

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

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

---

**DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**

---

**Present**

Kathleen Born (Chair), Margaret Drury (Vice-Chair), Christopher Bator, Barry Zevin Executive Redevelopment Officer Tom Evans, CRA Strategic Planner Kathryn Madden, CRA Urban Design Consultant Charles Redmon, Assistant City Manager for Community Development Brian P. Murphy, City of Cambridge Director of Urban Design J. Roger Boothe, CDD Project Assistant Minjee Kim, and David Stewart (Boston Properties).

Audience sign-in sheet/public comment sign-up for entry into record.

**Call to Order:** Kathleen Born, called the meeting to order (5:40).

**Public Comment**

**Steve Kaiser**

Mr. Kaiser reported that previous difficulty with web files has been resolved. Regarding Article 7, he expects to be able to report on expanded information in more detail in a month or two. The state's transportation bond issue includes discussion of different rail uses on the Grand Junction; there is interest in DMU [Diesel Multiple Unit] trains between North Station and Allston. This is in the bond issue but there has been no public process and it could have an effect on the corridor near us.

Regarding the Kendall Square study agenda item, Mr. Kaiser reported that he has been following the K2C2 process and has many criticisms of it, but pointed out that his communication submitted for this meeting relates to planning for Central Square and one of the developers. He noted that there has been no transportation/traffic plan conducted. One problem noted with the Kendall Square report is that it includes the former CRA executive director on the advisory committee list with an inaccurate retirement date. Mr. Kaiser suggested that in dealing with old issues that keep coming up, it is best to leave as history and move forward. The Board can, on a situational basis, re-vote retroactively to clear up any uncertain decisions.

[The Chair noted that the Board has done this for a significant number of votes. Mr. Evans identified some of the votes that were re-voted and Ms. Born recalled re-votes on 12 or 13 different items and offered to help locate them in the minutes.]

Mr. Kaiser referenced the traffic study agenda item, noting near- \$100,000 cost and questioning the purpose. If it is to show trending with the past, Mr. Kaiser stated that it would not be helpful because of the impact of Longfellow bridge work — the issue needs to be worked out in detail. The

City is conducting a bus study, coming out of the K2C2 process with the Transit Advisory Committee, but it is limited to buses and doesn't include the Red Line. This is a good opportunity for the Authority to do a Red Line study for the same amount of money.

With respect to dealing with past difficulties and moving forward, Mr. Kaiser stated his concerns that some matters are unresolved and others may merit investigation, but he is not in favor of self-investigation. For the sake of institutional memory and continuity, Mr. Kaiser suggested that Boston Properties might be asked to conduct their own 'look back report' and detail past activity as part of the process of putting history to bed.

#### **Heather Hoffman**

Ms. Hoffman noted that the December minutes did not fully characterize her comments and asked that additional clarification be included for the record, referencing her explanation of the inclusionary bonus at the last meeting. She explained that the matter is complicated in that there are two components to the bonus that developers can normally receive through the City's inclusionary housing program. One calculation is based on number of dwelling units and the other on FAR (floor area ratio). This raises questions with respect to bonus calculation for the Ames Street project because Boston Properties assumes the project will receive all bonuses, yet the project-specific zoning does not include limits for either FAR or number of units that can be built.

Regarding the Design Review Committee notes for the Ames Street project, Ms. Hoffman noted that it seemed like no bonus floor area was being claimed, but that she had been told otherwise. Regarding signs, Ms. Hoffman pointed out references to electronic signs, noted that the Zoning Ordinance (use regulations section) prevents noise, vibration or flashing, and that CRA is required to comply with zoning law and does not have the authority to change it. She would like to have the exemption from the Cambridge sign ordinance stricken from Article 14. Wayfinding signage must make clear the path through the garage to get to the roof garden.

#### **Alexandra Lee, Kendall Square Association**

Ms. Lee expressed concerns regarding the correspondence received from Clear Channel on plans for an electronic billboard. Her understanding is that a 48-foot electronic billboard is being proposed for a prominent location and she expressed that it would be an egregious item in neighborhood and would not serve the many users of the area well. She added that MBTA funds should be directed to public safety issues on stairs, platforms, etc. at Kendall Station. Regarding Mr. Kaiser's previous comments relating to the Red Line, she noted that there are people doing research on the Red Line and looking at the data for computer driven trains. Underfunding of the Red Line is big challenge to the neighborhood; to be viable, transportation must be funded.

Public comment closed.

#### **Acceptance of minutes:**

***Motion:*** To approve the minutes of most recent regularly scheduled meeting of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA) on December 18, 2013

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

**\*\***The Chair confirmed that Heather Hoffman's comments on the December minutes will be included in current meeting minutes

## **Communications**

### **Steve Kaiser email**

The Chair noted receipt of email from Mr. Kaiser on the Twining proposal and other issues. Mr. Evans noted that he had included both the email and the letter to which it referred in the meeting packet.

### **Clear Channel notice (outdoor advertising):**

Mr. Evans reported that he had received the letter via certified mail as required by MassDOT and has since been fact finding regarding land ownership and applicable regulations. The proposal is to remove existing billboards adjacent to railroad track near intersection of Broadway, Galileo Galilei Way & Binney and replace with a 14 by 48-foot electronic billboard. The CSX right-of-way was acquired by MassDOT two years ago and the billboard license was transferred to Clear Channel. The new electronic billboard is considered a new permit.

State regulations place limitations on brightness—such billboards can't flash, scroll or have animation; each image must stay up for at least 8 seconds. The billboards rotate thru ads and there is commitment (MassDOT/MBTA) to a certain number of public service announcements. The process includes public notification for a hearing where new permits are being considered. The MBTA is installing a large collection of these signs throughout the Boston area; they are a significant revenue source. The provisions that restrict flashing/movement are tied to public safety. The CRA is still trying to understand regarding ownership of the land and billboard, and any regulations regarding proximity to specific uses, such as open space. As of January 14, the permit had not been filed with the Office of Outdoor Advertising; the CRA received notice because it owns abutting parcel of land.

Ms. Drury asked about a court case settled several years ago in Cambridge establishing that there could be no new billboards. Mr. Evans replied that jurisdiction was a determining factor, and his understanding was that ownership by MassDOT or the state entailed more stringent approval requirements. This is related to the regional service function of the MBTA and its need for revenue. Discussion of court case settlement, history of billboard matters in Cambridge, billboard content, hours of operation, possible additional restrictions or mitigation, and timing/permit duration. The group agreed to seek a copy of the court settlement. Mr. Evans noted an error in where the notice directs comments—it should be to the Outdoor Advertising Authority.

Ms. Born noted important deadlines for response and the need to bring public and private stakeholders together to address this issue. People can sign up for notification related to outdoor advertising on the MassDOT web site and Ms. Born suggested that there be a point person signing up for Cambridge. There was also discussion of the adjacent "pork chop" parcel ownership and use of parcel for snow storage.

### **Report of the Executive Redevelopment Officer**

Mr. Evans reported a successful oral history interview with former executive director Bob Rowland, with many great stories; a second interview session is scheduled for later this month. They are also bringing on another intern from Harvard Graduate School of Design to help with archiving CRA documents and ensuring that material is accessible and properly cared for.

Mr. Evans and financial consultant Eric Kinsherf have been working with Kevin Gookin at the Community Development Department to complete the migration of CRA bookkeeping to the new

system. They are also transitioning to an online payroll system, and working with Cambridge Retirement Board staff to ensure proper execution.

Strategic planning work has continued and Ms. Madden has been following up with redevelopment authorities and staff throughout state. They have been preparing for meetings with City Councilors and the public. Also, they are expanding consultant capacity to begin work that will launch from the strategic plan, starting with real estate consulting services, for which an RFP will be prepared as part of a full public procurement process. An office administrator search will begin soon, and office reorganization continues, including proper disposal of unused and excess items in anticipation of moving and/or growing.

February is the annual meeting and election of officers and presentation of the Annual Report, as well as a full meeting agenda. They are waiting to hear back from Google on its signage proposal. The personnel policy has gone through legal review and a final draft is now ready. Work on procurement policy continues with Eric Kinsherf. The Design Review Committee is moving closer to development of signage review protocol but continue to work through new category of electronic signs. Work continues on the concept for a new wayfinding program and rebranding for Cambridge Center (to Kendall Center).

[Ms. Drury asked for confirmation that signs and rebranding will include street addresses.]

The final K2C2 Report will be discussed at this meeting and it is posted on the web site.

Interesting discussions regarding the community fund are ongoing, and with intern Chris Colley, staff has been researching best practices and seeking feedback from City staff to bring matter before the Board in February. The first revenue from Boston Properties is planned for next winter, based on the retail program and the timing of permits for Ames Street.

Boston Properties has established funds to repair / replace pavers in Point Park. Some of furnishings will be removed, lighting will be repaired, but Galaxy will not be touched as part of this work.

[Mr. Zevin asked for attention to Galaxy's steam component so as not to make its condition worse. Mr. Evans confirmed that this work was not planned to impact Galaxy and that he would look into the situation. Mr. Zevin wanted the steam repaired by the party responsible for its damage, noting that the sculptors of this piece are concerned about its future. ]

Mr. Evans reported on research regarding use of the Third and Binney parcel, which is subject to land use restriction due to lack of remediation of soil conditions. He will follow up with the assessment engineer as this may also affect the Volpe site. The draft Kendall Square traffic report by FST is being reviewed; they are likely to publish and present by next month and submit to MEPA (this relates to contract item later in Agenda).

Mr. Evans addressed circulation issues on Parcel 4, further complicated by the closing of the food court in conjunction with Marriott lobby renovations. He has been seeking information related to the closing and future use of the space; new signage has been posted for getting from the MBTA to Broadway.

Spending for snow and ice removal continues and Mr. Evans has been pleased with Greenscape work.

**Motion:** *To place the Executive Redevelopment Officer report on file.*

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

#### **CRA Board Meeting Calendar for 2014**

Mr. Evans has communicated with boardmembers regarding conflicts, and the only potential issue (regarding quorum) is the August meeting. Ms. Born suggested taking steps to allow remote participation, as this is an important option for a small board.

**Motion:** *To approve the meeting calendar.*

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

#### **Kendall Square Planning Study**

Roger Boothe, City of Cambridge Director of Urban Design, walked the board through highlights of the report, noting the presence of Assistant City Manager for Community Development Brian Murphy and project assistant Minjee Kim, PhD candidate in MIT's urban studies program, who was responsible for the overall look of the report. Mr. Boothe explained that the report came out of a three-year process involving much thought on a variety of issues. The report covers the history of the area and related planning efforts, analysis of various areas, MIT development plans, open spaces, housing, commercial market conditions, retail dynamics, environmental topics such as looking at the area as an ecodistrict and dealing with climate change, and also transportation, the red line and important connections. Mr. Boothe reviewed the report's goals, recommendations and priorities including the continued creation of an energetic area, building connections, the ECKOS (Eastern Cambridge Kendall Open Space) process, the opportunity for smart growth, the middle income housing gap, the need for R&D/startup space, and the thinking around zoning and infrastructure.

Mr. Boothe will deliver a talk at the Cambridge Public Library on February 25, presenting a retrospective of his 35 years of working with the City and thoughts about where Cambridge will go from here.

Ms. Born expressed appreciation on behalf of CRA for all that Mr. Boothe has done for the Authority through his work.

**Motion:** *To thank Roger Boothe for his many contributions; he will be missed.*

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

Ms. Born asked about next steps for the zoning process and how CRA will have opportunity for input. Mr. Murphy explained that in the first half of year both Central Square and Kendall Square zoning recommendations go back to Planning Board with the goal of sending petitions to City Council. Work will likely proceed parcel by parcel, with MXD and Volpe as separate parcels. The MIT zoning process set precedent for this approach.

Discussion of timing and coordination of zoning process with the urban redevelopment plan revisions. Mr. Evans continues discussion with the state on procedural matters and will work with CDD to coordinate progression of work.

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

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

#### **Amended and Restated CRA Personnel Policy**

Ms. Born acknowledge board and staff work to develop a fair and progressive policy. Mr. Evans noted the auditor's input into content and direction of the policy. He pointed out changes since the last discussion in the section previously known as the whistleblower policy (p.14, Section IV). Discussion of distinction between duty to report financial irregularity and ethical/conflict of interest matters. The board agreed that a simple amendment to the published motion would achieve the goal of establishing duty to report financial irregularity and protection of employees who report concerns within the scope of the Personnel Policy.

**Motion to Amend:** *In Section VI (A) Reporting Responsibility - Strike the word "professional" and after the word "activity," add "relating to accounting or auditing irregularities."*

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

**Motion:** *To adopt the policy as amended.*

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

#### **Trial Balance; CD Schedule/All Cash and Cash Flow**

Mr. Evans noted his production of new and old versions of this report to close out 2013 consistently, pointing out the primary outcome of having expenses under the original projections. This is mostly due to "belt tightening," mostly in the legal category and an engineering contract not fully spent. There have been some office savings, with Mr. Evans starting his position later than budgeted. Insurance and medical expenses differ from projections. Also, fees have come in from Boston Properties for Google project and 17 Cambridge Center. CRA has finished the year with nearly \$12 million in cash reserves. Depending on timing of transactions, individual items may sit on either side of the budget year. In response to a question regarding the period of CRA work with current auditors, Mr. Evans noted that good auditing practice is to change auditors every 5-7 years, so that CRA could extend one more year to fully complete the financial transition.

**Motion:** *To place the balance sheet on file.*

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

#### **Draft 2014 CRA Budget**

Discussion and appreciation of progress made by CRA with the development of an understandable budget, through a meaningful process, that provides clarity in tracking funds. Mr. Evans pointed out the additional sheet for comparison of 2013 budget and actual (translated back into Excel for readability).

**Motion:** *To approve the 2014 CRA Budget.*

**Roll Call Vote:**

*In Favor: Bator, Born, Drury, Zevin*

*Opposed: none*

#### **Ames Street Housing Project**

The Chair noted the Design Review Committee report prepared and submitted by Mr. Redmon as well as the presence of David Stewart, representing Boston Properties.

With respect to the project design development timeline, Mr. Evans reported discussions with CDD and Boston Properties on how to coordinate board review and Article 19 process for major project review. They have agreed upon a format to have monthly meetings of the Design Review Committee (which includes members of CDD staff). Boston Properties will come before the Board

for schematic review before they submit to the City for the full application, which kicks off a City process to review broader topics, a 60-day required noticing process, and a hearing between 0-90 days after submission of the application. Boston Properties will come before the CRA board for endorsement of the project, which will then be presented to Planning Board for decision.

Mr. Stewart reported that they have looked at the scope of work necessary to prepare for Article 19 filing. Boston Properties wants to be careful to study everything they are expected to study. One component is the effects of wind and only a few companies do that work; there is a six week lead time to book the wind tunnel. They must first have agreement on massing. Filing for Article 19 around the end of March is likely. Then they will go through the process and be in position by end of calendar year with biddable documents to go out to market and proceed with construction immediately thereafter. They may need twice-monthly meetings with the Design Review Committee to achieve this timing.

Mr. Evans referenced the Redmon report and items discussed in the meeting. Mr. Redmon noted that Boston Properties is looking for as slender a tower as possible for a distinctive skyline view. Mr. Zevin stated that the alternative he saw seemed to be reasonable and he looks forward to more detail. Mr. Evans expressed the desire to look at key viewpoints to see how the tower will be seen in the skyline--views from the river are particularly of interest. Ms. Born reported the meeting as being very positive and Mr. Stewart stated that at the appropriate point they would develop a photorealistic rendering. They are now focused on designing from the inside out, looking at what the customer will want.

Mr. Zevin noted that zoning forces a focus from the outside in and that he looks forward to the other direction and in more developed design schematic materials.

### **Kendall Center Signage and Wayfinding Proposals**

#### **Ambit sign:**

Mr. Evans directed attention to the initial graphic proposal to discuss evolution of thinking on this matter. Dean Lyettefi, Business Operations Manager for Ambit Creative Group provided information about the history of the company, services provided, and their presence at Cambridge Center. With the printing operation now located in Brighton, the Kendall Square location will be a sales, marketing and design suite with approximately four people working there. They are proposing installation of electronic sign (monitor) to showcase the firm's work, which would display scrolling information to help people understand what they do. The sign would be mounted inside their space and it would be all visual, with no sound. This type of graphic communication is a more engaging way for companies to communicate, which is what Ambit helps clients to do. Ambit's location is an arcade alleyway space between the parking garage and 5 Cambridge Center. The entry to Ambit is directly off the alley, with the door on the same wall as the proposed sign.

Ms. Born pointed out the Design Review Committee discussion of the changing nature of identity and signage, and that the MXD exemption from the City's sign ordinance is probably a good thing. Ms. Drury asked about implications for CRA's sign policy, which is in development, and Mr. Evans explained some of their current thinking about video signs, which might have a threshold for the highest level of review, while temporary signs would receive the lowest level of review. Larger signs and electronic images would go to a full board review. Mr. Zevin concurred with issues raised, pointed out the difference between the notion of a temporary sign versus serial temporary signs, such as one that changes each month but remains in the same place. Other questions are how

much of a storefront/building can be obscured by signage (test cases can be performed) and with respect to electronic signs, what defines “flashing” and how should proximate uses be considered.

Mr. Bator asked for clarification regarding door material (glass confirmed).

**Motion:** *To approve the proposed Ambit video sign for installation at Five Cambridge Center off the service alley within Parcel Four.*

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

#### **Kendall Center Wayfinding Proposal:**

Mr. Evans reported that the presentation at the committee meeting was an update of what they had seen before, noting four key issues: the “vine” graphic illustrating wayfinding to the rooftop garden, garage entries, building identification graphics/signage, and maps/monument signs. Discussion included questions about the definition and meaning of Kendall Center, the importance and hierarchy of building identity (street address) over Kendall Center. Discussion also addressed wayfinding for the roof garden and the need to carry the graphic theme through the trip from outside to the garden. Mr. Stewart confirmed that Boston Properties has asked the designer to make one more revision to satisfy the Design Review Committee before the proposal comes before the full board.

#### **75 Ames Street (temporary certificate of occupancy for Broad Institute)**

Mr. Evans noted that testing and tenant improvements were required to go on in tandem with activity for finishing the building. Temporary certificate would be an intermediate step that allows Broad to begin installation of scientific equipment while the contractor is still working toward completion. The CRA letter of support (demonstrating board endorsement) would go to the Inspectional Services Department.

**Motion:** *To authorize the Executive Redevelopment Officer to execute a letter of support to the Inspectional Services Department for the issuance of a Temporary Occupancy Permit for the Broad Institute at 75 Ames Street.*

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

#### **Amendment of Professional Services Contract**

Mr. Evans reminded the board that the traffic studies are connected to a MEPA obligation to do an annual traffic count report. The cumulative data is unique in the Commonwealth in terms of detail available for a defined geographic area. The scope of services was reviewed with CDD staff and they have added to the scope so that the report could look at a broader segment of traffic data and hopefully to reflect a broader perspective regarding Kendall Square growth. There is interest, in the Kendall Square report, in a follow-up traffic component for growth forecasting based on proposed Kendall Square zoning. This would include analysis of the implications of Galileo Way and the Grand Junction Path, challenges related to bike facilities, and median options. With additional items assembled for analysis, the scope of work has grown (independent of extension of the contract).

Ms. Born asked whether it makes sense to do this analysis while Longfellow Bridge work is in progress (per public comment). Mr. Evans responded that CRA has a long stretch of consistent information in hand, and although in the last year there has been major change, there is an ongoing commitment to do the traffic study. CRA has a strong data set that tells an interesting story, and will have to look at things differently for the next three years during the bridge work.



Discussion of merits of data analysis during time of change. Mr. Evans noted that there has not yet been a full build-out analysis, and if data gathering stopped now and resumed in four years, CRA risked losing data articulation. He reminded that the purpose of traffic analysis is to measure impacts of growth, and another key part of the report is to measure traffic in and out of garages and conduct an employee survey for mode share. This provides a rationale for continuing the study work and he anticipates that the report will tell a good story about smart growth and transit-oriented development. Discussion of defining scope of work to achieve larger CRA goals, build on the work of the Kendall Square Study, and address traffic issues in the redevelopment area.

***Motion:*** *To authorize the Chair and the Executive Redevelopment Officer to further amend the professional services contract with FST to provide an additional \$54,000 for 2014 related to its review of traffic studies for 20 year period and future traffic projections*

***Roll Call Vote:***

*In Favor: Bator, Born, Drury, Zevin*

*Opposed: none*

***Motion:*** *To adjourn (8:17)*

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

Next Meetings:

- February 19, 2014 at the Cambridge Police Station 1st Floor Community Room
- March 19, 2014 at the Cambridge Police Station 1st Floor Community Room