i. Agenda

1. Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the CRA Board on February 25, 2015

2. Whitehead Institute Zoning Petition Narrative / Zoning Guidelines Memorandum to City Council

3. Letter from City Manager Richard Rossi regarding staff assistance toward the construction of the Grand Junction Community Path

4. Correspondence from Stephen Kaiser regarding the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan Amendment

5. Monthly Report to the Board of the Executive Director

6. Monthly Budget Reports

7. Revised Schematic Design of the Grand Junction Community Path

8. Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan Affordable Housing Analysis

9. 2014 Annual Traffic Count Program & Trip Generation Analysis**

10. Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan Amendment:
    a. KSURP Amendment Summary
    b. Revised KSURP Amendment Text

** Under separate cover
NOTICE OF MEETING

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Open Meeting Law, M.G.L. c. 30A, §§ 18-25, notice is hereby given of a meeting of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority to take place as follows:

____________________________________________________
Regular Board Meeting
Wednesday, March 18, 2015 at 5:30 pm
Cambridge Police Department
First Floor Community Room
125 Sixth Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142

___________________________________________________
MEETING AGENDA

The following is a proposed agenda containing the items the Chair of the Authority reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting:

Call

Public Comment

Minutes
1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the CRA Board on February 25, 2015*

Communications

2. February 05, 2015 Whitehead Institute Zoning Petition Narrative / Zoning Guidelines Memorandum to City Council *
3. March 5, 2015 Letter from City Manager Richard Rossi regarding staff assistance toward the construction of the Grand Junction Community Path *
4. March 10, 2015 Correspondence from Stephen Kaiser regarding the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan Amendment *

Reports, Motions and Discussion Items:

5. Report: Monthly Report to the Board of the Executive Director (Mr. Evans)*
6. Report: Monthly Budget Report (Mr. Evans) *
7. Update: Grand Junction Path (Mr. Zogg) *

**Motion:** Approving the Revised Schematic Design of the Grand Junction Community Path and authorizing the Executive Director to execute public bidding of the Final Drawings for Construction in accordance with the Procurement Policy

8. Report: Kendall Square Urban Renewal Affordable Housing Analysis (Mr. Evans) *


10. Discussion: Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan Amendment (Mr. Evans) *

   a. Community Benefit Forum
   b. Text Revisions to Plan Document

Adjournment

(*) Supporting material posted at: www.cambridgeredevelopment.org/next-meeting/

Next Board Meeting:

- Regular Meeting - **April 15, 2015** - 5:30 PM

The Cambridge Redevelopment Authority is a “local public body” for the purpose of the Open Meeting Law pursuant to M. G. L. c. 30A, § 18.

M. G. L. c. 30A, § 20, provides, in relevant part:

(b) Except in an emergency, in addition to any notice otherwise required by law, a public body shall post notice of every meeting at least 48 hours prior to such meeting, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays. In an emergency, a public body shall post notice as soon as reasonably possible prior to such meeting. Notice shall be printed in a legible, easily understandable format and shall contain the date, time and place of such meeting and a listing of topics that the chair reasonably anticipates will be discussed at the meeting.

(c) For meetings of a local public body, notice shall be filed with the municipal clerk and posted in a manner conspicuously visible to the public at all hours in or on the municipal building in which the clerk's office is located.
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Public sign-in sheet attached.

Call

The meeting was called to order at 5:50 p.m.

CRA President Ms. Kathleen Born introduced herself, other CRA Board members, CRA staff and intern, Strategic Planner Kathryn Madden, and Architectural Design Consultant Chuck Redmon.

The meeting started with a moment of silence in remembrance of Assistant City Manager for Community Development, Brian Murphy. This was followed by a lovely tribute to Mr. Murphy by CRA Treasurer Mr. Christopher Bator whose words are below:

Many of us here knew Brian, as a friend, a professional colleague, or as a public servant in Cambridge and Massachusetts. For anyone who knew him, his passing is a profound loss. Foremost, he was a lovely person. He was also, in my view, a model, the ideal, public servant: deeply committed; highly intelligent and principled; interested and sophisticated in his understanding of the most complicated policy matters; and wonderful with people. He was always fun to be around.

Brian was also a great friend to the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority. This new Board, what we have done to-date, and what we might accomplish in the future, are in large part due to Brian’s vision and force of mind.

The tributes to Brian have been many and moving. I note particularly his wake in City Hall, where the lines were long, frequently down the stairs, from 3:00 until after 9:00 at night. I hope the memory of that will be important to his children, perhaps not right now, but later on. Brian’s wife, Kate, told me that his extended family was overwhelmed and moved in a good way; they hadn’t comprehended how many people and lives he touched.

The tributes to Brian were appropriate and fitting. For it is right to praise so much quality in one man.
Public Comment

Ms. Born thanked Mr. Kaiser for his letter regarding the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan Amendment.

Mr. Steve Kaiser stated that he would be leaving the CRA meeting early for the East Cambridge Planning Team meeting on the Volpe Center being held tonight at 7pm. Due to recent events this past month - the significant snowfall, the “rise and fall” of Olympics 2024, and the collapse of the MBTA system, Mr. Kaiser had some additions to his letter, which is part of this February board packet. Transit-oriented development is in jeopardy. The MBTA has demonstrated that they can’t deliver in an effective manner. We need to make transit a priority over everything. He suggested using money that would be raised for the Olympics for transit. Boston Properties should take ownership of this issue and work with the CRA to create an operations transit improvement. Mr. Kaiser urged getting Rick Azzalina involved. He suggested goals of increasing transit capacity by 100% in 10 years and 200% in 20 years be met to be on par with the efficiency of the Japanese transit system. No train should be delayed more than 8 seconds. Mr. Kaiser stated that he will oppose any up-zoning in the City until a viable transportation plan for the City of Cambridge is adopted.

Heather Hoffman –

ACTION ITEM: In the December board minutes, on page 9, correct “covernance” to “governance.”

In respect to the Biogen signs, Ms. Heather strongly objects to signs on the tops of buildings, especially since these signs are not a way-finding mechanism for drivers and pedestrians. Ground level signs are sufficient. With respect to the selection of trees for the Ames Street project, Ms. Hoffman referenced an article that attributed an increase in pollen count to the planting of only male trees. Since this negatively affects the multitude of people who suffer from hay fever, reducing the use of allergenic pollen producing trees should be considered.

Ms. Born asked Ms. Hoffman if there were minor refinements for the two Biogen rooftop sign locations since rooftop signs are accepted under the MXD Signage Guidelines. Ms. Hoffman repeated that these “billboards” are unnecessary and should be placed lower to the ground where people who need to locate the companies can see them. She added that any illumination be turned off earlier rather than late.

Public Comment closed.

Minutes

1. Motion: To approve the minutes of the December 17, 2014 regular meeting of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

   ACTION ITEM: The minutes will include the one edit from Ms. Hoffman and placed on file.

2. Motion: To approve the minutes of the January 21, 2015 regular meeting of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

   ACTION ITEM: On page 8, “London Pine” should read “London Plane” and on page 10, change “preceed” to “precede.” The minutes will be placed on file with these corrections.
Communications

3. Transmittal from City Manager Rich Rossi to the Cambridge City Council regarding the Disposition Report for the Foundry Building on January 26, 2015.

Mr. Zevin stated that this was a clear summary and useful to have.

**ACTION ITEM:** The letter was unanimously approved to be placed on file.

4. Letter from City Councillor Timothy J. Toomey, Jr. regarding the Grand Junction Multiuse Path received January 22, 2015

Ms. Born explained that the letter thanks the CRA for its action on the multi-use path and sets a larger vision for the continued development of the path. Mr. Evans noted that Transportation and Public Utilities Committee will be conducting a public hearing to receive updates and to discuss next steps for the shared-use, rail-with-trail path along the City's Grand Junction corridor on March 25 at 4pm.

**ACTION ITEM:** The letter was unanimously approved to be placed on file.

5. Comments received from Stephen Kaiser regarding the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan

Mr. Evans noted that many of Mr. Kaiser’s comments were reflected in the draft of the amendment found in today’s board packet. The board thanked Mr. Kaiser.

**ACTION ITEM:** The letter was unanimously approved to be placed on file.

Ms. Hoffman added that she attended an MAPC winter council meeting this morning which was devoted to transportation. The MPO and MAPC were soliciting ideas and priorities on spending transportation money. Ms. Hoffman said that over 100 people attended and the overwhelming preference was for transit improvement.

The Communication section portion of the agenda was closed.

**Reports, Motions and Discussion Items:**

6. Election of Officers (Ms. Born)

Mr. Bator moved to reelect the slate of officers as it stands for the following year. A role call was taken:

- Mr. Bator – Yes
- Ms. Drury – Yes
- Ms. Born – Yes
- Mr. Crawford – Yes
- Mr. Zevin – Yes

The current slate of officers remains as is.

Mr. Evans noted that a few updates were made since the report was posted on the February board materials portion of website. The word “draft” was removed and some other minor modifications. The overall point of the report is to look back to see what we’ve accomplished. Whereas the 2013 Annual Report was a story of recovery and assessment, the 2014 Annual Report is one of rebuilding our institutional capacity, our systems and, more importantly, what we should be doing in the future. In 2014, we created a Strategic Plan and wrote a mission statement which guides all of our future work. Mr. Evans noted that the report is dedicated to Mr. Murphy as our current situation is due to his vision.

The picture on the introductory page shows a peak moment of CRA work with the open collaborative planning process meeting for the Foundry, our first new initiative besides the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. This models our new mission and operating principals of transparency and working towards action, and helping to solve challenging real estate problems for the City. The general structure of the annual report follows that of the Strategic Plan – Internal Operations, Finances, Activities & Projects, and Outreach & Learning. With respect to our internal operations, we created an Internal Control Policy and a Procurement Policy. We concentrated on our history and files, understanding the pieces of the past and giving many documents and pictures to the Cambridge library for archival. We are holding onto the Kendall Square documents.

As for finances, we had a more positive audit than the 2013 Audit although we need to do some more bookkeeping adjustments and work with our investments. The chart on page 6 shows that although we have a good reserve of cash, we’ve had little income in 2014. There were no development fees in 2014 so we are working from our savings and small investment income. Most of our budget is spent on personnel staff and professional consulting services. Following that, are offices expenses, mostly due to rent. We have some property management expenses, especially for snow removal. A small portion of expenses are for community outreach which will be growing. Towards the end of 2014, we made a major bookkeeping improvement which will allow us to track all expenses by project.

In the activities and projects section, the biggest project occurring in Kendall Square was the opening of the Broad Institute which created a single research campus for them on Ames Street. There was also a rebranding of Cambridge Center into Kendall Center and an uptick in activities on the plaza in particular. As a fortuitous accident of the Main Street construction project, the farmers market moved onto the plaza and has been very successful there. We will continue to push for public programming on the plaza which creates a strong civic atmosphere. The rebranding of Kendall Center created energy for programming in the area. In conjunction with the new signage for Kendall Center, Boston Properties promoted the entrance to the rooftop garden with signs and mural to help direct people to that facility. We’ve made major strides with the Ames Street residences and hope to start construction this year. Boston Properties started construction of a portion of their innovative office space in the basement of 80 Broadway, formally 4 Cambridge Center, which the CRA had been using for storage space. The Google complex was finalized for their occupancy. The Kendall Square Connect Open Competition results are currently displayed in this area, there are two restaurants with indoor/outdoor seating, and possibly another vendor is coming but more can be done.

With respect to the Infrastructure section, the streetscape on Ames Street was completed, the final touches on the Broadway streetscape were made, and the Main Street streetscape was started. There were some delays with the Main Street project. In 2014, we began planning for the continued expansion of Kendall Center based on the urban design plans that were reviewed late last year. Outside of Kendall Square, the
main project is the Foundry. We’ve written a mission for the building and took the process from a collection of ideas to an implementation strategy. This involved the adoption of a demonstration plan that allows the CRA to get involved financially as well as in the procurement process of selecting a development entity. This is a deviation from the standard sole City’s disposition process. We hope to see this project move forward this year. We also launched the Forward Fund project which will provide micro-grants to community groups. We made strides on the Grand Junction pathway design after learning of the toxic soil issue which is being addressed.

In the Outreach & Learning section on page 14, we created a Strategic Plan, which defines our operating principals (focused on action, operating with transparency, maximizing public benefit in our work, operating with fiscal responsibility, and setting an example). This plan has created positive interest from other municipalities.

The graph on page 14 is a bit dated as the MXD and Forward Fund (now known as the Community Loan Fund) are 2015 current projects. We continue to do broader planning and connect with smart growth, innovation and sustainability for an urban area which has been evident with the focus of the Eco-district in Kendall Square. Also included in this document are eight strategic priorities for 2015, which will be evaluated for success when the annual 2015 report is written. Although there are other projects, like Parcel 6, we don’t want to lose sight that these eight are our main focus. Mr. Bator stated that he is pleased with the success of the year and publically thanked the staff.

Mr. Evans noted an item not on tonight’s agenda. There is an internal controls issue with regards to the snow removal budget item. Our policy states that we cannot spend more than 10% of the amount budgeted. Although we used last year’s high budget as a guideline, it isn’t enough this year. We have currently reached the budget and have outstanding invoices of twice as much just for January and February. There is also the possibility of more snow now and in November and December. Instead of a formal budget adjustment, Mr. Evans asked for authorization to spend above the budgeted amount for snow removal. Ms. Born stated that the board recognizes that this is an unusual year for weather. Mr. Bator explained that this process is exactly what he envisioned with regards to the internal controls policy so that expenditures above 10% would need board approval.

Mr. Crawford suggested we look at FEMA for financial assistance. Mr. Evans agreed that it would be helpful to understand the emergency response process for many reasons. In cooperation with Boston Properties and the City, Mr. Evans said that we are sharing our snow storage space. Mr. Zevin commented on the amount of ice melt being used. Our previous snow removal contractor left in the fall and due to time constraints, we shifted to our current vendor. We might want to do another procurement process for a snow removal operator in the area. State law exempts snow removal from 401B contracting. Ms. Born suggested using an average of the last three years when creating next year’s snow removal budget.

A role call was taken on the motion to adjust the snow removal budget line item to $40,000.

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

ACTION ITEM: The budget will be updated to reflect this approved amount.

ACTION ITEM: The annual report will be placed on file.
8. Motion: To approve the proposed Biogen Idec building identification signage program for Parcel Two of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area

Mr. Chris Barr, Associate Director of Community Relations, started the presentation to the Board. Over thirty years ago, Biogen moved into Cambridge and now has over 3,200 employees in Kendall Square with the mission to deliver cutting-edge science and innovative medicines to patients worldwide. As they continue to grow in Kendall Square, they want to update their signage around campus in a thoughtful and tasteful manner with innovative way-finding and mapping, building markers, address and building signage. John Fernberg, Director of Facilities, walked through the details of the proposal.

Biogen is undergoing a rebranding effort so this is an excellent opportunity to include way-finding and show the brand. The new address change is also included which is useful for first responders and pedestrians trying to find the campus. A larger map was distributed to the audience. Biogen has taken pedestrian and vehicular views into account. Mr. Fernberg indicated where signs (both ground and roof-line) are now and where they will be in the future. The content of way-finding signs is still in progress and they are open for comments and discussions. All locations worldwide will have the new logo brand. Mr. Fernberg showed examples of the free standing ID signs, way-finding signs and their placement. Mr. Evans said that the KSA is trying to uniform the map graphic used on way-finding signs so Biogen agreed to hold off its manufacturing of the map until an agreement was reached. Ms. Madden wants the CRA to have a voice of how these maps look. Mr. Zevin would like to have a standard look for the campus map as well as the sign. Biogen would like to include the hub-ways and EZ rides locations. Ms. Madden said to look at MASCO who just did a coordinated signage project. Mr. Evans noted that Downtown Crossing used the same designer. The signs are not currently illuminated but it was suggested to include this feature. Mr. Crawford asked about the analysis that was done for determining the locations of the way-finding maps. A discussion of viable areas occurred. Mr. Evans suggested that the best locations might be on CRA land. Mr. Redmon suggested raising the position of the company name on the signs. Mr. Zogg suggested that the revised handicap logo is used. The new Biogen logo will become public on March 23.

Ms. Born noted that the CRA does not have jurisdiction of what the signs say just their sign size dimensions.

The building identification signs in the proposal include two roof-line signs, two podium signs, a re-cladding of an existing sign and ground level signs on East and West. Mr. Evans noted that East and West are not municipal streets. CRA staff is still working with Biogen and the KSA to determine the amount of way-finding signs, their location and content. Biogen will come back to the CRA board once decisions have been made with the KSA.

Motion: The motion to approve the proposed Biogen Idec Building identification Signage Program for Parcel Two of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area, subject to future review of the pedestrian orientation sign locations and map graphic was unanimously approved.

9. Update: Ames Street Residences

Mr. Ben Lavery of Boston Properties provided an update on the process with the city. There’s been a lot of collaboration through the summer. As we entered into the Article 19 process, we didn’t report as often to the CRA group as we would have liked to have done. We had a hearing and subsequently met with CDD staff on more than three occasions to work out some of the details and met with respective staff groups. We
documented and submitted a revised packet on February 4th in response to the comments that we heard in early December and we are on the agenda for March 3rd. Mr. Lavery invited the CRA board to participate and provide comments and hopefully support for the project. Mr. Lavery feels confident about the outcome. The efforts with CDD staff have been good. Some of the aspects of the design were further advanced than had been anticipated which took longer to work through. The changes are relatively modest from where we left off last time. This presentation is consistent with what is being presented at the March 3rd hearing.

Mr. Evans noted that the full 70-color page submission was not printed in its entirety for the board packet. The packet does include the VHB summarized cover memo. The full report was posted on the CRA website.

Mr. Lavery explained that there were seven categories that Boston Properties was asked to revisit – architectural, landscaping, on-site bike parking and hubway, Pioneer Way, loading dock management procedures, unit mix, and wind comfort criteria. Minor issues resolved included bike storage which was expanded to fully comply with the ordinance and the addition of a hubway, loading dock procedures which were documented, and wind comfort criteria which was clarified. Mr. Lavery showed the renderings provided from the December 2nd meeting and the current renderings. He explained the differences which are very subtle changes. The fundamental building elements and geometry haven’t changed. Color has been added in certain areas and the pocket park design has evolved; raised planters, trees and a hubway were added.

Mr. Evans suggested doing a mockup. Mr. Redmon suggested a site visit to other buildings.

Mr. Lavery spoke about the building materials used. There is no lighting of the cap. He noted the modified corner for better visibility of pedestrians. The City determined the streetscape layout and wanted the protected bike lane to pass in front of the building. Mr. Zevin is puzzled by this decision. There will be time to revise the details of the street design but the residential project will not revisit the decision by the City. There is more dimensionality of the store front. The landscape summary is broken into three areas. The current trees will need to be removed and most likely not survive replanting. Mr. Evans asked if the CRA could consider taking them for the Grand Junction landscape. A level to the bike structure was added. The mitered corner that adds visibility between the sidewalk and Pioneer Way was noted. There needs to be more discussions regarding the access to the area by fire trucks. Mr. Evans suggested that a relocation of a hydrant might be considered.

Mr. Lavery spoke about the modifications made to Pioneer Way. There are some loading dock issues but these same situations occur in other crowded locations. An explanation of how a truck will maneuver was discussed. There’s a 35-foot maximum box truck allowance, no semi-trucks. Trucks will be needed for trash removal, moving residents, food services. Leases will need to be clear and building managers will know to turn larger trucks away.

Boston Properties is seeking a permit for a steel building. After the Schematic Design (SD) phase, when they get into Design Development (DD) phase, it is possible that a concrete building might be pursued. They prefer the quality of concrete buildings, but from a cost perspective at this time steel is less expensive. To change the materials, they would have to go back to the Planning Board. The change would not decrease the number of units but each floor would have 6-inch lower ceilings. Mr. Zogg urged Mr. Lavery to be creative with any alley-ways. Mr. Lavery remains optimistic and feels that all issues have been addressed except for one minor issue as it relates to transportation but they are working through it. The hearing is next Tuesday. CRA staff will be there. The architects are happy with the results of the process.
10. Discussion: Proposed 10th Amendment to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan

Mr. Evans stated that the board packet contains the initial draft of the fully amended restated Urban Renewal Plan. The framing of this entire plan amendment is the K2 Plan, the goal of which was to expand Kendall Square’s innovation center, which includes increasing commercial and residential opportunities and a new focus on sustainability. As we look at the MXD portion of the Urban Renewal Plan, the sites for expansion are the North Garage, 11 CC, possibly some new development at 14 CC sometime in the future, the Whitehead parcel at 9 CC and then possibly something at 3CC above the Coop. Working with Boston Properties who owns most of these properties, Boston Properties could create an office component on the North Garage, a residential component at the corner of Broadway and Galileo, a future mixed-use opportunity by the Kendall Square T-stop. The Urban Renewal Plan is also looking to accommodate the Whitehead proposal on the corner of Galileo and Main. We need to decide how to enrich open space while developing on some of it.

Mr. Redmon asked about the Volpe site. Mr. Evans stated that there will likely be some development at the Volpe site in the near future but its configuration is not known. The City is currently discussing a zoning proposal to increase FAR from 3 to 4. The GSA is currently working on an RFQ to shortlist a set of master developers that would provide Volpe with a new facility on site in exchange for the development rights on the rest of the site. The density and how the open space is laid out are unknown at this time.

Mr. Zevin suggested making thinner and taller residential housing so the area is less packed. Mr. Evans stated that raising the height is one of the variations from the K2 Plan. Raising the height greater than the current 250 foot limit for residential with a bonus for middle income housing could be considered. Ms. Drury suggested that this should be included in the urban renewal plan as a limit. Mr. Evans noted that we’ve been looking at the initial concepts during the past 10 months as well as the initial concepts from Whitehead. At this point we are just laying out the basic framework to allow this to happen within the urban renewal plan. A follow up would be to look at changing the zoning. Both the plan and the rezoning issue would need to go to City Council. And because it’s a major plan amendment a public hearing is required and it has to go to the Planning Board. We’d like urban renewal plan and zoning petition to travel together. We are also watching the outcome of the Whitehead petition. If it is successful, the CRA petition needs to be based on the new zoning as amended by Whitehead. Mr. Bator suggested that the Board would be in favor of increased housing for middle-income families. Mr. Zevin clarified that we want to control shadows and open views so a taller building would be better.

To continue with the intended policy discussion, Mr. Evans explained that we are currently undergoing a MEPA analysis, which will inform the discussion and provide information for the board, City Council and the public. It is a Notice of Project Change because we were operating under an existing EIR but we are analyzing all the major items – transportation and parking, air quality, storm water management, water and wastewater, hazardous material assessment, construction, and the analysis of greenhouse gas emissions, which wasn’t part of a MEPA analysis in 1977. In addition to analyzing the end-impact of the project, we are also analyzing the environmental impacts of creating the project. The MEPA analysis is being worked on with VHB, Boston Properties and other consultants and we hope to have a draft for circulation sometime in March. The materials submitted to MEPA do not include Volpe. There 1977 EIR analyzed the same project area as today, Volpe was not included then either. The EIR is testing the one million square feet of development. Mr. Evans explained that some configuration of the development is required for the analysis.
As for the timeline, there is public comment on the submission of a Notice of Project Change (NPC). The extent of that comment could change the EIR timeline. Mr. Evans noted that we’ve done a robust scoping and have analyzed these. Approval from MEPA supports the capacity we are proposing which could positively influence City Councilors’ votes regarding the urban renewal plan. Getting a MEPA sign-off by June is the goal. That is realistic unless we need to analyze something that hasn’t been done. Once we submit, we get a response in 90 days unless we need to resubmit. We have a signed scoping letter from MassDOT. A notice of project change is basically an announcement of scoping. Hopefully we’ve anticipated our scoping correctly. No certainty is provided by MEPA until they have all materials in front of them.

The intent of tonight’s discussion is to discuss the policy language in the urban square renewal amendment. The document is trying to create a space for one million square feet of development and update the objectives of any antiquated language. Foley Hoag recommended that the language not be removed but rather acknowledged as historical. Mr. Zevin asked if footnotes could be used for the irrelevant material to create a less burdensome document to read. Ms. Drury suggested saving the old copy as an archive and only use the text that reflects the present. Mr. Bator said that there should be a way keep the information but makes the document more interesting and attractive. Preserving the text without it getting in the way should be the approach. The first amendment in 1977 erased all of the NASA discussion and now has the MXD proposal. We will continue to wrestle with the awkwardness of history.

Mr. Evans passed out a chart with major changes to the development regulations, which are all in chapter 4 of the urban renewal plan. Almost everything here needs to be reflected in a future zoning petition. In the past, the urban renewal plan and the zoning petition have mirrored each other. They have strayed over time but much of it is repeated. When possible, our lawyers recommended changing the zoning language to what we want and then referencing the zoning rather than repeating it in the urban renewal plan. For example parking requirement will reference the zoning but for many of the other items there is value being in two places. Mr. Evans explained the columns in the chart. The first column describes the development limitations, the 2nd column states the reference in the document, the 3rd column is what the document currently says and the last column is the proposed change.

The maximum aggregate GFA reflects the K2 increase in development capacity and accidentally reflects the million square feet of K2 and then the Whitehead proposal on top of that. That’s what this document says and it’s an error so it should change and just be the one million square feet increase. Since the 60,000 square feet of Whitehead is going to be part of the million, the proposed language should say 4,302,100 square feet. It also includes the square footage for the 7CC Broad variance that was issued in 2001. The zoning didn’t ever increase the GFA so the overall cap for development in the MXD is a different number than that in the urban renewal plan. Another way to solve this is to take out that 29,100 square feet and have the zoning and urban renewal plan match. Lawyers are discussing this because MIT, when buying the Broad building, would rather have less of a variance and more certainty on how that building exists without a variance. But that’s square footage that already exists and just different in how it’s reflected in the numbers. MIT may not want to have it on the deed, so another variance might not be needed if they had to modify the building. Their interest is to not have the building be nonconforming. So the discussion is whether to change the Urban Renewal Plan number so that it matches the zoning but keep the two different numbers or propose that the petition include a million square feet plus the 29,100 square feet to solidify the Broad’s existence. Either way, the variance needs to be explained because the numbers in the zoning will be different than in the urban renewal plan. Ms. Born suggested changing the zoning number to 1,029,100 so that it includes the Broad variance and explain that the 29,100 is already built. Ms. Drury agreed to keep
things as simple as possible. Mr. Evans clarified that the number would need to change in the zoning; the urban renewal plan already includes this 29,100 square feet.

The K2 plan increases office/biotech space by 600,000 square feet and residential by 400,000 square feet. The urban renewal plan would reflect the Whitehead 60,000 SF addition and propose to change by 600,000 as opposed to 660,000. In the urban renewal plan, Mr. Evans proposed increasing the allowable residential square footage to 800,000 as opposed to 600,000. The million square feet could an office to housing ratio of 60-40 or 40-60. More than 600,000 of office space would not be allowed in the urban renewal plan.

Mr. Bator suggested that since we are setting policy for the considerable future, raising the housing numbers should be considered. We want Kendall Square to thrive and have as much housing as possible. Mr. Zevin stated that you need to know the minimum amount of office space needed to make it work. Mr. Lavery agreed with Mr. Zevin and added that there are a limited number of sites that will overcome the financial development hurdle. Mr. Evans stated that the urban renewal plan is using 15% inclusionary low-moderate income housing as a minimum rather than a 15% inclusionary after a density bonus. The amount of housing will not go below 15% but could go higher. If the City’s limit increases above the 15% yield, our percentage would increase as well.

The middle income requirement is exactly as written in K2 and also matches the MIT PUD and states a 25% of GFA over 250 feet. The next thing strays from K2, where we would propose the residential height limit to 350, with 250 for everything else. This is a difference between the zoning and the K2 plan today. Currently the height limit for the area is 250 from Binney down to Main Street. In the urban renewal plan, the height limit is 96 feet north of Broadway which we’d be removing no matter what.

Ms. Julia Nugent asked if the 60/40 (office/residential) split works from an economic and sustainability viewpoint with regards to viability of stores for a 24-hour community. Mr. Evans stated that in the K2 plan, a real estate economist was hired to focus on the retail economics and said that a 60/40 split would be viable. The CRA has not done any further research. She also questioned the impact to the area other than what MEPA looks at such as schools, transit and infrastructure. Mr. Bator mentioned additional tax revenue from the development. The CRA is not the planning entity of the City and we are relying on the K2 plan. The City is having a broader conversation on housing.

Ms. Born stated that some version of this chart is going to be used at the City councilor and public meetings. A few people will actually wade through the text of the document. Mr. Evans said that he would show the deltas.

The structure of the urban renewal plan and the MXD zoning have an overall GFA and maximums on the uses that make up the overall GFA. We are close to the retail maximum so we are adding a cushion making it 200,000 SF in that use category but that’s not an additive to the commercial square footage. In the K2 plan and in the MIT zoning, retail bits of 5,000 SF or smaller don’t count against your GFA so putting in small shops would not be penalized. This proposal increases that to 10,000 SF for that same exemption. All retail proposed in the plan is not anticipated to drive new trips but here for the ancillary uses of residential and commercial development. Therefore parking will not be required. The grocery store can be built but doesn’t count for the exemption. The language for a waiver for a grocery store or pharmacy is in the retail exemption section on page 17, 4c.
Mr. Evans stated that the K2 Plan has a gross floor area requirement for innovative office space of 5% of office square footage. He then mentioned the notion of innovative retail space in the urban renewal plan. Mr. Crawford asked if makerspace could be considered innovative retail. Mr. Evans suggested investigating this idea.

A larger area for discussion is how to deal with open space. The open space requirements in the current plan come in two forms – 1) For Public Open Space there is a 100,000 SF district-wide requirement and a sub-district requirement of 53,000 SF in the Ames Street district. This is for public open space with a covenant a public ownership of some form. 2) There’s a lot-by-lot requirement that is somewhat awkward with weird exemptions. Many buildings have done calculations of their open-space design based on this requirement so deleting it could create unintended consequences. A softer approach was taken. On pages 17 and 18, the district-wide open space requirement hasn’t changed at all. On page 18, the lot open space requirement we proposed having the same space requirement for residential and commercial open space requirement to remove any dis-incentivizing of residential development. There are three ways to meet this lot open space requirement, now called development project open-space requirement – on your lot, as a commitment or enhancement to open space within the MXD or some commitment of funds or land ½ mile radius of MXD up to 50% of the development requirement. Rather than creating small surgically placed pieces like roof decks and setbacks, this would strive to create larger open-space contributions to the community.

Mr. Evans added that there are revisions on page 25 to make up for the lack of Planning Board Approval and CRA board approval. This document now states that the CRA may create guidelines and procedures for design review. The point of Section 504 brings the concept of design review and planning into the urban renewal plan so that we would create a concept plan (or ask a master developer to create one) to review proposals more specifically. Item D would be a review of the open space plan, which lays out how the open space will be solved. We want to set some parameters to work through proposals as they come before us. There’s also a sustainability component and retail vibrancy conversation that should occur.

Mr. Evans requested feedback of the chart and the document. Ms. Born suggested that the chart be more complete and defensible but to keep it simple, especially for the public meeting on March 12. There should be another column that shows the net proposed change. For the forum, we need to explain why we are doing this and focus on the community benefits so it’s not just a growth debate.

11. Update: Pilot Forward Fund Program

Mr. Zogg said that CRA intern Gabriel Silberblatt has done a tremendous job in helping to move this project along. The website is up, the application is ready and 1500 postcards were printed. Copies of the postcards were available at the board meeting and will be distributed at neighborhood meetings that Mr. Zogg and Mr. Silberblatt will be attending. We also plan to meet with neighborhood leaders. Postcards have been left at CDD and City Hall. E-newsletters containing the information have been sent to the CRA e-list and the City’s participatory budgeting office’s email list. Notices have been sent via Twitter which was re-tweeted by the City and others. The board was very pleased. Mr. Redmon suggested sending notification to high schools.

12. Motion: To authorize the Treasurer to open an investment account with Morgan Stanley transferring up to $5,000,000 into a collateralized investment portfolio

Mr. Evans explained that the board packet contained a brief memo and application materials to enter into an investment account with Morgan Stanley. Staff met with the Morgan Stanley representative David Javaheri
who handles the investments for the City of Cambridge and the Cambridge Housing Authority. He was referred to the CRA by Mr. Louis DePasquale, Cambridge Assistant City Manager of Fiscal Affairs. We currently have close to five million dollars in soon-to-be maturing CDs as well as cash accounts that are earning little to no interest. The proposal is to transfer this money into an investment account with Morgan Stanley into FDIC insured collateralized accounts that are laddered appropriately. We would then work with the board to create a long-term investment strategy that looks at how much of our funds should be invested more aggressively to earn a higher income. The motion is to transfer the money that is not currently tied up in CDs into one Morgan Stanley account and have it managed by a professional financial investor who understands the guidelines for municipal entities. As other CDs become due, we would invest them with Morgan Stanley as directed by a CRA Investment policy. We would retain money for payroll and operating expenses in local banks to maintain those relationships. We have given a forecast of liquidity and on-going budget to Mr. Javaheri so that he understands the CRA’s short-term timeline for projects including the Foundry.

Mr. Bator was impressed with Mr. Javaheri’s knowledge and his ideas for creating a coherent view of our funds and producing a higher overall income. Mr. Zevin questioned allegations of misbehavior of Morgan Stanley and wanted assurance that by following stated mandated guidelines, the CRA is being fiscally responsible and diligent. Mr. Evans clarified the three areas of funds that are valid investment paths for the CRA. The first is FDIC fully insured CDs, each with a maximum of $250,000. The second is the State’s list of 25 or so companies, many of which are utility or strong Blue Chip stocks. The third group is a slightly more aggressive portfolio for the OPEB obligation for retiree’s future medical expenses. Once money is committed to this fund it cannot be removed. Currently we have a $90,000 annual obligation into GIC. Although the application documents cannot be changed, Mr. Bator requested a quick review by Mr. Mullan, the CRA attorney.

MOTION: Upon approval from Mr. Mullan, the motion authorizing the Treasurer to open an investment account with Morgan Stanley transferring up to $5,000,000 into a collateralized investment portfolio was unanimously approved via a roll call of the five board members, Ms. Born, Ms. Drury, Mr. Bator, Mr. Crawford, Mr. Zevin

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m.
MEMORANDUM

02/05/2015

Cambridge City Council

Andy Pecora, LEED BD+C

Whitehead Institute Zoning Petition
Design Narrative/Zoning Guidelines

In addressing the zoning implications for the Whitehead Institute proposed addition, our process began with the review of the K2 Final Report and K2 Design Guidelines. These important documents provide a clear framework for the future, based on detailed analysis and comprehensive planning efforts. The issues discussed within both of these documents are critical in creating a successful urban experience and provide a strong basis for design. The guidelines specifically establish a comprehensive strategy to address the desired character and spirit of the neighborhood. The specific items influencing our initial design are as follows:

- Environmental Quality
- Street Activity
- Universal Access
- Architectural Identity/Visual Interest
- Integrated Rooftops
- Retail/Mixed-use Ground Floors
- Open, public space

Additionally, through the zoning petition process and initial talks with the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, we have received concerns regarding certain elements of the proposed conceptual design. Replacement of existing open space, response to the existing Broad Institute entrance, providing a varied retail experience, aesthetic character, and the creation of a truly public space are among a few of the considerations we will be investigating. The following narrative is directed at addressing and responding to these initial concerns.

Replacement of Existing Open Space

The Whitehead Institute addition is proposed for construction in front of their existing building, located at 9 Cambridge Center, on what is currently a raised outdoor plaza. The proposed building edge along Main Street will be pulled forward, in line and in context with its neighbors, to reinforce a cohesive street wall condition and positive pedestrian experience. The first two levels of the proposed
addition will be primarily dedicated to public functions, following guidelines related to "street activity" set forth in the K2 Design Guidelines. This newly designed "urban living room" will be more than just a lobby. It will instead provide the neighborhood with service/restaurant/retail opportunities aimed at supporting the Kendall Square users at different times of the day throughout the year. The objective of this space will be to foster an engaging street edge and create a vibrant public space, as well as to provide the Whitehead Institute with a new civic face and front entrance.

Visual transparency, universal access, and a diverse selection of retail/service uses are all paramount in creating a successful ground-level urban experience. New retail spaces located along the sidewalk edge will aim to engage pedestrians, while the existing food service operation will be extended and highlighted to help further animate the interior space. The strategic use of glazing will enable visual connections between exterior and interior zones, while taking advantage of a south-facing orientation that affords us the opportunity to create appealing spaces which can be activated throughout the year.

Additionally, this proposal is obligated to carefully respond to direct contextual cues. The location of the existing Broad Institute entrance and the adjacent existing green seating area is such a cue. In this instance, the building envelope may afford some amount of relief along the street edge to acknowledge these existing spaces. This response provides a very exciting opportunity to create an interesting, site-specific moment within a rather consistent street wall; a civic notch, a seating area within a great space.

The design of this space will reflect the objectives of being a welcoming and accessible destination within the Kendall Square neighborhood. The retail and interior spaces must be well lit, highly visible, inviting and comfortable. Necessary elevation changes to access the existing building (level 1 is roughly +4'-0" above grade) will occur further into the building, allowing the new ground floor to be directly accessible from the streetscape. The secured entry for the Institute's lobby functions will be located toward the rear of the space, such that a majority of the "urban living room" is accessible to the public. Overall, the objective is to generate a successful public moment within the neighborhood fabric, while simultaneously functioning as the Whitehead's Institutional "front porch."
Expression of Architecture

The location for the proposed Whitehead Institute addition is also very prominent along the Kendall Square periphery. The site occupies the corner of Main Street and Galileo Galilei Way, acting as a significant node and gateway into the Kendall Square district. This highly visible site demands an architectural aesthetic that is interesting and expressive of the innovative activities occurring within, yet respectful of neighborhood context.

As previously stated, the ground-level expression should promote a welcoming and comfortable atmosphere, and be highly visible through the use of ground-level transparency. Proper proportioning and relation to human scale at the ground level are important strategies in providing a sense of comfort. Opportunities may be available to provide moments of engagement between the pedestrians and the building itself. For example, seating and interaction spaces could potentially be integrated into the building’s facade, creating another level of engagement as a community destination.

As a gateway building, the proposed addition will need to be distinct and embracing. Appropriate selection of materials and formal expression will be key to achieving these intentions. By integrating the penthouse volume into the top of the building, additional height will be incorporated into the building facade along Main Street. Formally, this will help signify entrance and will forge a stronger connection to the adjacent street wall.

While striving to develop a sense of architectural diversity and interest within the district, the addition must also establish some relation with the original building and its neighbors. Contextual datum lines, both from the original building and adjacent structures, should be continued to produce a unified street wall experience. Furthermore, materials similar and/or complementary to those in the original building will help to integrate the addition with the existing structure in order to create a cohesive identity. They will also provide a warm offset to the principal material, which is expected to be glass.
March 5, 2015

Tom Evans, Executive Director  
Cambridge Redevelopment Authority  
255 Main Street, 4th Floor  
Cambridge, MA 02142

Dear Mr. Evans,

I am pleased to be able to offer staff assistance to Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA) as the agency moves forward with the first phase of the Grand Junction Community Path between Main Street and Broadway. The Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Traffic, Parking and Transportation Department (TP&T) are both excited about the opportunity to support the development of this critical piece of infrastructure and look forward to working with you and your contractor throughout the construction phase.

DPW can assist with construction management services. The DPW has successfully overseen numerous infrastructure improvement projects that are similar in size and scope to this project. TP&T will utilize in-house expertise to assist with installing portions of the new transportation infrastructure. Both the DPW and the TP&T have joined in my enthusiasm to work together to bring this important transportation and recreation project to fruition.

The current expectation is that the CRA and its consultant would oversee the procurement process, from finalizing the bid documents to awarding the contract. The project would be bid by early spring to allow construction to be substantially complete before the 2015 winter moratorium begins, which is typically mid-November.

To help facilitate a mutual understanding of roles and responsibilities by DPW and the CRA, a bulleted summary is presented below.

**DPW Roles and Responsibilities**

- Read and thoroughly understand the Contractor agreement and final construction documents to be able to implement requirements of the agreement.
- Review and concur with design engineer’s recommendation for contract award.
- Provide overall direction, coordination, and evaluation to General Contractor.
- Assist in all required permitting. Coordinate the required inspections with City departments and utilities.
- Verify that the CRA and Contractor have secured all required agreements with utility early in the project.
• Monitor the Contractor’s Construction Schedule weekly to determine if the project is meeting the contract schedule. The schedule is produced as a contract requirement with the General Contractor. Alert the CRA team should the schedule be slipping or if any potential delays.

• Review and approve contract required submittals, such as shop drawing submittals that are in accordance with the design engineer’s plans and specifications. Otherwise forward to the design engineer for review and approval.

• Review changes as submitted by the Contractor with the designer and CRA for validation of entitlement and then value/scope. Assist with any required Value Engineering initiatives.

• Verify the Contractor has a valid site logistics plan; especially as it relates to traffic management activities, utility coordination, and applicable safety procedures.

• Communicate weekly with the CRA on any specific needs required of the Designer or CRA staff. Identify and push all finish related decisions/selections with the designer and CRA that the General Contractor needs to successfully execute their work.

• Inspect the actual project site for quality installation of all products. Ensure construction complies with the contract documents.

• Provide weekly inspection and documentation of the project progress and make reasonable efforts to reconcile discrepancies with the General Contractor daily reports.

• Review and approve all Applications for Payment.

• Manage the project close out process, including review of the record drawings provided by the General Contractor.

TP&T Roles and Responsibilities

• Review the transportation-related sections of the final construction documents to be able to implement requirements of the agreement.

• Where necessary, review and approve contract submittals, such as shop drawings related to transportation infrastructure.

• Assist with constructing components of the transportation infrastructure such as the placement of signal arms, upgrading street lighting and rewiring as necessary.

• Identify a TP&T representative for the project who will serve as the DPW’s point of contact. Attend construction progress meetings as requested by the DPW.
CRA Roles and Responsibilities

- Provide DPW the opportunity to review and comment on the bid package and recommendation for contract award.

- Have the design engineer under contract prior to issuance of a Notice to Proceed to facilitate review and/or approval by the design engineer in a timely manner. Make timely payments to the design engineer.

- Provide LSP services throughout the project. The CRA will sign all paperwork relating to offsite disposal of materials or any documentation required by the MassDEP.

- Identify a CRA representative for the project who will serve as the DPW’s point of contact. Attend construction progress meetings.

- Make timely payment to the General Contractor upon receipt of a DPW-approved Application for Payment.

The city is pleased that the CRA reached out for support on this important project, and looks forward to working with the CRA during this first phase of the Grand Junction Community Path construction.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Rossi
City Manager
To: The Board of the Cambridge Development Authority

From: Stephen H. Kaiser

Comment for the March 12, 2015 Public Form on Amendment #10 to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan

I am submitting this comment in advance of the hearing for your consideration.

To date, I have found the CRA process to be the best in the city in terms of presenting a plan first, before zoning has been adopted. Nevertheless, it does appear that the process did begin with draft zoning language, and the zoning concepts still remain more polished than the planning details. The opportunity for public comment on the plan is excellent. The Board appears to have followed its statutory obligations in preparing a plan amendment.

In preparing its plan the Authority has properly reconsidered prior statements of purposes by the Authority in 1977 and various other priorities recognized in the intervening years. The 1977 statement of purpose has served as a good basis to structure Section 102 of the plan amendment – as a 21st century statement of purposes for the Authority at Kendall Square.

Several elements of Section 102 are worthy of note, in particular:

“... To insure the replacement of such [decadent] conditions by well-planned, well-designed improvements which provide for the most appropriate reuse of the land in conformity with the general plan for the City of Cambridge (the “City”) as a whole and with definite local objectives ......

“... The improvement of land development and design to facilitate multi-modal circulation, emphasizing transit and pedestrian, and bicycle travel;
“The improvement of public transportation facilities, public infrastructure and utilities, and other public realm improvements;

“... The provision of a decent, pleasant, and humane environment involving a mixture of those land uses needed to produce balanced development;

“To capitalize on the location of rapid transit facilities to maximize the full socio-economic potential of the project area with transit-oriented land uses and densities, and consistent with the other objectives stated herein;

“To promote economic development which strengthens the City’s tax base without unacceptably impacting upon the physical, social, and cultural environment;

“To establish the minimum necessary land use controls which promote development, yet protect the public interest and the common good; with a flexible set of controls which are adaptable to both current and future market conditions;

“To encourage the development of Kendall Square as an activity center to live, work, play, and learn; and

“To promote neighborhood safety, public health, and wellness through universal access and active environmental design.

“To promote both environmental sustainability and climate change resiliency through resource efficient development and district level infrastructure planning.

=============== ===================

The Amendment proposes in Section 108 to create a “transit impact mitigation fund” to “provide support for the operation of existing rail service.” This effort is supportive of the goal for transit-oriented development and the need to improve transit services to the Kendall Square area. What is the necessary authorization needed to “obligate developers to contribute to the fund”? Who would be those developers so affected, other than Boston Properties? Could this fund be used to reimburse the CRA for any actions for immediate transit initiatives, as intended to further the purposes of Section 102 with regard to transit improvements?
The plan amendment makes reference to the Kendall Square or K2 study “completed by the City of Cambridge.” In fact, the City has never completed the study. The transportation study and report was never finished and submitted. To my knowledge, no organizational entity has prepared a traffic and transit study for the Kendall Square to account for the anticipated development of at least four million square feet of proposed construction. No such study report has been forthcoming from MIT, the Cambridge Planning Board, Cambridge Community Development, Boston Properties, the Federal GSA/Volpe Center, or from the Authority itself.

The need for such a study to be done prior to any upzoning should be recognized as essential to whether or not new development will be successful both socially and economically. The plan amendment appears to recognize that we cannot rely on roadway and automobile travel as a solution to Kendall's circulation problems. Given the severe winter damage suffered by the MBTA in the past two months, our transit system is suffering from a loss of credibility and a weakening of aspirations and trust.

The concept of transit-oriented development has been severely weakened. No developer can use that term without recognizing how our recent winter experience undermines any such mythology. It is one thing to discuss investing billions of dollars to correct for deferred maintenance, when the stated goal is little more than getting the MBTA back to the way it was last year. It is another to define the improvements that are necessary in order to grow the transit system into handling new ridership, gaining reliability and demonstrating superior management and service.

The MBTA has been making a valiant effort to restore service on the Red Line to the way it was. New managers with rail service experience are being brought into service leadership positions. However, even with restoration of peak hour service on the Red Line with at least 26 operational trains, the service is still an erratic mix of overloaded trains mixed in with half-empty trains.

The MBTA does impose on-time performance demands on the commuter rail contractor Keolis, but does not keep or enforce any on-time requirements for its own transit service. As a result MBTA trains and many buses are not run to any regular schedule. Riders incur unneeded delays and frustrations from long waits for trains to appear. When those trains finally do arrive, they are often overloaded. Anxious riders must wait to get on a second train, or possibly a third or a forth.
Mass transportation should not be another Guantanamo – with its implications of undue confinement, pain and torture. Yet for transit workers, managers and riders, these are not comforting times. We forget that in the days after the January 27 storm, the local newspapers carried stories of how easily we had survived the dreaded blizzard, with little damage and inconvenience. The aftermath seemed blissful.

We should have learned from the actions of top officials in the months leading up to the storms. Richard Davey, Secretary of Transportation, resigned and left office on October 31 of last year, declaring that he – as the states highest transportation official -- did not want to face another winter. What did he know that we all should have known?

Over the past decade, the plight of the MBTA has been obvious to most public officials and many members of the public. Five years ago we were promised “Reform Before Revenue,” and instead received no meaningful reform and insufficient revenue. Too many people it seems love transit, but do not care for the MBTA. Given the track record of the MBTA since the major scandals of the early 1980s and the struggles with winter weather in 2011 and 2015, we should be doing everything we can to prevent the MBTA from becoming the Detroit of the American northeast.

By contrast, the 1978 blizzard brought forth headlines telling of hundreds of motorists stranded overnight on Route 128. A regional emergency was declared, with driving bans lasting a week. Many side streets in Cambridge were blocked by four feet of drifting snow. In 1978, coastal damage was severe in Revere and the South Shore. But during those difficult days the MBTA still struggled to keep running. And it survived with no images of collapse.

Our recent winter storms dropped record amounts of snow, but the situation was hardly a severe blizzard. The streets of cities and towns were cleared and kept open with surprising ease. Cambridge had only a few instances of “losing” a street to snow accumulations for long periods, as occurred in 1978.

This winter we have had a bigger loss. It was the loss of our transit service and our trust and belief in them. A couple of days after the first storm, our tranquility was shattered by a smoky fire aboard a Red Line. Patrons were forced to kick out a window to escape and were then castigated by an MBTA spokesman for overreacting. Broken-down trains, snow blockages, and third-rail icing forced the MBTA to shut down entirely.
Businesses could have opened their stores and offices, but instead they were kept closed. Neither their customers nor their employees could get there—without transit service. Stores lost business by 25% to 50%, and some will take a long time recovering. Transit services had been a major part of keeping our social and economic process working as one piece. We can recognize the institutional damage done to the MBTA. We have yet to recognize the emptiness of recent proposals to do halt our transit decline.

Consider these facts: three entities have proposed significant increases in development around Kendall Square. Each group is seeking to expand by a million square feet or more. MIT seeks a million square feet for its holdings at Kendall Square. The Federal GSA and the Volpe Center are proposing to expand the Volpe site by over one million square feet. With allowances for the current underdevelopment of the Volpe site by allowed zoning, the total new Volpe area development could rise by two million square feet. Of course, the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority is proposing one million square feet of new development at Kendall.

This is the four million square feet that I alluded to earlier. City officials have not alerted us to how much the individual pieces add up. And where are the transportation studies and plans to deal with this significant “storm” of new development?

MIT, widely recognized for its scientific and engineering erudition, retained a traffic consultant during the K2 study. Did MIT produce a traffic and transit study? No.

The Cambridge Community Development Department commissioned a traffic study as part of the Kendall Square K2 study. Did this consultant produce a report on their work? No.

The Volpe Transportation Center is a national laboratory that assists other government agencies on matters of transportation policy, planning and analysis. It has been in existence for almost 45 years. At the first information presentation meeting by Volpe and GSA to the Cambridge Planning Board last year, I suggested to the Director of the Volpe Center that he initiate a creative transportation study to deal with the likely expansion of activity. He had not even thought of the idea, let alone considered it. Has the Volpe Center done any subsequent traffic studies to deal with the impacts of its new site development? No.
Over the past several months, the Redevelopment Authority has heard numerous suggestions that the Authority become proactive in the area of transit operations and service planning. One early effort would be to look at simple and inexpensive programs to recoup lost system capacity due to irregular operation of trains and buses.

Given all the inactivity by the government and business community in seeking positive new ideas for improved transit service, a creative effort by the CRA would seem useful, welcome, and an example of government agency leadership. In its Plan Amendment, the CRA does propose seeking funds from developers to be used for improvements to mass transit, and this is a positive step none of the others has been willing to take. But has the Authority come up with a plan for how the transit monies could be used to positive effect? No.

The transit crisis in the Boston area has been written about in many reports over the past quarter century, including the sadly neglected report by David D'Alessandro. Two others are noteworthy. One is the January 1989 report by the Conservation Law Foundation, “Gridlock: Facing Boston's Transportation Dilemma.” As well as being a recognition of the limits of auto traffic in cities, it also contained chapters describing the need to improve MBTA operations and management, as well as system expansion. The second report was released by the Urban Land Institute in 2012, “Hub and Spoke: Core Transit Congestion and The Future of Transit and Development in Greater Boston.” Both of these reports were written by the same person, Stephanie Pollock, now the state Secretary of Transportation.

This year should be a time of transportation opportunity, both in resolving the problems with MBTA operations and in bringing about a new future for the Volpe Transportation Center. We would appear to have the best leader in the right position to create a new future for the MBTA and to be open to new ideas. This unusual situation should be seen as a significant opportunity for the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority.

The choice is fairly straightforward. Does the Authority wish to take the initiative and work for an effective mass transit solution to provide the essential infrastructure necessary for the daily functioning of four million square feet of new development? Does the Authority recognize that creating the transportation equivalent of eight East Cambridge courthouses or about ten Volpe Centers is a major problem waiting to be solved and that the Authority controls the resources that could contribute to a solution?
Or is the Authority content to take no action to resolve transportation needs? Is it content to be part of a triumvirate that will have the effect of hitting the MBTA with the impact of another massive snowstorm?

There is only one way to make sense of any of this development load and to allow the social values of the city to survive. That is to provide for adequate mass transit, and this means a functioning Red Line. We cannot afford to lose the Red Line, even partially, for a day or a month.

True, there are other priorities to consider in the city. There seem to be five primary issues today -- mass transit, schools, housing, jobs and the Olympics. Any concern for the true social values of the city would immediately knock the Olympics out without argument. All the more reason to attend the March 18 forum at the city Library, 6:30 PM, and to stress the top priorities for the city - mass transit, housing, and jobs. The Authority should revise its draft Amendment #10 to include a stronger commitment to mass transit and to housing. No upzoning should occur without it.

Sincerely,

Stephen H. Kaiser
To: The Board of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

From: Stephen H. Kaiser

**CRA Forum of March 14 and New Transit Ideas**

The Board may be aware that there is a conflict in meetings scheduled for March 18. At the Main Library the Boston 2024 Olympics boosters will be presenting at a public forum, the same evening as the Board meeting. Because of my firm opposition to any Olympic proposal under the current plan and arrangements, I will be unable to attend the Board meeting and must instead attend the meeting on the Olympics.

With regard to an agenda report on the “benefits” forum, my own reactions were distinctly split. At first, I was highly negative, from the printed format of the forum and the drawn-out use of my old nemesis, PowerPoint. My later reaction was positive, because of the public interaction session and its results. The method was so successful it altered my view on the practical value of any such group interactions.

Initially, I was worried that the forum was a discussion only of the possible collateral benefits, and not of the pros and cons of the Kendall Square plan proposal. The public participation section appeared to be a variation on breakout groups, the method favored by CDD over the past 15 years. The initial PowerPoint presentation stretched out longer and longer. I was about ready to walk out.

By the middle of the meeting, what kept me there was that I was sitting between Heather Hoffman and Richie McKinnon, who are both Harvard graduates. If I had any old Harvard jokes to use up, that would be the time.

The public interaction process suddenly opened up as something quite different from the method used by Community Development and by the Authority in its strategic planning process. It took a while for the audience to catch on, but the use of small cards for written suggestions combined with the group doing the posting on boards allowed
for a more thoughtful and unadulterated participation process. It was a form of brainstorming that could be utilized either in a group or as individuals filling out the forms. Or a bit of both, which probably occurred in most cases.

The technology was not advanced. It was even primitive by modern expectations: foam boards, 5-by-8 cards, pens and stickers. The only flaw was in our penmanship – some people scribbled their comments illegibly. I spent five minutes block printing some of those comments on new cards to make them more readable.

This activity was not a review of the plan or the zoning. But it was a way of asking a rather motley group of citizens to think about some new ideas. How many ideas did we get – 100 or more? If one in ten is useful, that is excellent. If one in 100 is inventive, that is excellent too.

And we got at least one inventive idea, from another member of my group. It was the idea to install electronic display boards of train arrivals at street level, so people will know of the status of train arrivals before they go rushing pell-mell down the stairs to the platform. Display boards would mean less rush-rush-rush to get to a train that is not there.

Since that time, I have heard another suggestion for some sort of warning light to tell us that the Red Line is struggling or than service has been badly delayed. Now is the time to do more inventing. Take the earlier idea for a train display board and add three lights at the top. GREEN would mean system normal, YELLOW would mean some delays, and RED would mean the system is badly delayed. The colors would be controlled by on-time standards, not by MBTA public relations.

Now we have a composite good idea, and it all came from the grass roots. The idea arose from the people who ride the trains. And it would not have been possible if the Redevelopment Authority had not experimented with a new participation process.

Much of the media commentary for solving the ills of the MBTA has revolved around inconsequential issues such as firing MassDOT board members, eliminating the Board entirely, or playing shuffleboard with items in the T budget. This is all rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. None of that helps to actually improve the quality of service, which is actually determined by the riders themselves. From the March 14 CRA forum,
we now have a specific item to place on the list of actual improvements that can be made to enhance the public transit experience in Cambridge and Boston.

This one idea is worth more as a public benefit that all of the fluff being thrown up by the Olympics Committee. The danger here is that someone might suggest that the Olympics boosters should be fired and the CRA Board be appointed in their place to straighten out the Olympics snafus.

I did leave the meeting on March 14 with one regret. It is my sense that all improvements to transportation at Kendall Square are likely to be deferred to the MassDOT special committee on Kendall Square, and also with the select committee appointed by the Governor. My worry is that both the MassDOT committee and the Governor's committee will be too confined in their thinking – or will think only about billions of dollars in funding for transit.

The problem is more than money. It is about moving the hardware (trains) up and down the tracks in some sort of predictable manner. It is about an MBTA bureaucracy offering credible and trustworthy pronouncements, and not self-serving PR and coverups. Both the traveling public and businesses/institutions must come to trust the T again. It is about a population that is not angry with the T.

I contend that the mindset of government officials is unduly focused on money, and not on quality of service. Even before the snowstorms, transit service was erratic. Even before the storms, the MBTA did not operate any of its train systems by a fixed and predictable schedule. Will the train come in two minutes or will it come in 15??

These are totally unnecessary apprehensions for riders to endure. If the Japanese can operate their trains within a thirty-second window, and if the past MBTA practice is to have riders wait 15 minutes for a train and not be able to get on, then the MBTA should be able to choose the preferable Japanese alternative.

I disagree with any strategy for the CRA to defer to others. Waiting until others come up with solutions first is a formula for failure. Such a strategy relies on assuming the state processes will be successful, which they have not been in the past. If the state processes fail, then the CRA and Kendall Square fail with them.
In all the furore over the flaws of the MBTA, the one voice that has been largely silent is that of the professional engineers. They should be the ones who should look at the operations of transit services around the world and can recommend techniques that will help the MBTA correct its deficiencies.

The Redevelopment Authority can help by scheduling an agenda item for the April Board meeting, whereby Fay, Spofford and Thorndike would present their ideas on ways to achieve more effective transit service and more capacity in the system. Take that first step and then seek out a strategy for a proactive CRA to address transit priorities.

Sincerely,

Stephen H. Kaiser
Contracting, Personnel, and General Administration

In February, Shani Carter from the Harvard Graduate School of Design began an internship with the CRA. She has been assisting staff with planning research and outreach efforts related to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan. Her background in finance will also contribute to potential expansion opportunities of the Forward Fund program.

We have hired Ambit Creative Group to assist CRA staff with a refreshed branding effort, including a new logo design and style guides for CRA documents. We are narrowing down concepts and anticipate bringing a proposal to the Board next month.

In coordination with the Treasurer and Assistant Treasurer, staff have begun facilitating the shift of a portion of our savings account funds into the investment account with Morgan Stanley. Further we have begun the GAPS 45 actuarial study required to access future obligations for retirees in consultation with the state Group Insurance Commission and with Odyssey Advisors. This will inform our Investment Policy and the potential structure of an OPEB account.

Draft Forward Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2015</th>
<th>May 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KSURP Amendment</td>
<td>Ames Street Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSURP NPC Summary</td>
<td>MXD Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRA Branding</td>
<td>Forward Fund Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Policy</td>
<td>Foundry Lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT Coop Signage</td>
<td>Kendall Wayfinding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects and Initiatives

KSURP Forum and coUrbanize Outreach

On March 12th, we hosted a Public Forum on the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan, which was attended by approximately 30 participants. The forum included a presentation on the background of the KSURP and the elements of the proposed 10th amendment to the plan. This was followed by a public benefit activity that generated a wide range of ideas regarding priorities for Kendall Square. A summary of the results of the workshop is under development. Updates to the KSURP Amendment have been posted on the coUrbanize website, http://courbanize.com/kendall-sq-urban-renewal/ and staff hope that the conversations from the public forum continue to generate discussion on this online platform.

The Foundry Building

In accordance with Chapter 2.110 of the Cambridge Municipal Code, the Planning Board held a public hearing on March 3rd to review the City Manager’s report on the proposed disposition of a leasehold interest to the CRA. The Planning Board recommended that the
City Council proceed with the disposition as proposed, noting that the City’s Working Group and the community have put significant time and effort into planning for the future of the Foundry as a shared facility blending the innovation economy of Kendall Square with functions that benefit the community through the arts, education and culture.

**Connect Kendall Square**
The final plans for the Connect Kendall Square competition have been submitted and posted on the [http://www.connectkendallsquare.com](http://www.connectkendallsquare.com) website. Posters of the finalists’ submissions have been on public display for the past month in the Kendall Center Atrium off Main St. The designers will present their proposals to the jury on March 25th and 26th.

**Forward Fund**
The Forward Fund marketing materials have been distributed widely. The email announcement was sent to over 400 addresses, and spread through social media outlets. Since the launch of the Forward Fund, traffic on the CRA website has increased by approximately 50%. Although we are still three weeks ahead of the April 13th application deadline, there are currently two proposals under development through the online application. We will continue to coordinate with the Participatory Budgeting Group in the City as those project elections proceed next week.

**Ames Street Residences**
The Planning Board held the second public hearing on the Ames Street Residences on March 3rd and the review was highly favorable. One outstanding issue regarding the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program was unresolved so the final decision regarding the approval on the special permit was delayed until March 24th. Within a week of the Planning Board meeting, Boston Properties reached an agreement regarding transit passes and Hubway membership for residents with City staff, thus clearing the last hurdle toward a conditional approval.

**MIT Coop**
The MIT Coop management has begun its bookstore renovations. The interior work was initiated on the lower level and has begun on the main level, with no disruption of business so far from construction. The Food Court improvements have been approved by Boston Properties and are undergoing the permit process. The Coop Management is refining the signage program for the store with Boston Properties and is awaiting a package of signage materials for the food court. These items will likely come before the CRA Board next month.

**Main Street**
The Main Streetscape project has gotten underway again with most of the snow cleared from the right-of-way including the removal of the pear trees along the sidewalk and continued work on the storm water catch basins. The City has reported that Newport will require most of 2015 to complete the construction work.

**80 Broadway**
The development of the 6,000 square foot innovation office space in Four Cambridge Center has made significant process. The new access route into the basement has required modification to the Green Parking Garage. The small project will provide significant improvements to the setback area in front of the building along Broadway, including a public seating area and additional plantings.
## Cambridge Redevelopment Authority

### Budget vs. Actuals: 2015 Budget - FY15 P&L

**January - February, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4000 Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4100 Discounts given</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200 Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4210 Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4220 Proceeds from sale of development rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>830,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4230 Reimbursed Expenses</td>
<td>304.93</td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4240 Rental Income</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4250 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 4200 Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,304.93</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,381,400.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4300 Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4310 Dividend Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4320 Interest Income</td>
<td>3,028.11</td>
<td>85,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 4300 Other Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,028.11</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 85,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 4000 Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,333.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,466,400.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gross Profit                                       | **$ 4,333.04** | **$ 1,466,400.00** |

### Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6000 Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100 Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6110 Salaries</td>
<td>42,286.56</td>
<td>280,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6120 Payroll Taxes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6121 Medicare &amp; OASDI (SS)</td>
<td>1,054.94</td>
<td>13,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6122 Payroll Taxes - Fed &amp; MA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6123 Unemployment &amp; MA Health Ins</td>
<td>180.82</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6120 Payroll Taxes</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,235.76</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 14,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6130 Personnel and Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6131 Insurance - Dental</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6132 Insurance - Medical (for Employees)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6133 Pension Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6134 T Subsidy</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6135 Workers Comp &amp; Disability Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6130 Personnel and Fringe Benefits</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 210.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 48,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6140 Insurance - Medical (for Retirees, Survivors)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6100 Personnel</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 43,732.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 418,100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6200 Office</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6210 Community Outreach</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$3,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6211 Materials</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6212 Public Workshops</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6213 Other</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6210 Community Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6220 Marketing &amp; Professional Development</td>
<td>$791.87</td>
<td>$12,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6221 Advertising</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6222 Conferences and Training</td>
<td>$490.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6223 Dues and Membership</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6224 Meals</td>
<td>$1.87</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6225 Recruiting</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6226 Staff Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6227 Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6228 Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6220 Marketing &amp; Professional Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6230 Insurance</td>
<td>$6,259.00</td>
<td>$9,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6231 Art and Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6232 Commercial Liability</td>
<td>$2,561.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6233 Special Risk</td>
<td>$3,698.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6230 Insurance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6240 Office Equipment</td>
<td>$1,161.52</td>
<td>$19,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6241 Equipment Lease</td>
<td>$1,076.53</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6242 Equipment Purchase (computers, etc.)</td>
<td>$84.99</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6423 Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6240 Office Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6250 Office Space</td>
<td>$17,651.41</td>
<td>$121,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6251 Archives (Iron Mountain)</td>
<td>$874.42</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6252 Office Rent</td>
<td>$14,775.99</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6253 Office Utilities</td>
<td>$1,071.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6254 Other Rental Space</td>
<td>$930.00</td>
<td>$4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6255 Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6256 Repairs and Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6250 Office Space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6260 Office Management</td>
<td>$1,605.94</td>
<td>$5,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6261 Board Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>$88.03</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6262 Office Expenses</td>
<td>$333.39</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6263 Office Supplies</td>
<td>$35.91</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6264 Postage and Delivery</td>
<td>$16.02</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6265 Printing and Reproduction</td>
<td>$761.60</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6266 Software</td>
<td>$209.93</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6267 Payroll Services</td>
<td>$161.06</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6268 Financial Service Charges</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6260 Office Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6270 Telecommunications</td>
<td>$742.13</td>
<td>$6,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6271 Internet</td>
<td>$143.98</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6272 Mobile</td>
<td>$152.40</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6273 Telephone</td>
<td>$323.99</td>
<td>$1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6274 Website &amp; Email Hosting</td>
<td>$61.76</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6275 Information Technology</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6270 Telecommunications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 6200 Office</strong></td>
<td>$28,211.87</td>
<td>$177,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6300 Property Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6310 Contract Work</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6320 Landscaping</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6330 Repairs</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6340 Snow Removal</td>
<td>23,620.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6350 Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6351 NSTAR Gas &amp; Electric</td>
<td>41.79</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6352 Water</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6350 Utilities</td>
<td>$41.79</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6300 Property Management</td>
<td>$23,661.79</td>
<td>$65,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6000 Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$95,605.98</td>
<td>$660,250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7000 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7001 Construction Management</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7002 Design - Architects</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7003 Design - Landscape Architects</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7004 Engineers and Survey</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7005 Legal</td>
<td>16,864.74</td>
<td>120,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7006 Real Estate &amp; Finance</td>
<td>22,800.00</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7007 Planning</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7008 Market Management</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7009 Accounting</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7010 Marketing</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7011 Temp and Contract Labor</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7012 Web Design</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7013 Land Surveys</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7015 Other</td>
<td>27,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 7000 Professional Services</td>
<td>$44,664.74</td>
<td>$299,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8000 Redevelopment Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8100 Capital Costs</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8200 Forward Fund</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8300 Real Estate Acquisitions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 8000 Redevelopment Investments</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$540,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$140,270.72</td>
<td>$1,499,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
<td>$(135,937.68)</td>
<td>$(32,850.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>$(135,937.68)</td>
<td>$(32,850.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Cambridge Redevelopment Authority
**2015 PROFIT & LOSS BY CLASS**
**January - February, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>4000 Income</th>
<th>3,333</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4,333</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>$3,333</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Profit</td>
<td>$3,333</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>6000 Operating Expenses</td>
<td>71,452</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>5,362</td>
<td>2,647</td>
<td>7,132</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000 Professional Services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,432</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,232</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$44,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000 Redevelopment Investments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$71,452</td>
<td>$615</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td>$2,464</td>
<td>$13,794</td>
<td>$2,647</td>
<td>$38,364</td>
<td>$1,399</td>
<td>$5,438</td>
<td>$1,933</td>
<td>$772</td>
<td>$867</td>
<td>$140,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Monday, Mar 16, 2015 01:13:55 PM PDT GMT-4 - Accrual Basis*
SITE PLAN: OPTION 1 - Long Path with 3 Seating Areas and Children's Play

EXISTING PEAR TREES
EXISTING PINE TREES
EXISTING LONDON PLANE TREES
GALILEO GALILEI WAY
MAIN STREET
GRAND JUNCTION PATH LANDSCAPE DESIGN
MARCH 18, 2015
HALVORSON DESIGN PARTNERSHIP
MARCH 18, 2015
SITE PLAN: OPTION 1A - Long Path with Expanded Granite Seat Blocks and No Children’s Play
SITE PLAN: OPTION 2 - Short Path with 2 Seating Areas
ENLARGED PAVEMENT OPTIONS AT PEDESTRIAN INTERSECTIONS
PLANTING PALETTE

**Trees, Shrubs and Screening Plants**

- **Thornless Honeylocust**
  - *Gleditsia triacanthos var. inermis*

- **River Birch**
  - *Betula nigra*

- **Serviceberry**
  - *Amelanchier x grandiflora*

- **Bayberry**
  - *Myrica pensylvanica*

- **Virginia Creeper**
  - *Parthenocissus quincefolia*

**Groundcover, Grasses and Perennials**

- **Creeping Lilyturf**
  - *Liriope spicata*

- **Knock Out Rose**
  - *Rosa ‘Radrazz’*

- ** Feather Reed Grass**
  - *Calamagrostis x acutiflora*

- **Ivory Halo Dogwood**
  - *Cornus alba ‘Bailhalo’*

- **Fragrant Sumac**
  - *Rhus aromatic ‘Gro-Low’*
Loll Chair, Double Chair, and Square Table

Play Spinner Option on Play Surface
Markstaar Fountain with Bottle Filler (Available in Stainless Steel Finish)

Pet Fountain Option Available

City of Cambridge Standard Drinking Fountain Detail

**DRINKING FOUNTAIN WITH STAINLESS STEEL FINISH**
MEMORANDUM

To: Cambridge Redevelopment Authority  
From: HR&A Advisors, Inc.  
Date: March 16, 2015  
Re: Kendall Square Urban Renewal Affordable Housing Analysis

The Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA) engaged HR&A Advisors, Inc. (HR&A) to perform market and financial feasibility analysis for real estate development in and around the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan (KSURP) area, particularly as it relates to the production of low- and middle-income affordable housing. This memorandum summarizes our findings and methodology for determining the baseline feasibility and associated supportable values of mixed-income residential and office/lab uses. These results aim to guide CRA’s understanding of the economics of mixed-income housing and commercial uses in Kendall Square.

HR&A quantified the supportable land value (i.e., the value a private developer would pay for arms-length market transactions) for office, lab, and mixed-income residential development in Kendall Square by constructing multi-year development models that are calibrated to reflect current market conditions. We then adjusted the financial models to determine the impact of increased low-income requirements and incentives and the creation of a middle-income height bonus. HR&A also calculated the extent to which commercial uses could potentially cross-subsidize residential uses within a large-scale, mixed-use development project.

I. Executive Summary

The cash flow models project the development economics of mixed-income residential rental buildings as well as office and lab buildings. The Inclusionary Housing Ordinance in Cambridge requires developers to set aside 15% of their units for low-income housing, but provides a density bonus equivalent to 30% of floor area. After the bonus, approximately 11.5% of total units are therefore affordable to low-income households. Our methodology included the following steps:

- **Baseline development.** The model determines supportable land value for each use at a leveraged return on equity (internal rate of return) of 1.5%. We calibrated our baseline development feasibility models under two parking scenarios: underground and above-ground. Underground parking construction is assumed to cost $100,000 per space while structured, above-ground parking construction costs $25,000 per space.

- **Low-income units:** To understand the impact of varying the share of units for low-income households, we adjusted our model to reflect developments that would net 15.0% low-income units and 20.0%
low-income units (a) without additional subsidy and (b) with tax-exempt bond financing and low-income housing tax credits.¹

- **Rent and operating costs.** Based on market comparables and discussions with real estate developers and operators, we assumed average residential market rents of $4.50 per square foot per month. Based on current and proposed affordable unit regulations, we assumed rents that are affordable to low-income households earning 65% of area median income and middle-income households earning 102.5% of area median income.² We assumed operating costs for a typical residential development of approximately 26% of income each year. We assumed office rents of approximately $5.00 per square foot per month and office operating costs of 22% of gross income. We assumed lab rents of $5.42 per square foot per month, with all operating costs paid by lab tenants.

The table on the following page (Figure 1) compares the projected supportable land value per square foot for potential uses, assuming either underground or above-ground parking.

- **Commercial.** Our office and lab models projected baseline supportable land values between $95 and $235 per gross square foot, depending on type of parking construction and use.

- **Residential**
  - **Baseline residential.** Our residential model projected supportable land values of $75-$110 per gross square foot under current inclusionary regulations with 11.5% of the units reserved for low-income households, depending on type of parking construction selected.
  
  - **Additional low-income units.** Supportable land value decreases as the share of affordable units increases. HR&A also tested the impact of subsidizing affordable units using tax-exempt bond financing and low-income housing tax credits. These resources are only available for projects containing at least 20% affordable units set aside for households earning 50% of area median income. The additional subsidies generate supportable land value of $50-$90 per gross square foot, which are still less than the baseline residential values.

---

¹ HR&A modeled net low-income units with a low-income FAR bonus of 30% of floor area, which is the policy under the current Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. In order to net 15% and 20% affordable units after the current 30% bonus, Cambridge would need to mandate base inclusionary ratios of 19.6% and 26.1%, respectively (19.6% ÷ 130% = 15%; 26.1% ÷ 130% = 20%).

² A current project in development will reserve half of the middle-income units for households earning 95% of area median income; the other half will be affordable to households earning 110% of area income. The model uses an average of 102.5% to set middle-income rents.
Figure 1. Supportable Land Value Comparison After Parking Costs³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Underground Parking⁴</th>
<th>Above-ground Parking⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Development - Baseline (15% Low-income - 30% Bonus)</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5% Low-Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Low-Income Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Low-Income</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Low-Income</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Low-Income (with Bonds and 4% Tax Credits)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Comparative Supportable Land Value.** Assuming all uses provided underground parking, office has a supportable land value that is 27% greater than the supportable value of baseline residential development with 11.5% low-income units (or 1.27 times as valuable). Lab has a supportable land value that is over 130% greater that the land value for baseline residential (or 2.3 times as valuable).

- **Impact of Additional Low-Income Units.** Every 1% increase in the required percentage of inclusionary units affordable for low-income households reduces supportable land value by approximately $3.20. As shown in the graph (Figure 2), the model indicates that a development with 35% of units reserved for low-income households and underground parking can support no land value.

³ A detailed assessment of parking cost impacts is located in Appendix B.

⁴ Assumes 15% leveraged return on invested capital with underground parking, assumed to cost $100,000 per space for construction, required at a ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit residential, 0.9 spaces per 1,000 square feet of office, and 0.8 spaces per 1,000 square feet of lab.

⁵ Assumes 15% leveraged return on invested capital with above-ground parking, assumed to cost $25,000 per space for construction, required at a ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit residential, 0.9 spaces per 1,000 square feet of office, and 0.8 spaces per 1,000 square feet of lab.
HR&A also modeled a middle-income height bonus. The proposed bonus would give developers 50 feet of additional height if they agreed to reserve 25% of the units generated through the height bonus for middle-income families. The density bonus awarded through the Inclusionary Ordinance would also require a 15% unit set aside for low-income families.

- **Middle-income bonus units.** Holding the 15% low-income requirement fixed, each 1% increase in middle-income bonus units reduces supportable land value for the middle-income bonus portion of a project by approximately $1.50. If a middle-income bonus is granted at no additional cost to the developer, we estimate that including 42% middle-income units and 15% low-income units in the middle-income bonus portion of a project would generate a neutral impact. In other words, a bonus composed of 43% market-rate units, 42% middle-income units and 15% low-income units would earn a developer its required rate of return with no supportable land value.
II. Context

Kendall Square has historically been dominated by commercial and university uses but has recently been evolving into a more mixed-use district. The 2013 Kendall Square Plan (K2 Plan), a result of a community-based planning and design process, identifies housing for a range of income levels as a major need and challenge for the area. Despite scarcity of land, the K2 Plan notes that the Volpe site and the property reserved for the Constellation performance center in PUD-KS3 have unrealized development potential that could absorb additional housing.

In recent years, the CRA has encouraged the development of new housing stock in Kendall Square through rezonings. The 2013 MIT rezoning includes a requirement for a minimum of 240,000 square feet of housing in exchange for a maximum of 980,000 square feet of additional commercial development, and the 2009 Alexandria rezoning includes a requirement for a minimum of 220,000 square feet of residential space in exchange for a maximum of 1,500,000 square feet of commercial space. Alexandria is constructing approximately 90 residential units at 270 Third Street, including low- and middle-income units. Additionally, Boston Properties, the master developer of developer of the KSURP area, received approval for a zoning modification that will allow them to build a 240-unit residential tower along Ames Street with 31 affordable units. In light of recent projects and possible future transactions, three major considerations impact the residential market in Kendall Square:

- **High land value.** Commercial developers frequently outbid residential buyers when competing for privately-held development parcels. Recent transactions in the area demonstrate that lab and
commercial developers are able to offer higher land payments for these uses compared to residential uses.

- **Distribution of uses.** Developers in Kendall Square have favored the construction of higher-value commercial uses over lower-value residential uses. Recent rezonings have required commercial developers to include residential uses in future projects.

- **Proposed zoning changes.** The CRA is considering an amendment to the KSURP in order to provide an additional entitlement of up to 600,000 square feet of commercial and 400,000 square feet of residential in exchange for including some increased percentage of low- and middle-income units in future residential projects.

### III. Methodology

HR&A created multi-year real estate financial models, calibrated to reflect current market conditions, for lab, office, mixed-income apartment and structured parking uses.

- **Cost and revenue assumptions.** HR&A reached out to local developers and government officials to develop a thorough understanding of the principal assumptions driving the feasibility of commercial and residential development, including vertical development costs, financing assumptions, revenue projections, and the impact of parking in order to identify differences in land values. A summary of development and operating assumptions is located in Appendix A.

- **Parking.** HR&A examines the cost of parking for residential and commercial development. Developers in Kendall Square traditionally maximize scarce land supply by building required parking underground, which significantly increases the construction cost. Underground parking allows a developer to dedicate a larger portion above-ground area to residential or commercial uses, which are significantly more financially accretive than above-ground parking. We integrate parking costs and revenues into our analyses of each use.

Each real estate cash flow projects a supportable payment per square foot of development rights, assuming certain upfront construction costs, ongoing revenues and operating expenses and a required rate of return on equity invested by the developer.

### IV. Residential Development in Kendall Square

The Cambridge Inclusionary Ordinance currently requires affordable units to be included in new multi-family residential development. The CRA is also evaluating a middle-income height bonus and is seeking to understand the bonus’s financial implications for developers.

#### A. Sensitivities

- **Low-Income Sensitivities.** Cambridge’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requires that 15% of the base units in the building be affordable to households earning below 80% of the area median income. The Ordinance also provides a 30% floor area for developments in exchange for the affordable units, so projects net approximately 11.5% affordable units. The CRA Board has stated a policy goal that future residential development in the MXD District net at least 15% affordable units.

HR&A tests the current requirement of a net share of 11.5% affordable units at rents affordable to households earning 65% of the area median income, the standard underwriting level for affordable units regulated by the Cambridge Community Development Department. We also test the impact of
increasing the affordability requirement to an effective 15% and 20% share of low-income units, with and without applying Low Income Housing Tax Credits and tax-exempt bond financing. Applying the additional subsidy sources requires that we test a net share of 20% low-income units at rents affordable to households earning only 50% of the area median income to comply with statutory requirements of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program.

- **Middle-Income Sensitivities.** Units created from a middle-income bonus are also subject to the inclusionary zoning requirements, meaning that 15% of the bonus units must be affordable to low-income households in addition to the 25% of units affordable to middle-income households. The model assumes that middle-income units are affordable to households earning 102.5% of area median income, based on comparable middle-income requirements for a pilot project. HR&A tests middle-income levels at the proposed 25% and calculated the share of middle-income units associated with a land value of zero, after factoring in parking costs. The break-even scenario assumes that the CRA would offer the bonus floor area at no additional cost to developers.

**B. Assumptions**

- **Development Costs.**
  
  **Construction Costs.** Hard costs for residential product are estimated to total approximately $350 per gross square foot, based on conversations with local developers. Soft costs other than financing costs are assumed to equal 10% of hard costs. Adding in financing costs (interest plus fees) increases soft costs to approximately 25% of hard costs. The cost of parking varies depending on whether parking is built above ground or underground; underground parking is approximately four times as costly to build. HR&A’s modeling tests parking ratios of 0.5 spaces and 0.25 spaces of parking for every residential unit.

  Our cost calculations assume steel or concrete frame construction on a clean site. Extraordinary site preparation costs and delayed permitting could result in higher construction costs.

  **Financing.** The analysis assumes that a developer could obtain a construction loan sized at 60% loan to cost, with a 6% interest rate. After stabilization at month 30, the developer would refinance construction debt into a permanent loan sized at 65% loan to value. Base financing assumptions were vetted with market knowledgeable active in the Kendall Square area.

  **Exit Assumptions.** For the purpose of our conceptual analysis, we assume that a developer would exit the deal at month 60 with the expectation of a 5.5% capitalization rate.

- **Revenues and Operating Costs.**
  
  **Rent.** Rents for affordable units are assumed to vary based on the level of affordability. Tenants in affordable units pay only 33% of income on rent and parking, provided that the development offers parking spaces, resulting in rents that are approximately 50% below market for low-income units and 20% below market for middle-income units. Rents for market units are assumed to be similar to rents in comparable new buildings. Parking also generates revenue through fees for spaces. For the purpose of this analysis, we assume that the maximum allowable 33% of income for low- and middle-income units goes toward rent and does not support parking, rather

---

6 A current project in development will reserve half of the middle-income units for households earning 95% of area median income; the other half will be affordable to households earning 110% of area income. The model uses an average of 102.5% to set middle-income rents.
than separating income percentage by use. The resulting land value is equivalent to separating payments by residential rent and parking.

**Real Estate Taxes.** Conversations with area developers indicated that total residential operating costs averaged $12,000 per market-rate unit, with 35% of the cost going towards real estate taxes. Because taxes are based on net operating income (NOI) and change with rent levels, HR&A assumes that taxes associated with affordable units would vary according to differences in NOI for these units.

**Other Operating Costs.** Other building operating costs do not vary with affordability and remain at approximately 15% of market income per year. Because the NOI of affordable units is less than the NOI of market-rate units, the share of other operating costs as a percentage of revenues is higher for affordable units. Likewise, NOI for parking decreases as the share of affordable units increases, since revenues decrease while operating costs remain unchanged. The lack of additional revenues to support parking mandated for affordable units increases the financial burden associated with affordable housing substantially.

### C. Results

- **Affordability and Residential Land Value.** The current inclusionary requirement of 11.5% low-income can support the land values of $75-110 per square foot value of development rights, depending on parking requirements. Increasing the affordable requirement to 15% results reduces the supportable land value to $60-100 per square foot of development rights. Increasing low-income units beyond 15% without offering additional bonus area generates supportable land values of $45-85 per square foot of development rights. The addition of tax credits and bond financing results in a supportable land value of $50-$90 per square foot of development rights, which is still below the current inclusionary zoning values. A middle-income bonus offered with no additional land cost has a neutral impact on development economics when the middle-income bonus area includes 43% market-rate, 42% middle-income and 15% low-income units.

- **Parking.** Requiring underground parking reduces supportable land value by $30-$35 per square foot of development; a less onerous parking ratio or the ability to build above-ground parking without reducing development rights would decrease the negative impact of parking.

### IV. Office and Lab Development in Kendall Square

#### A. Assumptions

- **Development Costs.**

  **Construction Costs.** Based on local developer input, hard costs for office space are currently estimated to total $290 per square foot. Construction costs of lab space are approximately 20% higher than those of office space because of the higher structural costs associated with lab space. The landlord’s tenant improvement contribution for lab space is assumed to be substantially (three times) higher than the contribution for office space. Soft costs other than financing costs are estimated to total 10% of hard costs. Adding in financing costs (interest plus fees) increases soft costs to approximately 35% of hard costs. Underground parking is assumed to cost approximately $100,000 per space, including both hard and soft costs. The model assumes that a developer would build parking at a ratio of 0.9 spaces for office and 0.8 spaces for lab for every 1,000 square feet of development, in line with assumptions for other pending Kendall Square projects.
Financing. The analysis assumes that a developer could obtain a construction loan sized at 60% loan to cost, with a 6% interest rate. After stabilization at month 45, the developer would refinance construction debt into a permanent loan sized at 65% loan to value. Stabilization is assumed to occur later for commercial projects than for residential projects, meaning that construction loans would last longer for commercial projects, resulting in higher overall construction loan interest payments.

Exit Assumptions. For the purpose of our conceptual analysis, we assume that a developer would exit the deal at month 84, selling a stabilized asset based on a 6.5% capitalization rate.

- Revenues and Operating Costs.

Rent. For new Class A space, rents are assumed to be similar to high-end rents for new construction, at $60 (gross) per square foot for office and $65 (net) per square foot for lab. Parking is estimated to generate revenues of $250 per space.

Real Estate Taxes. Real estate taxes are assumed to total approximately 10% of gross revenues. Because lab space is assumed to be leased triple net, the model does not consider real estate or other operating costs for lab uses.

Other Operating Costs. Other operating costs for office are assumed to consume an additional 12% of revenues. Parking operating costs are estimated to total 10% of income per year, largely consisting of real estate taxes since the garages are assumed to be unmanned.

B. Results

- Comparison to Residential Land Value. The supportable land values calculated for office and lab uses are significantly higher than the supportable land values calculated for mixed-income housing. Office can support land values of $95-$160 per square foot of development rights, and office can support land values of $175-$235 per square foot. For developments with underground parking, the financial models indicate that one square foot of office development is worth 27% more than one square foot of residential development under the current inclusionary requirements (or 1.27 times as valuable). One square foot of lab development is worth over 130% more than residential product (or 2.3 times as valuable). Developers seeking to build office and lab spaces are therefore better positioned to bid successfully for development parcels.

Parking Burden. Building parking for commercial uses is also financially burdensome, though likely necessary to attract tenants. Each square foot of commercial development generates $45-$50 less supportable land value due to the inclusion of underground structured parking.

VI. Conclusions and Further Considerations

Building mixed-income housing in Kendall Square is challenging due to a variety of factors. Residential developers are at a disadvantage in the acquisition of privately-held parcels when competing against commercial developers because of differentials in development economics; increased affordability mandates would increase the differential between supportable commercial and residential land values.\(^7\)

\(^7\) The remaining soft sites in the Kendall Square area are likely to require longer site preparation and construction periods because of contamination and presence of existing buildings, which would increase upfront costs and further decreases feasibility of residential development.
may therefore be simpler to encourage the development of mixed-income housing on parcels on which the City has control over the price of development rights.

The following options could support the creation of additional mixed-income housing on both publicly and privately held parcels:

- **Further regulate pacing of residential v. commercial.** The CRA could require more valuable commercial uses to cross-subsidize residential by amending zoning statutes and developer agreements so that residential must be phased appropriately with commercial. In recent years, the CRA has required developers to commit to residential development in large-scale projects. The Authority could require more residential upfront in rezoning agreements for private land as well as disposition agreements of public land to ensure development in a timely manner.

- **Allow greater density for residential uses.** As a way to encourage residential on private parcels, the zoning code could be adjusted to allow significantly greater density for residential vs. commercial uses. The adjustment may allow residential developers to outbid commercial developers as land becomes available through increasing the potential value of residential uses.

- **Apply differential pricing when offering of public parcels for commercial and residential development.** HR&A’s analysis has shown that commercial development may be over twice as valuable as mixed-income residential development under current inclusionary requirements with underground parking.
  
  - The CRA could adjust the cost of development rights for commercial vs. residential uses to reflect market conditions on publicly-owned parcels.
  
  - If the CRA chooses to apply higher affordability requirements for projects to be built on formerly public parcels, it could offer additional reductions in the cost of development rights.
  
  - Higher payments from the sale of commercial rights could fund subsidies to support increased levels of affordability in inclusionary or stand-alone affordable projects.

- **Reduce parking burden.** Parking in Kendall Square can make up a significant share of development costs. Particularly in residential projects, where affordable units are not contributing market rent levels for their spaces, the current parking requirement is onerous. In a transit-rich area like Kendall Square, the CRA and the City could consider several policy options:
  
  - Reduce the overall parking ratio required by zoning,
  
  - Allow developers to build lower-cost, above-ground structured parking further from the Kendall Square core, or
  
  - Allow developers to rent unused spaces at market rates to non-tenants.

- **Provide middle income bonus area at no cost to developer.** In public dispositions, the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority currently charges for development rights on a per square foot basis and includes the area generated through the 30% inclusionary housing FAR basis in the price calculation. Excluding middle-income height bonus area from the disposition price calculation would stimulate the supply of affordable units.
Appendix A: Detailed Review of Financial Assumptions

### Development Cost Assumption Summary - per Gross SF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Lab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Costs</td>
<td>$385</td>
<td>$329</td>
<td>$395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction Loan Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan-to-Cost</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lender’s Points</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Closing Costs</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Permanent Financing Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan-to-Value</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lender’s Points</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Closing Costs</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization Period</td>
<td>25 Yrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Selections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Lab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Constr. Duration</td>
<td>21 Mo.</td>
<td>21 Mo.</td>
<td>21 Mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease-Up or Sale Period</td>
<td>9 Mo.</td>
<td>24 Mo.</td>
<td>24 Mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilization</td>
<td>30 Mo.</td>
<td>45 Mo.</td>
<td>45 Mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Unit Size (Gross)</td>
<td>845 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Market Rent PSF/Mo.</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Low-income Rent PSF/Mo.</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Middle-Income Rent PSF/Mo.</td>
<td>$3.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Contingency</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs (for Gross Rev. Uses)</td>
<td>26%*</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exit Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mo. 60</th>
<th>Mo. 84</th>
<th>Mo. 84</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exit Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Cap Rate</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Sale Costs</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assumption represents operating costs for market rate units. Operating costs for affordable units are weighted to reflect changes in project rent levels and resulting real estate taxes.
Appendix B: Impact of Parking

Parking Calculation. The analysis assumes that a developer would build parking for every 1,000 square feet of development at a ratio of 0.9 spaces for office and 0.8 spaces for lab. Residential was analyzed assuming either 0.5 spaces or 0.25 spaces of parking for every residential unit. Underground parking in Kendall Square costs about $100,000 per space to construct because of the high water table. Above-ground parking costs approximately $25,000 per space to build. Even with rent of $250/space, underground parking has a net negative impact on a project. This analysis assumes that low-income tenants contribute the maximum allowable portion of their income towards rent and do not pay for parking, so the burden of parking for mixed-income projects increases with greater levels of affordability.

Baseline Supportable Value Comparison for Commercial and Residential - 15% Leveraged Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Value Before Parking*</th>
<th>Underground 50% Resi. Ratio</th>
<th>Underground 25% Resi. Ratio</th>
<th>Above-ground 50% Resi. Ratio</th>
<th>Supportable Land Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>($50)</td>
<td>($50)</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>($45)</td>
<td>($45)</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo (15% Low Income - 30% Bonus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5% Low-Income</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>($30)</td>
<td>($15)</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Low-Income Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0% Low-Income</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>($30)</td>
<td>($15)</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0% Low-Income</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>($35)</td>
<td>($15)</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0% Low-Income with Subsidy**</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>($35)</td>
<td>($15)</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The parking revenues from affordable units have been allocated to the “value before parking” under the assumption that the maximum allowable portion of income would support rent. This methodology simplifies the analysis by calculating rents at 33% of household income rather than separating the rent and parking in 30% of income and 3% of income, respectively. Therefore, the “value before parking” is somewhat artificially high and the “impact of parking” is somewhat artificially low, but the resulting “supportable land value” is accurate.

**Subsidy includes tax-exempt bond financing and 4% Low Income Housing Tax Credits provided by the State of Massachusetts to finance affordable portion of the development. Low-income units are reserved for households earning 50% of Area Median Income to comply with tax credit requirements.
In Conservative Supportable Value Comparison for Commercial and Residential - 18% Leveraged Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Value Before Parking</th>
<th>Impact of Parking</th>
<th>Supportable Land Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50% Resi. Ratio</td>
<td>25% Resi. Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>($55)</td>
<td>($55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>$170</td>
<td>($50)</td>
<td>($50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo (15% Low-Income - 30% Bonus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5% Low-Income</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>($30)</td>
<td>($15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Low-Income Scenarios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0% Low-Income</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>($35)</td>
<td>($15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0% Low-Income</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>($35)</td>
<td>($15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0% Low-Income with Subsidy*</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>($35)</td>
<td>($15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The parking revenues from affordable units have been allocated to the “value before parking” under the assumption that the maximum allowable portion of income would support rent. This methodology simplifies the analysis by calculating rents at 33% of household income rather than separating the rent and parking in 30% of income and 3% of income, respectively. Therefore, the “value before parking” is somewhat artificially high and the “impact of parking” is somewhat artificially low, but the resulting “supportable land value” is accurate.

**Subsidy includes tax-exempt bond financing and 4% Low Income Housing Tax Credits provided by the State of Massachusetts to finance affordable portion of the development. Low-income units are reserved for households earning 50% of Area Median Income to comply with tax credit requirements.

---

8 A market slowdown could result in developers underwriting potential deals with higher return requirements, which would depress supportable land values.
Parking and Middle-Income Bonus Area. HR&A applied the same ratios and costs to parking to units generated through a middle-income height bonus. As in the low-income units, the model assumes that middle-income tenant pay the maximum rent based on their incomes and do not contribute to parking costs.

Baseline Middle-Income Height Bonus Supportable Value - 15% Leveraged Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Impact of Parking</th>
<th>Supportable Land Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Income Bonus Assessment</td>
<td>40% Affordable</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break Even: 57% Affordable</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conservative Middle-Income Height Bonus Supportable Value - 18% Leveraged Return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Development</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
<th>Impact of Parking</th>
<th>Supportable Land Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Income Bonus Assessment</td>
<td>40.0% Affordable</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break Even: 45.0% Affordable</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A market slowdown could result in developers underwriting potential deals with higher return requirements, which would depress supportable land values.
Appendix C: Glossary of Terms

1. **Area Median Income (AMI).** The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) uses Census data to estimate the area median income (AMI) in the current year. HUD adjusts AMI calculations for different family sizes. The 2014 area median income for a family of four in the Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH HUD Metro Area is $94,100.\(^\text{10}\) Percentages of AMI are used to calculate income limits for eligibility in a variety of Federal housing programs.

2. **Baseline.** Calculates supportable land value based on existing market conditions and regulations as a comparison for financial modeling.

3. **Capitalization Rate.** Equal to annual net operating income divided by total property value; used to determine market value in relation to net operating income.

4. **Discounted Cash Flow Model.** Financial model that uses discounted future cash flow projections to determine the payment a developer could make to acquire land or development rights while earning a minimum return.

5. **Hard Costs.** Direct costs of construction, including labor, materials (interior and exterior), and site preparation costs. The analysis in this memorandum includes fit out costs as part of residential construction, but these are accounted for separately in office or lab costs (see Tenant Improvements).

6. **Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.** Requires that residential developers set aside 15% of their units for low-income housing for households earning less than 80% of area median income (AMI). In some areas of Cambridge, including Kendall Square, it provides a density bonus equivalent to 30% of floor area. After the bonus, approximately 11.5% of total units are affordable to low-income households.

7. **Interest Rate.** Amount charged by a lender to a borrower for a mortgage. Interest rate is expressed as a percentage of outstanding principal on a mortgage.

8. **Internal Rate of Return (IRR).** Discount rate that makes the net present value of all cash flows from a particular project equal to zero. An NPV of zero using a required rate of return means that a developer has earned its minimum required return and no more; supportable land value is therefore the maximum a developer can pay while earning its minimum required return.

9. **Leasing Commissions (L/Cs).** Amount paid to a broker in exchange for bringing a tenant and landlord together to form a lease agreement.

10. **Loan-to-Cost Ratio.** Ratio used to compare the amount of the loan used to finance a project to the cost to build the project. Lenders will often make construction loans based on a set loan to cost ratio.

11. **Loan-to-Value Ratio.** Ratio used to compare the amount of the loan to appraised value of a project. Lenders will often make permanent loans based on a set loan to value ratio.

12. **Low Income Housing Tax Credits.** Common Federal affordable housing subsidy that provides a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for low-income housing investments. State housing finance agencies receive an allocation and award Low-Income Housing Tax Credits through competitive application or in conjunction with tax-exempt bonds.

13. **Middle-Income Height Bonus.** A proposed bonus that would give developers in Kendall Square 50 feet of additional height if they agreed to reserve 25% of the units generated through the height bonus for middle-income families earning between 80% and 120% of AMI. Units created from a middle-income bonus would also be subject to the inclusionary zoning requirements. Thus, 15% of the bonus units would be affordable to low-income households earning less than 80% of AMI in addition to the 25% of units affordable to middle-income households. Our analysis suggests that the middle-income bonus portion of a building could contain up to 27% middle-income units while still earning a developer its required rate of return if the bonus area is granted at no additional cost to the developer.

14. **Net Operating Income.** Income stream from a revenue-generating property that is equal to property revenues minus regularly recurring operating expenses.

15. **Principal.** Amount initially borrowed on a mortgage, or amount still owed on a mortgage excluding interest.

16. **Soft Costs.** Soft costs are upfront costs associated with but not directly related to the physical construction of the building. They include architectural and engineering costs, legal expenses, marketing expenses, insurance, and general administration costs. For this analysis, HR&A has calculated construction financing costs separately although they are also considered a soft cost.

17. **Stabilization.** The point in time at which a newly built or renovated rental building has achieved long-term projected occupancy.

18. **Supportable Land Value.** The land value or payment associated with a proposed development program that would be financially feasible for a developer after earning a minimum return.

19. **Tax-Exempt Bond Financing.** States and local governments are authorized to issue tax-exempt bond, up to a capped amount set by the Federal government, to finance private development activities. Tax-exempt bonds are frequently used to finance affordable housing development by funding mortgages to finance a portion of new project with preferential interest rates and other terms.

20. **Tenant Improvements (T/Is).** Changes made to the interior of a commercial space to accommodate the needs of a specific tenant. The division of cost for tenant improvements in negotiated between the landlord or owner of the commercial space and the tenant.

21. **Tenant Improvement Allowance.** The amount of money that a developer gives to a tenant to improve a newly leased space, equal to a portion of tenant improvement costs.

22. **Triple Net Lease.** A lease agreement in which the tenant is responsible for real estate taxes, building insurance, and common area maintenance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Development Limitation</th>
<th>Existing Allowance/Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Additional Allowance</th>
<th>Proposed Total Allowance/Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. TOTAL DEVELOPMENT (Aggregate GFA)</strong>&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 402 / p. 14</td>
<td>Maximum Floor Area</td>
<td>3,280,057 sf</td>
<td>3,302,100 sf *</td>
<td>1,000,000 sf *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allowance for Non-Multi-family</td>
<td>4,076,708 sf</td>
<td>3,102,100 sf</td>
<td>600,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Multi-family</td>
<td>- sf</td>
<td>200,000 sf</td>
<td>400,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>216,000 sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. COMMERCIAL USES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 402 / p. 14</td>
<td>Office/Biotech. Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,071,432 sf</td>
<td>1,634,100 sf</td>
<td>600,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0 FAR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 402 / p. 14, 15</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>121,560 sf</td>
<td>150,000 sf</td>
<td>50,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0 FAR</td>
<td>5.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 402 / p. 14, 15</td>
<td>Industrial &amp; Flex Space</td>
<td>890,690 sf</td>
<td>1,743,000 sf</td>
<td>- sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**S. 412 / p. 22</td>
<td>Innovation Space</td>
<td>6,000 sf</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>5% of com. *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>*</sup> Notes: Total Development

A.1. Existing allowance includes 7 CC Broad variance

A.2. Proposed additional allowance includes Whitehead zoning proposal; does not include exempted space

**B. COMMERCIAL USES**<sup>*</sup> | | | | |

B.1. The sum of the GFA restrictions by use is greater than Aggregate GFA cap to provide use flexibility

B.2. Retail spaces > 10,000 sf exempt from Aggregate GFA

B.3. Only 2,000 sf industrial sf built out 770,000 max.

B.4. Innovative space (office, manuf. or retail) must = 5% of new office & biotech space, 50% of which not counted toward GFA cap.

**C. RESIDENTIAL USES** | | | | |

C.1. Existing total of 652 hotel units

C.2. Under review: Ames Street, total 280 residential units with 32 inclusionary units

C.3. Multifamily proposed: 600,000 sf required (approx.560 units); up to 800,000 sf allowed

C.4. Existing 15% Inclusionary = effective net 11.5%; net 15% yields 82 more units in new development

C.5. New residential above 250 ft height requires 25% floor area for middle income; middle income units exempt from GFA

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Development Limitation</th>
<th>Existing Allowance/Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed Additional Allowance</th>
<th>Proposed Total Allowance/Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. 402 / p. 15</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>435,356 sf *</td>
<td>440,000 sf</td>
<td>- sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0 FAR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 402 / p. 15</td>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>200,000 sf</td>
<td>200,000 sf</td>
<td>400,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0 FAR</td>
<td>2.0 FAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 411</td>
<td>Below Market Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusionary</td>
<td>Net 11.5% *</td>
<td>Net 4.5%</td>
<td>Net 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Income</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>* See note C.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FAR = Floor Area Ratio; GFA = Gross Floor Area; sf = square feet; sp = parking space
SUMMARY OF DRAFT KSURP AMENDMENT #10
Revisions to the Development Limitations (Chapter 4)

March 12, 2015

FAR = Floor Area Ratio; GFA = Gross Floor Area; sf = square feet; sp = parking space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Development Limitation</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Additional Allowance</th>
<th>Proposed Total Allowance/Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. DIMENSIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 402 / p. 16</td>
<td>Height Limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Broadway</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>250 ft</td>
<td>0 ft</td>
<td>250 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of Broadway</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>96 ft</td>
<td>154 ft</td>
<td>250 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>250 ft</td>
<td>0 / 100 ft</td>
<td>250 / 350 ft *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Notes: Dimensional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. OPEN SPACE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 403 / p. 17, 18</td>
<td>Public Open Space</td>
<td>144,044</td>
<td>100,000 sf</td>
<td>100,000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ames Street District</td>
<td>62,670</td>
<td>53,000 sf</td>
<td>53,000 sf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of MXD</td>
<td>81,374</td>
<td>47,000 sf</td>
<td>47,000 sf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Notes: Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1 Existing Conditions open space calculations developed from desk survey of design review files</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2. Lot Open Space can be private or publicly accessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.3. Proposed Lot Open Space can be located off-site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. PARKING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. 404 / p. 20,21</td>
<td>Off Street Parking</td>
<td>2,748 sp</td>
<td>680 sp</td>
<td>3,388 sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Review</td>
<td>(40) sp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Notes: Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.1 Existing parking : Green Garage: 844 spaces , Yellow Garage: 734 spaces, Blue Garage: 1,170 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.2 Propose to remove minimum requirements and replace with maximum allowances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.3 Proposed additional parking north of Binney : Commercial: 540 spaces, Residential: 140 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Notes: *

D.1 Proposed residential height allowed to 350 ft if middle income units provided.

E.1 Existing Conditions open space calculations developed from desk survey of design review files

E.2. Lot Open Space can be private or publicly accessible

E.3. Proposed Lot Open Space can be located off-site

F.1 Existing parking : Green Garage: 844 spaces , Yellow Garage: 734 spaces, Blue Garage: 1,170 spaces

F.2 Propose to remove minimum requirements and replace with maximum allowances

F.3 Proposed additional parking north of Binney : Commercial: 540 spaces, Residential: 140 spaces
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INTRODUCTION TO AMENDMENT 10 AND THE RE-STATE KENDALL SQUARE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN

In the nearly forty years since the adoption of Amendment 1 to the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan (Plan), the CRA has facilitated many changes to the Plan document, but those changes pale in comparison to the transformation of Kendall Square itself both within the Project Area and the neighborhood around it. The Kendall Square area has become a center of innovation, creativity and technology, certainly exceeding the expectation of the planners, designers, and developers in 1977.

Amendment 10 will aim to reflect these changes and to chart a way forward in furtherance of the recommendations from the 2013 K2 Planning Study. The proposed update of the Plan’s objectives reflects not only the important work of bringing jobs and opportunity to Kendall Square, but also the larger goal of creating a sustainable, inviting, and inclusive neighborhood. As in prior adopted amendments, the proposed amendment would increase many of the development limits to reflect the continued demand for the built environment, with an emphasis on bringing additional housing and retail to the Project Area. New provisions would assist the CRA in linking transit investment to development, aiming to ensure that the Project Area’s transit assets grow along with it. Provisions for innovation space and affordable housing are proposed so that Kendall Square remains not only a destination for the great thinkers of today, but also a laboratory for the great ideas of tomorrow and a great urban neighborhood for Cambridge.

The Plan under Amendment 10 is being re-stated, not remade anew. Consequently, some sections - such as those discussing land clearance - address matters already undertaken. This is by design; the document is meant not only to guide Kendall Square’s development in the future, but also tell the story of its past. For this reason, bracketed numbers appearing at the end of paragraphs throughout the plan indicate where language has been changed, and sometimes changed again and again. The bracketed number identifies which plan amendment facilitated the revisions. The proposed language changes of Amendment 10 are further designated with underlined and strikethrough text. Formatting updates and clarifications of defined terms are not highlighted or numbered.
CHAPTER 1: DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

This document, prepared by the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority (CRA), sets forth a plan for urban renewal action in the so-called Kendall Square Area of Cambridge, in accordance with the terms of Section 26ZZ and other applicable provisions of Chapter 121 of the Massachusetts General Laws, and with the provisions of the U.S. Housing Act of 1949 as amended.

Section 101: Boundaries of the Project Area

The project is situated in an area bounded generally by Main Street, the land or right of way now or formerly of the Boston and Albany (Grand Junction) Branch Railroad, Binney Street, and Third Street.

A description of the perimeter boundary of the project area is attached hereto as Exhibit A of the Urban Renewal Plan and is made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein.

The perimeter boundary of the project area is shown on Map 1: Proposed Land Use Plan, which is attached hereto as Exhibit B of the Urban Renewal Plan and made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein.

As shown on Map 1 Proposed Land Use Plan, that portion of the project area which has not been conveyed to the United States of America (and which is bounded generally by Binney Street on the North, the Boston and Albany (Grand Junction) Branch Railroad on the west, Main Street on the South and discontinued Sixth Street and Broadway on the East) is hereinafter described as the “MXD District” or “MXD District portion” and the remaining portion of the Project Area is hereinafter described as the “remainder of the project area”.[10]

Section 102: Urban Renewal Plan Objectives

The Urban Renewal Plan objectives of the project are as follows:

(a) To secure the elimination and prevent the recurrence of blighted, deteriorated, deteriorating, or decadent conditions in the project area;

(b) To insure the replacement of such conditions by well-planned, well-designed improvements which provide for the most appropriate reuse of the land in conformity with the general plan for the City of Cambridge (the “City”) as a whole and with definite local objectives, which objectives are:

1. The provision of land uses which maximize job opportunities at a variety of skill levels within Kendall Square’s knowledge and innovation based economy, including blue-collar and non-professional white-collar employment, for present and future Cambridge residents, upgrade Cambridge workers' skills and wages in a manner commensurate with the cost of living in Cambridge, and help stabilize the City's economic base and maximize the provision of local jobs; [10]
2. The improvement of land development and design to facilitate multi-modal circulation, emphasizing transit, pedestrian, and bicycle travel; [10]

3. The improvement of public transportation facilities, public infrastructure and utilities, and other public realm improvements; [10]

4. The improvement of material handling and access to and within the project area; and [10]

5. The provision of a decent, pleasant, and humane environment involving a mixture of those land uses needed to produce balanced development;

(c) To capitalize on the location of rapid transit facilities to maximize the full socio-economic potential of the project area with transit-oriented land uses and densities, and consistent with the other objectives stated herein; [10]

(d) To promote economic development which strengthens the City's tax base without unacceptably impacting upon the physical, social, and cultural environment;

(e) To establish the minimum necessary land use controls which promote development, yet protect the public interest and the common good; with a flexible set of controls which are adaptable to both current and future market conditions;

(f) To create an urban environment that encourages innovation, entrepreneurship, and creative interaction; [10]

(g) To secure development in the shortest possible time period to be responsive to economic conditions and housing demand; [10]

(h) To relate to development controls in the surrounding area;

(i) To provide economic development opportunities for residents of the existing surrounding neighborhoods, including East Cambridge, Area Four and Wellington Harrington; [10]

(j) To help alleviate problems of mobility throughout the surrounding neighborhoods for all modes of travel and goods movement; [10]

(k) To achieve harmonious visual and functional relationships with adjacent areas;

(l) To establish a sense of identity and place for Kendall Square and integrate it into the built environment; [10]

(m) To encourage the development of Kendall Square as an activity center to live, work, play, and learn; [10]

(n) To promote neighborhood safety, public health, and wellness through universal access and active environmental design; and
(o) To promote both environmental sustainability and climate change resiliency through resource efficient development and district level infrastructure planning. [10]

Section 103: Execution of the Urban Renewal Plan

The CRA will undertake and carry out an urban renewal project within the perimeter boundary of the project area in accordance with the Urban Renewal Plan:

(a) After approval of the Urban Renewal Plan, and a Cooperation Agreement by and between the City of Cambridge and the CRA, by the Cambridge City Council and the City Manager;

(b) After approval of the Urban Renewal Plan by the Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development; and

(c) After execution of a Loan and Grant Contract by and between the CRA and the United States of America.¹

Section 104: Proposed Urban Renewal Actions

Proposed urban renewal actions will be essentially land assembly, and clearance and redevelopment, and may include as essential, appropriate or necessary for the carrying out of urban renewal objectives, but not by way of limitation:

(a) The acquisition, in whole or in part, of land, buildings, structures and other improvements, appurtenances, rights-of-way, easements, and other rights and interests in real property within the project area;

(b) The management of acquired property;

(c) The relocation of facilities, individuals, and business concerns displaced by the project;

(d) The demolition and removal of existing structures and improvements, and the undertaking of site clearance;

(e) The making of project or site improvements;

(f) The making of right-of-way, street, and utility adjustments;

(g) The provision of public improvements and public facilities;

¹ On April 10, 1985, the CRA, the City, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development executed a Closeout Agreement with regards to local loans and grants provided for the implementation of the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan.
(h) The planning and monitoring of development, construction and building usage;

(i) The making of zoning adjustments; and

(j) The disposition of land for reuse and development in accordance with the land use provisions and building requirements set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan.

Section 105: Land Acquisition

The CRA may acquire by donation, purchase, eminent domain, or otherwise, in whole or in part, land, buildings, structures and other improvements, appurtenances, rights-of-way, easements, and other rights and interests in real property within the Project Area.

Section 106: Relocation

The CRA assisted families, individuals, and business concerns who occupied property in the urban renewal area and who were be displaced as a result of the CRA’s action in finding standard dwelling or business accommodations to meet their rehousing and business relocation needs, within their financial means, in reasonably convenient locations. The objectives and methods of the original relocation plan are described in Exhibit C.[10]

Section 107: Land Clearance

The CRA previously implemented the following land clearance activities:

1) Demolish or cause to be demolished buildings, structures, or other improvements located on land acquired by it;

2) Fill or cause to be filled the so-called Broad Canal;

3) Back-fill or cause to be back-filled cellar holes; and

4) Rough-grade or cause to be rough-graded cleared or filled land.

Section 108: Public Improvements and Public Facilities

The CRA will provide for or cause to be provided the abandonment, improvement, extension, reconstruction, construction, and installation of:

2 The CRA anticipates no such relocations as a result of Amendment 10.

3 Extensive land clearance activities were performed by the CRA under the original urban renewal plan and the first amendment to the urban renewal plan. Subsequent plan amendments have revised the dimensional requirements for the lands both acquired and cleared by the CRA, but have not expanded those land clearance activities.
(a) Public buildings and facilities;

(b) Public open spaces, plazas, parks, and landscaping;

(c) Public rights-of-way and other easements;

(d) Public streets, sidewalks, and other vehicular and pedestrian and bicycle facilities, public transit infrastructure, and off-street parking facilities, appurtenances, and related improvements; [10]

(e) Waterways; and

(f) Public utilities such as water, sewer, drainage, police and fire protection and communication, traffic and parking sign and signal, and street lighting system devices, appurtenances, and related improvements, and all lines for such utilities shall be maintained, relocated, or otherwise placed underground.

The CRA shall be authorized to establish a transit implementation fund to provide support for the operation of existing rail service and the development of new transit and rail facilities to meet future transit needs of the Project Area and the surrounding neighborhoods. The CRA shall be authorized to obligate developers to contribute to this fund in such amounts as may be mutually agreed (taking into account the total mitigation required in connection with any specific project).

The CRA shall work with the City and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation to administer and disburse these funds to further the redevelopment objectives described in Section 102. Further, the CRA may also consider the use of programs established by the Commonwealth available for the creation and financing of public infrastructure. [10]

The CRA shall create a Project Area Implementation Plan that outlines the projected public improvements, private development, and other redevelopment programs to be undertaken by the CRA either directly or in partnership with the City and/or designated redevelopers. This Implementation Plan will provide a projection of future public benefits resulting from the execution of the urban renewal plan.

Section 109: Right-of-Way Adjustments

The City, upon request of the CRA, may discontinue and abandon certain existing streets and vacate certain existing rights-of-way located within the project area, and may convey any and all rights, title and interest therein to the CRA or a redeveloper.

Section 110: Zoning Adjustments

The City, upon request of the CRA:

(a) Will amend the existing zoning district within which the project area is located;

(b) Will conduct joint conceptual site planning and development project design review; [10]

(c) Will grant certain special permits; and
(d) May authorize, except with respect to permitted uses, certain variances;

under the provisions of City of Cambridge, Massachusetts, Zoning Ordinance, ordained May 28, 1962, as amended to and including the date of approval by the Cambridge City Council of Revised Amendment No. 1 to the Urban Renewal Plan (the “Zoning Ordinance”) and subsequent plan amendments and zoning petitions.

**Section 111: Land Disposition**

The CRA will:

(a) Dedicate certain land or rights, title, or interests therein, in whole or in part, for public use including rights-of-way and easements; and

(b) Sell or lease at its fair market value remaining land or rights, title, or interests therein, in whole or in part, for public or private reuse and development;

in accordance with the land use plan and the land use provisions and building requirements set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan.
CHAPTER 2: REAL PROPERTY ACQUIRED OR TO BE ACQUIRED

Section 201: Real Property Designated to be Acquired

Real property, including land, buildings, structures and other improvements, appurtenances, right-of-way, easements, and other rights and interests, acquired or to be acquired, in whole or in part, by the CRA shall be as shown on Map 2: Property Map, which is attached hereto as Exhibit C of the Urban Renewal Plan and made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein; provided, however, that real property, now or formerly of:

(a) The Boston and Albany (Grand Junction) Branch Railroad;
(b) The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority;
(c) The Cambridge Industrial Track Management Corporation; or
(d) Any utility distribution system which is under private ownership or control;

will be acquired subject to such requisite approvals of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities, or other public regulatory agencies, as may be required by law or regulation.\(^4\)

Section 202: Real Property Designated to be Acquired Under Special Conditions

Some real property not now designated for acquisition, as shown on Map 2: Property Map, which is attached hereto as Exhibit C of the Urban Renewal Plan, may be acquired in whole or in part, by the CRA under special conditions. Such real property shall include, specifically, land, buildings, structures and other improvements, appurtenances, rights-of-way, easements, and other rights and interests, now or formerly of:

Cambridge Gas Company bounded, generally, by Third Street, Potter Street, Fifth Street, and Munroe Street;

provided however, that such real property shall be acquired only upon mutual consent and agreement by and between the CRA and the Cambridge Gas Company.

---

\(^4\) The original urban renewal plan provided for the acquisition of the real property formerly owned by the Cambridge Gas Company upon mutual consent and agreement of the CRA and the Cambridge Gas Company. This property has since been sold and redeveloped as multi-family residential housing.
CHAPTER 3: LAND USE PLAN

Section 301: Right-of-Way Adjustments

The location of proposed rights-of-way and other easements, and right-of-way adjustments, shall be, at least tentatively, as shown on Map 1: Proposed Land Use Plan, attached hereto as Exhibit B of the Urban Renewal Plan.

Section 302: Street and Utility Adjustments

The location and nature of proposed streets and utilities, and street and utility adjustments, shall be such as to conform to the proposed rights-of-way and other easements shown, at least tentatively, on Map 1: Proposed Land Use Plan. All public and private utility lines within the project area shall be maintained, re-located, tended, reconstructed, constructed, installed, or otherwise placed underground.

Section 303: Zoning Adjustments

The zoning district within which the MXD District of the project area is located was changed from “Industry B District” to the "Cambridge Center Mixed Use Development District" (or "Cambridge Center MXD District") zoning classification for the project area, as shown on Map 1: Proposed Land Use Plan.

These zoning changes were made by amendment upon the "Zoning Map”, under the provisions of "Article I : Administration and Enforcement”, set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, prior to the time land was disposed of by the CRA for reuse and development. Future amendments to the urban renewal plan may require additional changes to the MXD District per the provisions of "Article I : Administration and Enforcement”.

Section 304: Public or Special Purpose Uses

The location and nature of proposed public or special purpose uses, shall be as shown on Map 1: Proposed Land Use Plan, to be developed by:

(a) The Department of Transportation (DOT) for a Transportation Systems Center (TSC) within a portion of the Project Area, bounded, generally, by or abutting Broadway, Sixth Street, (a portion of which was discontinued as a public way on December 15, 1969), Binney Street, and Third Street, except for land now or formerly of Cambridge Gas Company;

(b) The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) for improved subway, rapid transit, bus transportation and terminal, passenger station and interchange, electric power, and appurtenant facilities and incidental or accessory services, tentatively, in that portion of the project area adjoining or related to the present subway station and tunnel located under Main Street.

The City, the CRA, or other public or quasi-public agencies may develop or cause to be developed, at any location or locations, such other public or special purpose uses, including but not limited to public parking facilities, pedestrian circulation systems, and open space for parks...
Section 305: Land Use and Open Space Definitions

(a) Gross Floor Area or "GFA" is hereby defined as follows:

The sum, in square feet, of the gross horizontal areas of all of the floors of a building, as measured from the exterior face of the exterior walls or center lines of walls separating two buildings, including: (i) roofed and enclosed porches and balconies, whether enclosed or unenclosed, and unroofed porches and balconies above the second floor, (ii) elevator shafts and stairwells on each floor (iii) attic space, whether finished or unfinished, except as herein after excluded, (iv) interior balconies, mezzanines and penthouses, and (v) basement and cellar areas not devoted exclusively to uses accessory to the operation of the building;

but excluding: (i) areas used for parking garages, accessory parking, off-street loading purposes (ii) basement and cellar areas devoted exclusively to uses accessory to the operation of the building, (iii) open or lattice-enclosed exterior fire escapes, (iv) unenclosed unroofed porches and balconies for residential uses no higher than the second floor, and (v) attic space and other areas for elevator machinery or mechanical equipment accessory to the building. In a building with more than two floors the area of each floor level of any interior courtyard whether or not covered by a roof, which has a minimum dimension of less than forty feet in any direction shall be included unless twenty percent or more of the perimeter of such courtyard at each floor level measured consecutively is not enclosed.

(b) Floor area ratio or "FAR" is defined as ratio of gross floor area of a structure to the total area of the lot.

(c) Open space shall mean a portion of a lot or other area of land associated with and adjacent to a building or group of buildings in relation to which it serves to provide light and air, or scenic, recreational, or similar purposes. Such space may either be:

(i) Public open space or private open space accessible to the general public,

(ii) Available exclusively for entry and use by the occupants of the building(s) with which it is associated or

(iii) A limited proportion of space so located and treated as to enhance the amenity of development by providing landscaping features, for the occupants or neighbors or a general appearance of openness.

Open space shall include parks, plazas, lawns, landscaped areas, decorative plantings, uncovered roof decks or gardens, non-enclosed balconies, pedestrian ways, active and passive recreational areas, including playgrounds and swimming pools. Streets, parking lots, driveways, service roads, loading areas, and areas normally inaccessible to pedestrian circulation beneath pedestrian bridges, decks, or shopping bridges shall not be counted in determining required open space. [10]

Section 306: Other Land Uses
The portion of the Project Area located within the MXD District shall be developed for such other uses as are permitted under the provisions of Section 401 of the Plan Renewal Plan, and within Article 14 of the Zoning Ordinance. [10]

The portion of the Project Area located within the Kendall PUD District of the Project Area shall be developed in accordance with Article 12 and Article 13 of the Zoning Ordinance. [10]
CHAPTER 4: LAND USE PROVISIONS AND BUILDING REQUIREMENTS

Section 401: Permitted Uses on Acquired Land

Terms used in this Urban Renewal Plan and not otherwise defined shall have the meanings ascribed to them in the Zoning Ordinance, as the same may be amended from time to time. The uses permitted in the MXD District of the project area on land previously acquired by the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority shall be:

(1) Light Industry

   (a) Manufacturing: fabrication, assembly, finishing work (including packaging and bottling, but only as an accessory use) without limit as to category or product.

   (b) Wholesale business, only if affiliated with and accessory to another use or located on the same lot as other non-wholesale uses. Development on any lot in the MXD District shall not be devoted exclusively to wholesale uses.

   (c) Printing, binding, or related establishment.

   (d) Storage warehouse, cold storage plant, storage building, as an accessory use only and not exceeding 20,000 square feet, but not including storage or bailing of junk, scrap metal, rags, paper or other waste materials and not including outside storage of products or materials.

(2) Office Uses and Biotechnology Manufacturing Uses

   1) Business or professional offices.

      1) Bank, trust company or other financial institution.

      2) Research and development office.

      3) Research, experimental and testing laboratory.

      4) Radio or television studio.

      5) Manufacturing of biotechnology and pharmaceutical products, including:

         (i) Fabrication, assembly, finishing work (including packaging and bottling, but only as an accessory use).

         (ii) Wholesale business, only if affiliated with and accessory to another use or located on the same lot as other non-wholesale uses.

         (iii) Storage warehouse, cold storage building, as an accessory use only.

(3) Retail and Consumer Service Establishments
1) Store for retail sale of merchandise, but not a sales place for automobiles or trucks.

2) Eating and/or drinking establishment, whether or not liquor is sold or consumed, including restaurant, bar, lunchroom, cafeteria and food commissary.

3) Fast order food establishment only if it (i) is not located in a separate structure, (ii) it does not exceed 3,000 square feet gross floor area, and (iii) there will be no more than fifteen (15) such establishments within the MXD District (a maximum of (8) of which shall be located in the Ames Street District and a maximum of seven (7) of which shall be located in the portions of the District outside the Ames Street District), and (iv) it is approved through the granting of a Special Permit, as provided in the Zoning Ordinance. [9]

4) Consumer service establishment, including but not limited to hairdresser, barber shop, laundry or dry-cleaning pick-up establishment, self-service laundry, shoe repair or tailoring shop, or photography studio.

5) Rental agency for autos or other products, but not including taxi companies. Such agencies shall be operated entirely within a building and no major automobile repairs shall be made on the premises.

6) Automobile service station, provided that it is located within or attached to a parking garage or other structure as an accessory use, that no major repairs are made on the premises, and that all lubrication and repairs are carried out within the building.

(4) Residential Uses

1) Multi-family dwelling.

2) Hotel or motel.

(5) Entertainment and Recreational Uses

1) Indoor commercial entertainment establishments including but not limited to cinema, theater, concert hall, cabaret and night club.

2) Recreation facilities including bowling alley, indoor or outdoor tennis courts, public recreation building, health club, or skating rink. Such recreation facilities shall be allowed only if they are located in or attached to structures containing other principal uses.

3) Halls, auditoriums and similar spaces used for public gatherings.

4) Parks or playgrounds.

(6) Institutional Uses
1) Religious purposes.

2) Educational purposes exempt by statute.

3) Library or museum.

4) Governmental offices and facilities, including post office, fire station and police station.

5) Clinic licensed under Sec G.L. c. 111, § 51 but not a hospital licensed under said Chapter.

(7) Transportation, Communication and Utility Uses

1) Bus, subway or railroad passenger station.

2) Automobile parking lot or parking garage.

3) Distribution center, parcel delivery center or delivery warehouse as accessory uses only.

4) Telephone exchange, as an accessory use.

5) Radio or television transmission station.

6) Transformer station, substation, gas regulator station, or pumping station and related utility uses designed primarily to serve development within the District.

The location of these uses will be in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance changed as specified in Section 303 and with the objectives of the Urban Renewal Plan as specified in Section 102.

The uses permitted in the remainder of the project area, and the location of such uses, shall be as set forth in Section 304 hereof.

No activity shall be permitted in the MXD District unless it shall be in conformity with the following standards for environmental protection:

1) All dust, fumes, odors, smoke or vapor shall be effectively confined to the premises or so disposed of as to avoid air pollution.

2) Any noise, vibration or flashing shall not be normally perceptible without instruments at a distance of one hundred (100) feet from the premises.

3) All development proposals shall comply with Federal and State air pollution and water pollution control regulations, the City of Cambridge Ordinances, and other applicable environmental laws.

4) Except during construction activity on the lot all refuse and other waste materials shall be stored within buildings prior to collection and disposal.
Section 402: Dimensional Requirements

Dimensional requirements pertaining to floor area ratios, dwelling unit densities, and height limitations in the MXD District of the project area shall be as follows:

1) The Aggregate Gross Floor Area ("GFA") of development in the MXD District shall not exceed three million, seven hundred and two thousand, and one hundred (3,702,100) square feet plus six hundred thousand (600,000) square feet that shall be limited to multi-family residential, for a total GFA not to exceed four million, three hundred and two thousand, and one hundred (4,362,100) square feet. Aggregate GFA of development in the MXD District is at any time the sum of the GFA of all buildings (i) which are then located in the MXD District, (ii) which are being constructed or may be constructed in the MXD District pursuant to the effective building permits, and (iii) which, pursuant to then outstanding contracts (including options) with CRA and so stated in certificates from the CRA to the Superintendent of Buildings, may be constructed in the MXD District in the future. 5 [5] [6] [8] [9] [10]

At least two hundred thousand (200,000) square feet of the multi-family residential GFA shall occur within the area designated on the Zoning Map as the “Ames Street District”, the construction of which shall precede the occupancy of any commercial GFA in excess of three million and seventy three thousand (3,073,000) square feet. [10]

2) In addition to the Aggregate GFA limitation, the Cumulative GFA for each of the use groups shall not exceed the respective amounts stated below, except as provided hereinafter. The sum of the Cumulative GFA limitations below exceeds the Aggregate GFA limitation to provide flexibility between uses in the Project Area. Cumulative GFA for a use group is at any time the sum of the GFA of all portions, occupied or to be occupied by uses within such use group, of all buildings (i) which are then located in the MXD District, (ii) which are being constructed or may be constructed in the MXD District pursuant to then effective building permits, and (iii) which, pursuant to then outstanding contracts (including options) with CRA to the Superintendent of Buildings, may be constructed in the MXD District in the future.

1. Industrial uses permitted by Section 401(1):

   Cumulative GFA = 770,000 square feet.

2. Office and Biotechnology Manufacturing Uses permitted by Section 401(2):

   Cumulative GFA = 2,294,100 square feet. [3] [8] [10]

3. Retail and consumer service uses permitted by Section 401(3):

   Cumulative GFA = [2,294,100] square feet. [3] [8] [10]

5 These figures differ from MXD zoning due to 29,100 GFA provided to Seven Cambridge Center via Amendment 6 and then a variance.
Cumulative GFA = 200,000 square feet. [10]

4. Residential uses permitted by Section 401(4):

   (i) Multi-family housing:

       Cumulative GFA = 800,000 square feet. [5] [10]

   (ii) Hotel/Motel:

       Cumulative GFA = 440,000 square feet. [4]

5. Entertainment, recreational, institutional, transportation, communication and utility uses permitted by Sections 401(5), 401(6) and 401(7) and additional development of industrial, office, retail, consumer service and hotel/motel uses exceeding the foregoing cumulative GFA limitations:

   Cumulative GFA = 973,000 square feet for buildings which are located or are being constructed or may be constructed at any location within the MXD District. [2] [6] [10]

Any construction or change of use within the MXD District which would cause the foregoing aggregate or cumulative GFA limitations to be exceeded shall not be allowed.

The CRA and Cambridge Inspectional Services Department (ISD) shall maintain a record of the Aggregate GFA within the MXD District and a record of cumulative GFA for each use group specified in Section 401. The Superintendent of Buildings shall maintain a separate record of any development within the area of the MXD district designated in Exhibit G as the “Ames Street District.” These records shall be adjusted, as appropriate, from time to time, including upon issuance revocation or expiration of a building permit or certificate of occupancy and upon receipt of a certificate from CRA as to an outstanding contract (including option) for the construction of a building. Additional building area within the MXD District authorized by variance issued by the Board of Zoning Appeal, shall not be counted by the CRA or the ISD against the GFA Limitations of this Section 402. [9]

In determining cumulative GFA for a building containing uses in more than one use group, spaces to be utilized by users in more than one of the use groups, such as lobbies, interior courts, elevator shafts and basement storage areas shall be apportioned to each use group in proportion to the share of space that use group will occupy within the building.

3) In addition to both the aggregate and cumulative GFA limitations established herein, there shall also be a density limitation for each lot within the MXD District. The following Floor Area Ratios (hereinafter referred to as "FAR") for each lot shall not be exceeded, except as provided hereinafter. The area of the lot to be counted in determining FAR shall include land dedicated by the owner or former owner of the lot as public open space under Section 403, as well as developed land.
Industrial and Wholesale Uses: FAR 4.0

Office Uses and Biotechnology Manufacturing Uses: FAR 8.0 [3]

Retail and Consumer Services Uses: FAR 5.0

Residential uses:

- Multi-family housing: FAR 6.0 [10]

- Hotel/Motel: FAR 6.0

Other uses: FAR 4.0

If development on a lot is to include activities in more than one of the use group above, the maximum FAR for the lot shall be the FAR for the use group containing the largest proportion of space on the lot.

The gross floor area ratio of any structure constructed or to be constructed within the remainder of the project area shall not exceed four (4.0) times the net area of any parcel of land, as bounded by other parcels or by public rights-of-way, which is designated by the CRA to be used, developed or built upon as a unit under single ownership; provided, however, that neither arcades, nor the roof or uncovered and unbuilt open area on top of any platform, podium, plaza, construction deck or other similar structure shall be deemed to be a part of gross floor area for the purposes of this calculation.

(d) GFA Exemptions:

(1) Variances: Aggregate GFA within the District authorized by a variance issued by the Board of Zoning Appeal shall not be counted by the Superintendent of Buildings for any purpose in determining the Aggregate GFA within the District.

(2) Residential Outdoor Area Exemptions: Private outdoor decks or balconies for multi-family residential development shall be excluded from the Aggregate GFA and Cumulative GFA calculations for residential, up to five percent (5%) of the building floor area.

(3) Innovation Space: Fifty percent (50%) of the Innovation Space GFA required in Section 412 below shall not count against the GFA cap for the District, the Cumulative GFA for the office and Biotechnology use group, or the maximum FAR for the development lot.

(4) Retail: The GFA occupied by new retail and consumer service uses listed in Article 14.21.3 of the Zoning Ordinance shall be excluded from the limitations on Aggregate GFA and Cumulative GFA in the District set forth above, if the following conditions are met:

   i) The excluded GFA is located on the ground or second story levels of a building or not more than one story below grade.
ii) The excluded GFA has frontage and direct pedestrian entrances onto Main Street, Binney, Broadway, Third Street, Ames Street, Galileo Way, Pioneer Way, internal service drives or onto open space that is directly accessible and not more than one hundred (100) feet distant from at least one of the aforementioned streets or services drives.

iii) The excluded GFA is occupied by separate retail establishments each occupying no more than ten thousand (10,000) square feet of floor area. This space limitation for GFA exclusion may be waived for a grocery, market or pharmacy retail use. [10]

(5) Middle Income Housing Units: Residential Units:

The maximum building height for commercial buildings in the MXD District shall be 250 feet. Residential buildings may be permitted to be built up 350 feet provided they meet the provisions for Middle Income Housing described within Section 411 below. [10]

These requirements shall not apply to chimneys, water towers, air conditioning equipment, elevator bulkheads, skylights, ventilators, solar or wind turbine energy systems, and other necessary features appurtenant to buildings, which are usually carried above roofs and are not used for human occupancy. These requirements shall also not apply to domes, towers or spires above buildings if such features are not used for human occupancy and occupy less than ten percent of the lot area, nor to wireless or broadcasting towers and other like un-enclosed structures which occupy less than ten percent of the lot area. [10]

Section 403: Space-Use Allocations and Development Intensity

To the maximum feasible degree, the CRA will dispose of project land in such a manner as to achieve the mixture and density of those land uses needed to produce balanced development in accordance with the objectives set forth in Section 102.

1) The CRA will reserve at least 100,000 square feet of land in the MXD District for the development of public open space for parks, gardens and plazas. Public open space shall be open space reserved for public use and enjoyment as guaranteed through one or more of the following:

   (1) Retention by the CRA;

   (2) Dedication to and acceptance by the City or other public entity;

   (3) Easements or deed restrictions over such land sufficient to ensure its perpetual reservation for public open space purposes;

   (4) Dedication, by covenant or comparable legal instrument, to the community use of the residents, lessees and visitors to the MXD District for reasonable amounts of time on a regular basis; or
(5) Lease agreements of 99 years or longer from the private developer or owner to the City or other public entity.

2) Each development project shall be required to contribute to the open space network of the Project Area. Table One lists the minimum amount of open space (public, private or combined) to be provided by each development within the MXD District shall be as shown on Table One, subject to the reduction provided hereinafter. When development on a lot includes uses in more than one of the use categories in Table One, the requirement for each use category shall be calculated and totaled to determine a total requirement for the project. This open space requirement may be met by:

(1) Creating open space on the development lot. Some or all of this required open space may be designated and also serve as public open space, if reserved by one of the methods specified above.

(2) Dedicating and enhancing publically accessible open space within the MXD District, not otherwise reserved by another project to meet its lot open space requirement.

(3) Providing land or adequate acquisition and development funds for the creation of new public open space within a half mile of the MXD District. This off site option may be used to provide up to fifty percent (50%) of the Project Open Space Requirement.

The CRA shall maintain a record of cumulative GFA by land use for the purpose of determining and tracking open space requirements for existing and future development. [10]

Table One: Lot Open Space Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Group</th>
<th>Required Open Space (SF of open space required for each 100 SF of GFA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial and Wholesale Uses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowed by Section 401(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Biotechnology Manufacturing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowed by Section 401(2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Consumer Service Uses</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowed by Section 401(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses allowed by Section 401(4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily housing</td>
<td>8 +5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or Motel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowed by Sections 401(5), 401(6) and 401(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) The minimum amount of open space required for a lot may be reduced if at least 20% of the total perimeter boundary of the lot abuts public open space reserved under this Section 403, and if at least one major pedestrian entrance to the principal building will abut and provide direct access to said open space.

The allowed percentage reduction of required open space shall be determined by dividing the length of the lot’s common boundary on the public open space by the length of the total boundary of the public open space.

A table of the MXD District open space substitutions for constructing pedestrian ways is attached hereto as Exhibit E of the Urban Renewal Plan and is made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein.

3) Pedestrian ways listed and defined in Exhibit F may be counted toward the lot open space requirement determined in this Section 403. In calculating the open space reduction, all of the area of the pedestrian way located within the lot boundary and one-half (1/2) the area of such ways over streets or service drives adjoining but outside the lot shall be counted.

Section 404: Vehicular Access, Parking and Loading Regulations

1) Buildings erected in the MXD District need not be located on lots, which have frontage on a street. However, provisions for access to all buildings by emergency and service vehicles in lieu of public street access shall be made possible by the layout and design of driveways, interior service roads, or pedestrian and bicycle circulation corridors not normally open to vehicular traffic to the reasonable satisfaction of the City Fire Department, and the City Traffic Department.

2) Off-street parking requirements and restrictions for motor vehicles within the MXD District shall be determined according to building use, with additional standards as follows: [10]

Table Two: Off Street Parking Minimum and Maximum Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Group</th>
<th>Minimum Parking Required</th>
<th>Maximum Parking Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial and Wholesale Uses allowed by Section 401(1)</td>
<td>1/2000 sq ft</td>
<td>.8/1000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Biotechnology Manufacturing Uses allowed by Section 401(2)</td>
<td>1/2000 sq ft</td>
<td>.9/1000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Consumer Service Uses allowed by Section 401(4)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>.5 /1000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses allowed by Section 401(4) Multifamily housing</td>
<td>.25/unit</td>
<td>.75/unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Sq Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel or Motel</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1 / 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sleeping rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>.9/1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No permanent on-grade, off-street parking areas shall be allowed in the MXD District. [10]

The parking for requirements specified above may be satisfied in total or in part by a lease agreement between the developer and the City, other public entity, or private consortium for use of parking spaces in a public or pooled private parking facility located within the MXD District. The total number of parking spaces leased and constructed within the district for development on a lot shall be at least equivalent to the Exhibit F requirement. [10]

Parking spaces permanently dedicated to accessible parking, car sharing programs, vanpools, or electronic vehicle charging stations are not included in the maximum parking space calculations so long as the aggregate number spaces of the special designated spaced does not exceed 10% of the maximum allowance per use.

Parking requirements for bicycles within the MXD District shall be provided as called for in the Zoning Ordinance.

3) It is the intent of this Section that sufficient off-street loading facilities be constructed within the MXD District to meet the needs of users located there. The off-street loading requirements shall be those detailed within the Zoning Ordinance. Each building of 25,000 square feet or greater shall provide one loading bay plus an additional bay in accordance with Exhibit F, up to a maximum requirement of four loading bays. All buildings in the MXD District shall provide the number of bays required unless they qualify for one or more of the exemptions below: [10]

   (1) In buildings with uses in more than one use group under Section 301, the loading bay requirements for that use consuming the most gross floor area shall be first computed and required. Only 50% of the floor area of the other uses shall be counted in determining the additional loading requirements.

   (2) Where there are contractual arrangements for sharing loading and service facilities with other users in the MXD District for a period of ten years or more, a 60% reduction in the loading bay requirement shall be allowed. Such contractual agreement shall be guaranteed to the satisfaction of the Superintendent of Buildings by covenant, deed restriction, or comparable legal instrument. [10]

In addition, open parking and loading areas must be laid out, constructed, paved, equipped, landscaped, and effectively screened to provide an attractive visual appearance. The number, location, and character of parking and loading spaces provided or to be provided must be approved and consented to in writing by the CRA.

4) The parking and loading of vehicles within the remainder of the project area on land designated to be acquired shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of “Article VII Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements”, as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, as it may be amended from time to time.
Section 405: Vehicular Access and Discharge Areas

All buildings within the project area on land designated to be acquired shall be suitably provided with automobile, non-motorized vehicular access points, and truck service and delivery areas in such a way as not to impede general vehicular and pedestrian traffic flow in public streets and rights-of-way. [10]

Section 406: Building Construction

All buildings within the project area shall be constructed as “Type 1”, fireproof, or “Type 2”, semi-fireproof, in full conformity with the provisions of and as defined in the Cambridge Building Code, as amended from time to time.

Section 407: Signs and Advertising Devices

Signs within the project area, except for official, uniform traffic and parking signals and devices, shall be provided in accordance with development guidelines established pursuant to Section 502 of the Plan.

Section 408: Storage

The open air storage of materials, equipment, or merchandise, other than the temporary parking of automobiles, shall not be permitted within the project area on any land designated to be acquired.

Section 409: Exterior Lighting

Exterior lighting within the project area shall be provided in accordance with development guidelines established pursuant to Section 502 of the Plan.

Section 410: Landscaping

All open areas within the project area on land disposed of by the CRA must be suitably landscaped so as to provide a visually attractive environment in accordance with development guidelines established pursuant to Section 502 of the Plan.

Section 411: Housing

1) Affordable Housing Requirements

All multi-family housing in the Project Area shall be subject to the Cambridge Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Multi-family housing development above and beyond the initial 200,000 GFA of housing within the Ames Street District shall provide that at least a final net fifteen percent (15%) of new housing available to households qualifying for affordable housing under the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance, or the minimum required by the Zoning Ordinance, whichever is greater. The CRA will work with the City to utilize square footage measurement rather than unit counts for meeting this
requirement to provide opportunities for larger affordable units with two and three bedrooms to be constructed. [10]

2) Middle Income Housing

New residential development may utilize the middle-income housing bonus as described below to construct buildings up to 350 feet in height, under the following conditions:

(a) the use of any occupiable space situated above 250 feet in height shall be limited to residential units, and associated amenity and mechanical space, and

(b) Middle Income Units (as defined below) shall occupy an aggregate GFA equal to at least twenty five percent (25%) of the total residential GFA the portions of the building that exceed 250 feet in height. Such Middle Income Units shall be distributed throughout the residential building in order to ensure that the Middle Income Units are of an appropriate location, size, configuration and quality for households intended to occupy such units. The floor area of Middle Income Units provided per this section shall not be counted against the Aggregate GFA limitation in the District.

For the purposes of this Section, Middle Income Units shall be defined as residential dwelling units for which:

i. the occupancy is restricted to households whose total income does not exceed 120% of the median income of households in the Boston Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area adjusted for family size, or such other equivalent income standard as may be determined by the Board of Trustees of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund; and

ii. the rent (including utilities) does not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the income of the renting household or, in the instance of home ownership units, the monthly mortgage payment (including insurance, utilities and real estate taxes) does not exceed thirty percent (30%) of the income of the purchasing household, or such other equivalent standard as may be determined by the Board of Trustees of the Affordable Housing Trust Fund; and

iii. the Middle-Income Units are not also designated as Affordable Units for the purpose of meeting the Inclusionary Housing requirements in Section 11.200 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 412: Innovation Space

Any new commercial development proposal containing at least 100,000 square feet for Office and Biotechnology Manufacturing Uses shall include a plan for Innovation Commercial Space meeting the requirements below. Innovation Commercial Space within the MXD District must occupy GFA equal to, or in excess of, five percent (5%) of newly constructed non-residential
GFA beyond three million one hundred sixty-two thousand and one hundred (3,162,100) square feet. Existing GFA within the MXD District may be converted to meet this requirement. The Innovation Commercial Space requirement shall be met through the provision of office spaces of at least 20,000 square feet within a single building. Up to 25% of the Innovative Commercial Space may be met through provision of non-traditional ground floor retail space meeting the characteristics below.

(a) **Required Space.** For a development proposal containing new Office Uses, Innovation Commercial Space within the MXD District must occupy Gross Floor Area equal to, or in excess of, the amount of Gross Floor Area that is five percent (5%) of newly constructed Gross Floor Area for Office Uses. Existing Gross Floor Area within the District may be used to meet this requirement.

(b) **Combined Spaces.** Developers of properties within the MXD District may collaborate with other developers in adjacent zoning districts in the Kendall Square area to develop a joint Innovation Office Space Plan. In such a case, the total square footage of joint Innovation Commercial Space must be large enough to satisfy the sum of the requirements, if any, for such participating developers and zoning districts.

(c) **Characteristics.** For the purposes of this Section 13.89.3, Innovation Commercial Space shall have the following characteristics:

(i) Durations of lease agreements (or other similar occupancy agreements) with individual office tenants shall be for periods of approximately one (1) month, or with retail or industrial business entities shall be for periods of approximately one year.

(ii) No single business entity may occupy more than 2,000 square feet or 10% of the entire Innovation Office Space provided in the District, whichever is greater.

(iii) The average size of separately contracted private office suites may not exceed 200 square feet of GFA.

(iv) Innovation Commercial Space shall include shared resources (i.e., co-working areas, conference space, classroom space, office equipment, showroom, shop or lab equipment, storage, supplies and kitchens) available to all tenants and must occupy at least 50% of the Innovation Office Space.

(v) Individual entities occupying Innovation Commercial Space may include small business incubators, small research laboratories, non-traditional retail vendors, office space for investors and entrepreneurs, facilities for teaching and for theoretical, basic and applied research, product development and testing and prototype fabrication or production of experimental products.

(d) **Variations.** In reviewing development proposals, variations in the specific characteristics set forth above, may be allowed if the proposed Innovation Commercial Space is found to be consistent with the purposes of these characteristics.
Section 413: Interim Uses

The CRA may devote real property designated to be acquired, or acquired under special conditions, prior to the time such properties are needed for disposition for reuse and development in accordance with the provisions of the Urban Renewal Plan to temporary, interim uses for signs for project identification, relocation, parking, traffic circulation and public transportation, project or site improvements or building construction, storage, recreation, or landscaping in accordance with such provisions, requirements, standards, controls, and regulations as the CRA may deem essential, necessary, or appropriate to the carrying out of the objectives of the Urban Renewal Plan.

Section 414: Permitted Uses on Land Designated to be Acquired Under Special Conditions

In the event that the real property described in Section 202 above is acquired by the CRA the land use provisions and building requirements, which shall pertain thereto shall be those set forth in Chapter 4 of the Urban Renewal Plan.

Section 415: Special Provisions Applicable Within the Ames Street District

1) Applicability. The provisions set forth in this Section 415 shall apply solely within the Ames Street District. Where this Section 415 specifies some standard or makes some other requirement contrary to the standards or requirements set forth elsewhere in Chapter Four of this Plan, the provisions of this Section 415 shall control.

2) FAR. Notwithstanding the Lot Density Limitations in Section 402, there shall be no maximum FAR for Multi-family dwelling uses. However, the District Development Limitations in Section 402 shall continue to apply.

3) Lot Minimum Open Space Requirement. So long as the District Public Open Space Requirement in Section 403 is met and there exists within the Ames Street District a minimum of fifty-three thousand (53,000) square feet of public open space (as defined in Section 403), the Lot Minimum Open Space Requirements in Section 403 shall be inapplicable within the Ames Street District.

4) Parking. The minimum number of spaces for multifamily residential use shall be 0.50 per dwelling unit.

5) Loading Requirements. Where there are contractual arrangements for sharing loading and service facilities with other users in the Ames Street District for a period of ten (10) years or more, a sixty percent (60%) reduction in the loading bay requirements computed in Subsection 14.53.1 or 14.53.1(1) shall be allowed. Such contractual agreement shall be guaranteed to the satisfaction of the Superintendent of Buildings by covenant, deed restriction, easement or comparable legal instrument.
CHAPTER 5: DESIGN PRINCIPLES, DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES AND DESIGN REVIEW, AND REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

Section 501: General Design Principles

Proposals by redevelopers shall be designed to:

1. Create an environment, which will be lively and attractive and provide daily amenities and services for the use and enjoyment of the working population and City residents.

2. Establish an active urban character for the area by the intensive utilization of land and by the mixing of compatible land uses, especially near the Kendall rapid transit station.

3. Achieve a proper integration of buildings and spaces within and outside the project area by carefully relating the scale and materials in new development both among project components and with respect to the scale and materials of surrounding development.

4. Establish a focus through building form and open space which will serve to create development identity of sufficient positive impact.

5. Preserve and enhance long and short range views, visual privacy, and sun orientation by the careful positioning of buildings and open space.

6. Obtain a relationship between buildings, open space and public ways, which provides increased protection to the pedestrian during unfavorable weather conditions.

7. Link all project components with continuous and safe pedestrian and bicycle circulation systems. [10]

8. Establish an orderly sequence and hierarchy of open spaces and pedestrian routes throughout the site.

9. Provide maximum opportunity for safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access to surrounding areas. [10]

Section 502: Development Guidelines

The CRA shall from time to time establish land disposition policies and procedures, design standards, and other development guidelines and evaluate the quality and appropriateness of development proposals with reference to the Plan objectives, land use provisions, building requirements, design principles and other controls as set forth in this Plan, in the disposition
documents, and development guidelines. The CRA shall also utilize urban design guidelines established by the City, including the “K2 Design Guidelines.”[10]

The design review process will be conducted or caused to be conducted by the CRA in coordination with the City and the Planning Board. [10]

**Section 503: Compliance with Plan and Development Guidelines**

Redevelopment in the project area shall conform to the Plan objectives, land use provisions, building requirements, design principles, and other controls as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan and to development guidelines established by the CRA.

All development proposals and architectural plans will be subject to design review, comment, and approval by the CRA prior to land disposition and prior to the commencement of construction. All construction work will be subject to inspection by the CRA in order to assure compliance with the approved development proposals and architectural plans. [10]

**Section 504: Approvals of Concept Plan**

All new development shall be consistent with a Conceptual Development Plan (Concept Plan) for the District reviewed by the Planning Board and approved by the CRA. A Concept Plan shall include:

a) A site plan for all proposed new development within the MXD District including locations of Innovation Office Space as described in Section 14.32.5 and Active Ground Floor Uses described in Article 14.82 of the Zoning Ordinance.

b) A current development program illustrating the size and location of existing buildings at the time of submission.

c) A table summarizing the current and proposed future uses on building sites in the MXD District and indicating the potential size and use (or alternate uses) of future development.

d) An open space plan depicting the size, layout and configuration of all Public Open Space within the District, and any private open space to be provided by future development proposals. This conceptual open space plan shall illustrate the open space existing in the MXD District and open space proposed to be developed or modified within or outside of the District.

e) A sustainability narrative describing how the new development in the Concept Plan will meet the requirements set forth in Article 14.83 of the Zoning Ordinance, and additionally describing the consistency of the proposed development with other sustainability goals that may be established by the City, such as mitigating urban heat island effect, promoting district energy systems, and resilience to adapt to future impacts of climate change.
f) An analysis of anticipated parking demand for all uses in the Concept Plan throughout the course of a typical day and week. This analysis may identify opportunities for reducing the total amount of parking required to serve all uses through the sharing of parking spaces by multiple uses and the provision of spaces reserved for car sharing services. [10]

Section 505: Proposed Building and Architectural Plans

A development proposal shall consist of text, maps and drawings that describe to the CRA how the parcels will be developed. The exact form, content and time schedule for each development proposal will be specified in development guidelines established by the CRA pursuant to Section 502 of the Plan. [10]

Proposed building and architectural plans and related materials including diagrams, scale models, perspective sketches, and photographs illustrating building design and arrangement, to a suitable scale, and based upon the land development specifications set forth above, shall show, among other things:

1) Detailed elevations and floor plans for all buildings, and dwelling unit types;
2) The specific use of all non-residential floor space;
3) The location and layout of all signs; and
4) Outline specifications for building types, including construction and finish, together with actual samples of proposed exterior and interior building materials.

Section 506: Inter-Agency Development Review

The CRA shall conduct its design review in close coordination with the City and the Planning Board. The CRA, in consultation with the City, will approve a Concept Plan for new development within the MXD District. Subsequent development proposals shall be reviewed by the CRA for conformance with the Concept Plan before being submitted to the Planning Board or the CRA for approval. [10]
CHAPTER 6: REDEVELOPER’S OBLIGATIONS

Notwithstanding lesser requirements in the provisions of any zoning or building ordinance or regulation or hereafter in effect, the CRA by use of the following controls in the form of restrictive covenants or conditions running with the land, or by other appropriate means, shall obligate and bind all developers, purchasers, and lessees of project land, and their successors in interest, lessees, sub-lessees, or assigns. Such obligations, together with suitable provisions for reasonable action in the event of default or non-compliance, shall be inserted in and made an affective part of all agreements, conveyances, and other instruments for the disposition of any rights, title, or interests, in whole or in part, in any land acquired or to be acquired within the project area by the CRA.

Section 601: Use and Improvement of Project Land

The use, development, and maintenance, of any part or parcel of land within the project area together with improvements thereon shall be undertaken and carried out only for the purposes and in the manner set forth in the general conditions, land use provisions, and building requirements of the Urban Renewal Plan and in full conformity with the provisions of any applicable development proposal and the terms and conditions under which such a development proposal may have been approved and consented to in writing by the CRA.

Section 602: Commencement and Completion of Improvements

The construction of improvements on any part or parcel of land within the project area shall be commenced, carried out, and completed within such periods of time as the CRA may establish as reasonable and which it may have approved and consented to in writing as a part of any applicable development proposal.

Section 603: Disposition of Project Land by Redeveloper

No disposition of any rights, title, or interests in any part of land within the project area by the developer thereof shall be made prior to the full completion of each and all of the improvements thereon as required by and in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the Urban Renewal Plan, the approved development proposal, and the land disposition agreement which are applicable thereto, unless and until the CRA shall have consented in writing to such disposition.

Section 604: Non-Discrimination

At no time shall the acquisition, development, construction, installation, reconstruction, disposal or conveyance by sale or lease, management, or maintenance of any part or parcel of land within the project area or of improvements thereon, to or by any person, be denied, restricted, or abridged, nor his employment thereon, or his use, occupancy, or possession thereof preferred, discriminated against, segregated, or refused because of race, color, sex, age, religious creed, religious creed, disability, national origin or ancestry, sexual orientation, gender, marital status, family status, military status or source of income.
All transactions affecting or respecting such activities shall be subject to the applicable provisions of Chapter 151-B of the Massachusetts General Laws as amended, and to all other applicable Federal, State and local laws, ordinances, and regulations guaranteeing civil rights, providing for equal opportunities in housing, employment, and education, and prohibiting discrimination or segregation because of race, color, sex, age, religious creed, disability, national origin or ancestry, sexual orientation, gender, marital status, family status, military status or source of income.

No covenant, agreement, contract, lease, conveyance, or other instrument shall be effected or executed by the CRA, or its contractors, or by developers, purchasers, or lessees of any part or parcel of land within the project area, or their successors in interest, contractors, lessees, sub-lessees, or assigns, whereby the disposition of any rights, title, or interests, in whole or in part in such land shall be restricted because of race, color, sex, age, religious creed, disability, national origin or ancestry, sexual orientation, gender, marital status, family status, military status or source of income. [10]

Every covenant, agreement, contract, lease, conveyance, or other instrument by which any part or parcel of land within the project area is disposed of or by which its improvement is provided for shall include an affirmative covenant which shall obligate and bind each developer, contractor, purchaser, lessee, grantee, or other party to such instrument, or any successors in interest, so that there shall be no discrimination because of race, color, sex, age, religious creed, disability, national origin or ancestry, sexual orientation, gender, marital status, family status, military status or source of income in the sale, lease, or rental, or in the employment on, or in the use, occupancy, or possession of such land or of any improvements constructed or to be constructed thereon.

For the purposes of Section 604 of the Plan, the definition of the word “age” shall be in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 151-B of the Massachusetts General Laws as amended.

The CRA shall take all steps necessary and appropriate to enforce such provisions and covenants, and shall not itself so discriminate.
CHAPTER 7: RELATION OF PLAN TO DEFINITE LOCAL OBJECTIVES

Section 701: Conformity to General Plan

The Urban Renewal Plan is based upon a local survey, and is in conformity with a comprehensive plan for the City as a whole. Proposed urban renewal actions and the renewal and redevelopment of the project area for predominantly nonresidential uses are necessary for the proper development of the community.

Section 702: Relation to Definite Local Objectives

The Urban Renewal Plan for the project area, proposed urban renewal actions, and the renewal and redevelopment of the project area for predominantly nonresidential uses are related to definite local objectives as set forth in Section 102 by:

1) Providing for such mixture and density of land uses as will produce a balanced development consistent with the Plan objectives, land use provisions, building requirements, design principles, and other controls, as set forth in the Urban Renewal Plan;

Providing for the development of those light industrial uses which are consistent with the socio-economic and other objectives of the Plan;

Providing for the discontinuance of local, short and narrow streets and private ways, and for the establishment of a rational and efficient street network which reduces congestion, improves traffic flow, including truck access to and through the project area, and otherwise conforms to the objectives, design principles, and other controls of the Plan;

Providing for the redevelopment of Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) facilities in such a way as to make them more convenient, attractive and efficient;

Providing for the adjustment of utility service lines, making them more efficient and capable of providing better and more uninterrupted service; and

Requiring new building development to contain appropriate allowances for open space, landscaping and vehicular parking and loading arrangements.
CHAPTER 8 : PROVISION FOR MODIFICATION AND TERMINATION

Section 801 : Interpretation

Interpretation of the objectives, general conditions, land use and building requirements, and other provisions of the Urban Renewal Plan by the CRA shall be final and binding.

Section 802 : Modification

The Urban Renewal Plan may be modified at any time by the CRA; provided, however, that if the general conditions, land use provisions, and building requirements, applicable to any part or parcel of land within the project area are modified after the disposition of any land within the project area affected thereby, the modification shall be consented to in writing by the purchaser or lessee, or by his successors or assigns, of the land affected by the proposed modification.

Whenever proposed modifications of the Urban Renewal Plan will substantially or materially alter or change the Urban Renewal Plan, the proposed modifications shall be approved by the Cambridge City Council and the City Manager, and by the Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs.

Section 803 : Duration and Termination

The Urban Renewal Plan shall be maintained and in effect for a period of fifty-five (55) years from the date of the original approval of the Urban Renewal Plan by the Cambridge City Council and the City Manager, and by the Massachusetts Department of Community Affairs; provided, however, that the provisions of Section 604 shall remain in effect for a period of one hundred (100) years from the date of the original approval of the Urban Renewal Plan. [3] [8]
Exhibit A: Project Area Description

The project area is described as follows: That certain tract of land, referred to as the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Area, situated in the City of Cambridge, County of Middlesex, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and bounded generally as follows: Beginning at a point, near the southwesterly corner of the tract herein described which point is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Main Street with the westerly sideline of land or right-of-way now or formerly of the Boston and Albany (Grand Junction) Branch Railroad; thence, running northerly by various courses and distances along the westerly sideline of land or right-of-way now or formerly of the Boston and Albany (Grand Junction) Branch Railroad to a point which is the intersection of said line with the northerly sideline of Binney Street; thence, turning an angle and running southerly by various courses and distances along the easterly sideline of Third Street to a point which is the intersection of said line with the northerly sideline of the so-called Broad Canal; thence, continuing southerly across the so-called Broad Canal to a point which is the intersection of the southerly sideline of the so-called Broad Canal with the easterly sideline of Third Street; thence, continuing southerly by various courses and distances along the easterly sideline of Third Street to a point of curvature at Broadway; thence, running southeasterly on a curved line twenty-three (23) feet more or less along the northeasterly sideline of roadway to a point of tangency located on the northeasterly sideline of Broadway fifteen (15) feet more or less from a point which is the intersection of the prolongation of the northeasterly sideline of Broadway with the prolongation of the easterly line of Third Street; thence, running southeasterly by various courses and distances along the northeasterly sideline of Broadway to a point which is the intersection of said line with the northerly sideline of Main Street; thence, turning an angle and running easterly by various courses and distances along the northerly sideline of Main Street to a point which is the intersection of said line with the westerly property line of land now or formerly of Cambridge Gas Company; thence, turning an angle and running southerly across Main Street along a line which is the prolongation of the westerly property line of land now or formerly of Cambridge Gas Company to a point which is the intersection of said line with the southerly sideline of Main Street; thence, turning an angle and running westerly by various courses and distances along the southerly sideline of Main Street to a point which is the intersection of said line with the westerly sideline of land or right-of-way now or formerly of the Boston and Albany (Grand Junction) Branch Railroad; thence, turning an angle and running northerly across Main Street to a point which is the intersection of the northerly sideline of Main Street with the westerly sideline of land now or formerly of the Boston and Albany (Grand Junction) Branch Railroad, which point is the place of beginning.
Exhibit C: Historic Relocation Assistance Program

A relocation assistance program was established by the CRA for this purpose of finding standard dwelling or business accommodations to meet the rehousing and business relocation needs of displaced residents and business, within their financial means, in reasonably convenient locations at the earliest practicable time. The basic objectives of the relocation assistance program were:

1) To provide such measures, facilities, and services as are necessary to determine the needs of displaced site occupants for relocation assistance; and

(b) To make information and assistance available to them in such a way as to minimize the hardships of displacement.

Assistance will include the making of such relocation payments as may be provided for under the provisions of Federal, State, or local laws and regulations.

The CRA administered the relocation assistance program. It was the only agency responsible for the relocation of site occupants displaced from the Project Area as a result of its land acquisition.

There were some 10 families and individuals who occupied property, all of whom were relocated when the Project Area was originally cleared. [10]

The method for the relocation of these persons now living in the Project Area, and the availability of and the means by which there will be provided dwelling units for such persons substantially equal in number to the number of dwelling units to be cleared from the project area are as follows:

1) Method for Relocation:

Each dwelling unit vacancy found by or referred to the CRA will be inspected for the CRA by a trained housing inspector in order to determine (1) that it is decent, safe, and sanitary; (2) that it complies with the provisions of the Cambridge Housing Code; (3) that it contains adequate heating, lighting, cooking, and sanitary facilities; and (4) that it is structurally sound.

Only standard dwelling units reasonably accessible to the places of employment of displaced site occupants, and in areas not less desirable in regard to public utilities and commercial facilities than the project area, will be referred to families and individuals to be displaced from the project area.

The cost of any dwelling unit referred to a family or individual for rehousing purposes will, generally, not exceed (1) one-quarter of monthly income, in the case of dwelling units for rent, or (2) twice annual income, in the case of dwelling units for sale.

In order to make such referrals, the CRA will secure and maintain listings of all standard dwelling units for sale or rent in Cambridge and the Cambridge housing market area.
Preference will be accorded by the Cambridge Housing Authority to persons who appear to be eligible for (1) state-aided veterans’ housing and housing for the elderly; and (2) federally-aided low-rent housing and housing for the elderly. Persons eligible to be accorded preference will be admitted to public housing projects under “continued occupancy” income limits by the Cambridge Housing Authority.

(b) Availability of Dwelling Units:

Availability of private rental housing: As of the date of the original adoption of the Plan, records maintained by the CRA indicated that 1131, 1083, 1105 and 1126 private dwelling units were available for rent in the City alone for each year during a recent four-year period. [10]

Availability of private sales housing: As of the date of the original adoption of the Plan, records maintained by the CRA indicated that 107, and 122 private dwelling units were available for sale in the City alone for each year during a recent two-year period. [10]

Availability of public housing: As of the date of the original adoption of the Plan, records maintained by the Cambridge Housing Authority, as reported in December of 1964, indicated that 220 dwelling units in public housing developments become available on the average for occupancy each year. [10]

Clearly, dwelling units for the relocation of persons living in the Project Area at that time substantially equal in number to the number of units to be cleared are available, as are the means by which they can be provided through suitable methods, for the relocation of persons now living in the project area. [10]
Exhibit F: Definition of Pedestrian Ways:

Pedestrian ways shall be designed to provide for public access and shall have the following meanings:

(i) **An open pedestrian bridge** is a continuous open bridge having a minimum width of 6 feet and spanning a street, pedestrian way, access or service road or open space within a lot or between two adjacent lots.

(ii) **A raised pedestrian deck** is a continuous, open platform at least 20 feet in width which is at least 9 feet above the mean elevation of the lot and which extends over a street, pedestrian way, access or service road or open space within a lot or between two adjacent lots. It shall have direct pedestrian access from abutting buildings, shall provide seating facilities and shall be landscaped including one tree, of at least 3-112 inch caliper, per 500 square feet of pedestrian deck.

(iii) **An enclosed pedestrian bridge** is a continuous, enclosed space having a minimum width of 8 feet which spans a street, pedestrian way, access or service road or open space, making connections within a lot or between two adjacent lots. At least 50% of the surface area along its facades shall consist of transparent materials.

(iv) **An elevated shopping bridge** is a continuous, enclosed space which spans a street, pedestrian way, access or service road or open space, making connection within a lot or between two adjacent lots. Such a shopping bridge shall have a minimum width of 36 feet and a maximum width of 48 feet, with retail uses as allowed in Section 401(3) along one or both sides of a pedestrian circulation route with a minimum width of 12 feet. Such shopping bridge shall connect, at a minimum, at both ends to other internal or external pedestrian ways.

(v) **A shopping arcade** is a continuous, covered, but not necessarily enclosed, space which extends along the front facade of a building facing a street or a pedestrian way within the MXD District and having retail uses as permitted in Section 401(3) accessible from it. It shall have a minimum continuous width, unobstructed, except for building columns, of at least 12 feet, and also have a minimum continuous height of 12 feet. Such shopping arcade shall have access from the abutting street or pedestrian way, having its floor at the same level and continuous with the sidewalk or other abutting pedestrian way. It shall be open to the public at all hours.

(vi) **An elevated shopping way** is a continuous, enclosed space which extends along the front facade of a building facing a street or a pedestrian way and which has a minimum width of 12 feet. It shall be located on the second level of the building and have a minimum continuous height of 12 feet. It shall be open to the public for a minimum of 12 hours daily, on weekdays, and shall have fronting retail uses as permitted in Section 401(3).
(vii) A **through-block arcade** is a covered space which provides a connection through a building and connects streets, open spaces, pedestrian ways, or any combination of the above, and is directly accessible to the public. A through-block arcade shall have a minimum area of at least 2,000 square feet and a minimum width at any point of 20 feet. A through-block arcade shall have openings at the face of the building for entrances at least 12 feet in width and 10 feet high. At least 50% of its aggregate interior frontage shall be retail use. Vertical circulation elements, columns, pedestrian bridges and balconies are permitted obstructions provided they do not cover in the aggregate more than 15% of the floor area of the arcade.

The minimum height of any pedestrian way above the surface of a public way over which it is constructed shall be 14 '-0".
Table Three: Loading Requirements (Revisions under Development)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Group</th>
<th>Incremental Area for Additional Bay Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial and Wholesale Uses allowed by Section 401(1)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Biotechnology Manufacturing Uses allowed by Section 401(2)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail and Consumer Service Uses allowed by Section 401(4)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Residential Uses allowed by Section 401(4)  
  Multifamily housing  
  Hotel or Motel | 200,000  
  100,000                                      |
| Other Uses allowed by Sections 401(5), 401(6) and 401(7) | 100,000                                       |