

Regular Board Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday May 20, 5:30pm
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting was held virtually via Zoom

Approved Meeting Minutes

At 5:32 p.m., the following was read to the attendees:

In response to the COVID-19 State of Emergency, Governor Baker has issued an Order suspending certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law. The Order allows government bodies to meet using remote participation, without the presence of members of the general public, the chair, or a quorum of the public body in a physical location. In accordance with this Order, the CRA is holding this Board meeting virtually via Zoom, with the ability for the public to access and participate either through a computer, smart phone, or calling in via landline. To prevent certain meeting interruptions, a webinar format is now being used. This format is more structured and formal than the format used in past virtual CRA meetings. In this format, all attendees, except panelists, will be muted unless specifically unmuted by the host and only the panelists can share their video. There will be an opportunity for public comment at the beginning of the meeting and at select times during the meeting at the Chair's discretion. Ways to participate as a public member have been posted on the CRA's website. A link to these instructions will be put into the chat section of Zoom and can be referred to during the meeting. If using a computer or a smart phone, please press the "raise hand" icon at the bottom of the screen. You will be given the ability to unmute your microphone and voice your comment, after which you will be re-muted by the host. Alternatively, you can use the Q&A chat function at the bottom of the Zoom window to type your question or comment which will then be read by the host during the public comment section. If you are calling in via the phone and have no access to computer functions, you can call the CRA's main phone line which is 617-492-6800, and Ellen Shore will relay it during the public comment section. Also, questions and comments sent via email to planning@CambridgeRedevelopment.org will be relayed to the host.

The Board material will be shared on the screen during the Zoom meeting and can also be found on the CRA's next meeting webpage. Ms. Levering asked attendees to sign-in via the chat or email. The CRA is recording the meeting. Ms. Levering requested that others who are recording the meeting should indicate as such via the chat function or with an email.

Call

Chair Kathleen Born officially called the virtual meeting. A roll call of Board members, and a confirmation that the meeting was audible, was taken

Vice Chair Conrad Crawford - present

Assistant Treasurer Barry Zevin - present

Assistant Secretary Margaret Drury – present

Treasurer Chris Bator was having technical difficulties and had not joined the meeting yet.

Ms. Born also identified CRA staff attendees with a roll call. Executive Director Tom Evans and staff members Alex Levering, Carlos Peralta, Ellen Shore, Erica Schwarz, and Hema Kailasam were present.

Because this is a remote meeting, all votes will be taken by roll call and responses will be repeated for the record.

Public Comment

Ms. Born noted that there will be opportunities for public comment at the beginning of the meeting and at the conclusion of the meeting. There may be other opportunities if needed.

James Williamson thanked the Board for the generous approach to public comment. He said that there are people in the immediate neighborhood who are not informed on the evolution and progress of the 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive renovation project and asked how information is disseminated. He is not excited about the rectilinear character of the trellis structure on the outside of the building. He would like a list of the current tenants of the building and information on upcoming vacancies and qualifications necessary to become a tenant. He also asked for clarification on the longevity of the CRA and an explanation of the repurposing and evolving role of the CRA.

Mr. Evans noted that Mr. Chris Bator has joined the meeting and confirmed that the audio was acceptable.

Mr. Evans posted a link into the chat panel of the CRA webpage that explains how the CRA got involved with the purchase of the building and a list of the current tenants.

Heather Hoffman stated her disapproval of webinar mode as it is unfriendly to the public which is a marked contrast to the CRA's usual treatment of the public. Although she thanked Boston Properties and Alexandria for dealing with the Eversource issue, she said that the East Cambridge neighborhood is being asked to pay for the problems created by the developers in Kendall Square. Even with mitigation, the neighborhood will suffer. All the developers should be working to solve this problem that they created. She hopes that the developers are forced to verify their numbers. She also suggested seriously reevaluating all the commercial building in light of how the pandemic will change the future.

Steve Kaiser spoke about technology issues with Zoom. The only estimate of energy growth in Kendall Square is from Eversource. No modeling, data or calculations from any government source exists. The City should provide independent energy projections and planning.

Ms. Drury asked that public comments be kept to topics on the agenda. Mr. Evans noted that there have not been any phoned in comments.

A motion was made to closed public comment. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on April 15, 2020.

Ms. Born noted a typographical error in 2nd paragraph on the 2nd page. Ms. Shore will correct this. A motion was made to place the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on April 15, 2020 on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

Communications

There were no communications. Mr. Evans proposed allowing written comments to be posted within a few hours of a Board meeting even though the agenda was already posted. Ms. Born was open to the idea. She said that holding public meetings via this Zoom format is not ideal. She spoke about the efforts by the CRA to test ways to improve the user functionality.

Reports, Motions, and Discussion Items

2. Project Scope Review for 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive Building Renovation

Ms. Schwarz introduced David and Felice Silverman, the architects with Silverman Trykowski Associates, and shared a view of the building as it currently stands. There is memo in the Board packet which discusses the scope of the project. Although the scope hasn't changed drastically from last month's Board meeting discussion, it has changed from the original project's scope. Ms. Schwarz said there have been communication with tenants regarding their usage of shared spaces. The goal is to make the building as useful and efficient as possible. The scope of the project expanded once it was decided that all tenants should have elevator access. This caused a relocation of some tenant spaces and the ADA accessible bathrooms. The categories listed in the memo are deemed essential. She noted that the CRA could apply for Community Preservation Act (CPA) funds for historic preservation work but only guessed at the amount that might be received. Ms. Schwarz summarized some of the other non-construction expenses. The plan is for tenants to be relocated during construction as this is more time and cost efficient. The timeline showed construction drawings completed by the end of August, a public bidding process in September, and a goal of starting construction no later than January. The construction process will take between six to eight months. The goal is to have a fully occupied building by the end of July 2021.

Ms. Schwarz said that the slides being presented tonight are early renderings. There is still some value engineering being done as well as ongoing discussions about the scope and budget. Discussions regarding the leasing structure will be discussed in tonight's Executive Session meeting as that relates to the design which affects tenant leases and rental income for the building. The finishes are not finalized and the floor plans are about 95% done.

David Silverman spoke about the schematic design. Changes can still occur. The project has been presented to the Historic Commission. A cost estimate is being used as a tool for making decisions on how to proceed. The building had its last major renovation in the mid-60s. The new front door will be at the lower level with access via an accessible ramp for everyone. There will also be stairs off the corner of Essex Street. The parking lot has been reconfigured to create a new accessible ramp to the back parking, some bike parking and some space to hang out. There is a glass overhead canopy at the front door. Some space in front of the building is converted to a patio sitting area with shading and signage. Heading down Essex Street, there will be some plantings and a small rail fence capturing the look of the building found in historic photos. There are some added bicycle spaces between the bow and the bay windows. Removing an unnecessary staircase on Essex frees room for an additional parking space. The rear courtyard will be accessible and there is more space for bicycles. The area will be secured with a fence. A slide showed the view of the ramp from the sidewalk. The existing exit from 93 Bishop Allen is reconfigured as access to a new sprinkler system. The stairways need to be rebuilt as the concrete is deteriorating. The front patio area would have some plantings. There have been discussions with the Historic Commission. Elevations have been done which are used for pricing and materials. The shutters will be removed as they are not original to the building. The fire escapes will also be removed since they are not required for egress and have a potential liability issue.

Felice Silverman said that code compliance and general building upgrades related to maintenance are the main drivers regarding the interior planning, along with creating a sense of community and a connected experience of the two buildings for the tenants. Consolidating the entrance to one point of entry will make a welcoming space that also helps with security and flow. The main door is located at the lower level as this was the best way to resolve the accessibility issue. Although the first level has a low ceiling, Ms. Silverman showed how a double-height entry with an open stair to the second level was designed to create a bright entrance. The back courtyard as well as a shared conference room can be seen from the entrance. Another slide showed the double-height experience from the second level at the top of the stairs with several spaces for collaboration. The rest of the circulation within the building remains the same with only upgrading and code compliance changes. Ms. Silverman gave an overview of the interior floor plan. She was pleased to say that an accessible elevator solution can be created within the existing elevator shaft. There will be accessible toilets on each floor and on both sides of the building. A major aspect of the design is the creation of a central corridor that connects the two buildings. Currently it is impossible to go from 93 to 99 without passing through a tenant's space. She also noted the design includes a shared back core on the lower level with a storage area, a wellness room, and a shower room

available to all tenants. On the first level, the proposed reconfiguration creates a larger conference meeting space as well as a shared lounge/kitchen, with tenants' spaces surrounding these. The second level, which will remain totally occupied by BARCC, will have upgraded toilet rooms and code compliant changes to the egress stairs. On the upper level, which is occupied by multiple tenants, the design incorporates upgraded toilet rooms, a shared kitchen/lounge space, a small shared meeting space, and two phone call rooms.

Mr. Zevin said that design keeps getting better and that the solution for the egress stairs is very clever. He started a discussion about the height of the fascia above the dormer windows and suggested making the windows as tall as possible. Mr. Silverman said those are existing windows and there have been discussions about replacing them. Mr. Silverman said that he has a picture of the building from the 60's. There was speculation regarding the reason for the size of the current windows. Custom windows would be needed to replace the windows. In response to Ms. Born, Ms. Schwarz said that Charlie Sullivan has a list of historic preservation items that he would love to see. The use of the potential \$600,000 CPA grant would be prioritized. Window replacement could be done at a later time.

Mr. Evans added that CPA grants are given so that property owners do more than what would normally be done within a renovation project. There is a balance between the original scope of the project and the work that can be done with additional funds. Ms. Born emphasized that budget creep on this project is an understatement.

In response to Mr. Bator, Ms. Silverman said that workspace layout and appropriate distancing is part of the current conversation.

In response to Mr. Williamson's question in the chat, Ms. Born said that the fence and planting material along Essex Street recreates the original site plan for the building based on old photos of the building. Ms. Born said that this gives the building a nice setting and works with the bicycle parking. She expects lots of bicycles to be locked to the fence. She did not agree that it was a "grab" of public space.

Mr. Williamson said that going back to the old way is not always the best choice. He is concerned about fencing off spaces and abandoning the public realm. Mr. Zevin noted that this was a house, historically. The two feet between the building and the public sidewalk is not a grab of public space. The sitting area in the front adds an enhanced public area.

Ms. Born said that the budget for this project will be discussed later in tonight's Executive Session.

3. Presentation of the Annual Transportation Report Website for the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project

Ms. Levering introduced Lourenco Dantas, from VHB. She explained that the CRA is required to report on traffic data in the Kendall Square Urban Renewal area as a result of its 1994 Environmental Impact Report with MEPA. Annual traffic counts have been collected from 1994 through 2014. In 2015, the CRA submitted a single EIR as a result of the rezoning in the MXD, in which it agreed to continue to do traffic counts but increase the scope of the report to monitor multi-modal transportation and to analyze travel behavior. To achieve this, the CRA contracted with VHB in 2018 to create a new version of the annual transportation report. VHB collected field data in fall of 2018 and in the fall of 2019. They also sourced additional data from external sources to get a better snapshot of the mobility picture.

Mr. Dantas showed an interactive version of the 2019 KSURP annual transportation report. There will also be a hardcopy digital version of the report in a few weeks. Mr. Dantas said that the report will be posted on the CRA website. He explained that this is an enhanced product of the regular reporting of transportation data by the CRA. The digital report, which focuses on the traditional data, will be submitted to MEPA. Using the data in the report and other available data in the broader area, the website offers an exploration of the travel behavior in the area. The two formats complement each other. This is not a study or an analysis. It is a resource for sharing data on mobility. The data that is included was collected for the KSURP monitoring. It represents data that represents a snapshot as well as transportation over time. It includes data from the City of Cambridge, US Census, and the MBTA. This is a first-generation report and can be enhanced in the future. Mr. Dantas said that a link on a CRA webpage would bring the user to a webpage showing a tiled collection of six chapters, or story maps. The story

map called KSURP and Kendall Square Area Mobility gives context of travel behavior and incorporates PTDM data around mode shares. The Automobile story map focuses on vehicular traffic counts and parking information. The MBTA Rapid Transit story map focuses on the Red Line. There's a story map called MBTA Bus and EZ Ride. The Bicycling story map pulls information from City data and from Blue Bikes bikeshare. The Roadway Crashes story map gives insight into MassDOT's crash database and hotspots. He scrolled through each of the story maps showing the narrative and the features that pop up. One feature shows the change in development in the area over time. Introducing the PTDM monitoring data is a key component of the story map. This data is collected from property owners who are required to survey their tenants and employees regarding how they get to Kendall Square and where they are commuting from. He went into more detail about some of the charts. From the data collected from the City, he noted that transit, biking, and walking comprise 50% of the mode share for those commuting to Kendall, which is higher than the vehicle shares. Using the census data and the PTDM survey, an interactive geographical map was created that shows where commuters come from. He showed how to navigate through the website. He noted that the automobile story map includes the usual comparison of traffic counts at key locations in the area and the daily volumes relative to the 1977 FEIR for the KSURP area projections. Those numbers have remained below projected levels even with the current development. He showed a map of the count locations and the pop-up information that is provided when hovering over a count location. The counts can be explored in various formats such as time of day. Parking data is shown using data from the three KSURP parking garages. Ride-hailing usage can be explored using the counts at various curb locations. The Rapid Transit story map provides data on the Red Line and speaks to its relation to the other rapid transit lines in the area. It discusses the heavily used Kendall MIT station which is the third busiest station in the MBTA subway system. There's a chart showing the growth of boardings, a comparison of all stations on the Red Line, and ridership by time of year, days of the week, and hours of the day. Using data from the T, there is also a chart on passenger capacity, which compares users entering and exiting the station against the MBTA's standard of peak and off-peak capacity. The planned MBTA improvements to the Red line that are introducing new cars with more room as well as signal improvements in track technology will increase capacity during the busiest periods. Although there is less analysis on bus data, charts do show what services are available and the ridership by time of day of the five key MBTA routes in the KSURP area. Pulling data from the MBTA, another chart shows adherence to the stated departure and arrival times. He noted that many of the routes fall below the MBTA's target of achieving a 75% reliability. This is a concern for efforts to encourage transit use. The Charles River TMA provided data on their EZ ride boardings and a map. There is also a look at MBTA bus passenger loads relative to the crowding thresholds. In general, there is an issue with crowding during shoulder periods on certain routes. A major source of the bicycling data was the permanent bike counter installed on Broadway at the Marriott Hotel. A link to this EcoCounter's website gives access to even more data than shown. Mr. Dantas showed an interactive graph with bicycle volumes at the same locations as the traffic count locations on a daily basis as well as an AM and PM peak hour counts. The data set for bike shares was pulled from Blue Bikes, which shows immense growth in usage. A chart shows the usage of the various stations and the trip origins and trip destinations. The final story map, Roadway Crashes, uses state, transit, and local police data from MassDOT which is focused on motor vehicle crash locations. As no surprise, intersections have the most incidents. Those that involved a bicycle or a pedestrian were isolated.

Ms. Levering restated that a link to this interactive website will be posted on the CRA Transportation webpage and the Transport Kendall website after tonight's meeting. There is a lot of information and the pop-ups provide interesting views of the data. When the hardcopy version and trip generation reports are completed, these will be posted as well.

Ms. Drury said that this report is fabulous and interesting. It is a great use of data and interactivity and is looking forward to looking at it more closely. Ms. Born also thought it was great. Mr. Crawford said that he was looking forward to sharing this with partners. It is a great tool for engagement.

4. Annual Investment Report from Cambridge Trust Bank on the CRA Investment Accounts

Ms. Kailasam introduced Eric Jussaume from Cambridge Trust Bank (CT). Mr. Evans explained that two reserved fund accounts are held by CT – one for the Kendall Square Transit Enhancement Program (KSTEP) and the other for the Foundry. The funds are being held more conservatively to protect the principal as they have short-term financial commitments

Mr. Jussaume started with an overview of the market. Surprisingly, the S&P is only down about 7.5%. The CRA equity holdings were sold last year at almost the top of the market so the CRA portfolio is less affected by the volatility in the market. The CRA portfolio is conservatively managed with a large portion in cash which is earmarked for future capital needs. The portfolio has a two-year average life with fixed income investments. He spoke about the CARES Act and the government's packages that support the market. Some of these initiatives are supportive to the CRA portfolio's holdings. He spoke about the federal government and the state of the economy. He noted the low interest rates for various length treasuries. It will be a challenge for rates to move up. As for fixed income returns, the conservative CRA portfolio has had positive returns for the year of about 1-2%. Mr. Jussaume said that we are in a recession.

The Foundry account has about \$4.8 million in cash and \$2.8 million invested in short term securities, with a total market value of \$7.706 million. When the portfolio had equities, the portfolio was growing. Once the equities were sold to protect the principal, the account flatlined but it is generating income via the bonds. On January 1, the beginning market value was about \$9.65 million. Two million was taken out of the portfolio. The portfolio has earned about \$47 thousand of income and \$35 thousand in appreciation of the bonds. Subtracting out the investment fee, the year to date return is about 85 basis points. Looking at the year to date as of April 30, the cash has earned 45 basis points on a year-to-date basis, the bonds generated a 1.91% return. Since its October 2017 inception, the portfolio is annualizing a 4.3% return. The holdings include treasuries, agencies, and high-grade corporate bonds that meet SRI (socially responsible investing) criteria.

The KSTEP account has a similar setup as the Foundry. It has about \$4.7 million in cash and \$1.9 million in fixed income. As with the Foundry, the portfolio was growing until the switch out of equities. The beginning market value of the account was \$6.6 million, there were no withdrawals, the income earned was \$36 thousand, the appreciation was about \$19 thousand and the fees were \$8.7 thousand. The ending market value is \$6.6 million. The return is 86 basis points. The performance is very similar to that of the Foundry account. This is also a short-duration portfolio with bonds maturing within two or so years. The breakdown of the holding is the same as the Foundry. The corporate bonds were purchased when the rates were higher. These are unrealized gains but the same yields cannot be bought at this time.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Jussaume said that the portfolios are very secure. The funds are invested conservatively in bonds so the volatility of the equity market doesn't affect the portfolio. The bonds were laddered in three years to match the CRA's capital profile needs. There is plenty of liquidity within the portfolio.

Mr. Evans said that there are some elements of the CRA's cash spending that have drawn out longer than anticipated. Mr. Jussaume discussed some options for redistributing the portfolio, emphasizing that the risks should be weighed. Mr. Bator said that if the timeline changes for the large obligations, there would be a conversation to modify the investment strategy.

5. Design Review Update: Marriott Lobby Modification

Motion: Approving the Marriott lobby renovation alongside the public easement across Parcel Four of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan

Ms. Levering, introduced Eric Mo from Boston Properties and Kevin Alarie from the Marriott. She said that the Marriott Hotel submitted a proposal to modify their lobby adjacent to the CRA's public pedestrian easement. The CRA design review has reviewed this design in two previous meetings on March 4 and on March 6.

Mr. Mo showed plans of the proposed Marriott lobby modifications to the pedestrian walkthrough on the ground floor of the Marriott between Kendall Plaza on the north and Broadway on the south. An initial plan was reviewed and walked through on March 4. The feedback is incorporated into today's proposal. The plan includes replacing a double swing door with an automatic sliding door which will improve the pedestrian experience through the high traffic corridor. There will also be an adjustment to the Starbucks door swing so that it doesn't swing into the primary path of travel. Lastly, there will be wayfinding signage within the blue clouded area on the plans, indicating this as a public walkway to Kendall Plaza. The primary reason for the modifications is to mitigate the heating and cooling loads on the HVAC system on the Marriott's lobby. As the automatic sliding doors are consistently open, the installation of an infill glass storefront to separate the airspace of the passthrough will help mitigate the HVAC loads. He showed two views of the proposed glass panels and doors.

Mr. Alarie added that a separation of the lobby space will help keep the lobby more comfortable during inclement weather while maintaining public access.

In response to Ms. Drury, there was a discussion regarding the width of the corridor and it being difficult to socially distant oneself within the proposed confined space. In response to Ms. Levering, Mr. Alarie said that the hotel is currently closed and because the walkway opens to the rest of the building, the walkway is also closed. Mr. Evans said that the width of the legal easement is five feet. Mr. Alarie said that the corridor is about 10 feet wide. The door openings are 5 to 6 feet wide. Mr. Crawford agreed with Ms. Drury saying that busy pedestrian corridors are problematic. Mr. Zevin wondered if the glass doors would open fully in the six-foot opening. Ms. Born said that when this easement was drawn up in the 80's, nobody was thinking of the volume of people using this walkway and it will increase as the Volpe site is built out. It is not a problem that can be solved tonight. The way to solve the problem is to cut a big hole in the ground floor of the Marriott Hotel and to renegotiate a new easement but this is not in the CRA scope of work at this time. The plans as proposed don't impact the width of the existing easement. It was a busy place during the onsite review on March 4, and many in the meeting felt anxious in the space.

Mr. Evans recognized the number of comments in the chat box. In response to Mr. Evans, Mr. Alarie said that he initially wanted to finish the project before next winter but with the current Covid-19 situation, it now seems more urgent to separate the public walkway from the rest of the building to help keep his staff and clients safe. Mr. Evans said that once the garage reopens, the passage way that goes in front of the lobby behind the glass area would still be available. Mr. Evans thought that although there might not be an easement regarding this passage way, it was treated as a public way. Mr. Mo agreed and said that would open with the completion of 325 Main St. Mr. Mo said that the public lobby will be accessible directly from the plaza to create a more optimized passage to Pioneer Way and the Green Garage. There was a discussion regarding entrances to the Green Garage, public ways, and easements.

Mr. Evans said that the general circulation pattern needs more analysis; he suggested tabling this motion.

Mr. Bator said that he is not in favor of walling off and narrowing the public space, especially in light of the pandemic situation. He thinks that there must be a more imaginative solution. Ms. Drury added that walling off spaces might make the situation worse. Mr. Zevin said that placing glass on one side does not make the space more constricted. People do not filter through the lobby. This allows the Marriott the ability to control the ventilation system and adding automatic sliding doors is a major improvement health-wise. Mr. Bator said this makes the walkway more dangerous in the current environment. Mr. Alarie said that the glass walls will not make the environment any more troublesome than it currently is. He had HVAC engineers evaluate the situation and there will be plenty of airflow within the corridor. Mr. Bator suggested that such a study be included in the presentation.

Suzannah Bigolin, from the City CDD, suggested that Marriot guests and employees use one set of doors at the northern end of the passage so as not to crowd the passage as well as possibly recessing the infill panels further to provide more room for the walkway.

Mr. Alarie clarified that the entire left side of the corridor is still open to the atrium of the building. There are three massive air handlers to deal with air flow for this area which includes the passage way, the escalators, and the three stories of the atrium. Mr. Zevin said that separating the lobby and the corridor would make it easier to control the air flow in the corridor. He added that the details of the airflow amount and direction would be interesting data to have in light of the pandemic situation.

Mr. Mo said that he is happy to take another look at the situation in light of the changing circumstances.

Ms. Born acknowledged the comments in the chat regarding a truncation of public space. She noted that the actual public space is the deeded space that is hatched in the diagram. She wishes this wasn't the case. She is confident that there is a solution.

A motion to table the issue and bring it back at a future meeting was moved by Ms. Drury. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Mr. Bator – yes
Ms. Born – yes
Mr. Crawford – yes
Ms. Drury – yes
Mr. Zevin – yes
The motion carried unanimously.

In response to Mr. Evans, Ms. Born confirmed that this should remain an item for full board discussion and not go into design review.

6. Foundry Project Update

Motion: Approving the Term Sheet outlining the structure of the sublease and management agreement with the Foundry Consortium for the operations of the Foundry Building at 101 Roger Street, in accordance with the Foundry Demonstration Project Plan

Ms. Schwarz said that the agenda item is the draft lease terms, which summarizes the points that will ultimately become the sublease between the CRA and the Foundry Consortium (FC) nonprofit organization. Before getting into the lease, she used a presentation and summarized the project. The City owns the building and the CRA currently has a master lease with the City for the building. The CRA will enter into a sublease with the FC that will operate the building. The FC will have agreements with community organizations and individual users. The CRA will have contracts with nonprofit and market rate office tenants. The presentation included a cross section of the building. The first floor will be dedicated to community uses only. With the exception of some nonprofit office and meeting spaces on the second floor, the remaining space on the second floor and the entire third floor will be office spaces. Initially, the CRA will be managing the brokerage and leasing for the office space while the FC will be responsible for populating the community uses. The CRA wants to ensure that the new nonprofit FC, which will have a full plate, is not also burdened with securing office tenants who will be bringing in the bulk of the income to operate the building. The term of the document is intended to be ten years. As office tenants turn over, the nonprofit FC can take on the responsibility of owning those leases. The CRA will be collecting rent from the office tenants and is obligated to pass these funds onto the FC to use to run the entire building. The FC will also get some income from the community uses. After the 10-year term, the CRA can negotiate a new lease with the FC. The lease will follow a set of governing documents including the original demonstration plan, the CRA's master lease with the City, and performance measures that are now being drafted. These measures have been discussed with the Foundry Advisory Committee (FAC) and their feedback has been incorporated. They will outline benchmarks that the FC will need to report on to demonstrate that they are following the mission of the Foundry. The role of FAC is in the document and they will have continuing oversight and report to the City and the CRA. The CRA and the FC will come to an agreement annually regarding the overall operating budget for the building to ensure that income collected by the CRA can support the expenses. Three uses of income are also discussed in the document. Income from renting all floors would support the Foundry operations. Some funds can go to capital improvements and some funds can go towards operational or capital reserves. Capital improvements after the renovation is completed would require approval from the CRA. Depending on the amount requested by the FC, the CRA would need to get approval from the City as stated in the master lease. The CRA would open both a capital reserve and an operational reserve and the CRA would create a plan for allocating funds to these. The FC can raise other money besides the money from the rental income for programs. Lastly, the income from the building is subject to audit by the City.

Mr. Evans emphasized that although the FC will be managing the whole building, the FC will be entering into lease or license agreements for the ground floor and the CRA will be managing the leases for the income-producing upper floors. The ultimate goal is to have the FC manage the whole project. The CRA owns the risk of the building as it will need to provide the operator with funds via income or the reserves which are set aside to deal with vacancy issues.

Mr. Evans said the CRA as well as the FC need to approve the term sheet to construct the actual lease document. Mr. Zevin noticed that there were a few typographical corrections, including the address in the motion. Mr. Evans suggested that the motion be substantial in the form presented tonight. In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Evans said this document was legally reviewed by CRA and FC lawyers.

A motion approving the Term Sheet outlining the structure of the sublease and management agreement with the Foundry Consortium for the operations of the Foundry Building at 101 Rogers Street, in accordance with the Foundry Demonstration Project Plan. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Zevin will send his edits to staff and a corrected version will go to the FC for their approval.

At 8:13 pm, Mr. Bator requested a short break. The meeting will be reconvened at 8:20pm. In the meantime, the presenters for the next agenda item were made panelists in the CRA Zoom webinar meeting.

At 8:20pm the meeting reconvened.

7. 135 Broadway Status Update

Motion: Entering into a Letter of Intent regarding the price for residential development rights for 135 Broadway within the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project

Mr. Evans said that this is a two-part discussion. The packet contains a letter agreement with Boston Properties (BXP) regarding the GFA price for the residential component of the MXD project. Before that discussion, he invited representatives from BXP and Stantec to give a brief update on the design as it has evolved since last fall and on their ability to move forward on the residential as originally planned in the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP) should the Eversource plan for the site be rejected. This is not a formal submission.

Ms. Shore noted that Mr. Crawford needed to leave the meeting momentarily.

Melissa Schrock, Ian Hatch and Mike Tilford from BXP, Eric Wyatt from Stantec, and Christian Lemon from Lemon Brooke were present. Ms. Schrock gave an overview of progress on 135 Broadway. Firstly, she thanked the CRA for its willingness to consider setting the land value given the complexity of the Eversource project and the timeline for determining its feasibility. A major benefit of the Eversource project is the timing for delivery of the housing. As of today, BXP is obligated to start construction of the 135 Broadway project before receiving a certificate of occupancy (COO) for the 325 Main Street commercial building. BXP has incorporated the feedback it has received throughout 2019 from the CRA and CDD.

Broadly speaking, BP refined the unit mix and the split between the rental product and the condo product. The affordable requirements (20% affordable housing, 5% middle income housing, and 5% three-bedroom family-style units) are integrated into both products. Looking at a diagram of the stacking plan, the rental component is divided into three tiers from the base up. The family friendly product is located solely in the base of the building, creating a sense of community. It is close to the garden, includes storage space outside the units for strollers, etc., and might directly connect to the garage for added convenience. There is a total of 259 rental units in the three tiers. The condo product is split into two tiers with a total of 126 units, including the three-bedroom units.

Mr. Wyatt gave a recap of the building's design history, beginning from the approved master plan in 2017. At that time, the building had an articulation that mirrored the expression of the Blue Garage at the podium level, extending to the upper levels of the massing to create a vertical expression. As of the last review in September 2019, the massing had changed to a flat planed kinked glass front and the length of the building was broken up into a one third-two thirds relationship. Today's updated design has three main pieces to highlight. The articulation of the front of the building is now more similar to the original massing design and has a vertical articulation broken into a series of planes. The broken façade along the length of the building into a one third – two thirds proportion is still important. A picture showed how framed elements stack and rotate around the building. Mr. Wyatt spoke about the amenity locations. At the ground floor, the podium is clearly articulated in a darker material that is more pedestrian oriented. The foreground of the building is softened to relate to the park. He showed different views of

the building and various elevations. There were pictures of possible façade materials for various parts of the building. With respect to the ground floor, there is still one entry point into the building with a lobby, but then divides into a lobby for the condominiums and one for the rental units each with their own elevator core. The mechanical and loading spaces are tucked away as much as possible

Mr. Lemon gave an overview of the open space. Since meeting last September, he said that the public realm is much the same with the two main components of Broadway Park and the East-West connector. The scope includes all of the demo part of the garage to the north and the edges along the drives. The social lawn still exists with seating around it as well as various seating nooks within it including swinging benches. There is still a drop-off/pickup area that could be used by food trucks during the day. This soft entry of the park sets up the building's entrance. Although the lawn has rotated a bit to accommodate the single front door, it still affords flexibility for pedestrians to move throughout. There will be consistency with the streetscape design along Broadway. The four front trees might need to be replaced. The sidewalk continues along the front of the park and the Alta cycle plans have been incorporated into the design. The trees have been moved to the edges of the park which provides more shade over the drives and an opening up of the center. A storm water capture system, not a permeable system, is part of the plan. The façade is now greener along the edge of the building as gardens have been tucked along the building to soften its edge. The east west connector will be the main connection from the Sixth Street connector with seating, new trees augmenting existing trees, a dog park, temporary bike parking, and other landscaping enhancements. With the updated building design, there will be a mini amenity terrace at the seventh level that wraps around the entire tower. At the base of the building, in addition to the park, there will be a designated area on the amenity terrace for children. On the southern portion of the building, there will be more lounge and dining options overlooking the park. There is an amenity terrace on the 34th level for the condo owners.

Mr. Evans restated that this design has not been submitted for full review but it is a check-in relative to the development agreement. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans said that if the Eversource project is accepted, the housing is still expected at this end of the garage site but that the configuration would most likely change. If the Eversource proposal does not advance, the design review would need to advance quickly to meet the obligation related to 325 Main.

In response to Ms. Drury, Ms. Schrock explained that there is one front door with a joint lobby with a separation after that into two separate lobbies. She added that elevators are dedicated to either the upper floors or the lower floors. There will also be two distinct mailrooms. Ms. Drury said that this is not her preference.

Mr. Zevin said that the wrap around amenity space at the podium level is nice. The separation of the podium from the tower unit is satisfactory. While he understands the need for shadow and relief, the scalloped edges create lots of ledges which is problematic. There was a discussion of the façade strategy used on Ames Street and other buildings, including Echelon Seaport.

Ms. Born recognized comments in the Zoom Chat box regarding this discussion. She said that given the serious consideration of a major redesign of this site due to the Eversource substation proposal, she did not feel it was appropriate to have further design discussions on façade or lobbies as the building could likely change. She is not willing to approve the design of this building now in order to grant an occupancy permit for the commercial building that is now under construction.

Mr. Zevin noted that there are general principles that can be used for whatever building is located on the site.

Mr. Evans explained that the motion for the Board is actually relative to the letter agreement regarding the price of development rights. In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Evans explained that the original concept of the letter agreement was that the CRA would be through a design process had the attention not been shifted to the Eversource proposal. Without the distraction, this housing project or something close to it would have advanced through to the schematic design process. Therefore, Mr. Evans felt it was valuable to show the design progress. The milestone would have been met so that the housing price would have been fixed per the natural course of the development agreement. At the last Executive Session meeting, it was discussed that because of the delay, the May date for a GFA price increase unfairly penalizes the proponents of the housing program for having stopped the design work to answer the City's request to consider the Eversource project. If the Eversource project doesn't go through, this housing plan at the current site will need to advance.

Mr. Evans offered to amend the letter to remove references to the design review efforts. The letter agreement had originally incorporated the design progress as an exhibit to the letter to demonstrate that that work had gone forward. If the Board were approving a schematic design tonight, the price for the GFA, which is set by the development agreement, would have been \$50.47. The letter agreement intends to fix that price for any housing component whether it's in the 135 fashion as seen here today or another format. So if the Eversource project does go through, and the plan includes a larger residential component, the housing price would still be set at this same level. He added that the letter is fixing the price and the time line on the housing project such that the CRA will be reviewing this housing project within a year if the Eversource project does not go through. If the Eversource project goes through the IDCP would need to change.

Mr. Evans said that before the Board is a letter of intent that would fix the price at its current rate at \$50+ square feet for GFA either way. This housing in the current proposal has 350,000 square feet. A housing proposal in the Eversource proposal has 400,000 square feet. The additional square footage provided for middle income housing is exempt from GFA pricing.

Ms. Born said that the existing zoning for the MXD district conditions the occupancy permit for 325 Main Street on commencement of this housing project. Mr. Evans said that commencement of construction is not defined in the zoning, but is essentially when big machines start digging up the dirt. Ms. Born would like to acknowledge that the Board has reviewed the design for 135 Broadway. She suggested placing the design documents on file, with the intention that, if after the consideration of the proposed substation scheme the substation scheme does not proceed, the housing design process will resume and the design presented tonight will be taken up for further review by the CRA with the Planning Board. Ms. Born recognizes that design progress was made. If the substation scheme does not go ahead and this housing design is revisited, she will suggest further revisions. Mr. Evans clarified that if the CRA doesn't move forward with the Eversource project, the Board would need to review this project within a year to get it under construction by 2022. The CRA would be looking at a schematic design to fulfil the zoning commitment. There is a fair amount of ongoing design work after schematic design approval before construction can start.

Ms. Born thanked the team for the revisions in the design modifications and thanked those who shared their comments.

Mr. Evans restated that the timing is an element of this letter. If the Eversource project goes forward there would be a different form of residential GFA. Currently, the expectation is that there will be one single phase and it will be close to where this building is now. To be clear, the letter agreement is fixing the price for housing in either case, regardless if it's two years later or one year later. The CRA wants to consider this condition because housing isn't the economic driver in Kendall Square. The housing required under the MXD goes above and beyond the inclusionary requirements in the City. The CRA wants to ensure that the housing moves forward successfully. Approving this letter also commits to making changes in the development agreement at future date for the Eversource project.

In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Evans confirmed that CRA lawyers have seen the letter. He also clarified that if Eversource doesn't go through, then the goal will be to keep the housing moving forward basically as presented tonight. If Eversource goes forward the housing would be delayed due to the extensive infrastructure work. The timing as it relates to the Google project would need to be reconsidered.

Ms. Drury started a conversation regarding additional housing if the housing got delayed. Under the Eversource deal, all of the 400,000 square feet of housing in the IDCP would be built at once. Currently, the IDCP has the housing built in two phases. Mr. Evans said that the CRA would apply for a zoning amendment which would include a change to the timing of the housing.

Ms. Born said that it is fair to freeze the development fees for the housing. The process will take time as it involves the City and the State. She doesn't want to be locked into a design if that process falls through. In response to Ms. Drury, Ms. Schrock said that this letter doesn't delay the delivery of the housing. There will be housing on this site. Mr. Bator said that the only binding consequence of the letter are establishing the fixed price and setting forth the timeline of the first phase of the housing project. Ms. Schrock said that there are two deadlines that have to be met. There is an existing deadline in the existing zoning which states that BP must start

construction of the housing project in order to get the certificate of occupancy for 325 Main Street. That is already there and it is not changing unless the Eversource zoning amendment passes. The second deadline added is on the front end of the process which states that if Eversource doesn't work out, BXP must meet the first deadline and the schematic design of this project must advance no more than a year from the date of this letter. Mr. Evans said that the CRA and PB need adequate time to consider.

Mr. Bator restated that if the substation does not go forward in accordance with this agreement, the first phase timeline of the housing project as it stands is in effect and BP must live up to it. The only delay would be if Eversource project moves forward, in which case all the housing will occur at once. Ms. Schrock agreed. If the Eversource zoning petition on this parcel is not successful, the existing obligation to commence construction on the housing before 325 gets its certificate of occupancy stands. That exists and never changes. This letter puts an additional onus on BXP to make sure that they formally submit the design book for that project no later than one year from now.

The Board did not need the letter to be modified.

The motion to enter into a Letter of Intent, substantially in the form presented at the Board meeting, regarding the price for residential development rights for 135 Broadway within the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Project letter was seconded. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.

8. Summary of proposed amendments of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan and MXD Zoning to facilitate the Alternative Substation Site on Parcel Two

Mr. Evans said that the goal is to allow a new location for the Eversource substation within the MXD. He read through the list of components that are expected to be in a zoning petition and/or amendment to the urban renewal plan. They are listed in the order of appearance in the zoning.

Substations are an allowed use for servicing the district but the Eversource substation would be servicing the wider community, not just the MXD district. In exchange for the cost associated with the substation's existence on the property, the commercial cap would need to be increased by 800,000 square feet. The housing requirement would be detached from 325 Main Street and would now be triggered with the first GFA related to the substation. The residential and the first commercial component will move forward together. Both are constrained by the substation technical issues. It is not expected that the full substation is online until 2027 but the goal is for the residential and the commercial to be underway before that. The goal is to make sure the substation facility is in the CRA planning documents but make it clear that the IDCP, the CRA Board, and the Planning Board do not have design review or permitting authority over the substation. There will be a focus on the open space connectivity to the neighboring Volpe parcel. The zoning FAR is restricted by use and by parcel; this is getting awkward on this block since the actual restriction on development is the GFA cap. Mr. Evans suggested having a block-to-block blended FAR of about 6. Currently the commercial FAR is allowed to go up to 8 on a parcel by parcel basis. The height limit would be raised to 400 feet to allow the full residential project to move forward. In order to provide flexibility with commercial design and articulation in the building massing, the 200-foot height limit along Binney Street frontage would be removed so that the whole district would now be a one height district at 250 with the exception of one residential building at 400. Another change would be to soften the 75% linear active use retail requirement along Broadway given the need to have entry lobbies for residential uses. The retail environment is questionable use as things stand today and the 75% requirement works better for commercial buildings and residential buildings with large floor plates. There are a lot of demands for the ground floors of residential buildings. As previously discussed, the condominium requirement would be removed by removing the reference to the letter of commitment. The residential minimum parking requirement would be reduced and some flexibility of dimension of parking and shared parking would be added.

Mr. Evans said that he is currently working on the language. He needs to have some discussions with CDD about the language. The goal was to file a petition by the beginning of the summer so that a decision could be made by the end of the year and Eversource could present a proposal to the State in early 2021.

Mr. Evans said there the open space component of the urban renewal plan has an additional requirement beyond the MXD zoning.

Mr. Zevin suggested tying the height limit to some shadow criteria, such as amount of time in shadow, relating to the residential area to the north. Other buildings in the area might make this a moot point but he would investigate.

9. Monthly Program and Financial Report

Mr. Evans said that the interview process for a new planner will begin soon. Staff is in no rush to return to the office except for occasional logistical runs to deal with bills. Remote onboarding of a new employee will be interesting. Work continues on updating some policy documents. Some of the internal controls regarding payments have needed to change in light of the pandemic situation. The Broad M-1 Development item should not have been on the forward calendar as that agreement has been fully executed by the CRA and the Broad Institute.

Mr. Peralta said that since the CRA Covid-19 Grant program was approved by Board, there has been a lot of interest throughout the City. The grant currently limits its funding to small businesses in East Cambridge and Kendall Square. Applicants outside this area have been directed to the City. The first batch of applicants were approved and checks were sent this afternoon. As of today, 16 applicants have been approved. May 29th is the deadline for this application process. Other ways to assist businesses will be brought to the Board next month. Ms. Kailasam said that the Mayor's Relief fund and CRA loan program were launched last Friday. There are 124 applications, of which 75 have requested the loan and the grant, and 11 have asked only for the loan. The intake period is through May 29. After that, a committee will be evaluating the applicants and awarding the grants. The logistics are still be worked through. In response to Mr. Bator, Ms. Kailasam said that the City and the CRA have done outreach and the response is high. To avoid making it a first-come-first-served situation, all the applications will be reviewed after the deadline.

Mr. Evans said that staff continues to work on the Margaret Fuller House plan to reinvest in the house itself and build some housing on the parking lot next door. The current MOU with them expires in June so a new document will come before the Board next month for consideration.

With respect to the financials, Ms. Kailasam said that the highlight was the rebound in the stock market that helped compensate for the unrealized losses. There are no surprises in the monthly expenses. Mr. Evans said that there has been a lot of work done by consultants over the last few months as expected. The pace of staff work has increased as well. Ms. Kailasam reminded the Board that the budget shown reflects the modifications made at the May 4 special meeting. In response to Mr. Bator, Mr. Peralta said that there are links to the Covid-19 relief funds on the CRA and the City webpages. Mr. Evans said that the loan program could be highlighted better so one doesn't need to scroll as much. The Board asked to see the groupings of the awards if the names cannot be released.

At 10:06pm, Ms. Born said that the business of the regular meeting had concluded so there is no need to reconvene in open session after the Executive Session. The participants of the Executive Session were sent a unique Zoom link.

A motion to enter into Executive Session to consider the business terms of multiple leases within 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.

Mr. Bator – yes

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury – yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

The motion carried unanimously.