organizations that uphold the City’s aspirations to be a diverse, inclusive, culturally vibrant and welcoming home to all residents.
- Whereas, Central Square is a neighborhood experiencing hyper-appreciation of real estate values. At the same time, the Central Square neighborhood is home to some of our most vulnerable populations and an historical hub of social services and community organizations.
- Whereas, the building at 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive is uniquely important as a social service site due to its location in the Central Square district, close to many of the populations who are served by programs offered in the building; its proximity within one block of the red line, which provides access for those who need to use public transit and an important level of anonymity for some clients; and its occupancy by nonprofits for over 50 years, resulting in a level of familiarity and comfort among clients who require the services offered.
- Whereas, the building at 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive provides a location and unique amenities that are vital for provision of community services for a diverse population that includes low-income youth and families, youth with chronic or terminal illness, and people overcoming domestic violence, and serves as a center for programs that support Cambridge-based nonprofits and small business owners.
- Whereas, the CRA has determined that the combination of unique attributes described above is not available in another property in Cambridge.
- Whereas, the CRA has developed a strategic plan and working policy to guide its work related to housing and social service needs and seeks to invest its resources in areas of the City in which strong growth in Kendall Square has contributed to unaffordability and lack availability of social services for persons of modest means, of which the acquisition of the building at 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive is a part.
- Whereas, the CRA entered into a Purchase and Sale Agreement with Enroot Inc. on May 29, 2019 subject to due diligence by the CRA.

- Whereas, the CRA has conducted due diligence review of the title, property, and building conditions and is satisfied with the condition of the property.

Therefore, the CRA Board resolves:

- The Chair and Executive Director shall carry out the purchase the property at 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive from Enroot, for eight million, seven hundred and ninety thousand dollars (\$8,790,000).
- The Treasurer and the Executive Director shall secure a loan for up to seven million dollars (\$7,000,000) to support this purchase from Cambridge Trust, using tax exempt bond financing to be approved by MassDevelopment.
- The Treasurer shall allocate up to two million, two hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars (\$2,225,000) of cash to purchase the property and pay closing costs on the transaction.
- The Executive Director and the CRA staff shall work toward designing and contracting for a capital investment of two million dollars (\$2,000,000) focused on life safety improvements, accessibility upgrades, cooling system modernization, and related building remediation costs as well as other upgrades to maximizing the use of the space to help strengthen local social service provision.
- The Treasurer and Executive Director shall open a new bank account with Cambridge Trust that will be used to manage the finances for the acquisition of the site, and to serve as the operating account for the property.
- The Executive Director and the CRA staff shall negotiate a sole source contract for up to forty thousand dollars (\$40,000) with the firm currently under contract to provide property management for 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive, with a term that will initiate upon CRA acquisition of the property to allow continued smooth operation of the property for existing tenants and to provide the CRA with adequate time to procure asset management services.
- The Executive Director and CRA staff shall negotiate and enter into a lease with Enroot, Inc. in accordance with terms outlined in the Purchase and Sale Agreement.

Vote:

Adopted by the affirmative vote of five members

Date:

June 26, 2019

Attest:



Thomas Evans, CRA Executive Director and Secretary