

# Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

One Cambridge Center/Fourth Floor  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142  
617 492-6800



Regular Meeting  
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, July 23, 2014, 5:30pm  
Cambridge Police Station  
125 Sixth Street  
Community Room

---

## DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

---

Present: Kathleen Born (Chair), Margaret Drury (Vice-Chair), Christopher Bator (Treasurer), Conrad Crawford (Asst. Treasurer), Barry Zevin (Asst. Secretary), CRA Executive Director Tom Evans, CRA Strategic Planner Kathryn Madden, CRA Intern Young-Ae Chung, CRA Office Manager Ellen Shore, John Hawkinson, Steve Kaiser, Heather Hoffman

Public sign-in sheet attached.

**Call to Order:** Kathleen Born, called the meeting to order (5:32pm).

For those in the public who want to comment on the last item of the agenda, this will be a very transparent process and comments after the board discussion are encouraged.

### **Public Comment**

Steve Kaiser commented on three items on the agenda and one general point.

- # 8 Grand Junction: It is important for everybody in Cambridge (MIT, CRA, etc.) to do their piece to get this project in motion. The biggest issue is in Somerville where the MBTA wants to propose a fifth track for the Green Line which takes out room for the bike path. Mr. Kaiser feels that the MBTA could move the 5<sup>th</sup> track into the yards to solve the issue.
- # 11 Strategic Plan: Mr. Kaiser is puzzled and unhappy with this plan. He stated that it was wise to avoid the Courthouse. He stated that the Alewife area is poorly planned, traffic is horrible and doesn't see how to fix it. One piece of good news is that Equity and Rich McKinnon volunteered VHB to study the Red Line capacity. He suggested that CRA should support or help fund this study. Mr. Kaiser thinks that there's 20% more capacity. Since Boston Properties benefits from improvements they should also get involved and contribute to the study.
- #12: Mr. Kaiser stressed great unhappiness with the C2/K2 study. It never finished the traffic study and it didn't look at the headways. The transit study for the K2 plan must be properly done. To build on 1 million square feet, we must deal with transportation issues.
- Powerpoints should be used wisely. The intern had an excellent Powerpoint presentation but the one for the Strategic Plan was awful and unreadable with too many words.

Heather Hoffman

- This is a golden opportunity to say something about the Microsoft sign. This is an improvement because the sign doesn't stick out as much but unfortunately, it still looks like they own the Kendall Square T-station. Ms. Hoffman does not think the sign should be there at all.
- Ms. Hoffman is glad that Parcel 6 is moving forward as it is "really a dump." There used to be a food truck at this site which was removed for staging for a construction project. Although the sidewalk has been shoveled in the two winters, this area has not been maintained well.
- MXD District. Ms. Hoffman agreed with Mr. Kaiser. The MXD district should not be the wild west anymore and it's time for it to become part of the city. Its zoning, approvals, and signs should be part of the city approval process. She asked for the removal of the signage exemptions. She stated that that these rules can be improved but keeping the sign exemption leads to things we don't like.
- Grand Junction: Ms. Hoffman agreed with Mr. Kaiser. Friends of the Grand Junction have worked very hard with the Friends of the Community Path to make a network of paths so we can use cars less and have nice places to walk.

The public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

### **Minutes**

#### **1. Motion: To approve the minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of the CRA on June 18, 2014\***

The Chairman had 2 corrections:

- 1) Correct the spelling of Mr. Stohlman's name.
- 2) A clarification of the discussion regarding item 5 on page 3. The minutes will be changed to say "The Wall will not be used for advertising. Its intention is to be a visual display providing dynamic information."

***The minutes with these amendments were unanimously approved and will be placed on record.***

### **Communications**

#### **2. No correspondence currently on file for this meeting.**

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

#### **3. Report: Update on the Foundry Reuse Project (Ms. Madden and Mr. Evans)\***

Mr. Evans explained that this is a two-part report. Ms. Madden will report on the community meeting and the after-analysis of the model-building event and then Mr. Evans will follow up with a discussion of the next steps of the project with the City and the consultants.

Ms. Madden stated that over sixty people attended the community meeting, including board and council members. This was a hands-on interactive workshop to look at trade-offs for what types of businesses would comprise the Foundry. The overall feeling of the attendees was that this building should be inclusive, diverse, accessible, multi-cultural, multi-aged, multi-use and flexible. With this and past meetings, we are finalizing the set of consistent goals and objectives.

Board member Barry Zevin still feels that we need more of a data driven report quantifying the city's needs and stated that maybe the Multicultural Arts Center fulfills the same goal. Ms. Madden suggested that CRA's role is to create the building's objectives and possible programs. The workshop provided a way to look at the tradeoffs needed due to the size of the building. In the end, the company that is selected from the RFP applicants based on the stated criteria to ensure public interest and a governance, will decide what they can make work. The selected applicant would hopefully be a team of real estate developers and operators. In the RFP, the CRA will state that the public interest is an objective and goal of the building. CRA will be putting a governance structure in place that will allow changes over time that still fulfill the mission of the building.

The building has challenges for a builder. Documents of the historic form of the building (1980's permit changes) should be retrieved to give the bidders on the project as much data as possible. Ms. Born suggested that a building survey also be done since it would be worthwhile and inexpensive. If we can locate the as-builts, the information would be there.

Ms. Madden stressed that this shared City / CRA workshop was a pleasant working environment. CRA is in an unprecedented relationship with the City with collaboration on this workshop and other meetings. Ms. Drury enjoyed the interactive working nature of the workshop. One of the next steps is determining how to tap into the city's youth programs.

Mr. Evans stated that the CRA is working on general objectives that we want to set as parameters for each of the phases of the development process and the rules to guide future uses throughout the life of the building.

The CRA is proceeding on some technical aspects of the project – creating governance structure and the sequence of transactions from CRA to a development entity, financial arrangements that go along with that, and the oversight committee's makeup and responsibilities. Simultaneously, HRA is running a series of models of comparable rents for different types of uses and percentages of keeping the architectural features visible. We want to be able to present the scenarios in September in a public forum. We have an initial optimistic nod from HRA.

Barry Zevin suggested adding space to the building. This idea remains on the table with the City. An RFP will provide the opportunity for people to offer ideas.

***Motion to place the report on file was unanimously approved.***

#### **4. Motion: Approving the CRA 2014 Strategic Plan (Ms. Madden)\***

Ms. Born thanked Ms. Madden for her work. Ms. Born pointed out so that the public knows that the CRA isn't limited in its scope and that the CRA has a mission to respond to the Cambridge community, on page 12 of the plan, it includes suggestions of other possible areas that CRA can look at. KSURA will be 50 years old this year. CRA was in existence 10 years before that. Ms. Born stated that this plan is a great place to launch CRA into its second phase of redevelopment for this area. Mr. Evans stated that this is a good time to redefine what urban renewal means to Cambridge. CRA clearly announces that our intentions are beyond Kendall Square and that it's citywide.

***Motion to adopt the CRA 2014 Strategic Plan as presented was unanimously approved and placed on record.***

#### **5. Motion: Approving the Revised Design for the Microsoft Blade Sign at One Cambridge Center (Mr. Sheehan)\***

Mr. Sheehan stated that this is an application to redesign the Microsoft Sign to replace the old logo with a new identity and reduce the projection of the sign. There's been much back-and-forth with Microsoft and

a satisfactory solution has been reached.

Ms. Born requested clarification of the motion regarding the illumination and the metal finish.

***The motion to approve the Revised Design for the Microsoft Blade Sign at One Cambridge Center with matching levels of illumination and the same gun gray metal finish as the current sign was unanimously passed and CRA will send notice of this to Microsoft.***

#### **6. Motion: Approving the signage proposal for Bailey and Sage Restaurant at Five Cambridge Center (Mr. Sheehan)\***

Mr. Sheehan is amenable to the storefront sign but Boston Properties is not enthusiastic with the freestanding sign and planters in the arcade. Boston Properties feels that a sign on Main Street and a storefront sign is enough signage. The seating does not need to be private and the planters create an undesirable obstruction and clutter the arcade. Planters and the free-standing sign would look better outside on Pioneer Alley. The Board discussed livening up Pioneer Alley but not creating spaces to hide since the area is not well populated.

Mr. Zevin suggested that the planters might serve as a barrier against moving the chairs away from the restaurant and if that were the concern, a suggestion of using heavier chairs should be conveyed. However, there are light-weight chairs in other restaurants that tend not to stray too far. Mr. Evans mentioned that the arrival of more furniture (larger chairs, tables, etc.) will be proposed by Boston Properties for the arcade in the near future.

CRA will take a look at discussing Pioneer Alley signage with the interested businesses but the CRA does not want to micro-manage signage.

***The motion to approve the signage proposal for Bailey and Sage Restaurant at Five Cambridge Center excluding the freestanding sign and planters within the arcade was unanimously passed.***

Mr. Zevin asked about the status of the Clover signage. Mr. Evans stated that Clover was given suggestions for modifications by Boston Properties and CRA and that a new proposal should arrive in September.

#### **7. Report: Monthly Report to the Board of the Executive Director (Mr. Evans)\***

Mr. Evans posted the Project / Planner Manager position on various places – CRA website, APA, Planetizen (an urban planning website). Over two dozen applications have been received. This person will be taking on some of the work launched by CRA interns and other projects such as MXD, Cherry Street, for example. The CRA needs to add professional capacity with someone who has experience in project leadership.

Ellen is taking on the bookkeeping process, which is very helpful. Although auditors said we should bring this in-house nine months ago, we weren't ready at that time to take this on – now we are. Check processing is much quicker and our database is thus updated more accurately. We are still working on getting some of our bank accounts to have Mr. Bator and Mr. Conrad as official signers. For the time being, Mr. Gookin is continuing to be responsible for payroll process via Harpers Payroll company, which includes payments to Cambridge Retirement and other payroll details.

The auditors were in the CRA office last month. They were impressed with many policies that we have put in place and are also reviewing our draft Procurement Policy. This policy already needs modification since the state law just changed on procurement last week. The new budget now allows us to do a contract on three calls up to \$35K from \$25K. Above \$35K, the CRA still needs to do a full low bid or RFP process.

We've wrapped up Phase I of our archival storage project and shipped off a great deal of information on previous projects to the Cambridge Room of the library. We are currently holding onto all of the Kendall Square records and the Harrington/Wellington file boxes although we haven't sorted through these yet. We need to move out of our 4CC storage and are looking into moving into another location, possibly Iron Mountain. We are discarding duplicate documents and will be passing some duplicate as-builts to Boston Property that they don't have.

Mr. Bator suggested that an event be planned for the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. Also coming up is the 60<sup>th</sup> year anniversary of the CRA. Mr. Evans suggested that this could be a combined KSA / CRA / BP effort once the Main Street construction project is done, possibly late next summer. Mr. Evans will get an update of the expected completion date.

This opened up a conversation on the Main Street reconstruction. Demolition has started and the medians were removed. Taking down the flagpoles was more complicated and took longer than expected due to street closures, bringing in cranes, electrical shutoff's, traffic redirection, etc. In the next weeks, they will be starting on the intersection of 3<sup>rd</sup> and Broadway and Main Streets. This requires a lot of coordination since it affects us at Point Park with tree removals and the coordination of pedestrian detour plans. Pedestrian detour paths are very important to publish. For the next two months, there'll be a lot of circulation transition occurring including bus rerouting.

Mr. Crawford was concerned about providing adequate bike parking and notification. Mr. Evans is working with the City about providing carousel positioning in general. There are more bike racks now on Broadway. Mr. Evans will look into providing some in appropriate places on Ames Street and by the MIT Headhouse.

We need to delay the repaving of the plaza around the galaxy sculpture or do it in stages because of the pedestrian circulation. We can't reset the bricks while the Main Street intersection is being redone because there won't be a place to walk to the T-stop. This might need to wait until next spring. We are working closely with Boston Properties, DPW and Newport Construction to decide how this will work. However, Boston Properties has patched the sidewalk since it was becoming a public hazard.

In the next months, we will review the Foundry Demonstration project, get an updated Procurement Policy, possibly discuss the Ames Street Project, plan amendments, MXD zoning, some signage issues. An audit report is also due back from the auditors.

On Ames Street, we got acceptance of the traffic report and the Article 19 submission will go in next week. Then we will get a planning board hearing date. All the elements of the Article 19 will be up on the coUrbanize site which will supplement the results with a graphic presentation of the architect's study. Ms. Born stated that the developer needs to ensure that this information is reviewed before it goes online to ensure accuracy.

Other items in the report will be discussed as part of the items below.

***The report will be filed as presented.***

**8. Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director to Advertise for Bidding the Construction Contract for the Grand Junction Pathway on Parcel 7 between Main St. and Broadway. (Mr. Evans) \***

What's included in the distributed packet is the 95% submission from FST which was submitted to the City and MassDOT. MassDOT wants a 2<sup>nd</sup> rail-line to go through the Grand Junction corridor that we hadn't heard about before talking with them about this. At a meeting of the City Council's Transportation and Public Utilities Committee, the study states that according to the standards, there is room for two tracks and it would not affect our path. However, MassDOT disagrees due to the curve involved and says that the buffer needs to increase. This required us to do further study and we will need to resubmit the

section to prove to MassDOT that if they ever did bring a 2<sup>nd</sup> track they might need to remove the trees but they won't need to touch the path and they'd still have room for a fence.

Additionally, DPW suggested doing some quick soil samples which we did on three spots. Although this area had cleared MassDOT's environmental process a while back when it was a state highway project, we just heard results from the soil test indicating that more sampling is needed due to the presence of a certain (and at this time unknown) substance in one of the samples. We haven't seen the specific report but more testing will delay the project and increase its cost. By law, we have 100 days to report to the state so we want to report on a more thorough sampling.

The city was not happy with the design with the corner so we are taking a new look at clustering shrubbery, seating, ramps up to the gazebo and path-positioning.

Therefore, we are not really 95% ready for a bid package. We need to replace the motion "on the table" to amend the design contract to add an additional 6 months of time and \$30K, mainly due to recent notice regarding the soil and the possible results of the testing. CRA owns the soil problem unless we want to close the path down. Everyone is completely surprised by this, including the engineers who have built this project since this area has been dug up before with a new steam line by utilities and this soil issue has never been found before. Significant work is needed, including rigs to drill since we are forced to dig deeper.

Ms. Born asked for an explanation of the review process going forward. Mr. Evans explained that the DPW agreed to be the construction supervisor of the project. We are submitting this as a DPW project which will go through a review by DPW and other City Departments. So far, the CRA has been reviewing this with the Grand Junction Interagency committee but have been just focusing on the path design. There have been suggestions by the City on ways to upgrade the Gazebo but this is another issue in and of itself. The CRA is funding this project via MIT which has only committed to the path. The Gazebo would be considered a separate project.

Ms. Madden urged the board to consider, at least, removing the out-of-date, non-urban looking timbers of the Gazebo. Taking the wood down would require railings to be installed. Another issue is that the Gazebo is currently not accessible which complicates creating a path to it. A discussion among the board members regarding "what to do with this structure" followed. The Gazebo is not hazardous except for splinters and nails that are not flush.

The motion on the bid would be tabled until the soil results and the corner Gazebo issues are resolved. Since the East Cambridge Kendall Square design process should be completed in summer 2015, this project was for building an interim asphalt path that leads to the gazebo and adding some benches and plantings. Removing the Gazebo requires a demo proposal.

The current contract with FST is for roughly \$3 million and has been in effect for 30 years (since the 80's) for all of Kendall Square. That money has now run out. In the past, the CRA has added half million dollars to FST's contract to do work undefined. Now we are being more precise on the specific scope for what FST will be working on. The breakdown of the additional \$30K requested is \$23K for hazmat studies (as hopefully a worst case), soil testing and evaluation, a little over \$2,000 to deal with MassDOT's railroad right-of-way cross-section analysis, and \$4,500 for landscaping.

FST calls it a "95% submittal."

***Motion to authorize the Executive Director and the CRA Chair to execute a contract amendment adding \$30,000 and 6 months to complete the FST's design contract to further the Grand Junction project is unanimously passed.***

**9. Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director and Chair to negotiate a professional services contract for a Market Manager of the Pilot Market on CRA Parcel Six (Mr. Evans)**

We posted a contract scope to all market managers we knew of in the area. Although the ad appeared on the Commonwealth Food website and a national website, we did not receive a food market proposal. We did receive two other proposals. One is a proposal from Relish in Union Square for a craft maker based market rather than a food market where we would offer containers for workspaces. They couldn't do this by the Fall but would like to use that time to test the idea. They asked for \$25K. Should the CRA proceed since we'd be spending money without knowing what the costs or the results would be? The idea of containers is also unclear. We have the option of pursuing them as market consultants.

The second proposal was a freight farm project which would bring a farm (vertical growing) to Kendall Square with LED grow lights so it would be year-round. The company would oversee what is grown and distribute the produce. This is already done in Boston where basil is grown for restaurants. This is more of a commercial use of the site so it could create a small amount of revenue. There was also a fundraising aspect to the proposal. They want to be local so that they can grow in Kendall Square and sell to local restaurants.

A third option is to do minimal improvements – plants and benches - and make it a park. A fourth option would be to rewrite the scope and see if we get more responses.

Mr. Evans would like to offer Relish \$15K flush out their ideas, function as retail and event-making consultants and come back to us with more information. Mr. Evans received valid references about Relish. Mr. Evans was impressed with the conversation he had with Relish.

Ms. Born suggested offering the site to a civil contractor for staging where we could receive rent. Mr. Evans mentioned Newport Construction who is doing the Main Street construction but are coming daily from Watertown. Mr. Evans will negotiate with Newport Construction about renting the space and improving the site with paving, turf, shrubbery, and granite curb pieces which is allowed under CRA rules for license uses for temporary space. This would allow a groundwork to be laid. Ms. Drury questioned giving \$15K to a company when it's unclear what the end result would actually be. There was a discussion about this being similar to other feasibility contracts. Mr. Evans noted that their hourly rate was lower than our other consultants and they have had success starting projects in Somerville. A business plan would be expected from Relish.

Mr. Bator asked if we looked deep enough into other ideas. Mr. Evans stated that he and Chris Colley did much brainstorming regarding what to do: food truck was vetoed, parking lot was vetoed by the City. There could be more ideas but we should decide and move on to our other bigger projects. Engaging with Relish now doesn't preclude anything in the future. But if a market at this location is a Spring 2015 goal, we need to start planning for that now.

Ms. Born wants a contract with Relish to mention deliverables which Mr. Evans agreed to include and Ms. Born would be signing.

***Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director and Chair to negotiate a professional services contract for a Market Consultant with Relish, Inc. not to exceed \$15,000 passed unanimously.***

***Motion: Authorizing Executive Director to negotiate with Newport Construction for the temporary use of Parcel Six passed unanimously.***

## **10. Report: Quarterly Budget Report January – June 2014 (Mr. Evans)\***

There are two reports that look similar – the budget report and budget amendment report which continue to show budget vs. actuals. We have not yet brought in proceeds from Ames Street development nor MIT. Our personnel expenses are tracking as expected. Some of our office expenses are slightly higher than expected and our legal expenses have been less than what we budgeted for so there's an amendment to shift these monies. We will be spending more on community outreach and development. We also didn't have enough money for advertising to properly get a Project Planner position after advertising the RFP for HRA and for the Office manager's position.

Because of this, an amendment of the budget is proposed. As for income, the biggest change is if the Grand Junction is not done this year, which affects the income from MIT. MIT is treating this project as a reimbursement and only wants to pay the actual cost of the path. Another mid-year income adjustment is because we received more rental income because KSA stayed in the CRA office longer.

For operating expenses, we are asking for money to be shifted from Legal to Outreach Development for additional advertising and the need to host more meetings. As an aside, the CRA used the City's free once-a-year usage offer for the Multicultural space for the Foundry workshop. Mr. Evans suggested reallocating the unassigned salaries to various projects. We will need to spend more, from \$275K to \$300K, for covering the legal aspects on the Grand Junction project due to the soil testing, the additional monies to FST, and an additional \$15K on Parcel 6. Mr. Evans is reserving the right to allocate or have \$100K unencumbered for redevelopment investments for the Community Fund and is not expending capital costs for the construction of the Grand Junction. There might be some expenses for site preparation (water and electricity) for future temporary uses of Parcel 6.

Mr. Evans noted the line items for the distribution of salaries from July 2014 forward although it's a rough estimate. The Foundry is the biggest project, followed by MXD Rezoning and then finishing up on the Strategic Plan. There is also a shift of office administrative expenses. We spent less on the general legal category and moved it all to accounting for Eric Kinsherf but still need \$10K for the audit. The other two big items are the costs for moving out of our 4 Cambridge Center storage unit and our IT costs. WE need to hire an IT specialist to improve our network and file sharing setup, our wi-fi access, and buy more supplies and IT equipment. We are spending more on advertising and on the community workshops and we need a bit more for staff development on procurement training that the state provides for municipal officials. We are currently waiting for classes to be announced.

***Report to be filed.***

#### **11. Motion: Approving Revisions to the 2014 CRA Budget based on Strategic Planning Priorities (Mr. Evans)\***

***Motion to approve the revisions to the budget as presented by Mr. Evans passed unanimously.***

#### **12. Discussion: Process to initiate Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan Amendment and MXD Zoning Revisions based on the K2 Planning Study and Recommendations (Mr. Evans)**

Mr. Evans passed out excerpts from the K2 Plan that specifically dealt with zoning in the MXD. Although these were not in the current board packet, they have been previously distributed to the board and the public. In moving forward, this should be our base point for any amendment or petition to the redevelopment plan, as we want to stay as close to the proposed zoning recommendations as possible.

The message from legal counsel is that CRA has standing to be a petitioner. CRA is the only landowner with interests across the entire MXD.

The parameters of new development based on the K2 Plan are one million square feet - 400K towards housing and 600K towards commercial - that have been discussed several times with CDD staff. Beyond executing the K2 plan and allowing Kendall Square to continue to grow, there are a lot of non-zoning recommendations that came out of the K2 Plan that don't necessarily deal with development of buildings. The CRA could be in a position to execute some of those recommended non-zoning issues.

The CRA went through the K2 Plan, looking at policy goals and implementing actions to understand the roles that different parties might have in such a plan. Mr. Evans stated that the CRA could have an execution role for community benefits. The CRA's interest in the MXD zoning relates to the CRA's fiscal interests and its ability to reinvest in Cambridge for the public's benefit. CRA does not want to do this in a



vacuum. As Mr. Kaiser suggested, Mr. Evans proposed starting a series of meetings in the Fall about the K2 Plan and what the CRA will do with the funds that CRA would obtain. Topics for discussion at these interactive workshops should focus on transportation, public realm improvements like streetscape and open space, affordable housing - both inclusionary and moderate rate, and topics on the commercial side regarding innovation space and the high cost of office space. Mr. Evans stated that CRA can take ownership of these issues and is looking for ways to have the most interactive, open and transparent process for gathering information, especially since the current CRA staff was not part of the original K2 planning process. Boston Properties would like to be involved in these forums as well.

Ms. Drury questioned how this will all get done. Mr. Evans replied that this was one reason to increase staff with the assistant planner position. The CRA by-laws state that we use the City resources to help us with the process. Mr. Evans recommended doing this process quickly rather than stringing out a process with a committee meeting once a month.

Ms. Born stated that the CRA's mission is to operate in the public's benefit. CRA has this opportunity to engage both the public and the city. Ms. Born would like to continue to use HR&A for an objective view of implementation feasibility and sensitivity analysis with respect to moderate income housing in Kendall. Ms. Drury suggested getting more information from other places on affordable housing. Ms. Born stressed addressing the issue of open space especially since it's the densest part of the city. CRA wants a fully public process that is proactive, not reactive.

Mr. Evans will focus on outreach and meet with MEPA on transportation issues. The City is already focusing on moderate housing so we will collaborate on that. He hopes to kick off the public process by mid-September with awareness of other public discussions such as the MIT East Campus Gateway, Cambridge Conversations/Citywide, and Foundry meetings.

Ms. Hoffman suggested that CRA look at the CBT study commissioned by the East Cambridge Planning Team and there are other studies besides the K2C2 plan to consider. CRA should meet the goal of having an actual 15% of inclusionary units. Costs are driven by global investment and market. If people have data that they could really trust, it would change the conversation. People feel they are now being cheated. If we present data and facts, more people might show up at CRA meetings to learn more. CRA could contribute to the overall planning of the City of Cambridge.

Mr. Lavery of Boston Properties agreed that outreach on the issues raised by Mr. Evans are at the forefront of the project – transportation, open space. Adding density in a way that makes Kendall Square relevant in the future is important. This space was planned a long time ago, based on best practices at that time, but now we need to do things differently and make it more relevant to customers and community. Boston Properties is fully engaged and ready for undertaking.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 pm.