

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



Regular Meeting
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

Wednesday, November 19, 2014, 5:30pm
Cambridge Police Station
125 Sixth Street
Community Room

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Public sign-in sheet attached.

Call

Meeting called to order at 6:10 p.m.

CRA Chair Kathy Born introduced CRA Board members, staff members, Larry Bluestone (CRA design consultant), Boston Properties design team members, and members of the public. Board member Margaret Drury was not present as she was out of town and Christopher Bator was not present due to illness.

Public Comment

Ms. Born requested public comment regarding the previous 4:30 p.m. Design Review presentation meeting with Boston Properties and Sasaki on the Grand Junction "rail-with-trail" project.

Sam Seidel, former City Councilor, urged thoughtful and careful improvement to the current unpleasant street front suggesting that the streetscape go to the corner and possibly around it to stop the 1980s prison walls-look. He emphasized that spaces need to be made blatantly public and actively invite the public inside. Otherwise they will be used by the people in the buildings and thus have the effect of becoming private.

With regards to the public rail (with trail), he requested that a Hubway platform be included. It was noted that there is a hubway platform across the street.

John Sanzone, stated that the creation of alleys should be avoided in the Sasaki proposal. Binney Street seems far from Kendall Square station although it isn't. There needs to be more thought than a minor treatment of sidewalks. As head of the Grand Junction Path Friends group, we are heartened to see this project moving along. He's interested in how the current up-and-down grading of the corner might be corrected to create an inviting and active area.

Heather Hoffman stressed that all public space (especially the public gardens) should be prominently labeled including how they are to be accessed. The doors need to be open, they need to be public and they need to be public forever - until the building is taken down. There should be some commitment that if the building were to be taken down, public spaces of equal nature should still exist. This space is valuable and the public needs to get a sense of community from development in addition to better architecture and property taxes. With respect to the Grand Junction Path and the Whitehead Institute's proposal to remove their plaza, she stressed that this public space gets a lot of use and that the walls should be kept for seating.

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



Julian Cassa asked for a report on the presentation of the 4:30 meeting. Ms. Born said that there will be images on line. Mr. Cassa explained that he's worked with Novaris to keep some of their corporate space open during the weekends. He stressed that the public is concerned about green space, egress, safety and parking, and that public spaces need to be advertised. He is concerned about creating wind tunnels and poor lighting making it colder and darker for employees as well as residents.

Ben Lavery emphasized that the design does incorporate public space and the doors would be open to enhance their permeability. He stated that the retail presence on the street level will complement the winter garden space and it would have a corner presence. To make a public space successful, Boston Properties is looking for ways to activate the space to bring people into the space. Board member Barry Zevin added that permanent retail presence up to the glass would be more inviting to the public. There will be a public entrance to the parking garage.

Steve Kaiser submitted his comments in writing [which can be found attached to this report.] He mentioned that the presentations were strong on landscape architecture and weak on transportation and that more focus on this aspect should be provided by the CRA. The K2C2 process was also weak on transportation, that it had a traffic analysis that ignored pedestrians and the report was never finished. Ms. Born stated that Tom Evans is laying the groundwork for the MEPA process.

Mr. Kaiser wanted to know why this week's agenda did not include an item regarding Volpe. Ms. Born said that there was nothing new to report. Mr. Kaiser stressed the importance of the CRA focus on the transportation and transit that will arise from this development. He also suggested that the CRA create a program, similar to the new CRA Forward Fund, for transit related proposals leading to the improvement of the Red Line capacity. He feels that with the new governor and the possibility of the Olympics coming to Boston, the CRA could be a driving force.

The public comment period was closed.

Minutes

1. Motion: To place on file the minutes of the Regular Board Meeting on October 15, 2014*

Conrad Crawford asked that his name be corrected on page 4.

Kathy Born wanted to clarify her comments stated on page 4. The intent was that the CRA was grateful to be included in the initial stages of the project. (This will be indicated with square brackets.) In addition on page 5, "Mr. Born" should be changed to "Ms. Born." She emphasized that 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. Crawford noted his comments on page 5 which highlights the board's awareness and desire to share spaces and define public venues and that public benefits are important.

A motion to add the 3 amendments to the minutes and place them on file was unanimously approved.

Communications

2. Letter of Support for Ames Street Residential Project to Cambridge Planning Board*

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



Ms. Born stated that this meeting is scheduled to happen on December 2.

Mr. Evans noted that this letter was sent to CDD along with the design review notes from the January, March, May, July, and September meetings.

The letter will be placed on file.

Reports, Motions and Discussion Items:

3. Report: 2013 Audit of Financial Statements and Management Letter (Mr. Clark) *

Motion: To accept and place on file the 2013 Audit Reports, and to direct the Executive Director to submit the Audit Reports to the Department of Housing and Community Development

Mr. Chad Clark started with page 6 of the Financial Statement. The CRA has assets of \$11,400,000 on hand, nearly all of which is liquid in the form of investments in cash. The remaining \$235,000 is the value of land parcels held for future development. There are a few liabilities like vendor payments. The largest liability is OPED (other post-employment benefits) which is growing at \$100,000 annually but will drop off with time due to natural attrition. The CRA does not yet have money set aside for this liability but a plan to address this would be a good idea although this is not mandatory. Pension costs are currently addressed as an expense but in the near future it will need to be accrued and put on the books as a liability. This ultimately lowers the net position.

Ms. Born reminded everyone that the money held by the CRA is for public benefit and staff salaries. This money accrued because the past CRA administration did not have a recently stated aggressive policy towards public investment. This CRA administration has renewed public investments with projects like the CRA Forward Fund and the Foundry project.

The funding of the liability is being taken care of by the Cambridge Retirement System which has an actuarial plan in place and is required to be fully funded by 2040. Mr. Crawford suggested this could affect the bond rating if funds needed to be financed.

The next position of the CRA is \$11 million. Mr. Clark noted that the sum of the operating and non-operating revenue less the expenses shows a net loss of \$36,000. Compared to previous years' financials this is not bad. In 2013 there was a complete transition of staff which increased the cost of operations.

With regards to the management letter, there's been a lot of work to address the 2012 issues, many of which carried into 2013 and some that carried into 2014. Some items are expected to take 12-24 months to repair.

Mr. Clark jumped to page 4 and was happy to report that there are no significant deficiencies or material weaknesses this year. The numerous items mentioned last year have been adequately dealt with and in some cases, moved well beyond. He reiterated the funding of OPEB which was previously discussed. On page 5, items A through F now have policies implemented or are in the process of being finalized in the next few months.

The mention of fraud and theft is included for all municipal entities as a general warning. Mr. Clark liked that the amended CRA Personnel Policy includes a section of an employee's duty to report accounting and

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



auditing irregularities. Mr. Evans noted that the CRA legal counsel did not want a section called "fraud" so alternative phrasing was used which was acceptable to Mr. Clark.

In the general findings, there's mention of a certified procurement officer. Ellen Shore is going to the IG's procurement training in two weeks and Tom Evans is waiting for the 2015 to be posted. Mr. Clark is pleased with the state of the process. Mr. Clark encouraged the CRA to create a purchase order process but it is not required.

The closed-out prior year findings are on page 10. Much of this was carried forward to 2013 and has all been corrected. Procurement policies have been engaged. The violations relating to disbursements have all been eliminated. Most of the authorized bank account signatories have been resolved or are in the process of being resolved. The by-laws have been update, any unreturned property of the authority has been investigated and resolved, and an annual budget has been put in place. The gray area between the CRA and the [Kendall Square Association] have all been clarified regarding the division of entities. Ms. Born noted that Mr. Clark's management letter incorrectly named the Kendall Square Neighborhood Association. It should read Kendall Square Association. The vacation/sick policies, the compensated absences of resigned employees, and securing the postage meter have been addressed.

Mr. Evans stated that the Procurement Policy is on the agenda tonight. We are currently working on the Investment Policy by meeting with the City's Treasurer and their investment team who recommended speaking with an Investment Advisor. He also noted that Mr. Bator did review the statement and letter and is confident that the audit was done thoroughly.

A motion to accept and place on file the 2013 Audit Reports, and to direct the Executive Director to submit the Audit Reports to the State Department of Housing and Community Development was unanimously approved.

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

Mr. Evans stated that this is the 3rd version of the policy that has been brought before the board. By recommendation of the CRA Treasurer, it was reviewed by the CRA legal counsel who advised that a cover letter be added to introduce the policy. Of note in the letter are the general policies of fairness, transparency, accountability and a change to the objective of value-added-procurement. The objective isn't necessarily the lowest price but the highest value. Many footnotes were also added when applicable laws were referenced. It also mentions the existence of tiered procedures – as the procurement gets more expensive, the procedures expand for selection and advertisement. The letter calls attention to the ability of the Executive Director to proceed with contracts or purchases under \$10,000, with monthly reporting of those contracts to the Board. The procedures align with the CRA by-laws and the State's sound business practices.

A major change in the document involved pulling out the designed services element, which was on page 20 in the construction chapter, so it's now been rewritten to align with state law. On page 23, there's also an alignment with the City's minority and women owned business policy. In addition, a statement encouraging local contracts under state procurement laws was removed since a local preference can be seen as interfering with interstate commerce. Under general provisions, we are aligning with the State's public record law regarding the ability to avoid contractors who are on the State's list of contract violators.

If the State law changes then we would defer to the State law.

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



The motion to approve the proposed Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Procurement Policy unanimously passed.

5. Update: Foundry Community Meeting Feedback & Timeline (Ms. Madden)

Ms. Kathryn Madden handed out copies of the presentation and draft objectives. She stated that we are trying to understand the interests of all parties - the community, CRA, city, and a development entity – profit or nonprofit. Much pre-development work has been done. She reminded the group that the City is still considering the role of the CRA. We are in the transaction phase which has several components. The first phase is the City's disposition process for a lease where they would retain ownership via Chapter 2.110. This would be considered in December-January timeframe. The Planning board has a hearing and makes a recommendation to City Council. Then the City Council makes a decision, all within given time restrictions. The other document which is running in parallel is the CRA's initiation of the demonstration plan. A demonstration plan is a mini-designation of a specific redevelopment plan (in this case a building), that could possibly be a model for other projects. It does mimic Chapter 121B in terms of having approval of the CRA board and the City Council. These documents should be distributed in December and decided in January. We are still working on the timing of the document presentations to the respective boards. The City manager would write the lease that the CRA would approve, and then we would go through an RFP process. By involving the CRA, we can be looking for ideas and value rather than just price.

The HR&A process told us that the zoning requires 10,000 square feet of community uses but the project can be sustainable and support 25,000 square feet. This strengthens our negotiating position as one looking for the best value from a development entity. We are trying to keep the project on track and go for the developer RFP in the spring.

There will be a 7-person advisory committee – the City Manager appointing 5 people and the CRA appointing 2 people. This committee will have a stewardship role overseeing that the building operates successfully and achieves the public benefit we are all looking to have now and for the next 30-40 years. Mr. Evans has contemplated creating a management oversight role for the CRA with a physical presence in the building. Answers to the questions we received at the public meeting on October 29 will be posted. The input on the evaluation criteria that was received will be used in the RFP.

Mr. Zevin asked if there's been progress on measuring the building for exploratory demolition. Mr. Evans explained that the CRA reviewed the scope written by DPW to have someone do demolition plans of the interior partitions and afterwards create a set of drawings of the condition of the building that can be used in the RFP process.

Julia Nugent's firm HFHM is working on the demolition drawings and should be ready to go out to bid in December or January. They will be doing hazmat analysis or remediation so the site is either cleaned up so that the developers go in with full disclosure. She also asked if the developer will be responsible for improvement to the public way around the Foundry. Ms. Madden replied that this was a topic of public concern in the community meetings and will be added to the objectives.

There was a discussion about the residential construction occurring on the parking lot adjacent to the Foundry. Mr. Evans said that a special permit to the Planning Board will be required for that construction and that the timing should be investigated for information for the Foundry RFP. The developer of the

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



adjacent site, needs to be informed of the plans for the Foundry now and for the future so that the potentially high activity in the Foundry is not a problem for residential living.

Mr. Seidel asked if the City Council is aware of the Foundry plans to which the answer was yes, very much so. Mr. Evans has met with City Councilors; some have some attend board meetings and several attended the community meetings. Mr. Seidel cautioned that it must be made clear that the Foundry will be a public place due its proximity to a private residential space.

Renee Dankerlin is pleased that the CRA is aligned with City procurement policies and that the City is aligned with the State procurement policies. However, due to the size of the contract, there are federal rules that kick in and should be investigated. Mr. Evans explained that if federal money is involved, then federal policies trump ours. However, there is no federal money proposed in the Foundry but we can explore whether historic tax credits can be used. The Foundry was reviewed but not designated as a historic district due to the modifications that have already been done.

Ms. Heather Hoffman said that the communities surrounding the Foundry who have fought for this are going to push for a member of the community to be appointed as one of the advisory committee members. There is public perception that members appointed by any City Manager are not loyal to the community. Mr. Cassa agreed with Ms. Hoffman on the value of including personnel to the advisory committee that are members of the community.

Ms. Nugent asked to get information about who's going to review the developer proposals and the criteria for selection. Mr. Evans stated that this is being worked on.

The discussion was closed.

6. Motion: Approving the Grand Junction Pathway Design and Authorizing the Executive Director to Advertise the Construction of Phase One of the Grand Junction Pathway on Parcel 7 between Main St. and Broadway. (Mr. Evans) *

Mr. Evans stated that based on discussions at the Design Review meeting earlier in the evening, there is some new design directions which is surprising since iterations have been made along the way. Therefore he wasn't prepared to pursue this motion and may need to consider a design surface contract amendment to make changes to the plan but he has no idea of the scope. He will check with FST who believe they are done so asking them to do more work will require more money.

Ms. Born suggested that part of the plan be considered as "not part of the contract" and proceed in a subtractive method. Mr. Zevin explained that there were issues raised with the basic path. Ideas were discussed including just doing the path, removing the gazebo with the resulting soil excavating issues, being allowed to leave the gazebo in the quasi-open public space that's already been inaccessible for nearly a year. Mr. Crawford was also surprised since a walk-through months ago had addressed many of the issues. Mr. Crawford thought that it was recommended to remove the gazebo.

Ms. Born raised the idea of bidding alternates. Mr. Evans stated that it makes the bid document more complex, especially for a small contract. FST is contracted to draw up a bid set at some point when given the go-ahead. We had talked about alternate bids relative to a water fountain. Due to a new regulation, in order to have water servicing an open space, the water meter and back flow preventer need to be above

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



ground which requires a \$20,000 excavation for plumbing. Even without the fountain, we still have a nonconforming water meter and back flow preventer.

Ms. Born suggested doing something temporarily if the price is reasonable and she would feel comfortable proceeding. Mr. Evans stated that this interim solution had been discussed at one point but could be revisited.

There was much discussion about the refinement of the corner – rounding out the curve, getting rid of the diagonal path, ignore the stairs, dealing with the traffic control box, etc.

Ms. Born doesn't want to hold up the project and would vote to delegate the project. Mr. Evan explained that we are in the City's design review process and the city wants the current design.

Answering Ms. Born's question, Mr. Crawford stated that although this parcel does not have a prominent position relative to the East Cambridge open space plans; it does demonstrate some level of momentum.

Ms. Born asked about the "lifespan" of the internal area of the site – the gazebo and the cross-path. Mr. Evans stated that this is a short-term improvement. He expects that a combination of ideas being presented from the current open space design competition and the Whitehead discussion regarding the plaza will cause us to revisit this corner at a later time. The question is whether to do something now.

Other ideas discussed were removing the wood of the gazebo and installing railings on the concrete or downsizing the landscape material from shrubs to grass.

Mr. Jason Zogg stated that the primary purpose of the project is to get some element of the much-awaited Grand Junction bicycle path. Ms. Born agreed that the rest of it could be seen as filler until something more significant happens as a result of the longer East Cambridge open space planning process.

Mr. Evans suggested that a discussion with Whitehead would happen next month regarding their construction and the resulting loss of open space, which will most likely influence the decision of how to proceed. Ms. Born does not want us to be an impediment to the progress on this project.

Mr. Evans suggested increasing the turn's radii to address the sidewalk crowding issue, leave out the gazebo for future design but fill around it awaiting landscaping in the future. Mr. Evans explained that the City would like to keep the gazebo to see if they can make this area active with furniture, an accessible path, etc. Ms. Born gave a history of the gazebo and the area.

Mr. Evans stated the two counter-proposals. One is to "mothball" the gazebo and the other is to continue with this as an experiment in urban place making to be replaced by some other intervention at some point. He also suggested that the Board could make a delegation to a design sub-committee which would be in the form of a public meeting to be scheduled in a couple of weeks. Mr. Zevin suggested that City representatives be involved and that if possible, a better understanding of the Whitehead results should be known. Mr. Evans stated that a connection to the Whitehead resolution could add 3 or 4 months to the process.

Rather than going out to bid twice, Ms. Madden suggested asking FST to do a cost estimate and then put one thing out to bid. Mr. Evans stated that the reason to do add alts is because you don't have the budget figured out. We are currently under budget at this point in time from a construction standpoint and most of what we talked about would make the cost cheaper. However we are facing a 20-30% increase in soft cost.

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



The MIT money doesn't evaporate but it is designated for constructing the path. Mr. Evans thinks that creating a 2nd stage of this project would need to be financed by other means. The only thing MIT has asked not to finance is the accessible path leading up to the gazebo. The goal is to use all the MIT money delegated to things that won't change.

We want any construction to start early spring and a bid process needs to be included in that timeframe. Mr. Evans feels that this can be met if we approve a design at the December meeting. Unknown is whether we have the budget to do a significant redesign which means that we'd come back in December to re-contract and have a decision in January which could cause a slip in the schedule.

The motion was postponed to December pending conversation with the city to discuss the comments from the public meeting.

7. Update: CRA Forward Fund Proposal (Mr. Zogg) *

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

The CRA staff reworked the name of the fund from Community Fund to Forward Fund. The document is now only 4 pages. The CRA's mission and operating principals are outlined in the document, which shows a real connection. There is a strong purpose statement explaining this fund as a micro-grant to reinvest development funds generated in Kendall Square for piloting projects for physical improvements that better the community environment. The goals presented at the last board meeting haven't changed. The available funding is still \$40,000. There are 2 award types - capacity and capital grants. The latter one requires a 1:1 organizational match by an outside funding source. We changed the payout process from 100% reimbursement to 50% paid at the time of the award and 50% paid at time of the projects completion, which would be kinder to the nonprofit world.

Mr. Zogg pointed out the expanded section on who should apply; namely any Cambridge-based nonprofit (501c3) organization, a Cambridge-based nonprofit organization that has a contract with a (501c3) fiscal sponsor, or a Cambridge-based independent small business. He mentioned an added section, which provides examples of the types of project types that could be offered, an eligibility criteria section, which has 6 questions that must be answered yes to apply and a section on evaluation criteria. This latter section explains the 5 project-related and 3 applicant-related criteria that an advisory council will use to score each applicant. The actual sheet hasn't been created yet. He noted that one of the project related criteria is demonstrating a tangible public benefit in an under-resourced area of Cambridge designated by the City of Cambridge Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas. The last section explains the procedures for applying and awarding the funds for the two grant types. The last page discusses the reporting of the outcomes required by an awardee so that the CRA can report the impact of the dollars we are spending for public benefits.

The governance structure hasn't changed. Mr. Zogg will be the CRA staff member accepting applications and answering questions. He is working on creating the advisory committee of CRA and City staff members from various departments.

Mr. Evans stated that the next event for the board would be approving the funding for the group of recommended proposals selected by the advisory committee. Given the go-ahead, deadlines for proposals would be around 8 weeks with possible extensions.

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



Mr. Zevin mentioned some typos and also wondered what constitutes a small business. Ms. Madden focused on the word "independent" and added that the selection committee would use the evaluation criteria to select appropriate awardees.

Ms. Born thinks that this project might take a few years to know how the project is working. The Forward Fund is currently a one-year pilot program that will be evaluated to determine whether it should be continued "as is" or modified.

John Hawkinson asked if the CRA would consider helping people network with a 501(c)(3). Mr. Zogg said that this can be clarified in the document. The application would be a fill-in document on the CRA website. We would advertise with postcards, email lists, information sessions, an FAQ online forum, etc. to address the 501(c)(3) question and others that might arise.

Mr. Cassa asked whether design work for the creation of a small certification training center on the Cherry Street lot could be a potential Forward Fund application since the timetable for this could take longer than a year. Mr. Evans suggested that it is possible that the Cherry Street lot could be looked at by the CRA. Mr. Zogg said that the design could fall under the capacity grant.

Ms. Dankerlin cautioned that it is very tricky to be involved in selecting a fiscal agent. To ensure a level playing field in the procurement process, the fiscal agent shouldn't influence the process. Mr. Evans restated that the CRA should not suggest which fiscal agents are to be used. Ms. Dankerlin added that the fiscal agent should also be vetted. Ms. Born said the carefully selected advisory committee made up of City and CRA members would know the non-profits and could help screen fiscal agents.

The motion authorizing the Executive Director to implement a Pilot Round of CRA Forward Fund Grants for up to \$40,000 was unanimously approved.

Ms. Born reiterated that, although this is a small amount to start, it demonstrate that the CRA will put its money in the bank and money coming from development fees into benefits for the public.

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

Mr. Evans highlighted that the staff is considering a need to do some improved rebranding to help with our outreach. We are exploring options to hire a graphic designer to help with the concept of a new logo and graphic presence.

We have a new snow contractor replacing Greenscape who decided to discontinue their snow work in our area.

Mr. Evans passed out a list of proposed board meeting dates for 2015 if we continue to meet on the 3rd Wednesday of each month. There are some holidays that are noted so if a conflict exists, the dates should be modified.

Looking forward we need to bring in Whitehead in December. He was not sure when any valuable information about Volpe would be available. Mr. Hawkinson asked about the Volpe zoning which has a clearer calendar. Mr. Evans said that there wasn't much in the Volpe zoning that hasn't been seen as part of

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



the K2 plan until the CDD roles out something more specific in the January timeframe. Also coming up are the budget discussions for 2015 and the Investment Policy.

The Parcel 6 update was postponed. We've had several proposals "floating by" starting with a market manager to run a semi-permanent farmers market which wasn't feasible. We then explored a maker village concept, which is also turning out to be unfeasible because the space was not seen as conducive to the makers. A tool lending library was also investigated but it had a high programmatic operating cost. Now Relish is proposing in December a vending machine village with fresh food, craft and/or supplies.

Mr. Crawford commented that this will not promote job creation but rather appears to have the opposite affect. Mr. Zevin added that this is not "eyes on the street."

Ms. Born asked for more information about Whitehead. Mr. Evans will try to get more information for the December meeting. There was a discussion regarding their contribution into the Cambridge Community Fund, a development fee to the CRA, the approval roles of the CRA, Planning Board and City Council since their zoning proposal is going through Article 19, whether the State will view their amendment to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan as a major or minor amendment, etc. A petition presentation is being made to the Planning Board on December 16.

Regarding Kendall Center, there is construction at 80 Broadway, and a modification to the elevator location, which was part of CRA review. On another note, earlier last year, we didn't approve monument signs that Boston Properties proposed since a more global discussion about way-finding and signage in Kendall Square area was needed. Recently, discussions have occurred with MIT and KSA who want to bring in a consultant to move this project forward. We are exploring the idea of interested parties (Boston Properties, KSA, MIT, CRA, etc.) contributing financially on perhaps a \$30,000 contract.

The MIT coop is going through final sets of plans for the food court and the new store design with Boston Properties as the landlord and then it will come to the CRA board including the signage package for approval.

We continue to participate in the Connect Kendall Square process. We are working with DPW regarding the response to the Councilor order on the Galaxy Structure in Point Park and we are doing a bit more contractual work with Boston Properties for the Ames Street design review hearing on December 2nd regarding the letter of agreement from last year.

Ms. Born asked about the outcome of the Planning Board meeting. Mr. Evans said that the zoning hasn't changed (same proportion of housing, commercial, innovation space, heights, etc.) from the City's proposal; the only added thing was that this is expected in January and a Volpe RFQ is coming sometime soon after that. Mr. Zevin added that it was pointed out that the 7.5 acre park was a numerical impossibility given everything else desired for the site and that the Rogers Street Park be counted towards offsetting and that open space includes streets. Mr. Hawkinson added that the probability of Volpe moving was low. Mr. Zevin is of the opinion that the City seems keen on de-branding Kendall Square by removing the distinctive look (light fixtures, for example). Mr. Evans stated that the goal of the property owners is to do what they can control on a short/medium/long term by grouping together as a coalition. This was a compromise to hold-off from individual installations, although some owners are going forth with sign variance proposal.

The monthly Executive Director's report was unanimously approved to be placed on file.

9. Report: Monthly Report on Budget and Expenditures for 2014 (Mr. Evans)*

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

255 Main Street/Fourth Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
617 492-6800
617 492-6804 (FAX)



Mr. Evans stated that most categories, except payroll and taxes, are under budget. As part of the reconciliation of the closeout of the 2013 books by the auditor, some line items were affected and have been modified since the date of this report. We have not spent as much on lawyers and did not make some of the capital expenditures that were anticipated. The projected \$400,000 in income will occur once the building permit for the Ames Street residential project occurs which won't happen until Q1 2015, at best.

The monthly report on budget and expenditures for 2014 was unanimously approved to be placed on file.

10. Motion: Authorizing the Chair and the Executive Director to amend the professional services contract for real estate consulting services with HR&A for an additional \$15,000, for an amount not to exceed \$75,000 (Mr. Evans)

Mr. Evans stated that HRA has used \$35K out of \$60K based on the Foundry. We now want them to do a real estate analysis of the value of the development of air-rights in Kendall Square. We would use this to formulate a housing policy related to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. The CRA board wants to hit a 15% net affordability in housing so an independent assessment of the residential and the commercial square footage would help us in negotiations with Boston Properties of the LDA once new entitlements are provided under the urban renewal plan. Mr. Evans said that this will be geared towards the impact of both the land disposition agreement sums and affordable housing.

The motion authorizing the Chair and the Executive Director to amend the professional services contract for real estate consulting services with HR&A for an additional \$15,000, for an amount not to exceed \$75,000 was unanimously approved.

11. Discussion: Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan Amendment & MEPA Review (Mr. Evans)

Mr. Evans said that we have submitted a traffic study scope to MassDOT for review so we can assess the scope of the transportation analysis that MassDOT is going to require in the MEPA process. We have to do MEPA because this is an urban renewal plan amendment that will be a State decision. This will be a notice of project change from the original EIR of 1977 which cleared MEPA in general. This is an EIR of smaller scope since resources have been vetted and haven't changed. We'll be looking at traffic, greenhouse gases, climate change resiliency, possibly wind, and storm water /sewer /utility capacity. The critical path is traffic and its transit impact so we first went to MASSDOT. We are trying to get a document for public review in the MEPA process in February or March, assuming all the analysis happens. This should precede the zoning petition. At the end of this process, we hope to have the MEPA information before the City Council at the same time as a plan change and a potential zoning petition sometime in 2015. The final item is that our urban renewal plan needs to get approved by the state which is after they finalize the MEPA document.

We are doing the traffic analysis of the million square feet assigned in the K2 plan that Whitehead is doing 60,000 as one plan amendment. Mr. Evans spoke with GSA and Volpe staff about how MEPA/NEPA will work. They want to keep it separate so there's no state decision in the Volpe plan at this point, so it's unclear if that will meet a MEPA threshold. The US government needs to do an environmental document under NEPA for the disposition. GSA made clear that they want to do a land deal and after that it's the developer responsibility to deal with MEPA review and the permitting work. They will be looking at the design proposals as part of their RFP process.

Motion to adjourn was approved at 9:47pm