

# Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

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



Regular Meeting  
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, October 15, 2014, 5:30pm  
Cambridge Police Station  
125 Sixth Street  
Community Room

---

## FINAL MEETING MINUTES

---

Present: CRA Board and Staff, members of the public

Public sign-in sheet attached.

### Call

The Chair introduced Board members and Staff at 5:50 p.m.

### Public Comment

Ms. Kathy Born stated that she will run item #5 on the agenda as an informal discussion and welcomed public comment on possible revisions to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan at that time.

#### Steven Kaiser

With regards to the October 8 letter to the GSA found in the packet, Mr. Kaiser suggested having an agenda item next month to help define a role for the CRA, specifically on transportation.

With regards to the KSURP 1977 Plan's objectives, specifically on page 3 and 4, Mr. Kaiser called attention to item b3 (the improvement of public transportation, public utilities, and other public improvements), item j (to help alleviate problems of vehicular movement through East Cambridge) and item n (to capitalize on the location of rapid transit facilities). Since these are covered in this document, he emphasized the ability of the CRA to recommend improvements for transit. He urged the Board to submit a letter before the next CRA Board meeting outlining operational problems of the Red Line to start a conversation about improvements needed.

Mr. Kaiser expressed uncertainty about the role Boston Properties has played in improving transit or traffic issues in Kendall Square. In addition, with the advertised open position for a Director of Traffic and Parks, and the obsolete legislation, he will be circulating a rough draft of a bill to update the Traffic and Park Department into a Transportation Department which will include transit issues.

He said that citizen uproar has reached the City Manager about the Planning Board and their approval of 51 special permits and disapproval of none.

Heather Hoffman – Ms. Hoffman waived her time to speak.

John Hawkinson mentioned that the City has not found anyone for the Traffic and Park Director position which could lead to organization changes. He mentioned that the CRA could suggest opinions of structure or qualifications in writing if so desired.

Public comment closed.

## Minutes

### **1. Motion: To approve the minutes of the Regular Board Meeting on September 17, 2014**

Mr. Tom Evans referenced an additional handout of an email from Heather Hoffman with requested revisions to her testimony.

Ms. Margaret Drury asked that the spelling of Ms. Simmon's name be corrected and the pronoun be changed to "she."

Mr. Christopher Bator suggested we add the email as an addendum.

*Motion to accept the minutes of the Regular Board Meeting on September 17, 2014 with the edits regarding Ms. Simmons and add the email from Ms. Hoffman as an addendum.*

The motion was unanimously approved.

## Communications

### **2. Letter of Support to General Services Administration regarding Volpe Redevelopment \***

Mr. Evans and Ms. Kathleen Born attended the Industry Day open house as did some from Boston Properties. Following that, Mr. Evans, Ms. Drury, and the CRA attorney crafted the letter and sent it to the General Services Administration (GSA) by the GSA deadline. Mr. Evans received email notification from the GSA that the CRA letter was received.

If there were elements of RFI responses that were confidential, an indication as such should have been made and the GSA would determine what could be withheld. The CRA letter of support and assistance is public and available on the CRA website.

Mr. Conrad Crawford apologized for not being available to attend the Industry Day meeting. He asked if the process for development of the site includes landscaping or if this will be broken out from the building design. Mr. Evans said that due to the high proportion of open space involved, the eventual proposal should have a significant landscape element. Questions of whether it should be one big park versus a series of open spaces is a paramount part of this site design process.

Mr. Crawford mentioned that in recent conversations with colleagues involved in landscape space, GSA or Volpe might ask for a common benchmark standard and vocabulary. Mr. Evans said that they are focusing on the standard for a federal building setback compared to a private building.

Mr. Evans mentioned the flyer for the Connect Kendall Square process for an open house with the designers. Although open space proposals will be offered as part of the competition, he was unsure how much the competition will venture into the site.

Mr. Ben Lavery was recognized to speak. In regards to open space, the RFI is the first step to look for comments from the design community, the development community, and the CRA so they can structure the RFP. Everything else is a moving part. Once the RFP is done, the process will have more shape. Mr. Barry Zevin suggested that the letter was exceptionally open to the fact that it was a set of moving parts and welcomed feedback, which is unusual and good. Mr. Lavery said that the DOT who owns the parcel is working with the GSA because the GSA is more accustomed to these types of transactions but this is a unique structure and an exciting opportunity for everybody.

Ms. Born hopes that the CRA's letter will be taken as a marker to include CRA.

In response to the request for an agenda item on this topic, Mr. Evans will talk to GSA and Volpe about bringing information to the Board.

The discussion was closed.

### **3. Memorandum regarding Summary of Results, Soil and Groundwater Investigations along Galileo Galilei Way \***

Mr. Evans explained the reason for the memo. On the CRA-owned sliver of property between the Galileo right-of-way and the railroad right-of-way, a spike of the compound TCE was found. This required further digging and full screen testing. As it turns out, there is no cause for alarm but it does require a clear disposal plan. The final page of the memorandum lays out the scope that FST requires to close the soil's issue. With no other options, Mr. Evans instructed FST to take on the first two tasks, namely to put together a report to send to the DEP and to do a remediation design as part of the design of the path. However, we have postponed the implementation and final documentation piece for a potential follow-up contract with FST to have them do final construction oversight of the soil issues alongside our selected contractor for the project. The first two lines are folded into their existing scope and some of their construction oversight tasks are pulled out.

Mr. Zevin asked if this applies regardless of whether we are removing anything from the site. Mr. Evans said that FST is working on a final grading plan which will determine how much soil needs to be removed from the site. He thinks that their abatement plan will state that whatever is dug out requires it to be sent to a regular landfill, that nowadays, are regulated with liners, etc.

Ms. Born asked if our insurance can cover some of the cost. Mr. Evans will look into this but feels that coverage requires an incident which unfortunately we cannot target. Mr. Crawford thinks the insurance is calculated based on percentage of overall project cost so CRA would still be connected to that material no matter where it is taken so an overall register needs to be calculated and recorded. Mr. Evans suggested we start carrying environmental insurance for these digging projects and unforeseen issues in the future.

Mr. Evans reminded the Board that this is actually good news considering what we thought we might have had to deal with.

Mr. Bator asked about the cost of the project. Mr. Evans said that we won't know how much money it will cost until we finalize the grading options around the gazebo. As for the width of the path, we have decided to have a 12-foot width as opposed to the ideal goal of 14 feet. Looking at MIT's recently released study, 12 feet is the widest width found in this corridor which also means we wouldn't need to remove as much dirt.

Ms. Born asked for confirmation that untouched soil can remain on site. Mr. Evans confirmed. Ms. Born stated that the costs on page 3 were only for FST's work and that there are additional costs for an excavator and hauler. Mr. Evans explained that FST will not only design the path and landscaping, they will also now include the remediation plan. The total work to be done will be bid on by construction contractors and it will be reimbursable per the agreement with MIT. DEP allows the land to remain as is for one year so we hope to be in construction after the thaw next spring.

*The report will be place on file.*

#### Reports, Motions and Discussion Items:

### **4. Update on the Ames Street Residential Project (Mr. Evans)**

Mr. Evans stated that just before this Board meeting, Boston Properties submitted some design revisions for changes to the ground floor treatments of the Pioneer Way area, the Ames streetscape, the retail façade, and bike parking. Most of the changes were in response to CDD, Parking, Traffic and DPW City staff review.

We are expecting a schematic design packet for CRA approval per our design review protocol which is a parallel tract with the City's review of the Article 19 permit.

The CRA should be present at the Planning Board meeting when they review the Article 19 filing to make a statement in support of the project. They may or may not be approving it but they will be hearing it. Minor modification surround façade on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> floors but the Board was receptive to what was presented.

Mr. Lavery added that Boston Properties would appreciate a letter of support from the CRA that could be provided in advanced of the hearing.

Ms. Born stated that the Design Review meeting was a public meeting and had some public participants.

Ms. Drury noticed that the November 18 (or 19) meeting was indicated as the “first” meeting. Since Boston Properties has responded to all of the issues that CDD mentioned, she questioned the requirement of a second meeting. Mr. Evans explained that most projects that have been recently reviewed by the Planning Board have gone through multiple meetings but none of them have had a standing item at the CRA Board. We could make the case that there has been a lot of review and public review and the open transparent process which could be supportive of one meeting.

Ms. Drury urged the Public to be vocal with the Planning Board if they want this building project to get done which will provide more housing.

Mr. Evans asked if the Board would like to entertain a motion to write a letter of support or just show up and speak. Ms. Born agreed that it would be advisable to have a letter explaining the design review process of the CRA so that the level of scrutiny given to this project including how many meetings over a period of eight or so months, was understood. Mr. Zevin thinks the letter should be explicit in detailing the reasoning behind the design decisions made to emphasize that this has been a well-considered project. Mr. Bator agreed that having a rationale for the decisions in the letter is important and added that that it would also be useful to layout the process so it is clear that this has been carefully considered over some time.

Ms. Born wants the Planning Board to know that this project is different from other projects that come “first pass” to be reviewed. At every phase of the development process, there have been meetings with participation from the CRA Board and the designer review group who include CRA consultants and senior staff of the Community Development Department. Mr. Bator added knowing the amount of time and attention that has been spent on this project to-date would be useful information for the Planning Board to know.

Mr. Conrad suggested that the letter should also reference the K2 process because it would provide a foundation for many of the concerns that were clarified in terms of the quality of the design and the need to prioritize the development that came through the K2 discussion.

Ms. Born noted that she and Mr. Evans would be happy to attend the meeting and asked for the letter to be written before the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Bator doesn't want this process to be held up unnecessarily. A casual rejection would be inappropriate due to the extreme need for housing and extensive amount of effort that has been done on this project.

Ms. Born mentioned that a discussion took place in the Design Review meeting before tonight's Board meeting. She stressed that Article 19 is an urban design review not an architectural review. It is intended to measure the large general impacts on the City and its immediate environs – transportation, storm water, wind, shadow, streetscape, entrances and exits. It is not intended as an opportunity for the Planning Board to review fenestration. The CRA has spent a fair amount of time beyond urban design delving into some of the architectural elements because that is what the CRA has done in the MXD District since we are charged to do so. We hope that the Planning Board would see that these issues have been covered. [The CRA was grateful to be included in the initial stages of the project to work through these issues.]

*Mr. Evans motioned to authorize the Executive Director to work with members of the Design Review Committee to submit a letter of support on behalf of the Ames Street Residential project.*

The motion was unanimously approved and the report will be placed on file.

## **5. Discussion: Revisions to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan – Chapter One Objectives\***

Ms. Born opened a discussion with the goal for the implementation of some of the recommendations of the recent planning processes which have involved the MXD district in Kendall Square. She referenced the handout of the 1977 Urban Renewal Plan. Ms. Born noted that some of the goals live on today and others not so much. Ms. Born stressed the desire to involve the public in vigorous discussions with the Board tonight and further to produce a new or vastly amended urban renewal plan. This would lead to a proposal for a rezoning for the area.

Mr. Evans clarified that the 1977 document is actually the first full and restated amendment of the urban renewal plan which focused on mixed use development. The original 1966 plan was NASA based. We recently did a full amendment and restatement of Chapter 4 (the land use section) to include biotechnology, and other items overtime but there hasn't been an amendment of the entire plan. Jeff Mullen, our counsel, advised taking a look at the full document to propose an Amendment 10. After looking at the document, there doesn't seem to be a need to throw out all the objectives but there are some changes to include updates on what we imagine the space to be.

Mr. Evans passed out page 51 from the K2 plan, which states the four overarching goals. He said that using the K2 plan and objectives found in other documents such as the East Cambridge Planning Team studies from CBT, we might just need to make a few fine adjustments. Some of the economic development goals to add would be knowledge economy and innovation culture of Kendall Square, energy sustainability, street scape, open space, rapid/public transit and transportation.

Mr. Evans suggested we flag items that should be included and staff would craft a new document for review.

Mr. Crawford suggested keeping in mind another item from the K2 plan, which is programming to allow people to share the spaces and define these public venues. Mr. Evans agreed that the inclusion of actual programming should be considered part of the activities of the CRA in specific targeted spaces. There's been focus to reactivate spaces through design but also through event making and insertions of activity. Mr. Crawford used the partnering example presently occurring with Parcel 6. Mr. Evans added that our current maintenance and operating agreement that we have with Boston Properties regarding the plaza dictates programming that we are to provide such as performances and activities there. Electricity infrastructure is already built into the plaza so some of the ideas that we are considering to activate urban spaces have been in the documents put together by the CRA three decades ago.

Ms. Drury likes the wording of goal #4: "makes it living, working, learning, playing." She stressed that Kendall Square is at a different level – it's not a beginning. It needs to be knit together with a supermarket, drug store, housing. She also noted the references to economic development already in the old plan document on the last page (number 1.) This was a statement about the need for economic diversity in Kendall Square that still exists today.

Ms. Born mentioned truck traffic and alleviating the problems of vehicular traffic. [Since the 1977 version had already spent time on how to ease truck traffic thru Kendall Square, the CRA is concerned with general transportation issues and discouraging truck traffic.]

Mr. Steve Kaiser said that the 1977 plan is much better than he thought, and better than the page handout from the K2 plan document.

A discussion around economic diversity and the availability of blue collar jobs in Kendall Square took place. Mr. Evans said that the KSA is doing some consensus work on employment in Kendall. It would be

interesting to know what the economic diversity is in Kendall Square. The blue collar wording might be an antiquated terminology but perhaps the various levels of entry into the workforce should be assessed, not necessarily within the scope of the MXD but possibly the scope of the CRA.

Although only one page of the K2 plan was passed out this evening, Mr. Evans said that there are sections in the document that have implementation procedures and statements and should be emphasized in our work.

Ms. Born wondered if there is an appetite in the City for broad public involvement to revisit a new KSURP plan with the CRA or whether the public is more focused on specific city development projects that have a more tangible presence.

Mr. Kaiser likes the 1977 plan and believes it only needs fine tuning. He mentioned item #5 that specifies the goal of a "decent, pleasant, humane environment." The only thing missing in the 1977 is a reference to pedestrians and bikes which can be easily added. Mr. Kaiser likes the process but feels that little work needs to be done.

Another gentleman at the meeting stated that no one knows what happened with the K2 implementation. He said that it was an incredibly public process but it faded away and the public doesn't know what happened. He suggested that there is still interest but answering what happened is important.

Julia Nugent, a Cambridge citizen and architect, suggested that if the intent is eventually zoning then it would be valuable to conceptually analyze the 1977 plan – idea by idea – what does it cover and what it doesn't cover - and make that process public. Ms. Madden restated the idea. Take the 1977 plan, look at what the K2 said about each of the issues and then have the CRA make recommendations. Mr. Evans added that evaluating the 1977 plan qualitatively and then matching it up with the K2 document would be a worthwhile assessment to do of the old plan. Ms. Bator stated concern with an excessive expenditure of Board and Staff time and resources on theoretical matters getting in the way of getting something done. He feels that it is appropriate to do this in some form but the principles we choose will express themselves in the things we do so let's not get distracted. Ms. Nugent responded that the end document would give the CRA an analytical metric when a developer proposes things. Ms. Madden suggested that it could show an alignment with the City's policies so you can move forward with rezoning.

Mr. Evans said that these objectives may be used as a way to measure whether zoning proposal language changes or other implementation activities we take on would further the goals. The plan is not evaluating the past but evaluating the future. We want to make sure that what gets done actually promotes the goals of a plan.

Mr. Barry Zevin reminded the group that this only deals with 3 or 4 blocks. Ms. Drury replied that although small, this area is a huge economic engine for City. Ms. Hoffman requested that this fit into the huge master plan is being done by the City. Ms. Drury noted that we need to recognize the real limitations in what we can accomplish in the small area. It would be wise to avoid including goals that might be pipe dreams. Mr. Bator reiterated that we can design a wonderful plan but having a plan doesn't mean we've done anything.

Ms. Born suggested that much of the 1977 plan could be used as criteria for other parts of the City.

Mr. Bator then referenced some unrealistic language regarding relocation of families. Mr. Evans explained that historically, that is what urban renewal was about. It will be interesting to decide whether to keep the outdated language in the plan for historical reasons as this is part of our story.

Ms. Born stated that the empathy and concern mentioned in the document is still valid. She clarified that the end result is a revised urban renewal plan accompanied by a proposed zoning amendment that changes in some way the existing zoning of the MXD District that will allow for some additional development and enrichment of the urban texture.

Mr. Zevin proposed that we strive to keep conflicting uses of an area “out of each other’s hair.” We need to address how mixed-use zoning affects the parties involved precisely and carefully as opposed to a broad-brushed zoning. He feels that this is not difficult in that the zoning needs to reflect the physical form of the area and its use implications.

Ms. Born mentioned the importance of including the structure for the permitting process to make it clear that there are different needs in different places. Mr. Evans explained that there could be different criteria that are evaluated for different areas. It is important to include the potential conflicts and understand the measurable issues. Mr. Lavery, of Boston Properties, said that there is really a finite number of solutions within the district for this additional density. Therefore he feels that working through the assessments can occur within a reasonable timeframe.

Mr. Evans added that zoning is only one tool but there are other redevelopment activities that the CRA might want to own and execute as part of the next chapter of the development plan.

Ms. Drury emphasized Mr. Evan’s plan to get actual data for the master plan as the data being collected on Kendall Square can also help the City.

Mr. Kaiser pointed out the valuable items listed in goal #2 of the K2 plan which are not listed in the 1977 plan which should be incorporated. Also, housing, bikes, schools and churches are not mentioned in either one. There’s also the new issue of vulnerability.

Ms. Born feels that a rough draft (including outlines/framework for zoning) could be presented for comment by the next meeting.

Mr. Bator reverted back to the conversation regarding the Ames Street letter that will be sent. The letter should include a sense of urgency due to the fact that the economic situation is favorable to build the housing that is so needed, that we have a willing developer who is ready to build in ways that the CRA thinks is good.

Mr. Kaiser emphasized the sharp, definite format of the 1977 plan and stressed that the verbs are precise and powerful where as the K2 plan is vague.

Mr. Evans said that he would connect with the author of the 1977 plan and relay the highlights of the discussion.

The discussion was closed and will be reopened next month.

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

Mr. Evans introduced new CRA hire, Jason Zogg, who will be working on much of what has been discussed, welcoming his ability to build the CRA’s capacity in planning activities.

We continue to work on bringing in interns from our local universities. Mr. Crawford asked if intern opportunities from vocational schools (like Bunker Hill) as well as Ivy League universities could be provided. Mr. Evans said he would look into Northeastern’s coop program and that there’s also been a reconnection with the workforce development, which might lead to hosting someone from that program. A note was made to increase the CRA outreach.

Mr. Evans is working with Boston Properties in regards to the office which will continue to be the CRA location, hopefully with TI improvements as part of our lease. One big goal is to convert the large office space into a conference room to host larger meetings. Staff might need to move out while construction is going on. We have rights to use the CIC space which could be potential swing space during construction.

The audit is not ready as the auditors were really busy but a full presentation will be given to the Board in November. They will also be coming into our office to help us with continued bookkeeping adjustments and help us understand some of the assumptions that were made in the previous administration.

Ms. Drury mentioned that in the first line of Mr. Evans' report, the word "audit" was missing after the number "2013."

A meeting with the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurer will be scheduled to look at 2015 budget which will be coming up as an agenda item in the next couple months. Other things coming up will be a schematic design with a full set of construction drawings to move forward on the Grand Junction project, possibly the demonstration project on the Foundry, and having Relish present on their proposal for Parcel 6.

The converting of Cambridge Center to Kendall Center continues. Positive feedback has been received with regards to the advertising of the roof top garden. There are still pieces coming together, specifically the mural installation on the glass of the atrium. The Ames Street Deli should be opening sometime in October. They have to relocate one of their signs due to The Broad's concern about their stonework. We don't know what's going on at Coop. A letter was received about their plans being delayed until December or January. They are not in default in their rent. Boston Properties and the City Manager have been in conversation with the hopes of improving the situation.

There's been a lot of construction at Main Street's Point Park and a number of delays due to the underlying infrastructure of the sidewalk but the project is moving along. They've asked for at least a one month extension of their staging at Third and Binney. The biggest challenge is getting to the T from One Broadway. The KSA have been voicing their concerns and the retailers along Broadway are upset. CRA and Boston Properties were lined up to repave the area around the fountain but this needs to wait until next year.

We are waiting for the initial proposals and ideas that come out of this week's Connect Kendall Square Open House on October 30 at the Broad Center as advertised in the flyers on the table. They have selected four designers and Point Park is one of four areas involved although to what extent is unknown. The East Cambridge Kendall Square Open Space Committee was designed to inform this process but it hasn't been meeting regularly and it is unclear what role it now has.

Mr. Crawford stressed that he would like more than one participant from the CRA to be part of the Open Space Committee. Mr. Evans explained a snafu with the KSA's e-communication, which has been resolved so that future information about the process can be disseminated to the Board.

Adding to the chaos in the construction zone of Point Park is a public Wi-Fi project which is running a broadband wire through the Third Street intersection. Boston Properties is also involved in an MIT project to eventually have Wi-Fi along Main Street from Newtown Court to the Canoe Launch.

A small discussion began about free Wi-Fi, a way-finding component of its availability, and possibly using free Wi-Fi as a way to advertise Kendall Square.

The next community meeting on the Foundry is October 29<sup>th</sup> at the Senior Center where we will continue to dive into the technical aspects of the demonstration project plan. We are focusing on determining the governance structure and the transaction with the City. There is a very good working relationship with City. Everyone wants this project to work.

Relish will be bringing in a plan regarding Parcel 6 to the Board in November.



Regarding Volpe, Mr. Evans will relay any news regarding the next publically available information from the GSA's process.

The report will be filed with the word "audit" being inserted as discussed.

#### **7. Report: Third Quarter Report on Budget and Expenditures for 2014 (Mr. Evans)\***

We committed to the alternative format for the quarterly actual vs budgeted comparison.

One budgetary change to note is that Boston Properties has not begun the Ames Street Residential project so they are not pulling permits this winter and the approximate \$400,000 proceeds from sale and redevelopment rights will be forecasted in the next year. Likewise, the reimbursement money from MIT for the Grand Junction will be a 2015 budget item.

Mr. Evans expects to come below the project expenses. We used good constraint with legal services which had been a third or more of the CRA budget in past years. Our legal fees are less than expected. Some of our planning fees are down since we haven't had as much design review as we had thought. Not all the engineering work done by FST has been billed so there will be more engineering expenses.

Looking at the redevelopment investments from the budget summary handout, the capital cost line item was due to anticipated work on Parcel 6 but Newport Construction will be doing this work in exchange for the right to stage their construction machinery on the parcel. And the Community Loan Fund program might want to be piloted with a smaller amount.

Summarizing, there is less money flowing in both directions - less money coming in than budgeted and not as much going out as budgeted. Much of this will be carried forth into 2015. The major carrying costs are payroll, rent and legal fees on a monthly basis.

In discussions of the 2015 budget with the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurer, Mr. Evans would like to look at refining how the budget is organized and presented to the Board. We've made significant upgrades from what it was but we have more information from working with Quickbooks.

Mr. Bator would like to see the CRA investment strategy on the agenda. Ms. Born clarified that much of the money held by the CRA could be quickly used on the projects being proposed. Mr. Evans stated that investing in real estate is the best fiscal option for the CRA and actually part of our mission. Investing in the stock market is not an option.

The motion to place the report on file was moved and unanimously approved.

#### **8. Motion: *To approve the proposed Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Procurement Policy* (Mr. Evans)\***

There has never been an adopted procurement policy for the CRA. One of the major audit findings from 2010, 2011 and 2012 was that procurements have not been following any particular policy possibly including state law. Mr. Evans explained that a misinterpretation of the increased procurement flexibility redevelopment authorities do have could be the reason the rules might have been overextended in the past.

The main goal of the policy states that the CRA will follow state procurement laws that apply to both the purchase and sale of materials and services. The 30B procurement piece was flushed out in an earlier

version. This version dives into the bid rules for construction based on the type of construction being done. Besides restating state law, it also states the \$10,000 threshold for Board actions versus Executive Director action in procurement since this amount requires State review.

The policy is organized in four sections. The first is an introduction that lists the broad based policy objectives that will be followed regardless of the project – fairness, objectivity, efficiency, accountability, ethics, and sustainability. However, this document does include an exemption from the precision of the 30B process if a particular project is involved with real estate transactions, as is being done with the Foundry project.

The document includes the broad based exemption from 30B for engineering and designing services. It does include a set of rules for selecting designer architects on projects with estimated architectural fees over \$100,000 and/or when using any state money for housing.

The procurement thresholds included in the document were attained from the state's website. The state increased the threshold allowing a 3-bid quote process from \$25,000 to \$35,000. Above \$35,000 requires a bid or RFP process. Although we didn't have an official approved policy, we have been following this draft for procuring the services of Relish, designers, landscape and real estate consultants.

There is a sole service provision that, only with Board approval, allows the procurement of a vendor's services under \$25,000 provided it has specific knowledge set or unique qualifications. There are emergency procurement procedures in case of life safety issues or natural disasters, which allows an immediate response.

Mr. Evans stated that the procurement threshold for construction contracts did not get changed and it remains that anything over \$25,000 is a sealed-bid process but there is no procurement law for small scale construction under \$10,000. There is an option to use a 3-bid request process or a sealed bid process for amounts in between.

The rules follow the State's law and the Policy adds that the CRA would post openings on the appropriate City Board's website and the CRA website.

The last section contains general provisions which state the delegation of authority for items under \$10,000, the use of the credit card for items under \$1000, ethics, conflict of interest, etc., much of which is restating existing laws. There is also slightly modified boilerplate language provided by our financial consultants relative to disputes and protests. It also includes the issue of record maintenance.

Mr. Evans welcomed comments and clarified that it this is the guideline being followed in lieu of no existing policy

Ms. Drury expressed the helpfulness of the well-constructed cohesive document and moved to approve the document.

Before being seconded, Mr. Bator asked if the document has been thoroughly reviewed by Counsel. Mr. Evans replied that it has been reviewed by the auditor Chad Clark resulting in modifications but that he has not yet heard from Counsel. Mr. Bator requested a quick look from Jeff Mullen for significant omissions as opposed to a costly detailed review. Mr. Zevin offered several proof editing suggestions. Ms. Born would like to take one more month to review the document. Mr. Evans clarified that there have been discussions with Counsel regarding certain sections of the document and that the guidelines in this draft policy will be used while awaiting final approval.

There is a section in the document, which states the policy for giving away unused or unwanted items which referred to the approved Board resolution this Fall allowing the removal of excessive and unwanted office furniture.

*The motion to table the decision on approving the document until Counsel scans it for substantial omissions was unanimously approved.*

#### **9. Update: Community Fund Proposal (Mr. Evans) \***

**Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director to implement a Pilot Round of Community Fund Grants for up to \$40,000**

Mr. Evans delegated the explanation to Ms. Madden who reference the memo and a draft of a form.

Ms. Madden explained that, based on intern Chris Colley's work, our intent is to move forward with a pilot program of \$40,000, a non-risky amount.

She said that the term "Community Fund" is confusing and we might want to think of another name which emphasizes urban innovation.

The document lists the other funds available in Cambridge which are mostly for programs where as this money is for physical improvements. The money is for a public purpose but the applicant can be a small business or a neighborhood group sponsored by a 501c3 organization.

We are expecting revisions to the document but are hoping to announce this by the end of the year, have an informational meeting, deadlines by mid-winter and awards made by early spring so things could happen in the summer.

The actual application form has more information about the type of grant. The maximum capital grant would be up to \$10,000. There would be a 1:1 organizational match. There's a capacity grant, different than funds for programming, which could provide seed money to advance a project.

Ms.Madden would prefer that the procedure be made simpler than 11 points. A simple easy-to-fill-out form was the goal. The questions on the form ask about the project description, to highlight the public benefit, the team capacity, budget, other sources of funding, organizational matches, timelines, partnerships, and potential obstacles.

As for the governance structure, the recommendations will be made by the day-to-day level of City staffers rather than department heads and that these recommendations would then come to the CRA Board for approval. This would also help foster relationships. Because of the small size of the City, the applicants and the credibility of their work would not be unfamiliar to those making the recommendations.

Mr. Conrad agreed that involvement at all levels of staff is valuable.

Mr. Conrad suggested that recipients be required to incorporate the acknowledgement of the funding source and that the CRA manages the process of publicizing the award announcements.

Mr, Bator asked if there was a process of publicizing the Fund project. Ms. Madden suggested putting it on our website and agreed that further discussion is warranted regarding a rollout strategy.

Mr. Evans suggested that the other funds listed in the memo that are doing similar work might initiate communication with CRA if they are unable to wholly fund a project or if the project is outside their scope as the CRA funds aren't as constrained by CDBG funds or other restrictions. In addition, since the CRA is initiating this strategic initiative, although small-scaled, it can be looked at as a rebranding of the organization and an aggressive media strategy should be launched including all means of social media and communications.

Mr. Bator asked whether the success of this small-scale pilot program would result in the larger-scaled project as we had envisioned. Ms. Born clarified that we need development fees to go with the larger scaled project. Mr. Evans stated that the loan piece still needs to be decided. Mr. Bator restated that it makes sense to use the CRA cash on hand in this particular way. Ms. Madden stated that reinvesting funds back into the community is part of the CRA mission.

Ms. Hoffman suggested that most neighborhoods have organizations with e-mailing lists for meeting announcements and flyers distributions. Mr. Drury suggested creating brochures.

Mr. Drury asked for a clarification on the acceptable electronic mechanism for submitting a request. A discussion began regarding this as well as accepting low-tech hardcopy submissions.

Mr. Evans stated that we are looking for authorization to implement with the money committed in our budget for this project. We would like to "put it out there" and come back in 4 or 5 months with a set of proposals to fund.

Ms. Born asked about creating the committee. Mr. Evans stated that upon approval of the motion, we would create a working group with representation from various City departments, which would have a part in facilitating the project (such as ISD or DPW.) Discussions have occurred with CCD staff but more outreach needs to occur with the other departments.

Mr. Evans explained that the CRA Board has final approval of awarding the grants based on a ranking recommendation from the working committee. Mr. Evans stated that there is no need for Board approval of the selected members of the committee since it is staff related but that the status of selection would be included in any agenda update on the project and/or in the Executive Director's report.

This project is not a dispersal of \$40,000 in perpetuity. This is a pilot, 1-year project at \$40,000.

Ms. Born doesn't want the Board to micromanage the process but does want touch points with the Board.

Mr. Bator suggested a report of progress be made at the next Board meeting.

Ms. Born suggested turning the memo into a policy that would clearly state that it is for a one year timeframe and cost of \$40,000 and finalize the form that goes out.

Mr. Evans added that we would need to get partnerships.

Ms. Born suggested taking comments and reporting next month.

Mr. Bator asked if that would slow down the project. Mr. Evans said that we are heading in the right direction but we would not be able to market it next month and would not want to wait much longer. Ms.

Madden said that this is acceptable since the goal to get it out by the end of the year could still be attained.

Motion is tabled until next month.

Ms. Born would like to relay to the Planning Board in mid-November that the Ames Street project will yield revenue to the CRA that can be used for a range of purposes, which are similar to the Foundry and referenced the Community Fund that will be established. Ms. Drury stated that the Fund is being renamed to an unknown at this point. A discussion of naming options occurred. Mr. Conrad offered to help with naming the Fund and also provide a highly regarded application used at the State level for awarding grants. Mr. Drury offered to help shorten the list of 11.

A motion to adjourn was moved and unanimously approved at 8:31 p.m.