

Regular Board Meeting  
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, January 20, 2021 at 5:30pm  
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting was held virtually via Zoom

---

## APPROVED Meeting Minutes

---

At 5:33 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 this 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 a computer or smart phone, you can call the CRA’s main line at 617-492-6800, 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 by Mr. Evans.

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.

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

*Heather Hoffman* asked to comment during the conversation regarding the letter of commitment. She would like to read a letter from the East Cambridge Planning Team into the record. Ms. Born confirmed that the CRA received the letter by email.

***A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to close public comment. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member’s vote.***

***Mr. Bator – absent***

***Ms. Born – yes***

***Mr. Crawford - yes***

***Ms. Drury - yes***

***Mr. Zevin – yes***

***The motion carried.***

## Minutes

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on December 16, 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 December 16, 2020 and place them on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans, upon which he repeated each member's vote*

*Mr. Bator – absent*

*Ms. Born – yes*

*Mr. Crawford – yes*

*Ms. Drury – yes*

*Mr. Zevin – yes*

*The motion carried.*

## Communications

2. **December 30, 2020 Letter from Cambridge Camping regarding COVID-19 PPE Grant**

There were no comments regarding this communication.

3. **Written communications received since the publication of this meeting notice.**

Mr. Evans said that there was a recent communication from Chuck Hinds on behalf of the East Cambridge Planning Team. Ms. Shore said that she forwarded this communication to the Board about an hour ago and posted it on next meeting webpage. Ms. Born explained that this communication discusses ECPT's desire for the Fulkerson site. Paraphrasing the letter, she said that the ECPT would not like to see the CRA affordable housing commitment built on that site. Ms. Born stated that the Fulkerson site was not the site under consideration by the CRA.

Mr. Zevin was interested to hear what the neighborhood stance was when the Fulkerson site was planned to be housing before Eversource bought it from a housing developer. Mr. Evans said that any written or verbal concerns noted at the Planning Board meeting at that time would have been recorded.

Mr. Zevin commented on the notion of a swimming pool in the letter. He said that the City has just invested in a new swimming pool, although smaller in size, at the new school on Cambridge Street, which is close to Fulkerson. This could be made more accessible with a pedestrian railroad crossing.

Ms. Born welcomed a comment from Ms. Hoffman. Ms. Hoffman said that, at that time, the neighborhood felt that housing was an okay use. She added that Alexandria's plans were not fully public then. Eversource's plan to put a giant substation there caught everyone by surprise. Alexandria spoke about acquiring that site and doing a land swap so that the neighborhood would get a rectangular piece to give to the City and they would build on the rest of it. That got people thinking about open space. The proposal for Alexandria's plans for the Grand Junction Path were just being discussed. Ms. Hoffman said that the neighborhood supported the housing. Things change with time and one huge change is that more than one million square feet of commercial space is now on the table with even less open space. She said that the ECPT started working more with Linden Park residents. There is a history of things happening before any discussions with the neighborhoods so this letter states the desire sooner than later.

Ms. Born emphasized that the CRA is not directly connected with the Fulkerson site. Her understanding is that the City Manager is committed to a full public process regarding the use of the site. Ms. Hoffman voiced her opinion on the City's full public process. Mr. Evans added that the CRA is tangentially related to the site because the MXD zoning petition would mandate a public process when contemplating another use for the Fulkerson site.

Mr. Evans noted that there is a third correspondence, which is a letter from Bjorn Poonen. All Board members received this letter. Mr. Evans said that Mr. Poonen asks for the CRA's view on the appropriate balance between home ownership and rentals in Kendall Square. It specifically addresses the Implementation Plan, being presented to the Board later this evening, which has a section on Housing and Identity specifying a number of goals related to housing but does not address this particular issue.

Mr. Evans noted that Mr. Bator joined the meeting at 5:50 p.m.

In response to Ms. Born, Ms. Shore said that she did not see Mr. Poonen in the list of meeting attendees.

Mr. Zevin said that this letter seems to make a case that there is some mysterious character of a neighborhood that differs because of a predominance of one or the other unit type. It doesn't mention building equity. He is skeptical that one is better than the other. Mr. Evans started a conversation about the current status of ownership versus rentals in Kendall Square. There are 100% rentals in the MXD. The percentage decreases as the radius is expanded but it is still predominantly rental units.

There were no other written communications.

***A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to place the three communications 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.***

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

#### **4. Discussion: 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive – Renovation Contract**

***Motion for consideration: To authorize the Chair to enter into a construction contract with G.V.W. Inc., selected pursuant to Chapter 149 of M.G.L., as the General Contractor for the renovation of 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive, and to revise the full renovation project budget to \$11.3 million.***

Ms. Schwarz said that the bids have been received. The good news is there is a recommendation. The bad news is that the bids were high. STV representatives Bob Labrecque and Tim MacKay and Felice and David Silverman from STA were present to answer questions. She said that there is a motion recommending an option, from among several options, none of which are great. The team feels stuck and is hoping to get guidance from the Board. She said that the memo in the Board's packet gives some context to the discussion.

In September, the CRA Board voted on a project budget which incorporated the best information known at that time. The Board voted to commit to an \$8.685 million total project cost, using \$8.355 million of CRA funds and a \$330,000 Community Preservation Act (CPA) grant. At the time, estimates showed a construction budget of \$5.9 million.

In a subsequent meeting, the Board approved staff-proposed add-alternates which could be added if the bids were low enough. The add-alternates were double-hung windows that face the rear parking lot and the wall of the St. Paul AME Church, and the two 1960s large front windows facing Bishop Allen Drive. Since that time, additional study and design work was done to address storm water drainage and structural improvements to the roof for the addition of solar panels. An updated cost estimate was received that was based on the 100% design development drawings. Another cost estimate was not done because the architect, their cost estimator, and STV felt that the improvements in the construction drawings were minor and wouldn't change much. This brought the expected construction budget to nearly \$6.7 million.

STV then led the Chapter 149 process. This started with a prequalification process to look at firms that had done projects with similar scope and size, projects in tight urban settings, adequate bonding capacity, and good references. Nine of the ten general contractor (GC) firms that responded were prequalified. Under Chapter 149,

filing of 14 sub-bids are required in various categories. There were three to eight responses in most categories. The elevator sub-bid had only one response which was rejected due to ambiguity. An elevator allowance will be added to the GC's scope. The bid process for the GC followed. The GC can pick from any approved trade sub-bidders with no explanation required. They are not required to pick the lowest bidder. The lowest GC bid, by GVW, Inc was over \$8.7 million. Their bid included the add-alts in the base price and does not provide the ability to exclude this work. GVW does a lot of window work so it is assumed that breaking out the cost wouldn't be advantageous to them. The other GC firms did break out the add-alts.

STA went back to their cost estimator for the project, A.M. Fogarty, for some understanding for the large variance. Ms. Schwarz presented a comparison of the cost estimate done in October with GVW's bid. She added that A.M. Fogarty found that there was about a \$200,000 difference between their cost estimates of all the filed sub-bids and those that were chosen by GWV. Therefore, the major difference in cost falls within the GC's total scope bid. The chosen GC is required to send details of the costs within ten days of the GC contract being signed. It is unknown why the GC cost is significantly over the CRA's cost estimate.

A few options are noted in the memo. One is to accept the lowest bid and proceed, which is the motion in the memo. Small modifications to the scope can be made but there is a cost to any changes. Another option is for all the bids to be rejected, followed by a reduction in scope, and a rebid in hopes of getting lower responses. This could delay the timeline by six weeks which would then impact income as tenants would be moving back into the building later. It is also unknown how future bidders would respond knowing the current bids. It is possible that smaller-sized bids for less scope could be received. If a rebid was done, the prequalification step could be eliminated but that is not recommended due to the risk of having to choose the lowest bidder without knowing if they are legitimate and capable. A third option, which is not being recommended, is rebidding under Chapter 149a. This is a more expensive process and was rejected initially. One of the advantages to using Chapter 149a is that the GC is on board through the design process to give input, but it is too late to get that input now. This would add two months to the project schedule and might result in a higher construction budget for the same scope. Lastly, the current design can be scrapped and redesigned to create a less extensive project. About 75% of the project is code compliant construction so there is a lot that must be retained.

A couple of pages of the invitation-to-bid are included in the memo as well as part of the addenda showing that the deadline was extended. All of the bid documents can be seen by doing a search on the website BidDocsOnline.com using the keyword Cambridge.

Ms. Schwarz showed a summary of the budget used for the Board vote in September, the figures before the bid in January 2021, and the lowest bidder's figures. In September, the Board voted to commit \$8,354,818 in CRA funds to a total project cost of \$8,684,818, which includes the CPA grant. Assuming the project proceeds with the lowest bidder, the total project cost would be \$11,294,441. The CRA outlay would be \$11,040,541. This takes into account \$330,000 in CPA grant funds and approximately \$8,900 in Eversource energy rebates. The CRA commitment would also include an \$85,000 cost to install solar. The total project budget before the bidding process was thought to be \$407,865 over but after the bid process, it is \$2,609,411 over. Including the energy rebate and the solar installation, the CRA commitment would be \$2,685,541 over the budget approved at the September Board meeting.

In response to Ms. Born's remark about the low number of bids, Mr. MacKay reiterated that the pool was limited to qualified contractors who had done work of the same size and in the same environment. He said that one contractor didn't bid due to a lack of capacity after their estimator left. COVID-related delays last year created a glut of projects now. Mr. Labrecque added that there was outreach throughout the bidding process. There was very good filed sub-bid participation given the market situation. There were 52 bids that ranged from one elevator bid to eight in some other trades. Based on review with counsel from the Attorney General's (AG) office, the elevator bid was rejected and an allowance is being carried in the general bid for that. It is disappointing that there were only three bids and he attributed this to market timing and conditions, and what the backlog is for various firms. There are dollars that are carried in the general portion of the bid that cannot be uncovered until a contract is signed. The lowest bidder carried zero dollars for the alternates since these are included in their base bid, including the filed sub-bid portions that had alternate related scopes of work. If their bid is accepted, the alternates can be accepted at no additional cost. The second and third bidders had additional costs for the alternates. If added up, there is almost a 5% incremental increase in the price of the second bidder that puts dollars on his

alternates one and two at about \$450,000. GVW carried itself as a file sub-bidder in the trades of masonry, windows, tile, and one other, which is beneficial as GVW can then control the work directly.

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. MacKay said that he did the reference check on GVW and also has direct experience with the firm. He added that the statements of qualifications for each of the firms were divided among the members of the general contractor selection committee, which included himself, Mr. Labrecque, Ms. Schwarz, and Mr. Silverman. Mr. MacKay connected with four of the six references that GVW supplied. The references were all good. He can forward all the evaluation sheets if requested. He added that he once worked for CTA, a company that was one of the prequalified general contractors. CTA used GVW as a filed subcontractor for the windows portion of the project. GVW was experienced, knowledgeable, and had good contacts in the industry and good lead times. Window renovation is on the critical path of the construction schedule for this project. Mr. Labrecque spoke about another positive evaluation. He added that although they specialize in windows, they are well qualified for the project and met all the thresholds outlined in the request for qualifications. They have a good DCAM rating. This project suits them well which is why they have taken on themselves as a filed sub-bidder in a number of different categories. That self-perform element will help move the project. The double hung windows are actually not a filed sub-bid but they do a lot of filed sub-bid window work. They were the low bidder on the masonry restoration which is a fairly significant component. Their filed sub-bid was \$620,000 so they do control a lot of the envelope scope - the metal windows, the double hung windows, and the masonry. That is a driving force and critical activity for this project.

Responding to another question, Mr. MacKay said that five of the resumes submitted in GVW's statement of qualification are people who Mr. MacKay has worked with in the past so he is confident that the group is intact.

Mr. Evans spoke about the options. According to Chapter 149, the CRA must take the low bid unless an error was found in the bid, which would disqualify it. He said that Ms. Schwarz's memo outlines the options that gradually step farther away from the scope, from asking the GC to reconfigure small components of the site design, rebidding everything that the subcontractors bid on, to a full redesign. Moving farther away from the scope as presented will create serious timeline challenges. Currently, all the tenants are out of the building. Their office equipment and furniture are in storage. Only a few of tenants chose to use swing space so this is an opportune time.

Mr. Bator said that he is comfortable with the bid, although it is more expensive than the CRA had hoped. It appears to be a symptom of the times and the nature of the business of bidders. As treasurer, he said that the CRA can afford this. To try to do otherwise than accept the bid, the likelihood of cutting costs in any other than a marginal way is slim and time is lost. Time is important to this project. Given Mr. Labrecque's testimony, his concerns regarding the quality of the work are satisfied. Mr. Bator is comfortable accepting the bid.

Ms. Drury said that if the CRA treasurer is comfortable then she would be in favor of accepting the bid.

Mr. MacKay added that GVW's DCAM rating is 92 with 28 projects evaluated, which is on the higher end of DCAM contractors.

Mr. Crawford spoke about an ongoing project in his neighborhood. He said that it is unfortunate to get cornered into this situation but favored moving on rather than rebidding the project.

Mr. Evans said that there is a scope change option to postpone the solar installation which is in the budget. This could have some implications regarding the value of the solar contract, as a third-party deal is being worked on that would take advantage of current tax laws regarding solar. The goal is to make the building a fully electric heat-based building so there is value in pursuing solar. The cost is between \$80,000 and \$85,000. Mr. Bator said that this amount is trivial related to the overall expense. It is likely that the tax and other benefits of solar, over the next several years, are likely to improve. Mr. Evans said that the budget already included enhancements to make the roof solar-ready.

Mr. Zevin said that it is difficult to know the cost of solar in the future. He added that the reason for the high bid price could be to cover themselves, especially on an old building. Mr. Labrecque agreed that it is a tight site and a tight schedule. He recommended that the wording in the motion include accepting the alternates 1 and 2, which would have no additional costs as these were included in the general bid.

Mr. Drury thanked the presenters. Ms. Born said that the CRA is lucky as a public institution to have the money to spend. Mr. Evans said that the CRA has the resources to use to help the nonprofits continue their important work. The alternative options have many hazards without any guarantee of significant savings. Mr. Bator said that there is value in relative certainty.

**The motion was moved by Mr. Bator to authorize the Chair to enter into a construction contract, with alt #1 and alt #32, with G.V.W. Inc., selected pursuant to Chapter 149 of M.G.L., as the General Contractor for the renovation of 93-99 Bishop Allen Drive, and to revise the full renovation project budget to \$11.3 million. 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.**

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

**Motion: To authorize the Chair to execute a Letter of Commitment to the Cambridge City Council accompanying the MXD Zoning Petition, for the CRA to implement the development of at least 20,000 square feet of below market-rate homeownership housing.**

Mr. Evans said that Ms. Levering's memo outlines steps that have occurred since the filing of the MXD zoning petition. There was a Planning Board meeting on November 17 and an Ordinance Committee meeting on November 19, which reviewed the petition as the Board had filed it, along with the urban renewal amendment. At the Ordinance Committee meeting, there were a number of concerns regarding the loss of the condominium portion of the project. There were other minor grammatical or clarification issues. A letter of commitment was put forth regarding the affordable home ownership portion of the project being removed by the elimination of the condominium requirement. That commitment would be something for the CRA to undertake over the course of the next few years on a site to be determined. The feedback received on the original letter of commitment, at the second Ordinance Committee meeting on January 5, was positive but there was still concern that an adequate timeline commitment was not provided in the letter. Staff revised the letter and added a timeline that gets to at least half the housing commitment with a site identified within three years of the zoning adoption and a full commitment being met within seven years. Other changes that were made to the letter of commitment were based on feedback from City staff regarding the zoning ordinance to be more specific about proportions of middle income and affordable home ownership units and getting the citations correct. Attached to the memo in the Board packet is a red-lined version of the letter of commitment that had originally been put forth, which was then reviewed by City Council for a first reading of the full council on January 11. It passed unanimously for a second reading to be scheduled in February just before the petition expires. All the relevant notes from the Planning Board and Ordinance Committee meetings are included in the memo. Mr. Evans would like to bring the approved letter to the second reading.

Ms. Drury said that this is a good thing for the CRA to do. Ms. Born suggested attaching the proposed zoning amendment in its current form to the letter to avoid any last-minute changes to the zoning amendment that could make it more difficult for the CRA to provide the housing. Mr. Evans displayed a version of the letter with additional text in yellow, adding the phrase, "as attached," to the last sentence. He will include the zoning amendment as an attachment. With respect to adding more clarity to the timeframe, Mr. Evans said that he used a three-year timeframe in the memo as that is the very outside of when he thought that Boston Properties (BXP) would have to move forward with the residential component of the project phasing. The housing component would need to wait until some Eversource infrastructure was completed, although the payment to the CRA would come at the issuance of the building permit. At \$50 per square feet, \$20 million is more than adequate for the CRA to follow through on the housing commitment.

Ms. Drury suggested giving the CRA as much wiggle room as possible, as delays are common. Mr. Bator agreed. There should also be reasonable pressure on the developer to do their part of the housing without delay.

Mr. Evans noted some possible alternative scenarios regarding timing. The trigger is currently the adoption of the MXD zoning amendment, which is typical of letters of commitment. The highlighted version outlined an alternative trigger which would be issuance of the special permit, which is the Infill Development Concept Plan (IDCP). He noted that this would be a slight change from what the City Council has already seen. Optimistically, the IDCP would come to the Planning Board and the CRA Board this year in order to meet the timeframe for Eversource. This text change doesn't increase the timeframe very much but it takes the project to another level of certainty before the CRA would be expected to deliver the affordable homeownership units. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans said that the IDCP process will happen in parallel with the state Energy Facilities Siting Board (EFSB) process. The zoning states that the IDCP will recognize the location of the substation but it will not regulate it. However, there will be a local review of what's on top of the substation and its access points, while the state will review the substation design. Ms. Born questioned BXP's willingness to continue with their consultants on the IDCP before it is assured of the EFSB's approval. Mr. Evans said that BXP needs to enter into some kind of land transaction with Eversource that gives the EFSB confidence that Eversource can control the land to build at the proposed location. BXP would like as much development certainty as possible before they enter into a more fixed transaction with Eversource. He assumes there will be a series of small steps with options and agreements that are conditioned on the entitlement processes moving forward. Both the state and the municipality need to approve two different projects in relative timeframes for everything to work. The CRA is not party to the actual agreement between Eversource and BXP but he assumes they will point to conditions in their transactions related to progress on the development permit for BXP and the substation permit for Eversource.

In response to Mr. Evans, Mr. Bator recommends that the letter be amended to trigger off approval of the IDCP rather than the zoning approval so as to give the CRA slightly more time and more certainty that the project will move forward. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans was not sure if there would be an issue for those who have not seen the new text changes. Mr. Evans will speak with Vice Mayor Mallon ahead of the meeting. Mr. Bator explained that it is appropriate for the CRA Board to have concerns regarding the time constraints given the ongoing uncertainty in the world. In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Evans said that if the zoning ordinance is adopted at the February 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, an aggressive timeline could get the IDCP to go before the Planning Board for approval in four to six months.

**A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to authorize the Chair to execute a Letter of Commitment, as amended on January 20, 2021, to the Cambridge City Council accompanying an attached MXD Zoning Petition, for the CRA to implement the development of at least 20,000 square feet of below market-rate homeownership housing. 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.**

The amended letter will be posted on the website. There are four areas highlighted in yellow which include the two timings referencing the IDCP, adding the phrase "as attached," and a siting to the attachment in the letter.

## **6. Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan (KSURP)– Five Year Implementation Plan Review**

Ms. Alikpokou gave an update on the 2016 - 2020 Implementation Plan. The CRA's implementation plan was established in 2016 to set goals that were informed by the K2 Plan, a product of the City of Cambridge's K2C2 planning process, the 2014 CRA Strategic Plan, and the 2017 Infill Development Concept Plan for the MXD District. The goals cover City projects, CRA programs, and private development that affect the district's public realm and community benefits. The plan is broken down into five focus areas – transportation, open space, economic development, sustainability, housing/neighborhood. There are three components for each focus area - a timeline, a project status, and a metrics table.

Ms. Alikpokou gave some highlights in each of the categories, starting with transportation. The KSTEP Transit Investment Plan is partially complete. The governance structure has been finalized. Two KSURP projects have

been funded and are underway. The Ames streetscape-cycle track is completed. Boston Properties (BXP) rebuilt Ames Street to include a two-way protected bike lane, a new bus shelter/stop, and green space at the street corners. This was done as part of the 88 Ames residential project. The CRA completed 25% of streetscape designs for parts of Binney, Broadway, and Galileo Way, adding cycle tracks and protected intersections. BXP has taken that 25% design and created 100% designs for their portion of the streetscapes. The enhanced annual transportation report is completed, using ESRI's Storymap to create an interactive transportation report, which reports on multi-modal travel and behavior patterns in the KSURP area.

Moving to the next category of open space, the interim use of Third and Binney (Parcel 6) is complete. This parcel was transformed into an active civic space by adding seating, shade structures, landscaping, a bike-share station, community art, and establishing a successful food truck program. It is now being used as a temporary dog park. The KSURP Open Space Programming Plan is partially complete. An open space analysis was conducted to examine what amenities are planned and what should be added in the Kendall Square area. Additionally, the KSA has also formed a placemaking committee to work with property owners and businesses to launch a broader initiative to activate Kendall Square area parks. The renovation of the Sixth Street Walkway is complete. BXP built a separated cycle track, refurbished the concrete path, and added new seating and lighting amenities to the Sixth Street Walkway. These improvements were required as part of the approval of BXP's 145 Broadway project. Lastly, the Green Garage Rooftop Garden is undergoing reconstruction as part of the 325 Main Street project.

In the economic development category, the Foundry redevelopment is underway. Construction of the building is in progress and is expected to be completed in 2022. The goal of office and R&D expansion is partially completed. BXP completed 145 Broadway, the new headquarters for Akamai Technologies, and 325 Main Street is under construction. The market rate & below-market-rate innovation space goal is complete. The Cambridge Innovation Center provides start-up and scale-up space for growing companies with short-term leases. It opened their market-rate innovation space in 2018 at 245 Main Street. Additionally, The Link opened on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor of 255 Main Street and provides below-market-rate innovation space for non-profits focusing on technology and workforce development. The retail goal to provide Kendall Square with a grocery store and pharmacy is nearly complete. In 2019, MITMCO opened a Brothers Market grocery store at One Broadway. MITMCO has also leased pharmacy space in the Kendall building for a CVS, which is expected to open in 2022.

In the sustainability category, the measures to contain stormwater are partially complete. Large retention tanks have been installed underground at the 145 Broadway project site to meet DPW's requirement for retaining a specific volume of rainwater. Also, through the Galileo-Broadway-Binney Streetscape redesign project, the pervious surface was increased through planting and pervious paving. Implementation of enhanced transportation demand management (TDM) measures is complete. The CRA worked with the City and building proponents to design and implement more aggressive TDM programs for office and residential uses, consistent with the K2 plan. Because of the enhanced TDM measures, the CRA annual transportation report does not show an increase in traffic, despite the increase in development. The goal for all buildings to be LEED Gold and solar-ready is partially complete. The 145 Broadway project installed solar panels and has a minimum of LEED Gold, and is currently working through certification for LEED Platinum. Design and installation of resiliency measures for the Red Line Kendall North T-station is underway. The Kendall MBTA station may be vulnerable to flooding during high water events in the future, and the KSURP EIR requires resiliency measures to protect the station. As part of the 325 Main Street project, the North headhouse reconstruction will improve the headhouse's flood vulnerability.

Lastly, Ms. Alikpokou discussed the housing and neighborhood identity category. The goal for public meeting space is partially complete. The Link, on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor of 255 Main Street, is open and provides meeting rooms for rent to the public. Once complete, the Foundry will also provide additional space for the community. The Broad Museum redesign is complete. The CRA has approved the redesign of the Broad Institute's DNatrium at 415 Main Street. The lobby museum will provide public educational displays on genetic research and medical applications and create a more engaging ground floor on Main Street. The installation is expected to be completed later this year. The public art program is partially complete. The CRA worked with the Cambridge Arts Council and the Community Arts Center to create art installations for Parcel 6. In 2020, the CRA Board approved the 325 Main Street Wayfinding Art and Master Plan, which will provide a dozen digital, mural, and sculptural art installations on the building site. The 135 Broadway residential project is underway. The IDCP requires BXP to initiate the construction of 135 Broadway. Currently, an MXD zoning petition is under consideration, and if approved, it will expand the 135 Broadway project to a full 400,000 square feet of housing.



Since many open space projects are in progress, there is a desire to make open space development cohesive. Therefore, a mapping project was created to evaluate current and planned open space amenities in the community. There was no outreach in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Developing the map allowed staff to get a sense of future open space amenity needs in the Kendall Square area.

Staff will be creating a new implementation plan by the end of the year. The MXD substation proposal's fate does have an impact on that as well.

Ms. Drury said that the accomplishments are impressive. She noted that the presentation noted total employment of 5983 people but only 15 retail establishments in the MXD. The document is posted on the CRA website.

#### **7. Google Signage Proposal for 90 Broadway**

**Motion: *Approving the Google building entry signage proposal for 90 Broadway (Four Cambridge Center) within Parcel Four of the Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan area.***

Mr. Peralta said that because this is a simple signage proposal, there was no need for a separate design review committee meeting. Google is proposing a 14-foot-long opaque matt white vinyl cut lettering graphic (Google) that will go inside the 90 Broadway building above the revolving doors. Currently, the only signage on the building is the address and the Kendall Center signage, which will be replaced by the Google sign.

Mr. Zevin noted that the drawing and the rendering show different placement of the lettering. Sarah Narburgh, from Rews Projects, clarified that the elevation drawing is the correct version. It will align with the mullion to make sure that it can be seen beyond the 90 Broadway signage. Mr. Zevin also stated his disappointment that the staid corporate logo has replaced last decade's more cheerful graphic.

***A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to approve the Google building entry signage proposal for 90 Broadway (Four Cambridge Center) within Parcel Four of the Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan area. 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. Auditor Contract**

**Motion: *Authorizing the Chair to enter into a one-year contract with Roselli, Clark and Associates to conduct financial audits of the CRA for fiscal years 2020***

Ms. Kailasam said that the current CRA auditor Roselli, Clark, and Associates has been with the CRA since 2014. Massachusetts General Law Chapter 121B, Section 52 regarding urban renewal agencies has very simple guidelines in terms of financial reporting. In keeping with best practices, though not mandated in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, it is recommended that the auditor relationship be reviewed every 5-7 years, and at a minimum a change in the lead partner (if the firm is large enough) be requested. For this reason, staff recommends a one-year contract for the 2020 audit to be completed in 2021 with an auditor selection process to be considered for future years.

As treasurer, Mr. Bator supports the recommendation. Given the complicated world situation, the CRA's rapid growth and increased project complexity, using an accountant who has done fine work and understands the CRA history make sense for another year. Ms. Born agreed with staff. The CRA should revisit the auditor selection for the 2021 audit and beyond.

***A motion was moved by Mr. Bator authorizing the Chair to enter into a one-year contract with Roselli, Clark, and Associates to conduct financial audits of the CRA for fiscal year 2020. 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.*

## **9. Foundry Update**

Ms. Schwarz said that after several delays, including Covid-related reasons, the construction timeline is finally set and it is under contract to be completed by May 31, 2022. At the Foundry Advisory Committee meeting in January, representatives from BioMed Realty spoke about their development in the Canal District at the former Constellation Center site. It will include a theater that is twice the size of the theater at the Foundry; there is a need for different sized theaters. The groups discussed the importance of aligning and coordinating efforts of available cultural facilities in Kendall Square and beyond.

In coordination with the City, the CRA submitted a \$250,000 application to the Mass Cultural Council. This is the upper limit and it is a competitive grant. The results should be known in a few months. The Executive Director search for the Foundry is going to formally begin on February 1 with emails and social media posts, as well as the position being posted on the CRA's and the Foundry Consortium's websites. Ms. Schwarz shared some photos taken by the architects, Cambridge Seven Associates.

Ms. Drury would like more frequent contact with those who are working on the Foundry and updates on its progress. Ms. Schwarz said that a Board member from the Foundry Consortium could attend a CRA Board meeting and give reports. Mr. Evans said that the Foundry Advisory Committee is another group that meets regularly and will have an obligation once the building opens up to report to the CRA Board annually. Mr. Evans said that the City might be able to provide a more substantial construction update. By late summer or fall, the new Executive Director can be introduced. Mr. Evans will ask Brendan Roy from the City to attend a CRA Board meeting.

Ms. Born was relieved to see the new structural supports in the pictures. Ms. Schwarz confirmed that the pictures were taken over several weeks.

## **10. Monthly Staff Report**

Mr. Evans said that the steel on 325 Main was completed in December. Now, there is a lot of structural work occurring in the basement. The curtain wall is starting to go up so the window system and the spandrel glass can be seen. In order to build out the connection between 4 Cambridge Center and the new building, the pedestrian connection that runs from Main Street to the Green Garage will be closed for five months while the buildings are being attached. Once that happens, work will begin on the interior public lobby.

A few years ago, Ms. Levering created a map of the privately owned public spaces (POPS) in Kendall Square. This was shared with the City in a collaborative effort to map all the POPS in the City and conduct a design and interest survey of community members. Mr. Evans encouraged the Board to take the survey using the link in the report in the Board packet. Working with the City and the developers who own these areas, the goal is to develop a logo and signage design to help the public identify these open spaces. A number of other US cities have done this. The CRA has hired a design firm to come up with a graphic representation that will be presented later in the year. The first project to incorporate this will be 325 Main, for the Roof Garden, the Plaza, and the Porch.

Staff have been working with Sasaki to advance streetscape designs for Main Street, Broadway and Third Street; this has required close coordination with the Volpe team and the City. The transportation impact study that was created by the VHB-Volpe team is being reviewed to see if the pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure plans for Broadway and Main Street, that had been envisioned by CRA staff, are still feasible.

The dog park has finally opened on Third and Binney Streets. A license agreement has been executed with the City and runs until December, but the park is expected to be decommissioned in the fall, once Toomey Park on Rogers Street has opened.

The child care grants are being executed with most being \$5,000. Over \$70,000 of PPE and other safety equipment or other child care provisions have been dispersed to both nonprofit and privately-run childcare facilities and other youth programs. Applications are still being accepted through mid-February.

Ms. Kailasam reviewed December's financial report for 2020. The expenses are on target as planned for the year. When the budget was amended, it was done with a conservative estimate for investment income. However, the investment portfolio rebounded with the election of Biden, resulting in a deficit lower than projected. The investment return was boosted by the 30% allocation to equities. There is nothing unusual to report in the December numbers.

Mr. Zevin started a conversation regarding Eversource laying a large cable vault in the intersection of Fulkerson and Binney Streets. Mr. Evans cited some possible explanations and said that there is work that Eversource needs to do regardless of the final location of the substation. Mr. Zevin also noted that Sweetgreen looks ready to open and he deeply regrets allowing them to do the white vinyl window covering at the bathroom. Mr. Evans said that he would review the approval to determine if anything could be done. He noted they were due to open February 2<sup>nd</sup>.

At 7:48 p.m., Ms. Born said that the business of the regular meeting had been completed. She suggested taking a break before the Executive Session. The reason for the Executive Session is that discussion of the Eversource project in an open meeting could have a negative impact on the CRA's ability to effectively negotiate. The Board will not reconvene in open session thereafter.

***The motion was moved by Ms. Drury to enter into Executive Session to consider potential amendments to the Cambridge Center Development Agreement. 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.***

Ms. Shore will send a new link to the Board and Staff for the Executive Session