

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800



Regular Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, September 17, 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 Office Manager Ellen Shore, Chuck Redmon (Design Advisor), Greg Smith (designers of 73 Ames Street Restaurant), Steve Kaiser, Heather Hoffman, John Hawkinson, Carly Nix, Andrew Meyer, Zachary Katz

Public sign-in sheet attached.

Call

The meeting was called to order at 5:35pm. The Chair introduced Board members and Staff. The meeting started with a review of the agenda.

Public Comment

Steve Kaiser

With regard to the budget, it is interesting that during the first 9 months of the year the income was reduced from expected ½ million dollars to \$12,000 and the expenses reduced even more so now ½ million dollars ahead of net operating comment. He also noticed other internal changes in the budget.

With regard to the Director's Report, he noted that on page 2 at the bottom there is a short paragraph on Volpe and he feels that this is one of the most important issues for the CRA. He requested that it be put on the agenda in October for general discussion about what's been done so far and what the plans. In particular, he directed attention to the last line which states that the nature of CRA's role, if any, is not determined at this time.

He stated that this a total breakthrough on the part of the federal government to allow private developers to build a new building in exchange for owning part of the property. This is going to increase activity on the site and it surprising that there's no mention of how all these new workers are going to get to the site. We need this to be a transit oriented project and work needs to be done on the Red Line. He suggested that the CRA contribute to the project by providing a transit plan.

Ms. Born agreed that there is a great opportunity for the CRA regarding the Volpe project.

Heather Hoffman

Firstly, there's a typo Page 5, section 14 8 B, first line uses the wrong spelling of the word "undo".

1) Signs.

There seems to be a confluence of signage discussions in the city. There's the CRA proposal and there was a lengthy discussion at the Cambridge Planning Board meeting where its chair, Mr. Russell, gave a history of the Cambridge sign ordinance. He stated, and Ms. Hoffman agrees, that signs exist so that people down on the street level traffic can locate the business. She is vehemently opposed to branding signs. She feels they are truly billboards and do not add anything to the skyline. Not too long ago, 18,000 people signed a petition to get rid of the sign ordinance that the city council had adopted to allow branding signs so it's clear that voters, including me, do not like these signs. Although the previous board regime claimed that these voters weren't knowledgeable, she feels that the current board is smarter and classier and will prevent such branding from being regularized.

2) Project 19 filing and the percentage of affordable housing

This topic was also on the citywide agenda. This is the 3rd time it's come up. The first instance was the Andrews petition which proposed doing a real percentage but not adhered to, the second instance was during the last term of Councilor Simmons where she asked for the affordable housing percentage to be looked at which also went "no where" and now, just this week, once again, it's being brought before the City Councilor and City Manager. Regardless of the fact that other projects of this type have been allowed to "monkey around" with the numbers, the zoning ordinance clearly states that there is no legal or moral justification for this building to have less than 15% of its affordable housing, especially since they have unlimited FAR and unlimited units. This project and other luxury condos are creating havoc for those who are not rich and Ms. Hoffman requests support from the CRA to ensure that we get every affordable unit that the law provides.

John Hawkinson

To add to Mr. Kaiser's concerns, Mr. Hawkinson is also troubled that Volpe doesn't appear on the CRA agenda. The board should be able to respond quickly to business not anticipated and suggested there be a section in the agenda for "business not anticipated," although a conversation about Volpe should have been anticipated. The planning board had a presentation from GSA on Sept 2, where some CRA board were present. Please respond to the RFI, which is a solicitation for general ideas but the deadline is Oct 10. Please send ideas to GSA to influence the process.

Although discussions don't normally take place during the public comment process, Ms. Born asked Mr. Evans to respond since it is not on the agenda.

Mr. Evans explained that one of the reasons the CRA has not had any direct discussions with GSA on the Volpe project is because if they think we are a possible respondent and they talk to us but not to other developer respondents, it would be considered unfair. CRA will be attending their open house this Saturday. The purpose of an RFI from a government's or CRA standpoint (as a government agency) is to learn about market interest and to get information. It does not restrict the participation in a future RFP. So we are much like the GSA, and the city, listening to the development community to make it the best project.

Mr. Hawkinson urged responding and allocating resources if necessary.

Andrew Meyer

Introduced himself, Carly Nix and Zach. Mr. _____ all who built Industry Lab, a co-working space in Inman Square who has interest in the Foundry Project.

Public comment session is closed.

Minutes

1. Motion: To approve the minutes of the Regular Board Meeting on July 23, 2014* Communications

There were no comments, additions, or corrections entered.

The minutes were unanimously approved.

Communications

2. City Manager Update to City Council Regarding the Foundry Reuse Project – July 25, 2014*

The executive session regarding the Foundry which appears on the agenda will not include anything about the programming or eventual use of the Foundry. The executive session, allowed under the Open Meeting Law, allows the board to deliberate terms of the real estate agreement to be reached with the city.

Mr. Evans stated that the letter talks about process with the City and more importantly puts brackets around the objectives, vision, and concepts by which the project would be developed. There will be oscillations in proposals over time but we want to start to layout the general framework of operations applicable on day 1 or year 30. The idea is to create a flexible but clear directive of the types of community based uses in the building and discuss the interactions of the users. Our process with the city will head toward an RFQ/RFP process where we get information and qualifications and eventually proposals from the developing community on how they can implement this vision. All financing discussions fall under the template of this vision and set of programmatic objectives.

Ms. Born asked how the City Council reacted to this at their summer July 30 meeting. Ms. Madden said that this was part of their report but that it wasn't on the agenda and it was not discussed.

Mr. Crawford suggested that the transaction phase, taking place this Fall – Spring 2015, would be useful for understanding the next steps and when they might take place.

Mr. Evans stated that the general transaction structure is conveyance from the City to the CRA, and then from the CRA to a redevelopment entity. The CRA is actively working with the City to figuring out the conditions that exist at each of those transactions to ensure a viable project.

Mr. Zevin stated his concerns about determining what use this building has and since some of this building is for the public good, someone needs to ensure that the public will truly get what it needs. We need to understand what we don't have and what should be in this particular place.

Ms. Madden said that this is a joint document which outlines the objectives for the building. In order to leave as much flexibility as possible for how someone puts the project together in terms of finance and because this building will have a 30-50 year lifespan, the CRA does not want to legislate specific uses that won't endure over time. The CRA is trying to set up the criteria that uses would be evaluated.

Mr. Zevin thinks that a City inventory would be helpful and noted that there are some uses on the list that would make a substantial impact on the building structure such as theatre space since this is not as flexible as other uses. Ms. Madden said that even performance space could be made flexible. We have done an inventory of the many of the visual and performing arts and Cambridge has a lot so it's hard to say we have a need vs. a want for them. It's important to understand that we aren't competing with things but rather complement things.

Mr. Evans stated that a tangible need is for collaborative workforce connectivity from the proximate neighborhoods and economic activities of Kendall Square. The City is also taking a broader art inventory with the Arts Commission and whether their proximity to one another negatively affects each other.

Ms. Madden noted that feedback from the teens suggest that this is not a great location to them. Mr. Zevin stated, however, that this is a great location for research for Kendall Square so perhaps performance arts shouldn't be included to keep the Foundry viable.

The Board took a comment from the floor. Andrew Meyer agreed that Cambridge doesn't want to lose R&D and incubator space to other towns and Industry Lab has created a multi-functional use building in an old building and it's working well in Inman Square

Motion to place letter on file is unanimously approved.

Reports, Motions and Discussion Items:

3. Report: Monthly Report to the Board of the Executive Director Officer (Mr. Evans)*

CRA has been conducting interviews and honing in on a candidate to fill the Associate Planner position which will add capacity to the office.

We are now in the process, perhaps a tad late, for hiring new intern(s). Intern Young-Ae is still working at CRA through the Fall semester.

We released an RFP for office space in July. It was advertised over 21 days in the Chronicle and we also notified other brokers. We had only one response which isn't surprising since we only need a small space and for a short period of time (3 years) which will be discussed later on..

We moved out of our free storage space in the basement of 4CC as requested by Boston Properties. We moved a lot of old documents and flat files to Metropolitan Storage. Beside Iron Mountain being very expensive, we didn't have enough time to properly categorize them to go to this facility. We want to whittle down our use of Iron Mountain.

We do need to work on a record management policy which is now on the to-do list of internal issues.

We are close to completing the audit process which should be forthcoming in October. In clearing out a lot of the big issues over the past year, there are now little things to work. The understanding is that there will be a management letter coming but not an internal controls report which is a successful place to be.

Looking forward in the calendar, we will see on the agenda the following items:

- Volpe, as suggested this evening
- Grand Junction
- KSURP renewal plan amendment

On some specific projects, the signage package that we had approved in the Spring, which addressed all of Cambridge Center is now in its implementation phase. We are now at 255 Main Street and no longer at One Cambridge Center. Block 4 is complete and the next phase is Parcel 4 - Broad, Acamai buildings. It is not clear if the Whitehead Institute (8 Cambridge Center) and the Marriot Residence will follow suit as they are not owned by Boston Properties.

Ms. Drury questioned whether changing addresses is a choice. Mr. Evans stated that they are negotiable at times. For instance, the addressing of the North Parcel has been a bit odd since some of the access roads are private roads and not city roads.

The Public Gardens artwork is coming along. There's still some testwork for the window application but painting on Main Street is done. The goal is to follow the vine to the garden.

The Ames Street article 19 application was filed on August 2nd and we are coordinating a design review process with the City. There are a few technical transportation issues with access and the street design of Ames Street which is outlined in the packet. The preferred method chosen by the City requires talks with MIT about their plans for Ames Street which have just begun.

Mr. Bator asked if the process as it was broadly understood still on schedule. Mr. Evans said that it is a little behind. We had hoped to do initial construction work before Winter and it will now be a Spring start. The goal had been to get into construction documents and some initial prep work in the garage before the calendar years so it has slipped.

Ms. Born asked for clarification on process. Since we are coordinating design review between the City and the CRA staff, what process exists if our reaction is different than the planning boards reaction?

Mr. Evans stated that we haven't talk about that specifically. The CRA would incorporate minor modifications and present to the Planning Board. If there is a major conflict, the October schedule would be affected. We have no indications of any issues as of yet.

Ms. Born stated that since the issue of affordable housing was mentioned during public comment, she wanted to state that this is a City issue since it is under the City ordinance. Under the current MXD zoning, CRA can make suggestions, but we don't have the teeth to make that happen. Mr. Bator suggests that the City determination is mentioned as a minimum. For future new development, the CRA has much more influence than a request.

The goal is to have a public design review meeting in October that will be announced to all CRA contacts. We are working on scheduling this as a coordinated review with the folks who have been previously been involved in the design review meeting (Stuart Dash, Suzannah Bigolin) to inform a full board meeting of the schematic design.

Ms. Born asked whether the planning board could have a subcommittee to be part of the meeting. Mr. Evans will find out.

As for the Foundry item, we covered the nature of our work over the summer, that we are going to financial analysis and government structure, and will be taking more about the CRA's role in the executive discussion following the regular agenda.

On the Grand Junction, further testing of the soil has relieved the initial concerns mentioned in July of the questionable element found in the samples. There seems to have been a testing error or a really tiny spot concentration. We will be getting a full report which will become part of the construction documents. The soil cannot be reused and must be removed in a line facility offsite. There is no harm in its levels. A final report will be published once we receive it.

Mr. Bator asks whether this will save money that we had anticipated spending. Mr. Evans stated that this project still involves outside trucking and new fill to be brought in. Mr. Evans clarified that our income decrease mentioned in public comment by Mr. Kaiser, is due to the fact that reimbursement money from MIT for the path creation is delayed until the soil situation is resolved.

Mr. Crawford asked about the estimated volume of soil involved. Mr. Evans did not know exactly but also stated that the volume is affected by a slight design change for grading up to the Gazebo and dead pine tree removal. More information will come with the report.

On Parcel 6, we have entered into an agreement with Relish who have been conducting "brainstorming interviews" with a number of interested parties involved in a maker-village concept. They are sending a draft report to Mr. Evans in October which will be more formalized and presented to the board in November. They will probably ask for more money to be invested into the program. Since this is supposed to be a pilot for a season, it's not clear what the decision will be.

Lastly, we are participating in Industry Day as interested observers and abutters on the Volpe Project. We have a role as gate keepers of the access points since we own a lot of the boundary since we didn't widen the roads as once anticipated in the 1960s. Mr. Bator stated that as an organization we are paying very close attention to this issue.

Mr. Kaiser wondered whether the October 10 GSA submission deadline would help define the role of the CRA by the next board meeting?

Ms. Born said that it will be clear to those people who are well informed who are looking at that site.

Mr. Evans doesn't know the GSA process well enough to know if they would be ready to relay information a week after the deadline.

Ms. Born stated that people have different opinions of the role of the CRA and we want to show our full hand.

Mr. Hawkinson urged the CRA to offer opinions of what should be done with the Volpe as the organization has ideas that others do not and might not consider otherwise.

Ms. Born feels this is a multistep process and that things won't happen fast.

Speaking of gate keepers, Mr. Zevin mentioned that the gate keeping the octahedron is falling down and could actually be a hazard.

Mr. Evans will have it moved to make room for snow storage and relocate it outside of the gated area and they will repair the fence. The area is for Cambridge Center snow and not other sites. Otherwise, we should be charging rent.

Report to be place on file.

4. Report: On the Monthly Expenditures for July and August 2014 (Mr. Evans)*

This month is a quick check on where we are we will have a more robust report on a quarterly basis.

We are done with a couple of oddities with our bookkeeping transition. The spike in the payroll taxes line item reflects the manual entries that needed to occur from Harpers payroll system into Quickbooks.

The electrical use is at 93% of budget because this is a summer use as the fountain gears off in September. We recently learned that we can bill back to Boston Properties for half of the fountain's operating expenses and they have been invoiced.

The office supply and furniture purchases are on hold until next year with the exception of possible redesign of office which we'll discuss.

Mr. Bator likes the design of the report.

Mr. Crawford thought that the line item for snow removal was helpful to look at while discussing snow removal.

Mr. Evans added to the snow removal discussion, that the CRA might take over some of the snow removal responsibility from the city for the 2-way bike lane as our plows are smaller.

Mr. Hawkinson mentioned that the City just acquired a smaller plow to Mr. Conrad's interest.

Motion to place the report on file was approved unanimously.

5. Motion: *Authorizing the Executive Director and the Chair to negotiate and execute a three year lease for office space in the current CRA office location at 255 Main Street / One Cambridge Center* (Mr. Evans)*

We went through a RFP procurement process. Boston Properties responded with an increase in rent from \$43/sq ft to \$57/sq ft with a one year annual increase. This is a significant increase in rent. This is a

market process. We are not cutting any deal, nor would we take one. We are allowed to negotiate on the as-is facility and ask for allowance of in-kind work on their part such as new carpet and paint. There is a need to modernize and open up the office to provide a shared co-working office space among staff. We need to increase the size of our conference room to hold meetings of more than 6 people.

Ms. Born stated that it would be a way to provide small public meetings at the office which would give us better visibility and relations.

Mr. Evans stated that we have three options:

1. Accept this offer with some negotiations
2. Not sign the lease and go to a month-to-month agreement.
3. Recirculate Talk more to other brokers.

Our current lease expires at the end of October. Moving seems daunting, option 2 is risky and Mr. Evans wasn't sure there were any more brokers interested. Mr. Evans recommends option 3.

The amended motion "*Authorizing the Executive Director and the Chair to negotiate and execute a three year lease for office space in the current CRA office location at 255 Main Street / One Cambridge Center conditioned on a commitment to tenant improvements*" was unanimously approved.

6. Motion: Approving the MXD District Signage Review & Approval Process and Guidelines (Mr. Evans)*

Ms. Born stated that we have been working on this since this board started. She stressed that these are guidelines and not to be thought of as laws. It states what we like and don't like that can be handed to a developer. The MXD is exempt from City sign ordinances. Ms. Born likes that the CRA has flexibility in their signage decisions. Ms. Born thanked all parties involved in the process – Tom Evans, Barry Zevin, Larry Bluestone, Kathryn Madden, and, I guess, myself, Kathy Born. The need for a document like this as soon as we were seated as a new board. We have learned from every proposal and now we feel confident to stand by the document.

Mr. Evans stated that we have already tested it with the 73 Ames Street process and it was helpful to have a set of guidelines.

Ms. Born stated that it helps the developer and also safeguards from feelings that this is all subjective.

Mr. Evans stated that the following typographical corrections should be made:

- Page 1 - remove 2nd period and a few other punctuation edits that aren't necessary to go through here.
- Page 5, section 4.8B- correct spelling of the word "undue"
- Page 7, replace word "staff" with "design committee" to read "...initial review of the design committee"
- Page 6, section reference to 7.2 should be 6.2 (since we eliminated section 7)
- 5.2 references 6.1 should be 5.1
- Page 6, on section 5.1, 2nd paragraph, Ms. Drury would like it to say ".....staff will respond to proponent within 30 days and may ask for additional information...."
- Page 2.1, ownership and placement, within the MXD district....add CRA jurisdiction includes the following. Also make sure there's a full sentence.

Ms. Drury stated that she is happy with the document. Mr. Bator agreed and called it a great public policy document.

Mr. Zevin asked to include more specifics but since we are only talking about two blocks worth of signs, I think we spent enough time on this. He requested that the reasoning for signage approval or disapproval be documented and recorded and pictures be kept on file.

Ms. Born requested one more review of the document before it goes onto the public website.

Since they are all minor issues, Mr. Evans is given the authority to make the edits after which the board will review the document and then it can be placed on the website for public access.

Motion “*approving the MXD District Signage Review & Approval Process and Guidelines with minor amendments, posting it onto the CRA website and having it be a companion document of the Urban Renewal Plan.*”

Motion passes unanimously.

7. Motion: Approving the Signage Proposal for Ames Street Deli and Study Restaurants at 73 Ames Street (Mr. Smith of Next Phase Studios)*

73 Ames Street is the condo owned by the Brode, not Boston Properties.

Greg Smith from Next Phase Studios Architects, the designer of two restaurants on the first floor of the new Brode building, introduced himself and the owners of the restaurant at 73 Ames Street. This is a wide space where one side of the space is a restaurant called Ames Street Deli which is a deli café/sandwich bar during the day and a cocktail craft bar by night and the other side is a restaurant called Study serving breakfast, lunch, and dinner. They are essentially one business with two dimensions which share kitchen staff. The seating capacity of each restaurant is 40 for each restaurant. Mr. Smith explained the layout of the space, its doorways, seating, bathrooms, and kitchen locations.

Signs for both restaurants were explained and discussed in great detail, including dimensions, weight, color, materials, how they are hung from the building, lighting used, visibility from the street, etc.

After much discussion, Ms. Born restated that the CRA should not be playing building inspector.

The motion *Approving the Signage Proposal for Ames Street Deli and Study Restaurants at 73 Ames Street* was unanimously passed.

8. Motion: Approving the Signage Proposal for Akamai at 150 Broadway / 8 Cambridge Center (Boston Properties)*

Ms. Born recused herself from this decision since her husband is doing some consulting work and asked that Ms. Drury chair the discussion.

Mr. Evans will present this since there were no Boston Property representatives in attendance.

Replaces the 8 Cambridge Center sign with the same materials as its current exterior sign but smaller. This has been in the lease once the 8CC address was removed from that location. This sign is above the entrance into the internet observatory lab. Mr. Zevin stated that someone should tell Akamai that their observatory is not observable when the curtains are often closed.

The proposal is contradictory because it mentions both “illuminated” and “non-illuminated.”

Mr. Evans did not have more information about the proposal and offered the option of requesting more information.

Mr. Hawkinson suggested that the board should request that staff review for this type of inconsistency to avoid this in the future.

The motion *Approving the Signage Proposal for Akamai at 150 Broadway / 8 Cambridge Center* was unanimously passed exception for Ms. Born’s abstention.

9. Motion: Approving the Signage Proposal for 80 Broadway / 4 Cambridge Center (Boston

Properties)*

Mr. Evans will present this since there were no Boston Property representatives in attendance.

This space serves as the extended lobby of 4 Cambridge Center which is becoming 80 Broadway. Boston Properties is converting the existing lobby to a new lobby space and an elevator and stairs into the basement where they are creating a 6000-8000 square feet of innovative office space.

The issue for CRA is the external signage which is minimal and the activation of the sidewalk with planters and benches. The other modification would be a new ramp. This is all within the property line.

Mr. Zevin thinks the new ramp looks minimal and temporary and feels it would look better with more masonry that what's proposed. He also questioned whether the font is consistent with the existing font?

Mr. Evans stated that Boston Properties want to make this space more hip so the font is more edgy so not consistent.

Motion Approving the Signage Proposal for 80 Broadway / 4 Cambridge Center was unanimously passed,

10. Motion: Approving the Signage Proposal for Clover Fast Food at 355 Main St / 5 Cambridge Center (Boston Properties)*

CRA provided informal feedback at previous meetings with Clover. It's been hard for Mr. Evans to find the marketing decision maker of Clover to get answers to these CRA's issues. Boston Properties was looking for more feedback.

Ms. Zevin said that it violates the guidelines because of uplighting and its light pollution issues. In addition, it's larger than it should be for an urban street.

Mr. Evans will return the feedback of the uplighting "violation" and size issue back to clover and also get a point person.

Ms. Born doesn't want the CRA to mico-manage signs. Our interest stemmed from how this sign was going to stay on the building.

Ms. Born suggests that CRA's approval letter that the vendor takes to ISD specifically state that the CRA relies on the Inspectional Services to ensure that the sign is structurally stable.

Ms. Born stated that she doesn't share the same concern regarding the size of the Clover sign.

Mr. Evans stated that this company is doing very well and that they have plenty of informal signage painted on the window.

The motion was tabled.

11. Report: Update on the Ames Street Residential Project and Article 19 Filing (Mr. Evans)*

It was agreed that this topic was covered previously in the meeting.

Public Portion of the meeting adjourned at 8:42pm.

There was a motion for the Board to convene an executive session for the purpose of discussing a proposed real estate transaction with the City of Cambridge; stating exemption 6 (Move to go into Executive Session to consider the purchase, exchange, lease or value of real property, and that the chair declare that an open meeting may have a detrimental effect on the negotiating position of the body)

We will not reconvene in open session after this.

Mr. Evans, CRA Executive Director called role to meet in Executive Session:

Mr. Zevin: Yes
Ms. Born: Yes
Ms. Drury: Yes
Mr. Bator: Yes
Mr. Crawford: Yes

ADDENDUM: Email from Ms. Heather Hoffman

From: Heather Hoffman <heather.m.hoffman.1957@gmail.com>

Subject: September meeting minutes

Date: October 14, 2014 at 6:18:26 PM EDT

To: Tom Evans <tevans@cambridgeredevelopment.org>

Here are my suggestions for changes in the September meeting minutes. They're all from my testimony. Given the limitations of email text, I've put brackets around what I'd take out and put replacement text in **bold**. Apparently I was less coherent than I was trying to be, but this is what I meant.

1) Signs.

There seems to be a confluence of signage discussions in the city. There's the CRA proposal and there was a lengthy discussion at the Cambridge Planning Board meeting where its chair, Mr. Russell, gave a history of the Cambridge sign ordinance. He stated, and Ms. Hoffman agrees, that signs exist so that people down on the street level [traffic] can locate the business. She is vehemently opposed to branding signs. She feels they are truly billboards and do not add anything to the skyline. Not too long ago, 18,000 people signed a petition to get rid of the sign ordinance that the city council had adopted to allow branding signs so it's clear that voters, including me, do not like these signs. Although the previous [board] **council** regime claimed that these voters weren't knowledgeable, she feels that the current **CRA** board is smarter and classier **than that** and will prevent such branding from being regularized.

2) Project 19 filing and the percentage of affordable housing This topic was also on the citywide agenda. This is the 3rd time it's come up. The first instance was the Andrews petition, which proposed doing a real percentage [but] **rather than the pretend 15% that is** not adhered to, the second instance was during the last term [of Councilor Symmons] where [he] **Councillor Simmons** asked for the affordable housing percentage to be looked at, which also went ["no"]where[""], and now, just this week, once again, it's being brought before the City Council[or] and City Manager. Regardless of the fact that [other projects of this type have been allowed to "monkey around" with] **Brian Murphy of CDD has jiggered the numbers on this project in order to produce the same effect**, the zoning ordinance [clearly states that there is] **contains** no legal [or moral] justification for this building to have less than 15% of its **units** affordable housing, especially since they have unlimited FAR and unlimited units. **There is also no moral justification for less than 15% affordable units**. This project and other luxury condos are creating havoc for those who are not rich and Ms. Hoffman requests support from the CRA to ensure that we get every affordable unit that the law provides.

I hope that you and the Board will agree that these changes accurately represent what I said so that the record will reflect what I meant.

See you at the design review session, I hope.

Heather