

Regular Board Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

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

APPROVED Meeting Minutes

At 5:36 PM, Ellen Shore, CRA Operations Director, said that CRA board meetings are being held remotely in accordance with section 20 of chapter 20 of the Acts of 2021, signed into law on June 16 2021. There will be opportunities for public comment at the start of this meeting and at the discretion of the chair. Ms. Shore explained the steps to take to provide public comment. Board meeting materials can be found on the CRA's next meeting webpage. This meeting is being recorded, including all video audio and QA messages

Ms. Shore noted that there were nine attendees and six panelists.

Call Roll

Chair Kathleen Born called the regular meeting of CRA Board. A roll call of Board members and the Executive Director was taken.

Vice Chair Conrad Crawford - present
Treasurer Christopher Bator – absent
Asst. Treasurer Barry Zevin - present
Asst. Secretary Margaret Drury - present
Executive Director Tom Evans – present

Because this is a remote meeting, all votes will be taken by roll call and Mr. Evans will repeat the response of each member.

Public Comment

Stephen Kaiser entered a question into the chat. He noted that at the September 28th joint hearing with the Planning Board, most of the transportation discussion was about valet parking for bicycles. He asked how the CRA proposes to get a better handle on complex issues such as traffic. He asked for the name of the traffic consultant for the CRA. Mr. Evans responded that he wrote a memo outlining the transportation issues and said that various traffic consultants were used. The CRA worked with VHB on the MEPA document, Sasaki is the main design consultant for the streetscape work, and HDR is their traffic subcontractor.

Ms. Born thanked Mr. Kaiser for his October 20th memo regarding the Notice of Project Change. Mr. Crawford expressed his gratitude and said that the topics raised will be considered.

No other requests for public comment were offered.

A motion was made by Ms. Drury to close public comment. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

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

Minutes

1. Motion: *To accept the minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Board on September 22, 2021*

Ms. Born noted a misspelling in the 3rd paragraph. The word should be “public”.

A motion was made by Ms. Drury, to place the minutes, with the correction noted, on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member’s vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator – absent

The motion carried.

2. Motion: *To accept the minutes of the Joint Meeting with the Planning Board On September 28, 2021*

There was no vote as the minutes were still being aligned with the transcript of the Planning Board which was recently received. This will be a motion in the November Board meeting.

Communications

3. October 8, 2021 Email from Bjorn Poonen regarding the design of the plaza at 120 Broadway

4. October 8, 2021 Email from Stephen Kaiser regarding congestion in the Kendall – North Point Area

5. October 8, 2021 Letter of Interest from MITIMCO regarding 174 Binney St., Parcel 6 of KSURP

6. Written communications received since the publication of this meeting notice.

Ms. Born responded to Mr. Poonen’s concern about a wood-burning fire pit saying that it would be explicitly noted that there would not be one. As part of a design review meeting regarding modifications to Danny Lewin Park, the fire department was being asked to confirm prohibition of fire pits in the City of Cambridge.

Ms. Born said that another email was received by Mr. Kaiser regarding congestion in the Kendall-North Point area. She said that Mr. Kaiser wisely points out that congestion in one place usually creates congestion spill over on other roads that feed into the major congestion point. Mr. Zevin thanked Mr. Kaiser for a clear and compelling memo as this is an important issue. He was alarmed to hear the City’s traffic person during the joint hearing with the Planning Board state that this situation cannot be solved. It is problematic to think that people can be forced out of their cars for everything. Ms. Born added that people are lulled into denial by the events of the last 18 months when many people stayed home. Mr. Evans said that traffic analysis hasn’t kept up on the assignment of peak level volumes to a particular peak hour. This is evolving due to COVID as well as the tech and biotech workforce spreading out their travel more. The peak hour congestion should not be sandwiched into one hour of analysis.

Ms. Born referenced the MITIMCO letter regarding their interest in the CRA Parcel 6 site at Third and Binney Streets. She added that a late communication regarding this site was received by Mr. Poonen as well. Mr. Evans said that once the GSA told the City that they were interested in developing the Volpe parcel, the CRA began discussions with MITIMCO about having this corner parcel be part of the Volpe redevelopment plan. When the City selected MITIMCO as the developer, the inclusion of the parcel was again noted during the zoning review with CDG as there was a desire to incentivize the parcel’s inclusion into MIT’s redevelopment plan. If the parcel is included, there are different GFA allowances within the zoning. However, at the time of MITIMCO’s application, it wasn’t included because MITIMCO didn’t have control of that parcel. Since that PUD permit was approved, MITIMCO has expressed an interest in including the parcel as an element, possibly for the next-door residential project. This communication letter begins a formal process. Any land disposition in a redevelopment project area must first go through an appraisal process. The State Department of Housing and Community Development needs to be notified of the appraisal’s results. They don’t approve the transaction but they do want to ensure that the land is not being given away at below market value, unless there’s some part of the plan or some part of the disposition that has some community benefits. Selling below market has to be justified to the state. The CRA will now get an appraisal of the land’s value. MITIMCO will get their own appraisal. There will then be a discussion about the

results. Any resulting proposal would come before the Board for consideration. This is not a transaction that can be done quickly or without a fair amount of public oversight. Staff has begun the appraisal selection process in response to this letter.

Mr. Zevin noted that under the previous Executive Director, there was a long-standing proposal to put a small building with three or four row houses on that site, which was not well received. He said that Professor Poonen's points were reasonable, although trying to change the Volpe plan might result in a bureaucratic nightmare. Ms. Drury said that the CRA might want to maintain ownership of that parcel. Ms. Born said that it is prudent to get an appraisal regardless of the decision. Mr. Evans stated that there is no obligation for the CRA to sell the land. There is an array of options - sell, don't sell, or sell later and continue using the site as a civic space. In addition to an executive session, there would be a public discussion and a public vote. Ms. Born noted that the appraisal would take into account any utility incumbrances. Mr. Evans said that the property could be considered for widening the streetscape and the public way.

Ms. Shore noted the invitation to the ribbon cutting at the O'Connell Library Pocket Park on Friday, October 22 at 3pm.

A motion was moved, by Ms. Drury, to close the Communications section and place all the communications on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator – absent

The motion carried.

Reports, Motions, and Discussion Items

7. Monthly Staff Report

Mr. Evans said that the report included a number of administrative issues, a growing forward calendar to consider before the end of year, and project updates. Rather than read through each item, he asked the Board if they had any questions.

Mr. Zevin said that the bus shelter looks really good; however, across the street, the Broad Institute's new sign is slightly misaligned, which is irksome. He said that he likes that the west side of the Galileo- Broadway intersection is less of a maze of "complete" intersection elements than what was shown in the preliminary designs. Mr. Evans explained some reasons for the simplification of the corner. Mr. Zevin said that the plantings are amazing.

Mr. Crawford asked if staff could think about etiquette suggestions during closures of the Kitty Knox Path to reduce cyclist-pedestrian confrontations. Mr. Evans said that temporary signage could help people understand that everyone has the right to be there during the next construction phase. There was a discussion of cyclists using sidewalks in general. Mr. Evans said that this will be an issue for the bike valet parking in the substation project as well.

Hema Kailasam, CRA Director of Finance and Operations, spoke about the financial portion of the staff report. Ms. Kailasam referenced the memo in the board packet. As in previous months, the CRA benefited from a strong market. The operations expenses are tracking below the budget because projects have been slower to start or the billing has yet to come. The primary expenses this year are the Bishop Allen renovations. The biggest expense in professional fees was for Year 3 of the Transportation Report.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to accept the staff and financial report and place it on file. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator - absent
The motion carried.

8. 99 Bishop Allen Drive – Project Update

Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a Solar Power Agreement with CollectiveSun for \$93,974 for the installation and financing of a 24.8 kWp rooftop solar array at 99 Bishop Allen Drive, with SunBug Solar as the installer

Erica Schwarz, CRA Director of Projects, gave a brief project update: The timeline was extended by a couple of weeks primarily due to an unexpected supply chain issue related to the lighting for the building. Other critical path items are the completion of the front entryway and rework of the electrical closet in coordination with the utility company. The new certificate of occupancy is expected by late November, with tenants fully in the building by December 3rd.

Ms. Schwarz then spoke about the solar installation project. In a previous Board meeting, Resonant Energy was selected to manage the project. On behalf of the CRA, they conducted a selection process using Chapter 25A, which allows more flexibility in selecting contractors for energy conservation projects. Two responses were received, of which SunBug Solar is recommended due to their experience conducting public projects and their ability to meet prevailing wage laws. Tonight's vote is about the solar power agreement with a financier. The CRA would share the federal solar tax credit benefit with them, and direct them to use the selected installer. The contract details the ownership arrangement and the financial arrangement. There aren't many financiers that work in Massachusetts and invest in projects of this relatively small size.

In response to Ms. Drury, Madeline Barr, from Resonant Energy, said that Resonant Energy often recommends this financier and this contract for projects that fall into this category. This financier is solely interested in the tax credit, which leaves the electricity and all the Solar Massachusetts Renewable Target (SMART) state incentives to the CRA. The contract is complicated but it allows the CRA to benefit fully from solar incentives. The deposit to be made and what is paid back comply with IRS regulations. Ms. Barr said that the RFP was issued in various places. Resonant does a significant number of competitive RFPs and has lately seen a low capacity from their installation network. Because of solar's boom, installers are busy and are saying no to projects until the spring. She added that the small response could also be due to the small project size and the prevailing wage requirement. Nicole Sanches, from Resonant Energy, added that the pandemic created timing issues with state processing of electrician licenses.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury, authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a Solar Power Agreement with CollectiveSun for \$93,974 for the installation and financing of a 24.8 kWp (Kilowatts of Power) rooftop solar array at 99 Bishop Allen Drive, with SunBug Solar as the installer. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator – absent

The motion carried.

9. 2020 Financial Audit

Motion: To Accept the Financial Audit of the 2020 CRA Fiscal Year

Ms. Kailasam welcomed Chad Clark from Roselli, Clark and Associates. Mr. Clark summarized the highlights of the balance sheet. The cash is down about \$4 million year-to-year, which includes the \$2 million payment to the City for the Foundry and \$1.5 million in Covid small business loans. The net receivables are up due to the Covid loans. There was no large sale of development rights received or recognized revenue. The CRA's finances will be affected by its new role as landlord of the Bishop Allen building. In 2020, \$440,000 was collected in rental income to maintain the building's operations. This was the only operating revenue source. However, there is a debt component that the rents didn't cover. Non-operating revenue is the investment income of just under \$2 million.

Looking at the expenses and revenues from all sources, the net deficit is only \$180,000, some of which is depreciation. Much of the renovations were capitalized into fixed assets, which reduces expenses. At the end of the project, a reasonable estimate of the value of assets taken out of the building will be needed, which will be a write-off for 2021.

There is still a net pension liability of about \$328,000. This is the amount assessed by the retirement system. The OPEB net liability, which is managed in-house, is \$730,000. The CRA could continue to allocate a certain amount every year to the OPEB trust or it could choose to fund the entire amount into an investment account, which would help the discount rate. The actuary would be able to calculate the pay-off amount, which would likely be less due to time value of money principles. This affects the unrestricted fund balance amount of just over \$40 million. It does not affect the restricted KSTEP and Foundry funds

In response to Ms. Born, Mr. Clark said that the staff are finalizing responses to the management letter. Mr. Clark said that improvements to small procedural issues were suggested in the letter. There was nothing bad or mismanaged. One item was that the loan agreement documentation between the small businesses and the CRA did not have both parties' signatures. He has discussed this issue with Ms. Kailasam who had told him that this was done with legal advice. Ms. Kailasam will relay this concern to the lawyer. Ms. Kailasam said that the loans were given to businesses to help them get over a hump. This zero-interest loan did not include a lot of vetting. With that in mind, the lawyers accepted a looser structure. The bank was hired to be the servicer. They sent the checks from a CRA account and collected the first amortization that occurred on September 30th. Mr. Clark noted that larger loans that have been granted in past years have had double signatures. For future loan projects, he recommends having both signatures.

An item that remains in the management letter is for the CRA to acquire more sophisticated financial software as the number and complexity of projects are increasing. He said that this is being addressed by CRA staff.

Ms. Shore added that the audit report will now be sent to the City. Mr. Clark said that he is waiting for a legal letter from the attorney and the rep letter to be signed by Mr. Evans and Ms. Born.

A motion was moved, by Ms. Drury, to accept the Financial Audit of the 2020 CRA Fiscal Year. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator – absent

The motion carried.

10. Privately Owned Public Open Space Identity Update

Fabiola Alikpokou, CRA Project Planner, said that in the fall of 2020, the CRA and the City of Cambridge began discussing signage for Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) in Cambridge. Her presentation showed a map of the 49 existing POPS throughout Cambridge, with the majority being in the Kendall Square Urban Redevelopment Plan Area. The CRA was especially interested in creating POPS signage for the Kendal Square area (KSQ) to make the area feel more inclusive and welcoming to those who live and work in KSQ as well as to those in the surrounding communities. Ms. Alikpokou spoke about the overall messaging goals for the signage

The CRA contracted with Visual Dialogue to lead the design for the project. The team looked at signage from other cities, such as NYC, San Francisco, Seattle, and Toronto. A community survey was created and conducted by CDD, rating 14 images of Cambridge POPS to see if the space felt like it was intended for public use or not. The survey ran from January 8 to February 19. Not one space was rated 100% as a space intended for the participants. Most people do not think POPS are for public use. Cues are needed. Among the comments was a welcoming message because explicit permission to use a site is extremely helpful, especially for people of color and teenagers.

In addition to the community survey, two meetings with KSQ POPS owners were held. The first meeting introduced the project, and discussed opportunities or concerns about making future POPS more beneficial for the

community. After many design iterations and meetings, a consensus was reached with the POPS owners on the logo and the phrase. Ms. Alikpokou spoke about the signage design standards, and the thought process for creating the messaging and the logo. The presentation showed a slide of the final design in the preferred horizontal format, although owners are free to use the vertical design. The color of the logo is spring green, and the text color is tree green. There is also a black logo and text version.

As for the implementation, there will be brand guidelines that will be provided to all POPS owners to use. Boston Properties (BxP) has agreed to pilot the signage. This is going to allow staff to see the logo's effectiveness and how the community responds to it. The metrics for measuring this have not been decided yet.

Eric Mo, from BxP, noted the locations of the signage in the Kendall Roof Garden, the connection from the Kendall Plaza up to the Roof Garden through the level 2 porch and through the public lobby between 325 and 355 Main Street. BxP will ensure that the signage is featured prominently and applied appropriately in the strategic areas.

Mr. Zevin said that the slogan is great but is less enthused about the closed form of the leaf logo. He asked if the designers are providing standard procedures for adding other information. The sign to the roof garden needs to have hours posted. There are lots of other situations with restrictions. Mr. Evans said that the key goal was to make sure that the POPS piece was standalone, simple, and compatible with other signage protocols. Staff has discussed placement protocols but Visual Dialogue hasn't been asked to do this. Ms. Born likes the orb-shaped design. Mr. Crawford said that the text is more important. Ms. Born said that some POPS don't have trees. Ms. Drury thought the design is fine.

Mr. Zevin hopes this initiative will be citywide, not just in Kendall Square. Mr. Evans said that the goal would be for other properties beyond the MXD District to apply this signage. The challenge is to label existing spaces. He said that Alexandria Real Estate participated in the meetings. The design materials will also be transmitted to the City so they can work to get it applied on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Zevin said that the designers should prescribe a predictable place to add other site-specific text, especially if certain areas within a building are open to all but others areas within that same building are not. Ms. Born said that if more annotation is needed, additional text would be the property owner's choice as there is no prescriptive size or material for the sign. Mr. Zevin noted that the template of the San Francisco sign was exemplary because it had a logo, a series of other icons explaining what the public could find in the space, hours of operation, and other useful information in smaller print.

Mr. Evans said that this is an addition to BxP's wayfinding plan for the main block of Parcel 4 and will be discussed in design review.

Ms. Born would like to have the City, or the CRA, insist on the placement of this logo on any privately owned property that is determined to have a public easement, such as Harvard. Mr. Evans said that this is the intention of the City but the timeline is undetermined.

Mr. Evans said that no action needs to be taken tonight on this agenda item.

11. Design Review Meetings Update and Follow Up Actions

Motion: To accept the meeting notes of the Design Review Committee Meeting of September 15, 2021

Motion: Approving the revision to the Phase Two Wayfinding Plan proposed by Boston Properties for 325 Main Street, Parcel Four KSURP

Eric Mo, from Boston Properties (BxP), spoke about updates to BxP's wayfinding plan. He said that BxP met with the Design Review committee last week to discuss the need to change the sign on the Social Wall from e-ink display technology to traditional LED screens because of several temperature and weather engineering challenges. BxP is mindful of night time lighting issues. The split-flap feature has been moved to the inside of the public lobby. He said that the design review committee agreed to allow the signage designers to decide on the overall design of the wayfinding column. The committee liked the three-dimensionality of the UP logo.

In response to Mr. Crawford, Mr. Mo said that BxP will ensure that the sign is maintained and operational. The programming will be coordinated with CRA staff. The content will focus on events happening on the roof garden, the plaza, and around the block. Some transit information and other helpful information to the public will also be on the sign. Mr. Zevin said that the transit screen near Cava by Pioneer Way looks good but may have been repaired a couple of times.

Mr. Evans summarized the two items to consider – adding the POPS logo and transitioning the screen from one technology to a different one. There has also been a mock-up review of coloration for the sign.

In response to Ms. Drury, Mr. Mo spoke about the artwork along the social wall by artist Silvia Lopez Chavez. BxP will be back before the design review committee with more details. Mr. Mo said that if the ambient lighting of the rails is not sufficient for the artwork to be seen at night, supplemental lighting off the MBTA headhouse might be another option.

Alexandra Levering, CRA Project Manager, said that the wayfinding masterplan was approved at the end of last year and there is a motion tonight to approve the revision.

Mr. Zevin commented on the meeting minutes. The discussion of 135 Broadway brought a good beginning architectural scheme. Pushback from the City regarding exceptions to the design guidelines was discussed at some length. Although Ms. Levering covered this in the minutes, Mr. Zevin emphasized that a rigid application of those design guidelines in this particular space would be a big mistake. To clarify, the building “violates” the “rules” about an unbroken “street wall” and a podium height at eight stories needing to be followed relentlessly down the street. The proposed scheme sets part of the building back from the sidewalk in response to the jenga structure of the Akamai building and to open a view from Broadway into the Central Plaza above the substation. There are currently a number of departures from the guidelines along Broadway and Main Street which are arguably reasonable. He was alarmed that the city latched on to this as being noncompliant.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to accept the meeting notes of the Design Review Committee Meeting of September 15, 2021. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member’s vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator – absent

The motion carried.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to approve the revision to the Phase Two Wayfinding Plan proposed by Boston Properties for 325 Main Street, Parcel Four KSURP. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member’s vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator – absent

The motion carried.

12. Real Estate and Brokerage Services RFP

Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a three-year house doctor contract with HR&A Advisors and Cushman & Wakefield for real estate consulting services for an amount not to exceed three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000), not including brokerage fees, to assist in citywide strategic planning efforts.

Ms. Levering said that the board packet includes a memo providing details on the CRA’s Real Estate advisory and brokerage services RFP. This is for a consultant on an as-needed basis to help with real estate development strategies and analysis and to help the CRA act on real estate opportunities. For the procurement process the

CRA released the RFP on September 1st and posted it on the Goods and Services Register on September 6th. There were two advertisements in the Boston Globe in September. Staff also emailed firms who responded to a previous RFP in 2018 for real estate advisory services, other known firms in the area, and firms found in the Cambridge business diversity directory.

A single submission was received from HR&A Advisors and Cushman Wakefield, who partnered together for the submission. After reviewing the proposal, staff determined it was complete and met the standards in the RFP. HR&A's experience nationally and with the CRA over the past six years, as well as Cushman & Wakefield's organizational breadth in being able to provide a diverse set of real estate services makes them a strong team. Staff recommends entering into a three-year on-call contract with them. Because only one proposal was received, staff might initiate other procurement processes that would be attractive to smaller and more diverse firms

Mr. Evans explained that Cushman Wakefield is a global commercial real estate firm but they have a local Boston office. HR&A is not a licensed broker in Massachusetts. The two firms are partnering together. Mr. Evans said that the CRA had asked for a brokerage component in the RFP to assist with potential real estate transactions. Cushman Wakefield represented Enroot in their sale of 99 Bishop Allen Drive. HR&A would use Cushman & Wakefield's local knowledge. Mr. Crawford said that the proposal notes that Cushman & Wakefield would provide support to HR&A with market information, compare transaction history on similar properties, prepare broker price opinions, monitor properties that may be suitable for CRA purchase, and then conduct the negotiations. The CRA could use them to possibly find a location for the CRA's promised housing. Mr. Evans said that if a specific real estate component is present, another RFP might occur. An RFP process is required by the state to select a broker. To find land, a separate RFP is needed.

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury, authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a three-year house doctor contract with HR&A Advisors and Cushman Wakefield for real estate consulting services for an amount not to exceed three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000), not including brokerage fees, to assist in citywide strategic planning efforts. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - yes

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator – absent

The motion carried.

13. KSURP Update: MXD Transportation Efforts/Mitigation

Mr. Evans acknowledged that there are transportation concerns regarding growth around Kendall Square. There has been a lot of transportation analysis through the MEPA document, as well as through Boston Properties' special permit process. More analysis won't solve the issues. He proposes that the CRA should continue, and possibly expand, its role to work on solutions to some transportation issues.

The CRA will continue to commit to ongoing annual reports on the traffic in the area. The CRA is a steward of the KSTEP program, which is looking to make smaller scale investments in the transit system and infrastructure. The CRA continues to work on numerous streetscape enhancement projects aimed at making walking and bicycling more prominent elements of our transportation mode split. A few years ago, the Kendall Square Mobility Task Force was created by the state to look at Kendall Square's growth and how to best meet that need. The task force did not focus on the mobility elements of pedestrian-bike facilities because it was thought that the City and the property owners were already improving those facilities. However, a number of things need to happen to keep the transit system robust. These are investment in the Red Line, expanding investment in bus services in the area, and the exploration of the Grand Junction as a transportation corridor.

The CRA has flagged issues regarding the original purchase plan for the Red Line cars that did not replace the entire fleet of vehicles. In addition, the MBTA wasn't necessarily carrying forward on some of the signalization improvements that people felt were necessary. The state has, since then, made some significant investments, or planned to make some investments, for those pieces of infrastructure. The CRA continues to work on Red Line station improvements with Boston Properties.

With respect to the bus component, the state has begun a new round of planning for bus service improvements system-wide. They specifically focused on short-term improvements through the Better Bus program to expand existing routes in Kendall, a Silver Line extension from the north, and work with Easy Ride and other shuttles. With the streetscape design project, the CRA hopes to engineer better bus circulation through the area. The KSTEP program also hopes to invest in transit improvements. The transit service along Grand Junction has had the least momentum. The City is doing a design process for the pathway that reserves space for transit, but they aren't really planning for it. They are just ensuring that the path doesn't preclude transit service. A few years ago, the mobility taskforce recommended that the CRA start to do some work on ridership demands from the growth in Kendall Square. For various reasons, this didn't occur at that time but Mr. Evans would like to reengage on that front. He suggested that the Grand Junction planning work could be included in the review of the Infill Development Concept Plan as a mitigation that Boston Properties might be willing to fund. The CRA and BxP could collectively administer the work. Staff has started to scope out a study. He added that the CRA will probably need to help facilitate some of the finalization of the streetscape ideas. The CRA remains very involved in transportation planning in Kendall and could be a facilitator of development and of transit enhancements that support that development.

In response to Ms. Drury, Mr. Evans explained why it would be easier for the CRA than the City to lead the Grand Junction effort. Mr. Zevin suggested working with Volpe. Mr. Evans agreed that Volpe could help evaluate the best track management programs for the shared space. There was a discussion of the issues. Ms. Born brought up a Globe article about the Mass Pike relocation project and the railroad bridge.

Mr. Crawford said that he is also happy to see that mobility discussions have also focused on breaking up these big blocks and making it easier for people to get to the open spaces and to move between their destinations inside of Kendall and from the neighborhoods into Kendall. It's nice that presentations include pedestrian through ways. While it's not as natural to think of this as transportation through the district, the CRA should take pride that this is highlighted and standardized.

Adjournment of CRA Board Meeting

A motion was moved by Ms. Drury to adjourn the meeting. A roll call was taken by Mr. Evans and each member's vote was repeated.

Ms. Born – yes

Mr. Crawford – yes

Ms. Drury - absent

Mr. Zevin – yes

Mr. Bator – absent

The motion carried.

The meeting ended at 8:19 p.m.