

Regular Board Meeting  
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, December 16, 2020 at 5:30pm  
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting was held virtually via Zoom

---

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

---

At 5:30 p.m., Alex Levering read the opening statement:

In response to the current COVID-19 situation, the Governor has suspended certain provisions of the Open Meeting Law allowing government bodies to meet using remote participation. In accordance with the Order, the CRA is holding this meeting via Zoom webinar. In a webinar format, all attendees, except panelists, will have their videos suspended and be muted unless specifically unmuted by the host. There will be opportunities for public comment at the start of the meeting and at the discretion of the Chair. To provide public comment, please press the “raise hand” icon at the bottom of your screen and you will be called upon to speak. Once you are called upon, you will need to press unmute. You may identify yourself but are not required to do so. After stating your comment or question, you will be re-muted. Alternatively, you can use the Q&A function to type a question or comment. If you are calling in via phone and have no access to computer or smart phone, you can call the CRA’s main line at 617-492-6800 and press extension 11 to bypass the opening messages or you can email [planning@CambridgeRedevelopment.org](mailto:planning@CambridgeRedevelopment.org).

Board meeting materials can be found on the CRA’s next meeting webpage. This meeting is being recorded by the CRA, including all audio, video, and QA messages.

**Call**

There was a quorum so Chair Kathleen Born called the remote meeting. A roll call of Board members and a confirmation that the meeting was audible to them was taken.

Vice Chair Conrad Crawford – not present yet  
Treasurer Chris Bator – not present yet  
Assistant Treasurer Barry Zevin – present and audible  
Assistant Secretary Margaret Drury – present and audible

CRA staff members in attendance were Executive Director Tom Evans, Alex Levering, Carlos Peralta, Ellen Shore, Erica Schwarz, Hema Kailasam, and Fabiola Alikpokou. Mr. Evans said that while all staff members are present, not all of them are participants so they cannot be heard. As this is a remote meeting, all votes will be taken by roll call and responses will be repeated for the record by Mr. Evans.

**Public Comment**

There were no requests to comment.

***A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to close public comment. The motion carried unanimously.***

**Minutes**

**1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 18, 2020**

There were no amendments or changes.

***A motion was moved by Mr. Zevin to accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on November 18, 2020 and place them on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member’s vote***

*Ms. Born – yes  
Mr. Crawford – not present  
Ms. Drury – yes  
Mr. Bator – not present  
Mr. Zevin – yes  
The motion carried.*

## Communications

### 2. Written communications received since the publication of the December meeting notice.

No communications had been received.

## Reports, Motions, and Discussion Items

Ms. Born noted that Mr. Crawford had joined the meeting at 5:36 p.m.

### 3. Update: 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive – Renovation and Tenant Relocation Plans

***Motion: To approve the contract for off-site tenant storage with Sterling Corporation in Chelmsford, MA for an amount not to exceed \$45,000***

***Motion: To approve the nine-month lease for space from Caru Retail LLC at 552 Massachusetts Avenue in Central Square and a corresponding sublease to the Boston Area Rape Crisis Center to provide tenant swing space during the renovation project.***

Ms. Schwarz said that the bid documents went live on BidDocsOnline.com this past Monday. CRA bids can be found with a key search using “Cambridge.” Fourteen sub-bids have been filed. Responses are due by December 29. The general contractor (GC) responses are due January 12. She expects to come to the Board in January to take a vote on a GC selection and a final project cost. Ms. Schwarz, the owner’s project manager, and the architects will be hosting a site visit for the bid process this Friday.

The memo in the packet describes the swing space procurement. Tenant negotiations, regarding their future leases and other obligations during the construction period, were required before a proposal could be brought to the Board to ensure that the tenants would be returning before they took up residence in their new temporary locations. TSNE is managing the negotiations which are close to all being signed.

A standard procurement process for rental real property under 30B was used because the expected cost was over \$50,000. However, due to the pandemic, many tenants decided to continue working remotely and no longer need swing space. There were five responses to the RFP.

In the end, four tenants require swing space. Three tenants will lease space in The Link at 255 Main Street. They will contract directly with TSNE, who also manages that space. The fourth tenant, BARCC, will occupy two suites at 552 Main Street from Caru Retail. For logistical reasons, this 1650 sq ft space will be leased by the CRA directly and there will be a sublease with BARCC. The contract has a value that exceeds \$20,000 and requires a Board vote. The Board packet contains the lease document to be signed as well as a draft of the sublease contract with BARCC, which BARCC is now reviewing and is likely to be the final version. Ms. Schwarz explained that BARCC will continue to pay their current price per sq ft but as this price is less than market rate, the CRA would need to pay the difference for the swing space at Caru Retail. The motion states a term of nine months which is the expected construction period. If the construction period goes over nine months, the lease can be extended one month at a time for up to two months.

At 5:42 p.m., Mr. Evans noted that Mr. Bator is now present.

Ms. Born said that the \$20,664 is a good measure of the favorable rates that the CRA is charging their nonprofit tenants. Mr. Evans added that as part of the tenant negotiations, the rents are being increased incrementally to

allow the CRA to keep the building operational and pay for the mortgage. They are still significantly below market rate.

***The motion was moved by Ms. Drury to approve the nine-month lease for space from Caru Retail LLC at 552 Massachusetts Avenue in Central Square and a corresponding sublease to the Boston Area Rape Crisis Center to provide tenant swing space during the renovation project. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.***

***Ms. Bator – yes, he added that he read the documents and heard enough of the discussion to be sufficiently informed.***

***Ms. Born – yes***

***Mr. Crawford – yes***

***Ms. Drury – yes***

***Mr. Zevin – yes***

***The motion carried unanimously.***

Mr. Peralta introduced Eva Hamori of STV DVM who has been helping with the move coordination. Ms. Hamori said that part of the process was to secure storage warehousing for the bulk of the items that are currently in 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive. A chapter 30B real property procurement process sought a qualified storage facility for space for approximately 15 truck-loads, estimated to be about 13,500 cubic feet. This estimate was given by the selected mover. The tenants are purging many items so less space is likely needed. All three RFP respondents are moving companies that also do storage as part of their services. Ms. Hamori has worked with each respondent and said that all of them would do a fine job. Sterling Movers had the lowest cost and the highest rating. Using a rated selection, Sterling had a 4.8 out of a possible 5 using the four major criteria points articulated in the RFP. They are being recommended.

Ms. Hamori explained that the movers will bring items to the dock of the storage warehouse. The storage warehouse will take an inventory of the items, put them on pallets, and secure them for the nine months. These items are not expected to move before nine months. When it's time to move things out, the warehouse will pull the pallets off shelves and the selected mover for the second part of the move will retrieve them from the warehouse.

Sterling's cost is \$40,080 for 15 truckloads. The motion includes a not-to-exceed amount of \$45,000 in case more truckloads are needed. Ms. Hamori said that the warehouse's final cost will be based on actual storage. They charge on a per pallet per month basis. Mr. Evans added that all tenants were asked to carry their own insurance into the storage facility so the CRA is not directly insuring the materials.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Peralta said that the movers are taking items to storage on December 28 and December 29. On December 30, the movers are moving the remaining items to the respective temporary swing spaces.

***A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to approve the contract for off-site tenant storage with Sterling Corporation in Chelmsford, MA for an amount not to exceed \$45,000. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.***

***Ms. Bator – yes***

***Ms. Born – yes***

***Mr. Crawford – yes***

***Ms. Drury – yes***

***Mr. Zevin – yes***

***The motion carried unanimously.***

#### **4. KSURP and MXD Eversource Substation Rezoning Update**

Mr. Evans gave an update on the rezoning process which includes an amendment to the urban renewal plan, now called the urban redevelopment plan. On November 17, the Planning Board heard the petition and the plan amendment. They voted to recommend it to City Council and, critical to the state process, also found that the redevelopment plan amendment was consistent with the City's general planning documents. Two days later, the first hearing occurred with the Ordinance Committee. The CRA presented architectural renderings and spoke about the text of the amendment. Most of the feedback focused on the proposal to remove the letter of

commitment from the zoning which would remove the requirement that 20% of the residential units be for-sale rather than rental.

Mr. Evans explained the chart that was included in the Board packet. There is a total GFA commitment of 400,000 sq ft of housing in the project. Boston Properties is also required to build an additional 5% of middle-income units but those units are exempt from the GFA calculations. This was the model of zoning that came out of the K2 planning process in 2013. In the 2019 Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP), there would be a full portfolio of 336,000 sq ft of rental that would come in two phases. The first phase was at 135 Broadway and the CRA has seen initial concepts of that. There would then be 84,000 sq ft of market rate housing. There is a question of whether the amount is 84,000 vs 80,000 sq ft. The letter of commitment speaks to 20% of GFA but it is unclear if that relates only to the 400,000 or includes the bonus middle income of 20,000 that is exempt from GFA. This issue is still being discussed. For this discussion, Mr. Evans used 420,000 sq ft of housing which results in 84,000 sq ft of rental product. Also, 5% of the units would be 3-bedroom units, all of which will be either middle income or affordable.

The chart also showed the number and type of housing units proposed. There is no condo requirement and the full housing composition, including affordable and middle, is rental, all in one building. The ranges based on zoning for each housing type were also included in the chart. Affordable rental units are available to households with 50-80% AMI (Area Median Income). For middle income, that range rises to 120% AMI and is defined specifically in the MXD. The range for affordable condominiums is capped at 100% AMI, as defined in the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. It starts at 60% AMI and is based on the City's Homebridge program. Below the chart is a summary of the MXD requirement and the published income limits and the definitions of AMI levels for Cambridge.

Mr. Evans said that rental units are usually smaller than condo units so there would most likely be more units available without condos. He added that the AMI levels for affordable and middle-income housing are lower for rental units than condo units. Resolving the removal of the condominium component needs to be addressed in order to move the substation proposal forward. This will be discussed more tonight during the executive session. In addition, other urban design issues will need more review such as the configuration of buildings, the quality of the open space, circulation, how the project connects to the Volpe project, its architectural character, elements of materiality, façade treatment, setback, etc. Staff is using the Volpe design guidelines to make sure the materials presented by Boston Properties and Pickard Chilton reflect those guidelines. The next Ordinance Committee meeting is January 5.

In response to Ms. Born's question regarding Volpe, Mr. Evans said that both projects have focused on connectivity between the two sites across the Sixth Street walkway. The quality of those connections is important. Also, the open space in the center of the block needs to be a welcoming place within the composition of all the open spaces in Kendall. The next biggest planned open space contribution comes from the Volpe parcel. There has also been some discussion about a possible GFA exemption for an educational or workforce development use that has been written into the proposed zoning. There isn't a specific concept of what that would be or who the tenant is or where it would go but if it were part of the special permit negotiations with Boston Properties, the CRA would want to incentivize it to be developed within the commercial building so the developer wasn't penalized for creating that community space.

Ms. Born said the housing comparison in the chart is useful. It shows that the square footage of housing is constant. Any affordable home ownership units that the CRA might provide in connection with this petition are additional units. Mr. Evans said that the CRA might be able to make an offsite commitment for the affordable condominium component. This does not reduce the requirement for inclusionary housing within the project. Mr. Bator restated that the possibility of offsite development by the CRA of affordable condominium units would be above and beyond the existing and unchanging commitment to total units and affordable units in the original plan. This proposal converts the condominium units in the original plan to rentals but the square footage for housing will remain the same and anything done with regard to affordable condos would be additional. Mr. Evans said that the unit cap will likely increase because rental units tend to be a little smaller.

Mr. Zevin said that using the Fulkerson Street as the offsite location makes sense as it has a better chance of putting families with kids closer to the ground and near a park and playing fields. He started a discussion of the BZA's issues with the housing proposal at Mass Ave and Walden Street. Mr. Bator said that there was a

demonstrable track record of filling affordable rental units in Cambridge but he doesn't know that there is a similar track record when it comes to filling affordable condo units. Mr. Evans said that it is harder to buy a house than it is to rent an apartment. The affordable condo units have limited equity so they might not escalate as strongly. Ownership comes with tax benefits, security, and getting rent payments back but there is not the 1-4% increase in property value that standard home ownership provides. Mr. Bator supports the concept and understands the notion of having more moderate- and lower-income people acquiring an ownership stake and step into investments. He is worried, however, that the system can be gamed in some situations, such as rent-controlled apartments in New York City. There was a discussion of gaming the system by people of means. Monitoring over time would be required. Mr. Zevin seconded Mr. Bator's skepticism and cited an example of inadequate safeguards in a CRA project in the 1980s. Mr. Crawford said an oversight mechanism is the fourth estate. Transparency and accountability are necessary for a CRA affordable home ownership project. Ms. Drury said that the City might currently have about 500 affordable home ownership units but she wasn't clear how they are being managed.

Ms. Born said there has been a rightful focus on the historical lack of opportunity of certain people to buy real estate as a way to grow personal wealth or family assets which is due to exclusionary practices on the part of lenders and city zoning policies. Limited equity co-ops are not a way to right that wrong. In a limited equity co-op, one has the ability to use a rent payment as a mortgage payment which builds equity but it does not provide the benefit from an explosion of property value. Mr. Evans said that the tools used in the affordable housing field work against people gaming the system but also work against giving lower income households the ability to grow wealth.

Ms. Born concluded by saying that the CRA is committed to push forward to produce affordable units because it believes in the concept. Mr. Evans said that the CRA's history includes the wonderful story of Harwell Homes which is a co-op model that has maintained its affordability through its own governance but then there's Linden Park which was initially low income but is now all market rate. Mr. Evans said that the CRA will learn from these projects as it builds a new chapter towards housing.

Ms. Born noted that Heather Hoffman has been communicating in the QA section and asked if she would like to comment. Ms. Hoffman said that she does not know what the answer is. Habitat for Humanity has a lot of experience with figuring out ways to try to make these things equitable. People want to own property to build wealth so they can leave something to their kids. There are people in Cambridge whose knowledge can be tapped and want to give back to their community. Mr. Evans said that staff are also interested in diving into this issue. Mr. Bator said that a challenge of public policy is measuring success.

Ms. Drury thanked the staff for following up and paying attention to the situation. Ms. Born emphasized that there is not a single square foot less of housing in the substation proposal and possibly more in a yet to be solidified CRA proposal as an ancillary part of the zoning agreement.

Mr. Evans noted that Nicola Williams had asked to comment. Ms. Williams said that she is thrilled that this conversation is occurring. It is an uplifting economic opportunity for low- and middle-income families. The current Homebridge program doesn't allow for the transfer of the property to families and there is a limited equity. It is good to explore all options, including cooperatives, but the key is to generate huge pride and economic development that is measurable. Making life better for families will make them less dependent on the government and can build equity over time.

## **5. Revised Internal Controls Policy Amendment**

### **Motion: To approve the revised amendment of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Internal Controls Policy dated December 2020**

Ms. Kailasam said that at the last Board meeting, an amended and restated Internal Controls Policy (ICP) was proposed which had similar goals to the ICP written in 2014. While there was a discussion of the changes, some items were unintentionally excluded from the text of the draft presented to the Board. The draft before the Board tonight contains all the text of the amended and restated ICP. The text includes the wording for check writing authorization thresholds, Board approval for real property acquisition or disposal, and Board notification or approval for the disposition of assets maintained in the general ledger.

Mr. Evans said the memo also states that the policy allows a provision for electronic check distribution which was actually used as part of the Covid assistance grant distribution. This will be immensely helpful in a remote working environment.

Ms. Born said that when this Board was initially seated, before any of the current staff were hired, there was no such thing as a CRA Internal Controls Policy. It is a measure of how highly functional and thorough the current CRA staff is. Mr. Bator agreed and was proud of how far the CRA has come.

***A motion was moved by Mr. Bator to approve the revised amendment of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Internal Controls Policy dated December 2020. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.***

***Ms. Bator – yes***

***Ms. Born – yes***

***Mr. Crawford – yes***

***Ms. Drury – yes***

***Mr. Zevin – yes***

***The motion carried unanimously.***

## **6. Forward Fund Five Year Review and Proposal for 2021**

**Motion: To authorize the Executive Director to administer a revised Forward Fund grant program of up to \$300,000 for 2021 and further to authorize the Executive Director to develop a program for distribution of \$200,000 of additional COVID relief funds in coordination with the City of Cambridge.**

Mr. Peralta gave a review of the Forward Fund (FF). The program has been in existence for five years. Unfortunately, due to Covid, the CRA did not have a full program this past year. The funds were re-allocated to Covid relief to assist nonprofits and small businesses in the community.

The 2015 pilot FF distributed \$39,600. In 2019, the total awarded was \$285,000 which shows how the program has grown. Pictures of past FF projects were included in the presentation. The goals of the FF haven't changed. The annual FF budgeted amount is approved by the Board as part of the budget process. Different grant types have been offered throughout the years. Capital Infrastructure grants are the most desired grant type. The Technical Assistance grant has proved to be very important to organizations that need to do feasibility studies for future larger projects. The Dance Complex used this grant type in 2019 and then received financial assistance to complete their project in 2020. Mr. Peralta said that the application process will continue with a rolling format as this provides the ability for organizations to choose which timing is more convenient to them. Mr. Peralta said that he needs to improve the outreach to small businesses. He spoke about the FF governance structure. The committee of City and CRA members select the recipients based on individual and group assessments. He showed a list of all the grant recipients, the grant type and the amounts awarded since the program started. He noted that some organizations have received grants in multiple years. The projects in black type were all completed. The projects in red type were not completed for various reasons. Two organizations took advantage of the Board's offer in April 2020 to use their unspent FF grant towards Covid assistance. The organizations in green text are still working on their projects. Most of the projects are located in the Port, Kendall Square, and Central Square. More work needs to be done to expand the program to other parts of the City. The small business Covid grants focused on the East Cambridge / Kendall area not covered in the City's grant for NRS zone businesses. Applications for the Childcare Safety support grant are still being accepted. Thirteen applications have been approved, and three more were just received. He spoke about data results of an assessment survey given to grant recipients and other organizations. Forty-seven organizations were surveyed. He touched on four questions - grant type, average operational budget, application submission preference, and feedback about CRA's awareness.

In response to Ms. Drury, Mr. Peralta said that technical infrastructure relates to computers and technology. He would like to propose this as a new grant type for the 2021 Forward Fund. The Capital infrastructure grant should continue to be offered. Businesses will continue to need Covid-19 recovery assistance through 2021 so Mr. Peralta proposed a dedicated program with a budget of \$200,000. In past years, FF grants have been given to

artists but to build a more impactful program, he proposed a social experimentation grant to fund public art or other ways to activate public spaces including storefronts and sidewalks.

Mr. Crawford said that, as an enthusiastic supporter, he is struck by the maturity of the program as it has developed over the years. He complimented Mr. Peralta on adeptly addressing the issues of public capital support. He is excited to see the tangible results. Mr. Bator said that he is proud of this program. It reflects the CRA's Board core principles and motivations to tap the wealth of Kendall Square and put it to important uses and needs citywide. The program has been nimble and has responded to the community's needs. He hopes the program can continue to grow. He is pleased to hear the goal to support small businesses and welcomes creative and imaginative solutions that might enable the CRA to support operations within its charter. However, CRA funds cannot be part of an organization's regular ongoing budget. Mr. Born said that she is 100% behind the proposal. The four goals are excellent.

***A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to authorize the Executive Director to administer a revised Forward Fund grant program of up to \$300,000 for 2021, and to further authorize the Executive Director to develop a program for distribution of \$200,000 of additional COVID relief funds in coordination with the City of Cambridge. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.***

***Ms. Bator – yes***

***Ms. Born – yes***

***Mr. Crawford – yes***

***Ms. Drury – yes***

***Mr. Zevin – yes***

***The motion carried unanimously.***

Mr. Evans said that staff will report back to the Board possibly next month.

## **7. 2021 Budget**

### **Motion: To approve the proposed 2021 Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Budget**

Ms. Kailasam started by explaining how the 2021 spending plans will affect the assets. In summary, the CRA is projected to use \$9.2 million from its main US Bank account. From the restricted funds, \$1 million will be drawn from the Foundry account and \$55,000 from KSTEP account.

Looking at the 2021 budget, income is expected from the Broad Institute M1 development. There will not be a food truck program at Parcel 6 due to Covid restrictions but any expenses regarding maintenance will be offset as the City will be maintaining that location for a dog park. Next year, the CRA will see the first amortization payment for all of the Covid loans. Income is not being accrued because the loans are at 0% but a 12.5% return of the amortization payments is expected. A factor for non-repayment due to the business climate has been incorporated. Also included in the budget is the projected income for the Bishop Allen project. There is a full proforma of what is expected for the project for a partial year of tenancy as the construction schedule is planned for nine months. During construction, the CRA will bear all of the costs for the operations and the financing. Finally, Ms. Kailasam is estimating a conservative number for the return on investments. She is estimating \$500,000 which is a 2% return on a balance of \$25 million as the CRA will be using the assets. This brings the total budgeted income to about \$2.38 million.

Operating expenses include personnel, office management, property management, Bishop Allen operations, and Bishop Allen financing. In this 2021 budget, the pension cost has been separated into an employee component and a retiree/survivor component. The latter component and the medical insurance line item for retirees/survivors are being moved out of the personnel budget and into office management (administrative) budget. The property management budget is for operations of the CRA's public spaces. Bishop Allen is a negative contributor in 2021 with \$416,000 in expenses because no rent is being collected during the renovation period.

In the professional services section, column G notes the projects where the services are expected. There are more details provided in the budget narrative which is included in the Board packet. With the Forward Fund budget, the total expenses are \$3.3 million. This leaves a deficit on the earnings of about a \$1 million. Of that \$1

million, \$250,000 is due to Bishop Allen being unoccupied during the construction phase and \$500,000 is due to CRA grant-making, which explains the \$970,000 deficit. She emphasized that the generated investment income is helping the CRA work on initiatives.

Ms. Kailasam said that the budget has a holding place of about \$9 million as an estimate for the Bishop Allen construction which brings the total 2021 spending plan to \$12.3 million. If the Foundry and KSTEP projects are included, which have dedicated restricted funds, the total spending is \$13,976,000. Going back to the Sources and Uses chart, Ms. Kailasam showed the beginning balance, expected payments, and projected balance of the restricted KSTEP and Foundry accounts.

To finance the projected \$970,000 CRA operations deficit, the sources of cash will come from the expected from the Ames Street annual payment of \$431,818. A \$330,000 grant expected from the Cambridge Historical Society will reduce the total renovation costs. These sources of cash reduce what is needed from US Bank to \$9.2 million. The projected ending balance for the investment account is \$25.8 million at the end of the year.

In response to Ms. Born, Ms. Kailasam said that the \$9.97 million of cash needs does not include the additional contribution to the Foundry as that payment is not due in 2021. The \$1 million commitment to the City plus about \$75,000 for operator support is included. Ms. Kailasam said that the budget narrative provides more detail.

In response to Ms. Drury, Ms. Kailasam said that total operation costs for 2021, including \$250,000 for Bishop Allen, is \$3.245,000. The expensed include \$500,000 for the Forward Fund and \$426,657 for Bishop Allen mortgage and operating costs. Bishop Allen operations is projected to operate in 2021 with a net loss of \$250,000 as a result of the renovation.

In response to Ms. Born, Ms. Kailasam agreed that the budget on the website differs from the materials just presented. The numbers are the same but the presentation was hopefully made clearer. Tonight's presentation will be posted on the website in the meeting's presentation section. In response to Mr. Bator, the investment income is included in the 2021 budget. Mr. Evans said the number is conservative because it is 2% of the end balance in US Bank and the drawdown is gradual, as it occurs over the course of nine months.

***A motion was moved by Mr. Bator to approve the proposed 2021 Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Budget. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.***

***Ms. Bator – yes***

***Ms. Born – yes***

***Mr. Crawford – yes***

***Ms. Drury – yes***

***Mr. Zevin – yes***

***The motion carried unanimously.***

Mr. Bator thanked Ms. Kailasam for a detailed and sophisticated view and for managing the CRA finances. Ms. Drury added that the budget narrative was very helpful

## **8. Monthly Staff Report**

### **Motion: To approve the draft 2021 Board Meeting calendar**

Mr. Evans said the staff picture was taken last week when staff was on site to tour 325 Main. Earlier in the week, there was a topping off ceremony for the building which some staff members attended. Over the past 10 weeks, staff has been participating virtually in a training that the KSA put together to assist Kendall organizations in their work towards building and sustaining anti-racist organizations. The CRA was an initial sponsor of this training. While the mission of the CRA focuses on equity, there is a great deal of work to institutionalize and embed the sentiments of diversity, equity, and inclusion into its written policies and programs. He noted that redevelopment authorities have historically been responsible for urban policies that drew on racist points of views of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Mr. Evans said that a strategic planning effort, that was put on hold due to Covid, will focus on this as well as future programs of the CRA.



Finalizing the 93-99 Bishop Allen renovation general contractor selection will be a major item in 2021. The project went out to bid earlier this week. Numerous relocation-related contracts have already come to the Board.

The 325 Main Street project continues to progress at a phenomenal pace. It is interesting to watch a façade come together, especially given the large amount of time that the CRA spent discussing it. When people go back to work next year, they will be surprised at how different the area looks. Staff is working with the City and other developers in the area (Biomed and MITIMCo) on streetscape design of the three main streets that converge at Galaxy Park. Biomed has plans on Third Street which will hopefully improve the retail corridor by moving the gas transfer station.

The open space maintenance is done for the year except for snow removal. Today, the license agreement with the City was finalized for the dog park at the Third & Binney Street parcel. The City hopes to get the fence up next week. At the end of 2021, the dog park should be removed and a 2022 food truck program implemented.

A number of staff participated in the Volpe community workshop due its proximity to the MXD and its overlapping connectivity to the programs at the Foundry. MITIMCo has moved forward with a desire to build a program that makes connections to the neighborhoods of the Port, Wellington-Harrington, and East Cambridge. The Foundry is working to make similar connections to the nearby neighborhoods. The ability to outreach and collaborate will be pivotal in the CRA-funded search for a Foundry Consortium Executive Director. Staff is working on plans to find tenants for the space. A meeting with the City to discuss the project timeline occurred today and it appears that the construction project will be done late spring-early summer of 2022. This means that marketing for office space should occur in the late spring of 2021. There is a Foundry Advisory Committee meeting in early January which will discuss ways to build connections and collaboration among the three community centers (Volpe Community Center, the Biomed Project, and the Foundry) that are emerging in the corridor along Third Street.

The Covid relief grant for childcare, youth, or afterschool facilities has been out for about a month. Staff is assessing the first batch of applications. To date, 14 businesses will receive up to \$5000 in assistance. This is a rolling grant and more applications are expected to be approved. In response to Ms. Drury, this is available citywide. There was a discussion of the Anti-aid amendment. Mr. Evans said that the grants are for any small business or nonprofit. He sees this as an emergency response and has an economic development component which provides safe facilities so households can go to work. This program is focusing on physical improvements or necessary operational shifts due to Covid. In response to Mr. Zevin, Mr. Evans said that the City had some bulk buying programs. Elena Sokolow-Kaufman spoke about the Cambridge Volunteer Clearinghouse and the mask initiative but organizations need more than masks. Ms. Drury started a discussion of a citywide broadband effort as something in between operations and brick-and-mortar.

Regarding the November financials, Ms. Kailasam said that the most notable positive surprise the complete rebound of the investments that were down almost \$1 million at the beginning of the year. Mr. Evans said that the 2020 funds budgeted for OPEB have been transferred. Cash in the KSTEP and Foundry accounts held by Cambridge Trust investment accounts will be transferred to KSTEP and Foundry bank accounts held by Cambridge Savings Bank. This will result in a large savings on investment fees. Interest, although small, will also be earned.

Ms. Levering noticed that Ms. Sokolow-Kaufman requested to comment. Ms. Sokolow-Kaufman thanked Mr. Peralta for his support. She is excited about the child service grant moving forward and that a technical infrastructure grant is being considered for the Forward Fund. There is a great need for devices, connectivity and technical skill support. Mr. Zevin said that this is physical infrastructure.

Mr. Bator asked to vote on the Board meeting calendar. Mr. Evans said that Board meetings will be on the third Wednesday of each month except for September when it falls on the fourth Wednesday due to the Jewish holiday.

***A motion was moved by Mr. Bator to approve the 2021 Board Meeting calendar as noted in the materials. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.***

***Ms. Bator – yes***

***Ms. Born – yes***

***Mr. Crawford – yes***

**Ms. Drury – yes**  
**Mr. Zevin – yes**  
**The motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Bator wished everyone a happy holiday. He particularly thanked the staff for the work done, especially in times of Covid, without missing a beat. The staff continue to perform at a high and professional level.

Mr. Evans said that the meeting is not being adjourned but moving into Executive Session. Ms. Born added that discussion of this development agreement in open session would be detrimental for negotiations. Since the Board has concluded all of the business set forth on the regular agenda, the Board will not be reconvening in open session thereafter. This Board meeting will end and Ms. Shore will send staff and Board members an email with a different link to a new meeting.

***The motion to enter into Executive Session to discuss matters related to the Cambridge Center Development Agreement with Boston Properties within the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote.***

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

The Board meeting ended at 8:03pm. The Executive Session will start at 8:15pm.