

**Regular Meeting**  
**Cambridge Redevelopment Authority**

Wednesday, April 16, 2014; 5:30 pm  
Cambridge Police Station  
125 Sixth Street  
Community Room

**Draft Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Kathleen Born (Chair), Margaret Drury (Vice-Chair), Barry Zevin, Conrad Crawford, Chris Bator, Executive Director Tom Evans, Iram Farooq (CDD), Brian Murphy (CDD), John Hawkinson, Heather Hoffman, Steve Kaiser, Nadeem Mazen, Ben Lavery,

**Call** (5:39 pm)

**Public Comment**

**Heather Hoffman:**

Ms. Hoffman offered a comment of the minutes of March's meeting. She clarified that she was not voicing her own skepticism about CoUrbanize, but was relaying the skepticism that she had heard from other members of the community about the platform's efficacy. She requested that the minutes be adjusted to reflect this distinction.

Ms. Hoffman lamented that her husband could not attend the meeting, as he is the chair of the Foundry Committee, but relayed that he was already working on ways that the community can be involved in the CRA and City's work on the Foundry.

Ms. Hoffman was disturbed by the suggestion that there is too much open space in Kendall Square and that existing open spaces need to be built on by Boston Properties (BP). She hasn't seen evidence that BP improves streetscapes or architecture in Kendall Square, nor that they make Kendall Square a better place. She expressed her own personal skepticism that a rooftop garden, which could have a very short life span, would be an adequate replacement for at-grade open space. If it is determined that the rooftop garden is an adequate replacement, she hopes it will be fully accessible to the public like a street level would be. She noted that when BP is pushed, they do make good parks.

On the Grand Junction Path, Ms. Hoffman offered a short report on a recently attended meeting regarding the Allston rail yards and MassPike tolls. The meeting was to get initially community input, and a smaller group is being put together for lengthier discussions. This group will draw from a variety of stakeholders. She was pleasantly surprised that Bill Deignan from CDD was in attendance. She suggested that members of Cambridgeport and Riverside neighborhoods also be invited, as they will be most affected by the proposals.

**Steve Kaiser**

Mr. Kaiser began by expressing how the jocular tenor at the end of March's meetings reflected the progress the CRA had made in recent months in terms of public trust and procedural quality. He noted, however, that over the last month he has seen increased community concern about

planning issues, specifically related to the Courthouse, which might call for additional seriousness.

He mentioned that the Planning Board has an e-mail list to inform the public of future meetings and suggested the CRA does the same. Mr. Evans noted that the CRA already has a similar list.

Mr. Kaiser noted that there is a grassroots call for a citywide master plan, and thinks there might be a role for the CRA in this process. He sees this as an issue that the City Council will be addressing. There is no role proposed at the moment for the CRA—he thinks the Board should have a discussion about the potential role the CRA can play.

Regarding the March 26 meeting, Mr. Kaiser thought there was an excellent turnout. He thought that the open nature of the event made it particularly useful. He had a few takeaways regarding how it was conducted. First, PowerPoint never does its job. He recommended banning its usage in future presentations, as it is a poor tool for communication and pedagogy. He also felt there was an unfortunate chaos in the break out groups.

As an addendum to his letter on Alewife, Mr. Kaiser called for a moratorium on development there until the necessary planning is done. It's too big and complicated for the CRA, but the CRA has money in the bank to initiate a planning effort. One precedent example occurred during the K2 process: an independent architect came in and proposed different ideas that spun off a new study.

In reference to items 11 and 12 on the agenda, Mr. Kaiser is unhappy with the K2 study because it didn't complete traffic or transportation studies. Zoning shouldn't even be on the table yet—the city does zoning before planning which it's a tradition that needs to be changed.

Mr. Kaiser read a quote from a recent Globe article about the importance linking transit and growth. Given that the CRA shares an office with KSA, perhaps there is an opportunity for collaboration to study the Red Line. He suggested no additional development until it is fixed.

As a last note on Master Plans, the Authority can contribute to a potential history of master planning. He offered the Inner Belt and urban renewal as examples of top-down master planning. He cited local examples (Arlington, Belmont, Somerville) of communities making master plans.

Ms. Born mentioned that the CRA is not the City's planning department. Mr. Kaiser said, "that's what you need to become. Because the planning department doesn't do planning." Mr. Crawford emphasized that while the CRA may have a role in the planning process, the role suggested by Mr. Kaiser is beyond the Authority's purview. Mr. Bator said it would be presumptuous for the Agency to expand its scope in this manner.

## **Minutes**

**1. Motion:** *To approve the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA) on February 19, 2014*

**Vote:** *Approved. In favor: Bator, Born, Drury, Zevin. Abstaining: Crawford (absent from meeting)*

**2. Motion:** *To approve the amended minutes of the Regular Board Meeting of the CRA on March 19, 2014*

**Vote:** *Approved. All in favor*

### **Communications**

**3. Email from Stephen Kaiser regarding suggestions for possible CRA involvement at Alewife, March 28, 2014**

Ms. Drury stated that she enjoyed the correspondence and lamented that the process of improving Alewife did not begin 15 years ago. Ms. Born talked about the difficulty she has getting directions driving around Alewife. Mr. Zevin noted that certain light industrial uses exist in Alewife but nowhere else in the City—if redevelopment pushes them out it would not be a good outcome. Ms. Born mentioned that the zoning still allows for light industrial, but that the density bonus encourages residential. Mr. Crawford was encouraged by the mention of flooding—according to a recently published map, Alewife would be affected by Category 3 and Category 4 storms, making its sensitive redevelopment an issue with local and regional importance.

**Motion:** *To place Mr. Kaiser's e-mail of April 28 on file.*

**Vote:** *Approved. All in favor*

**4. Letter of support for Bailey & Sage fast food permit application from CRA to Zoning Board of Appeal April 8, 2014**

Ms. Born explained that the Bailey & Sage item came to the Board's attention in between two meetings. The Board was polled individually to see if they were interested. Procedures were followed so open meeting law was not violated. The letter of support is in line with an earlier position of supporting fast food. Ms. Drury reminded the audience that the Board has taken a public position earlier.

Mr. Evans clarified that the BZA did support the letter and that while they are still in the application process they are moving forward with design and beginning to discuss the Atrium layout with Boston Properties. Ms. Born mentioned that all three paragraphs cite the earlier position related to earlier zoning amendments. Mr. Zevin expressed his belief that the Board should push for a third bay into the Atrium as chairs and tables leaking out of Clover and Bailey & Sage would improve the street environment.

Mr. Evans felt that it was worth contemplating if the Board should ask BP and the Coop to come discuss that area moving forward. He suggested putting an item calling for discussing goals in the Atrium and the evolving situation in the food court on future agendas. Mr. Zevin was perplexed by the lack of action in the food court.

Ms. Born said that the reason why the letter was sent was to formalize the CRA's support for Bailey & Sage. She read the following section of the letter into the record:

The CRA was strongly supportive of the provision in the amended Ordinance to increase the number of fast food establishments in Kendall Square. The CRA felt that a relaxation of the "cap" in the MXD district in Kendall Square would be beneficial to the work culture of the area.

We realized that because the Kendall Square workforce was young, energetic, and worked long hours, there was a new demand for fresh, healthy food, available to go.

We especially wanted to encourage small, Massachusetts-owned, food businesses, serving locally sourced, healthy products, to open for business in Kendall Square. We hoped that, because each new Fast Food License required a Special Permit from the BZA, the CRA's support would encourage businesses like Clover and now, Bailey and Sage to locate in the area, in place of more conventional and ubiquitous multi-national fast food operations.

Ms. Born expressed her continued desire to increase high quality food options in Kendall Square.

**Motion:** *To place letter of support for Bailey & Sage fast food permit to place letter on file*

**Vote:** *Approved. All in favor.*

*5. Motion: Authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a Letter of Agreement with the City of Cambridge Redevelopment of the Foundry Building as an initial step toward satisfying the March 17, 2014 Cambridge City Council Policy Order Resolution (Mr. Evans)*

Mr. Evans explained that he had begun to look into the role the CRA could play in assisting the Foundry redevelopment as per the City Manager's request. He explained that he wanted to offer CRA expertise in financial modeling, as well as assist in continued community outreach regarding potential uses. This would be conducted in conjunction with City staff. Mr. Evans and City staffers are aggressively working out some concepts to bring back to City Council by the early summer, exploring legal issues relating to the project, as well as its programmatic scope. Something that is key is the financial contribution of the CRA to the project in some form. What is the format and quantity of this contribution, and how will it be mixed with public city money or money from a private developer? Is it part of an upfront investment or an operating subsidy? Mr. Evans has been doing research on the reuse report—the CRA needs to assess the building's condition and see how it fits in with redevelopment in terms of prevention of future blight. While he explained that the CRA is "getting on [its] horse," he wanted to formalize the partnership before proceeding too far.

Ms. Born asked for a refresher on how and why CRA would be involved. Mr. Evans identified three facets of CRA involvement: the potential use of CRA resources, the participation of the CRA in facilitating a more flexible procurement process, and potential long-term management or oversight of the facility by the CRA. In all scenarios, the Foundry would continue to be owned by the City, with the CRA's involvement being limited to, at most, a component of a master lease agreement,

Ms. Born explained her understanding of how the CRA could conduct a more flexible procurement process than the City. She asserted that if the CRA issued the RFP for the development, there could be a more conversational negotiated agreement between the City and a potential developer, whereas if the City wrote the RFP it would be constrained specifically to the language of the RFP. She asked for Mr. Evans to clarify and/or expand on this understanding.

Mr. Evans explained that in the RFP process, the CRA can be less proscriptive, which, given the uncertain program of the building, may be advantageous. The discussion thus far has been

centered on a general set of goals and broadly defined community benefits. If the CRA were to facilitate the RFP process it would allow for greater exploration of potential uses and architectural solutions, as well as a more fluid process that could adopt to new emerging options. This is contrasted to the precision required if the process is conducted directly by the City—this precision could preclude the utilization of a new, thus far not discovered, solution.

Ms. Farooq thought that Mr. Evans did a good job characterizing the situation. The City can do a lot of things, but the flexible procurement process is what really distinguishes the CRA, and could make its involvement invaluable.

Mr. Maze the CRA for inviting him to the meeting and for taking on a role with the Foundry. He expressed his appreciation for the CRA using its time and resources to improving the community through the Foundry and other projects, and added that this shows both generosity and foresight. Speaking generally on the topic of planning in Cambridge, he stated that he envisions a planning process where stakeholders take the time to draft a wide variety of position papers on topics important to them. CDD doesn't have the resources to conduct planning that can represent the needs of all stakeholders, so a joint effort of developers, neighborhood organizations, City Agencies, etc. need to work together to broaden the literature and analysis related to future planning initiatives. The earlier these documents are created in the process, the more diverse the set of solutions explored can be. While the CRA won't take CDD's role, there is a middle ground that all City stakeholders need to operate in.

Relating specifically to the Foundry, Mr. Mazen expressed his belief that the earlier concrete discussions about use take place, the more efficiently dollars can be used. Similarly, the earlier the level of CRA funding available is determined, the greater the value of these funds will be in affecting the project.

He noted that he wants to avoid an outcome where for-profit space is cross-subsidizing non-profit space, as he worries about how this could cannibalize the community space. The most successful community spaces either leverage private donations, or charge everyone below market rate rents and then subsidize with public funding. In the case of the Foundry, this can take absorb of the pent-up demand for cheap space, while still keeping the tenants' "skin in the game" and as active and productive stakeholders. He thinks the ideal rent figure is \$11-\$13 per square foot.

Mr. Mazen expressed his belief that the best ideas don't come from RFPs alone, but from real community processes. This process gives additional context to the RFP, which should be "crafted upon a bedrock of community process and brainstorming."

Mr. Crawford added that relationships are central in this process, and should be established early on. Mr. Mazen agreed, citing a charette he conducted during his campaign where he worked with constituents to identify and assess different uses, layouts, and financial models for the Foundry. While he acknowledged that working with a group of "nonexperts" can be perilous, there's a way to do it where experts can help shape these ideas. Mr. Crawford added that this type of effort adds credibility to the process.

Ms. Farooq noted that in discussions with Mr. Evans, there has been discussion of including a public process. She welcomed any new and bright ideas about how to best do this, as in order

to inform any RFP, the City needs a good sense of community desires. Part of the challenge at this stage is to narrow down and best frame the range of ideas. Mr. Mazen imagined a massive community process, mentioning the potential for ten separate three-hour meetings.

Mr. Evans mentioned that the CRA may be extending Ms. Madden's role in partnership with the CRA to lead this charge. He noted his belief that the brainstorming process has largely happened—now it's time to figure out how the actual implementation will work.

Mr. Evans wondered if the project is more of an East Cambridge process or a citywide process, and pondered how best to make the process and eventual outcome feel like a citywide resource rather than an East Cambridge resource.

Mr. Zevin brought the conversation to the realm of the building's physical existence, asserting that it's not a building that can be understood in terms of plan and is best understood in section. He pointed out the opportunity the building presents to make unique connections between levels that can increase light. Ms. Born, concurring with Mr. Zevin's assertion regarding the unique nature of the building's structure, wondered if the existing 52,000 square feet could all be retained following renovations.

On the question of whether the building is a city resource or East Cambridge resource, Ms. Born expressed her belief that the facility should be for the benefit of the entire City. Mr. Mazen agreed that the Foundry should benefit the whole City and that all residents should have input, but that some preferential attention should be given to the needs of residents in its immediate vicinity.

Ms. Born acknowledged that the building came to the City as a result of development impact, and should therefore benefit the East Cambridge residents disproportionately affected by this development. Ms. Hoffman concurred, but added that she didn't think the use should be exclusively for the immediate neighborhood. She also noted that the building is adjacent to Wellington-Harrington, a community that is often left out of these types of discussions.

Ms. Drury noted that the letter of agreement is open ended, a necessity given the undefined nature of the project at this time. Mr. Evans agreed, adding that the more proscribed roles become, the more likely something will be left out.

Mr. Bator expressed his excitement for the project, and his belief that the CRA should work to make sure that the end result is "truly wonderful."

**Motion:** *To authorize Mr. Evans to enter into letter of agreement with the City.*

**Vote:** *Approved. All in favor.*

#### *6. Report; Monthly report to the Board of the Executive Redevelopment Officer (Mr. Evans)*

Mr. Evans began by reporting that the CRA's RFP for a real estate consultant closed the week before, with seven submissions having been received. Of these, three to four will be shortlisted. Jeffry Mullen and Kathy Spiegelman will be consulted for the selection process, with interviews being conducted in early May and a recommendation likely at the next Board meeting. He also

noted that he has a number of interviews set up for the posted office manager and summer internship positions.

Mr. Evans has continued to work with financial consultants and Kevin Gookin for CDD on the CRA's bookkeeping process. The migration process has ended, and budget coding will begin soon. He foreshadowed a forthcoming discussion about the newly created Internal Controls report and modified financial summaries. He also noted that the CRA purchased a new computer and server.

Mr. Evans happily reported that the Octahedron has been relocated to the Pork Chop parcel. The next step is to appraise it and gain a better understanding as to how it was originally procured.

Looking forward to the May meeting, Mr. Evans cited Parcel two design, signage review, the community fund, parcel six development, and the real estate consultant's contract as likely items.

He felt that the March 26 meeting went well and has followed up with a number of neighborhood organizations. The feedback received at the meeting was supplemented by public comments on CoUrbanize, for which the CRA's pilot period recently ended.

On the subject of the Grand Junction Path, Mr. Evans has asked FST to investigate making a multi-modal path on CRA parcels adjacent to the railroad right of way. This is a continuation of earlier efforts they conducted for the CRA in 2010. The CRA's section of the path could conceivably be constructed in the fall. While Mr. Evans sees the functional transit use of CRA's section to be minimal on its own, it has great symbolic value as the first phase of a three-mile transit project with multiple actors. He explained that he is meeting with DPW and CDD to switch from conceptual to implementable planning, and that a future step would be to approach MIT for a capital contribution to accompany our design work.

Ms. Born questioned which landowners would be affected between the Charles River and Binney Street. Mr. Evans and Mr. Crawford stated that the involved landowners were MIT, MassDOT, CRA, and DCR. One hurdle facing the project is the idea that the path could be used for an actual passenger train. MIT has commissioned a study to examine the section of the path that they own. Mr. Evans reported that north of Binney Street the path lacks a "champion," but implementation strategies are being discussed. While MassDOT owns most of this section, there are many different abutting landowners.

Mr. Zevin asked if the path would interfere with potential future connection of the Vassar cycle track with Binney Street. Mr. Evans stated that this is a consideration and that the CRA will make sure not to interfere with this potential outcome.

Mr. Evans briefly discussed a number of miscellaneous issues. He reported that, besides landscaping, the Broadway streetscape project was nearly complete. He stated that the Marriott lobby renovation has been completed, and that any detours through the lobby have been eliminated. He noted that the food court is still closed and he is working through the Coop Board and Boston Properties to better understand what is going on.

Ms. Born questioned whether fast food businesses in the food court count towards the aforementioned cap. Mr. Murphy was unsure and said he would need to discuss this with CDD staff. Ms. Born refreshed Mr. Murphy's memory on the CRA Board's support of fast food with a healthy component and a local flavor. Mr. Murphy acknowledged the different qualities of different fast food establishments.

*7. Report: On the budget and expenditures reports for March 2014 (Mr. Evans)*

Mr. Evans explained that he wants to do two things with this section: update the Board on the budget and discuss the format that is used to deliver it.

He detailed operating expenses to this point, noting that most are less than one quarter of the annual expectation. He cited a need to disaggregate expenses further, because legal costs are inflating the office/administrative figure, and should probably be their own line item. He explained that the CRA hasn't been paying fringe benefits because no existing employees pull fringe benefits for medical and dental. This will change next month when Mr. Evans joins GIC. The office rent is higher, because of reconciliation of January costs for 2013 responsibilities. Auditors will straighten out this discrepancy. Project by project costs are not yet populated, but this will happen in the near future as the scope of projects become more defined.

Mr. Evans broached the subject of what level of reporting was appropriate on a monthly basis versus a quarterly basis. Ms. Born asked if the auditor has an opinion. The original auditor suggestion was that every check cut would be presented to the Board. Mr. Evans thought the reporting of every disbursement was bordering on too much information. While ever invoice is a publicly available document, he does not know if it needs to be put on the website every time. The auditor must have been persuaded, because he changed it on the monthly report.

Ms. Born asked to clarify the proposal. Mr. Evans explained that he proposes showing profit or loss on a monthly basis and overall financials on a quarterly basis. Mr. Bator thinks this makes some sense—the inflow of revenue is not consistent—as a result, looking at outflow versus inflow can be somewhat confusing and or misleading. Of course, Mr. Evans as the Executive Director should be flagging anything unusual that happens.

Ms. Born recalled that on previous boards she served on, the monthly financial reports took up a lot of time. Unless the Board feels there is duress, which doesn't seem to be the case, then being on a quarterly basis should be ok. If any of them have problems, they should contact Mr. Evans. Ms. Drury serves on another board where they receive notarized statements each year. For his role on the Somerville Homeless Coalition, Mr. Crawford sees monthly reports. Ms. Born pointed out that this program relies on monthly federal and state funding, which the board needs to be aware of.

Mr. Evans expressed the level of reporting in the stated policy should be something that you can maintain, and that he will fulfill whatever the wishes of the Board are. Ms. Drury notes that it's a lot of paper to provide complete financials each month, indicating that maybe the summary and profit/loss statement each month would be sufficient. Ms. Born added that if there is an extraordinary expense, he should mention it in his report. Mr. Crawford noted that there are also regular finance committee meetings to provide oversight.



#### *8. Discussion: Draft Internal Controls Policy (Mr. Evans)*

Mr. Evans explained that the document is an outgrowth of the corrective process that stemmed from the audit. He walked through the document, highlighting key issues. These included:

- 5) Cash loans to employees are prohibited
- 6) Everyone who is a signer on an account should be covered against theft.
- 8) Annual formal budget
- 8a) Flexibility with transfer between budget line items for values up to 10% of the value of the lesser line item
- 10) Petty cash, with a safety.
- 11b) CD accounts, on which the Chair, Treasurer, and Vice Treasurer shall be signatories
- 12) Disbursement process is similar to existing policy. Main modification is in E, which is a formalization of the authorization encumbrance process. For unusual expenses, invoice would come with an explanation of why.
- 13) Purchase of goods- key figure is \$10,000 figure required for a contract and Board approval.
- 14) Purchase Orders- General idea is two sets of eyes on every purchase except petty cash. Mr. Zevin expressed concern that writing the proper noun QuickBooks into the policy is not a good idea.
- 15) The payroll process has been simplified, while retaining existing controls. Salary schedule is approved by the Board and part of the budget process. The salary schedule needs to be formally defined, and has also been modified to include additional checks.
- 17) The CRA needs an investment policy, specifically one that includes procedures for real estate.

Ms. Madden noted that the policy does not include any reference to the Community fund or other significant outlays of money.

A discussion occurred as to whether members of the Board were included under the political clause of section 17. Clarification was requested whether or not this referred to on the job activity or all activity. Ms. Drury questioned the prudence of using the capital B bookkeeper as a term for the person keeping accounts. Mr. Evans suggested that perhaps a more explicit description of who the bookkeeper is should be included. Mr. Bator asked if the office manager would be the bookkeeper—Mr. Evans said that this would eventually be the case, but that at first they should formalize a relationship with the City to ease the transition.

Mr. Evans noted the CRA's lack of a credit card. He discussed it with the Cambridge Trust, who encourage him to keep the debit card because it is disaggregated in bill payment, rather than get a credit card that wouldn't provide the same detail. Ms. Born asked if there were times when you can't use a credit card. Mr. Zevin liked that it was better on the bookkeeping, but liked that it gives you directions that the credit card doesn't. The debit card we have has a \$1,000 limit.

Ms. Madden felt there is more oversight when there is an expense sheet, rather than just a debit card. Mr. Evans agreed, and noted that this is reflected in the personnel policy. Ms. Born expressed her opinion that the reimbursement process is awkward, but Ms. Madden was worried about the potential for abuse.

Ms. Born expressed that Mr. Evans should be able to procure the services he needs in a way that isn't onerous and fits accounting requirements. She suggests increasing the limit—Mr. Evans doesn't think this is necessary. The \$1,000 limit coincides with the check policy that they have.

Mr. Evans suggested having every check signed by a board member, a measure that Mr. Bator found to be excessive. Mr. Bator thinks this is a terrible idea.

Mr. Evans stated that he would add a section on debit cards and further explore the travel policy.

**Motion:** *To table discussion of the Draft Internal Controls Policy.*

**Vote:** *Approved. All in favor.*

*9. Report: Executive Committee: Offer of Executive Director to Tom Evans (Ms. Born)*

Ms. Born reported that the Executive Committee has extended an offer to Mr. Evans to be the CRA's Executive Director, and that he accepted the offer. The offer letter was placed on file.

**Motion:** *To place the offer of Executive Director to Tom Evans on file.*

**Vote:** *Approved. All in favor.*

*10. Discussion: Strategic Planning Process and Document Development (Ms. Madden)*

Ms. Madden described the report's Table of Contents. It included: Introduction, Context, External Activities, Internal Operations, Financial Considerations, and Outreach/Learning.

She outlined the progress the Authority has made since last fall, including different outreach efforts and planning initiatives. She described the context of the study, including different models of redevelopment. She described the toolset of redevelopment authorities. She described the different projects the CRA has undertaken and continues to undertake, including design review, rezoning, Ames Street residential, Point Park and eco-districts.

She also reported on new projects that the CRA is attempting to undertake. These included the Grand Junction Path, the Third Street Lot, the Community Fund, and the Foundry. She then outlined projects for further consideration. The CRA does not necessarily have the existing capacity to deal with these issues, but sees them as a priority for planning and development in Cambridge. There are also a number of initiatives that do not fit into specific projects. These include moderate-income housing, transportation strategies, workforce development, public space and park programming, and public art. These are concepts that the CRA cares deeply for but does not have a specific project currently associated with.

She identified the need to better understand staffing needs as central to the CRA's success. She also noted that the CRA's policies (personnel, financial, etc) need to be integrated into future chapters, and also cited the need to consider how best to reinvest funds and to continue the conversation with the community in order to clearly establish the CRA's role as the real estate arm for the City.

Mr. Evans added that he and Ms. Madden had focused on wordsmithing the introductory chapter in a way that was both pithy and comprehensive. The mission statement has been abbreviated from its original sense to better capture the aim of the organization. Ms. Madden questioned whether the mission is the future 'elevator speech' for the organization. Ms. Born suggested e-mailing around the old mission statement in order to insure the new mission met the original message. Ms. Madden noted that the new vision eliminated some of the redundancies of the old message.

Ms. Born asked for clarification regarding the timeline for the report. Ms. Madden said that she would complete the next three chapters and send them out as a draft by April 28, with comments by May 5, and posted by May 16.

Ms. Born was concerned with finalizing the report before finishing the community outreach. Ms. Madden suggested finalizing it as a draft. Mr. Evans said the report only represents a snapshot of the CRA's operations, so finalizing it before finishing the community process would not be problematic. Ms. Born was unsatisfied by this, as it could open the CRA to criticism from community organizations that had not yet been consulted.

Mr. Evans saw the document of next month as a walk-around document. Ms. Born cited unnamed reports on Central Square that were created and then submarined by a lack of continued dialogue. She expressed her belief that all promised discussions with community groups need to happen before we lose draft. Ms. Drury stated that she didn't think the CRA needs to wait for community input to finalize the our mission and vision, but that to include the projects in anything but draft format at this point, at least until outreach is completed, would be premature.

Mr. Evans noted that the categories that projects are put into reflects the amount of staff time being put into them. He is actively working on Foundry and Grand Junction but he's not traipsing around the Fresh Pond.

Ms. Born clarified that she didn't mean to suggest that community meetings would result in significant changes, just that as a matter of protocol, meetings should be conducted before the document is finalized. Mr. Evans noted that even after the document is done, that it can still change, an assertion that Ms. Born and Ms. Madden agreed with.

Ms. Drury wondered why after all of the discussions on Alewife the Fresh Pond Shopping Center is what emerged as central. Ms. Madden said that it was the Fresh Pond Shopping Center and Quadrangle that was most commonly cited, and reiterated that its inclusion in the document does not necessarily reflect a potential role of the CRA but is just a response to community comment.

Mr. Evans proposed putting the draft on the website for comment. Ms. Born supported this idea.

Mr. Bator noted, for the record, that kids used to sneak into the Fresh Pond and swim.

Mr. Evans said he would put the full draft on the website when it was ready.

The attendees observed results of CoUrbanize data. Ms. Madden noted this was only one cross-section of the community outreach process. Mr. Evans noted that even though certain topics had more comments than others, the comments actually revealed a diversity of opinions on each issue. Mr. Zevin commented on how well managed the process.

A brief discussion ensued about the Big John's Mattress building. Ms. Madden described it as the definition of blight. Ms. Born expressed her perceived difference between the First and Second Street Corridor and Alewife, where there was a need for rearrangement of infrastructure. Ms. Born sees the CRA's role as more limited in the First and Second Street corridor because of the lack of need for rearrangement of streets.

Ms. Born expressed her pleasure with Ms. Madden's work and her desire to collect more feedback with CoUrbanize. Mr. Bator suggested additional e-mail outreach.

The record was placed on file to be addressed in future meetings.

#### *11. Discussion: K2 MXD Rezoning Proposal (Mr. Evans)*

Mr. Evans suggested discussing the next two agenda items together. The K2 zoning change is a zoning proposal and an urban renewal amendment in tandem. In addition to the urban design and programmatic discussion of what the development might look like, consideration of implementation also needs to occur.

Mr. Evans explained some of the intricacies of the process. The existing concept is a PUD overlay over the MXD. The petitioner will likely be Boston Properties. Before a petition is submitted, there is conversation over what it should look like, because the amendment process is limited. One of the questions is how do you deal with a zoning process on top of the MXD, which is a unique chapter in the zoning code and tied to the KSURP. How the CRA and City processes work together is currently being explored. The assumption is that the planning process would be conducted in a parallel fashion. The CRA has master plans for each of the blocks, which provides compatible organization of how development would go through. One complication is that there are multiple property owners.

Ms. Born asked if there are any property owners with whom the CRA doesn't have a development agreement. Mr. Evans explained that there is no agreement with BioGen Idec., but they are subject to BP's land disposition agreement. Whitehead is a different situation because they have their own land disposition agreement with the CRA. They are a tax-exempt entity that issues a PILOT payment.

Ms. Born wanted to make sure the CRA is protecting our financial interests. This new development will gain us revenue—Whitehead being a non-profit research development group will likely ask for smaller development fee than BP.

Ms. Born clarified that financial arrangements would be a factor in determining the PUD allowance. Mr. Bator thought that is an appropriate and fair concern. The ability of the CRA to conduct long-term projects is dependent on the ability to raise money.

Mr. Evans added that one thing that would definitely need to change in the urban renewal plan is the parcel-by-parcel open space requirement. He expressed his belief that it's worth

considering having the urban renewal plan rewritten at the same time as zoning, with certain differences between the two.

Ms. Born expressed concern about sacrificing leverage. Mr. Bator thinks much of the new plan is negotiable. Mr. Zevin pointed out that different concerns like open space and parking are tied together. Mr., Bator noted that these are master planning issues. Ms. Madden characterized them as design elements. Mr. Murphy cited North Point as a precedent for effective negotiation of PUDs.

Ms. Born thought it makes sense for the URP to mirror zoning, but is concerned with potential future implications. What if a future city council decided to change zoning to make housing not a permittable use? Mr. Evans explained that the rule will always revert to the more restrictive class. He stated says that the legal suggestion was to merge the two. Mr. Hawkinson said this would raise the question as to whether the CRA would remain a stakeholder. Mr. Bator noted that this would diminish the CRA's leverage.

Mr. Evans noted that the more rigorous point of development control is through the land disposition agreement. Mr. Evans noted that unlike zoning changes, changing the urban renewal plan would require state action. Depending on scale of the proposed change, there's a potential need for MEPA review. He thinks the MEPA discussion should begin fairly soon.

#### *12. Report: Design Review committee: Development Alternatives for Parcel Two in accordance with K2 Zoning*

Mr. Evans explained that the Design Committee met with BP to look at potential development sites. Two emerged: the North Garage and 11 Cambridge Center. The Design Committee sent feedback and BP is modified the proposal. This iterative process regarding conceptual design has been helpful. Mr. Lavery agreed that it was a productive discussion and expressed his belief regardless of the final plans, they will provide for a multitude of options to be able to respond to market demands.

Ms. Drury expressed her hope that all configurations won't include eliminating two parks. Mr. Lavery noted that BP is putting a great deal of effort into improving open spaces.

Mr. Evans thinks there is a fair amount of public realm improvements that the CRA will continue to push BP on, particularly in terms of activating ground floor levels. Parcel Four has the most lively ground floor activity in MXD whereas Parcel 2 doesn't have much at all.

Mr. Bator asked if there was significant housing in the development. Mr. Zevin noted that there was, which he considered to be encouraging, although he found the form to be somewhat disconcerting.

Mr. Zevin had observed that there were balconies on renderings for new development at Third Street and Binney Street but lamented that it would count against FAR. He also expressed his concern that middle income housing requirements will limit height. Mr. Murphy stated that this incentive is being reevaluated. Ms. Born noticed that she would prefer to have tall skinny buildings than tall fat buildings. She noted how the climate in Cambridge has changed concerning building heights. Mr. Crawford expressed concerned with the wind created by tall

buildings and the impact on open spaces. Mr. Zevin agreed that this was a good point, but said skinnier buildings would mitigate this impact. Mr. Bator stated that the Board's desire for housing contributes to their willingness to be flexible, at least at the start of the process.

Ms. Born expressed her satisfaction with the amiable back and forth during the design meeting. Mr. Lavery agreed with this statement.

Ms. Hoffman noted that people at the East Cambridge Planning Team's meeting the week before were furious that BP had approached the Planning Board without public notification. She described the lack of popularity of BP amongst the East Cambridge community, and predicted serious resistance to their proposal. She emphasized the lack of trust between BP and the East Cambridge community.

Mr. Kaiser noted that the Courthouse (500,000 square feet) is running in the range of about 5,000 daily trips and that the proposed million square foot development would likely generate 9,000-10,000 trips. This would require a MEPA waiver. Mr. Evans clarified that there will not necessarily be a waiver.

Ms. Born emphasized that no vote is taking place on this matter, but that this is merely a discussion.

**Motion:** *To place the report on file.*

**Vote:** *Approved. All in favor.*

### *13: Report: Design Review Committee: Ames Street Residential Project Streetscape Design*

Mr. Evans reviewed the report. Areas under consideration include space in front of Legal Seafoods and Mead Hall as well as Pioneer Way. Ways to activate the streetscape are being explored through a mixture of plaza space and sidewalk seating for restaurants. A redesign of Pioneer Way to improve flow is also being explored, taking into consideration both pedestrian and loading needs. Streetscape improvements include sidewalks, tree pits, and bike infrastructure. These enhancements are intended to provide lively urban spaces.

Ms. Born added that Cambridge's bicycle coordinator had introduced "European looking" bicycle lanes. Mr. Evans noted that this next generation of facility was not limited to Europe, but was being added in locales like Lincoln and Indianapolis.

**Motion:** *To adjourn.*

**Vote:** *Approved. (9:37).*