Call

The meeting was called to order at 5:43 p.m.

Chair Ms. Kathleen Born introduced CRA Board and staff members.

Public Comment

Steven Kaiser asked if there was any CRA attendance at last week’s informational meeting on the Volpe Center which was sponsored by the East Cambridge Planning Team. Ms. Born said that the CRA was there and that it was very similar to the Planning Board’s presentation and discussion. Mr. Kaiser encouraged CRA to get involved wherever possible. He suggested that the CRA should possibly consider alternatives. He is concerned about the transit capacity on the Red Line. He mentioned that a look at the Boston Redevelopment Authority’s big projects might provide useful information for the CRA since these are dealing with similar design issues.

Heather Hoffman spoke about the Foundry. She mentioned there are corrections to be made to the minutes on page 5, 1st paragraph. On the 5th line, it should read Chapter 2.110 rather than 2.1.10. Also in the second 2nd paragraph, dollars are mentioned twice and should be changed to square footage.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the report doesn’t sufficiently reflect the needs of the arts community, especially since they were the ones who initially pushed the city to rejuvenate the building rather they see it crumble. At the time, space was needed for the faculty displaced by Longy and the dance studio. This community is being priced out of the area.

Ms. Hoffman is not happy with the Akamai sign at the top of the building. It looks like a billboard and doesn’t belong in Cambridge. She hopes the CRA will not encourage the proliferation of this type of signage.

She would like more info about the Dante Alighieri Center.

Mr. John Hawkinson corrected the minutes on page 9, 3rd paragraph. There are two instances that should read 501c3 rather than 5013c. In response to Mr. Kaiser’s request for information regarding Volpe, Mr. Hawkinson felt that it was premature as he didn’t feel the GSA actually knows what they are doing at this
time. There will be RFQ and RFP processes which might be a better time to get information. From the Volpe meeting, he relayed that it is highly unlikely they will move out of Kendall but it is possible. He also stated that Congress gave them the authority to do land swap trades but they haven’t successfully done this. However there are currently 3 in progress.

Rev. Diane Hudson congratulated the Board for taking on the Foundry reuse project. She expressed her interest in being a member of the Foundry Advisory Committee and spoke of her credentials. She was happy to see that the CRA is including the community. She emphasized the important role of financial management and ensuring affordability to the community. Mr. Tom Evans said that the committee would be assembled after the lease agreement from the City Council is resolved sometime in March.

Ms. Born reassured the group that everyone’s voice will be heard regarding the Foundry.

Public comment was closed.

1. Motion: To accept the minutes of the Regular Board Meeting on November 19, 2014

Including the corrections from Mr. Hawkinson and Ms. Hoffman, Ms. Born wanted Board approval to clarify or reword what is written in the 2nd paragraph of Section 3 on page 3 regarding the past CRA administration. Ms. Born emphasized that the past CRA administration did make many contributions to public investment projects in the City. Mr. Evans agreed and stated that there is evidence that the past CRA administration did work to leverage CRA funds with federal funds.

Ms. Born requested rewording the sentence to read “…..the past CRA administration did not have a recently stated aggressive policy towards public investment.” There were no objections to this substitution being made.

Mr. Barry Zevin noted that on page 6, in the 2nd to last paragraph, “Mr. Conrad” should read “Mr. Crawford” and on page 7, in the last paragraph, “budge” should be changed to “budget.”

The minutes with the discussed modifications were accepted and will be placed on file.

Communications

Mr. Evans passed out two correspondences to enter into the record that came after the packets were put together. See below for more detail.

2. DPW response to Council Order O-2, regarding Galaxy: Earth Sphere condition and Restoration, December 10, 2014

Mr. Evans explained that there was a presentation to City Council. The CRA participated with the DPW which acknowledged the commitment of the CRA and Boston Properties to reinvest in the Point Park area, the Galaxy fountain, and the plaza surrounding it. At the same time, we are also watching the Connect Kendall process. We need to understand how the park would be transformed by that planning process versus wanting to work with what is already there. Another element that has delayed the short-term investment in the plaza is the Main Street to Third Street connector. That construction cut off pedestrian traffic in one
direction and doing the plaza construction would have blocked the other passageway. We will continue to wait until the Main Street construction is completed.

Another influence to what’s done in Point Park is the result of the Kendall Square rebranding and way-finding project that is being lead by the KSA.

_The letter will be placed on file._

**3. Letter from the Dante Alighieri Center Regarding the Wellington Harrington Urban Renewal Plan Tract 17 Land Disposition Contract**

Some members of the Dante Alighieri Center went to City Manager’s office and then reached out to the CRA. They wanted us to look into what specific restrictions existed within the Wellington-Harrington project and the Land Disposition Contract from the CRA to the developer that partnered with Dante. We are looking at the legal documents to see what leverage remains after the Wellington-Harrington project has expired. In most of our agreements, everything, with the exception of nondiscrimination clauses, tend to expire with the urban renewal plan. However, we could respond about the “intent” of that contract. There is a significant record of about five years of predevelopment work to bring about the center and some housing which replaced the old junkyard that was there. This is not a legal mechanism but we could help to tell their story.

At one time, this parcel was CRA land but it was deeded over and the CRA no longer has specific ownership rights. We are in the process of determining if any restrictions in the deed still exits.

_The letter will be placed on file._

**Two additional late communications**

The first item is a letter from the Toomey Family and forwarded to us regarding the memorial monument for former state representative John Toomey that is currently in Point Park. It was placed next to One Cambridge Center but repositioned when the Microsoft entry was put into place. The monument is still In Point Park but there’s no access to it while the Main Street construction project is in progress. This letter speaks to the desire to enhance the presence of the Toomey name in the park. Repositioning of the monument should be discussed as part of the landscape plans for the Main Street connector. Mr. Crawford asked to investigate the statutory designation in order to decide if permission is needed to move it.

The monument’s existence should enhance the landscape and Mr. Evans said that he would highlight the monument to the Kendall Connect competition participants.

_The letter will be placed on file._

The second item of communication distributed at the Board meeting is a letter from the East Cambridge Planning Team to the Cambridge Planning Board in support of the Whitehead Institution petition which was forwarded to us by Ms. Barbara Broussard. This item is not on the agenda so it is not a topic for discussion.
Reports, Motions and Discussion Items

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

Mr. Evans stated that bookkeeping improvements continue. The last major correction resulting from the auditor’s recommendations is to set up an encumbrance system regarding contractors. We are having conversations with an investment advisor who was referred to us by the City’s Financial Department for our suite of investments and we will be getting a CPA to help us in a comptroller role.

Interviews for spring interns are in process and we signed up for the Mayor’s Youth Summer Employment Program. We continue to engage in a broader workforce conversation regarding the urban renewal plan in Kendall Square by connecting our network within Kendall Square and the Department of Human Services.

In order to do advance posting of board meetings on the City and other calendars, as well as reserving the meeting room, we’d like to confirm our third Wednesday schedule for 2015 which was also distributed at last month’s meeting. We flagged a few conflicts. Last year we didn’t have a meeting in August. A motion was passed to move the June meeting to June 24 so as not to conflict with the first night of Ramadan and to move the February meeting to February 25 to avoid the school vacation week. A decision to combine the July and August meeting was postponed until a later time.

Looking ahead in the calendar, in January, we will have a more robust look at the urban renewal plan and begin zoning discussions so we can plan the schedule into the new year. Also in January, we will come back with an update on the Ames Street project which is going through some minor modifications as the special permit is working its way through the Planning Board. We are waiting to hear from the MIT Coop regarding the food court. Although they only need to come to the CRA for their signage proposals, Mr. Evans encouraged them to talk about their whole plan due to the public nature of the food court.

Mr. Christopher Bator reiterated his concern that the Ames Street project seems to be losing momentum with duplicated review processes. It is important for the CRA to keep this project moving ahead so that its success is not jeopardized. Mr. Barry Zevin agreed that getting the project done is important, and so is getting it done right. He mentioned that the Planning Board process is difficult as it’s hard to have a design review and a discussion with a big group. There were some comments at the meeting which improved the project, but Mr. Zevin felt that some made it worse. He wasn’t sure how any disagreements would finally get resolved. Mr. Ben Lavery said that a meeting occurred with the CDD staff to work on resolving the major issues from the Planning Board (such as bicycle parking and technical issues on Pioneer Way). A follow up meeting will be occurring on January 6 and participation of the CRA at this CDD/Boston Properties meeting would be helpful. The last (hopefully) presentation to the Planning Board would then occur at the end of January or February seeking approval which Mr. Lavery felt would be satisfactory to him. He also explained that the delay to February is due to the Planning Board’s heavy agenda and the time to resolve the issues. Mr. Zevin suggested that the CRA “stay strong” to items they feel are important in the project. Ms. Margaret Drury would like to get a conditional approval for getting the permit to begin work even if there are small outstanding issues. Mr. Evans noted that Ames Street has been a learning process regarding the avoidance of duplicating review efforts with the MXD zoning proposal.

The Kendall Square Eco-district has advanced its work. So far, ten participates have agreed to pool a small amount of funds into a broader value-added technical assistance program. The CRA has been asked to act as the fiscal agent for this Target Cities grant project since the City cannot. It would be a small amount of
administrative work in return for advancing the City’s K2 goals regarding sustainability. There is an existing MOU to pursue this Target City idea which is signed by the CRA, Boston Properties, Alexandria, Bio Med Realty, Biogen, the KSA, Draper, MIT, Google.

Mr. Bator would like the Board or Chair to write a letter to the Planning Board stressing the importance of time in having the Ames Street review in January. Mr. Evans said that he has been stressing the time issue and felt that it would be a stronger statement coming from the Board. He mentioned that there have been some technical issues involved with closing the access on Pioneer Way that required time to resolve. He reiterated that the process could improve moving forward. Ms. Kathryn Madden said that it is very difficult to get onto the Planning Board’s agenda. Mr. Evans said that he would talk with Jeff Roberts to see if 100% certainty is needed to calendar this.

A motion to authorize the Executive Director and/or the Board Chair to write a letter to the Planning Board expressing their appreciation for the work done and to strongly encourage the earliest date for review by the Planning Board as it is vital to the progress of this important project was unanimously passed.

The report will be filed.

Mr. Evans suggested moving the Foundry item up in the agenda for the sake of time of the Deputy City Manager, Ms. Lisa Peterson.

7. Discussion: Foundry Demonstration Project Plan (Ms. Madden)

Ms. Kathryn Madden said that the Demonstration Plan continues to develop with a good working relationship between the CRA and City staff. Community input received during the October 29th public meeting also shaped some of the changes to the vision, objectives and other elements of the Demonstration Plan.

Ms. Born pointed out that this part of the agenda is a public discussion. There will be an Executive Session following this regular board meeting, but it will only involve the CRA Board and staff and the CRA counsel for a discussion of real estate transaction issues related to the Foundry, which are not ready to be discussed publically.

Ms. Lisa Peterson, Deputy City Manager, expressed real pleasure with the progress achieved so far. Although there is a lot more work to be done, it has been a great collaboration effort between the City and the CRA. The Demonstration Plan will be a good model for the City, and the Foundry will be good resource for the neighborhood. On Monday night, the City Council was updated on the project, and they were enthusiastic about the progress and the relationship between the City and the CRA, which is an important milestone.

Ms. Madden reiterated the steps moving forward. The CRA Board votes to approve the Demonstration Plan first, and it is later approved by the City Council. Under MGL Chapter 121b, this approach uses the abilities granted to redevelopment authorities to test something that’s unique and, if successful, could be used in other places in the City. The other piece that’s running in parallel is the City’s disposition process under Cambridge Municipal Code Section 2.110 to grant a long-term lease to the CRA. The City needs to submit a Disposition Report to the City Council, Planning Board, and City Clerk. The Planning Board holds a public hearing and makes a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council then holds a public hearing and
votes on the disposition of the long-term lease as well as the Demonstration Plan. The City will retain ownership of the building.

Ms. Peterson stated that the goal is to get the Disposition Report to the City Council by January 26 which sets the timeline for getting it to the Planning Board. We will be complying with the Municipal Ordinance but will be asking for a diminution of process at this time on the appraisals of the property and the traffic analysis, which can be done by the development entity once selected. We are hoping that the City Council votes could happen as soon as March, and if favorable, that the lease between the City and the CRA would be executed soon after.

Then the CRA will be able to launch into the two-step selection process for a development entity. First there will be an RFQ to promote a competition of ideas and then we will issue an RRP. The Foundry Advisory Committee will be formed after the City Council votes on the Disposition. There will be a call for the applicants to this committee to websites, newspapers, and social media in the April timeframe.

Mr. Evans explained that a vote on this is the first step in the redevelopment process. There are still discussions and CRA Board approvals needed with respect to the specific terms of a lease.

Ms. Madden stated that the current document identifies where the property is, but that the document will also attach a plot plan, which was handed out in the meeting.

Once the proposals are submitted in response to the RFQ, we would like to present these to the Board and the public for discussion. We are optimistic that there will be a good response, but can take other steps if not.

The motion to adopt and recommend to City Council the Foundry Reuse Demonstration Project Plan, with the attached plot plan, was unanimously approved.

To expedite the meeting in the interest of time, Mr. Evans referenced the report and noted that we were close to our predictions except for the development rights from the Ames Street retail development and the Grand Junction which have been discussed in past board meetings.

*The monthly report on budget and expenditures for November 2014 will be put on file.

6. Discussion: Draft 2015 Budget (Mr. Evans)

Mr. Evans handed out an initial draft of a proposed format for reporting on the 2015 budget. A notable change is that salaries for administration and for individual projects would be combined on this new format. However, supplemental project reports (or “class” report as named in the bookkeeping software) can report on the salaries for each project (i.e. class). As another example, the professional services line item for legal on the new format would include all legal expenses. The supplemental project (class) report would show the legal expenses for each project.

We are still working on populating the actual values for a 2015 budget which will be presented in January.

8. Update: Parcel Six Interim Use Proposal (Mr. Zogg)
We have been working with Relish Management on ways to activate Parcel 6, a small parcel located at the corner for Third and Binney Street. Representatives from Relish Management did a short Power Point presentation on their work to date. Relish Management is a company that specializes in making more vibrant spaces by doing place-making, food-based and creative economy initiatives. They discussed the Parcel 6 statistics (size, location, distance from T-stop), the current unappealing nature of the parcel, and their goals of fostering a retail corridor along Third Street, creating a more pleasing environment, and building a “buzz” which could create an positive economic impact to the community and Kendall square area. They discussed the challenges of the project – a limited return-on-investment timeframe of three to five years, specific infrastructure limitations, and that food trucks, lottery and alcohol were not options. They proposed a combination open park and playful marketplace with vending machines that feature farm fresh items, local foods and producers, or small necessity items. Their presentation showed various types of interactive vending machines that can sell fresh farm items, products of local restaurants or producers, drug store basics and other sundry items, or be used to test-market products or be used for civic purposes. Parts of this concept have been seen in some other countries and US cities. Mr. Zogg added that due to the location of the parcel and the surrounding neighborhood, this proposal gives the area a fun destination for people to come to Kendall Square. This is an innovative idea on an old concept which feeds into the reputation Kendall Square has.

Various comments and questions from the Board included the portion of the space needed for stocking and service the machines, the number of vendor spaces available, the use during inclement weather, the price of the food in the machines compared to brick-and-mortar stores, the presence of machines versus employing people, and financing the entire operation. Ms. Born asked for the initial investment. Relish replied that they are working on a budget and while they have a handle on the expenses, they are in discussions regarding commercial leasing. Mr. Evans stated that there is a significant infrastructure investment upfront (electricity supply, place-making/landscaping) that will not be recouped through sales. Mr. Zogg explained that the cost would depend on whether sponsorships could be obtained. Ms. Born said that budget figures are needed to better understand the extent of the project. The CRA is not looking to make huge revenues from this site. Activation of the site and eliminating the eye sore is very important. Mr. Evans stated that timing is also an issue to consider since it might take time to find funding sources.

9. Motion: Approving the Revised Signage Proposal for Akamai at the entryway of 150 Broadway / 8 Cambridge Center (Boston Properties)*

A proposal for an Akamai sign to the entry of 8 Cambridge Center came before the Board and the proposal was approved if the lighting was the same. However the lighting is not the same so it’s back on the agenda.

A representative from Akamai Technologies explained their request to replace the current Akamai sign over the front door of their corporate headquarters at 8 Cambridge Center. He discussed the features of the proposed sign – size, lighting, construction, installation. He spoke of reasons to make this a face-lit sign although that’s not typical in Kendall Square. Now there is a halo lit sign where the light bounces off the building but during the day, it has a stainless steel effect.

Mr. Zevin thinks the sign is fine but objected to the bus-sized posters currently on the windows of the building. Mr. Evans explained that those signs were approved by him on a temporary basis as per the signage guidelines. Since then, the approved CRA signage guidelines have been tightened to prevent such serial temporary signage and this has been discussed with Boston Properties and Akamai.
Ms. Born recused herself from the discussion and vote since an immediate family member is in contract with Akamai.

The LED is not on a dimmer due to the LED lighting.

*The motion to approve the Revised Signage Proposal for Akamai at the entryway of 150 Broadway / 8 Cambridge Center was approved. (Four votes of yes, 1 abstention by Ms. Born).*

10. Discussion: Whitehead Institute’s development proposal and zoning petition for the corner of Main Street and Galileo Way / Eight Cambridge Center (Mr. McKinnon)

Rich McKinnon stated that Whitehead Institute needs to expand its office space for additional personnel. It needs an addition to the building of about 60,000 square feet. Because all three million square feet have been used, Whitehead needs a zoning amendment to the MXD. On Tuesday, the Planning Board gave Whitehead a favorable recommendation to the City Council. Whitehead has met with neighbors, the East Cambridge Planning Team, Boston Properties, and the CRA. Whitehead is waiting for the notice of change MEPA study before starting construction. There is no need to shut-down if rebuilding is done out onto the plaza. The K2 study has many recommendations for Kendall Square and Whitehead has taken as many of them as possible and put them into the zoning petition. There are some they feel that don’t apply to a small project such as the need to build housing. The project will be subject to a Planning Board review and they will come back to participate in a CRA design review before going to Planning Board to apply for special permits. There will also be a City Council vote on the change of open space configurations and obligations.

The addition will give a new face to the building, have the building meet the sidewalk, and put retail space on the first floor for a connection to the public. The plaza is 10,000 square feet and the building is 520 feet high. There is a height allowance of 250 feet in the area but they are only asking for 120 feet for the addition. They will not be asking for more parking spaces. Although the biggest drawback to the addition is the loss of the plaza, they believe they can put a public open space on the first floor with retail or a winter garden that can be used all year round. They will work to advance the open space in other areas. Martin Mullans from Whitehead spoke about the history of the Institute - its history, staff makeup, current projects, past achievements and future goals. A majority of their employees live in Cambridge, etc.

Ms. Drury suggested that the open space within their building would be acceptable as long as they clearly invited the public. Mr. Zevin questioned the extent of first floor retail space in the plans. He stated that open space means open to the sky. A restaurant was highlighted as the retail component. Mr. Zevin stated that the addition creates a massive structure and suggested that some of it be placed behind the current building so as not to create an unattractive alley way between buildings.

Ms. Drury wondered if eliminating the plaza would negatively affect the open space requirement for the district. Mr. Evans stated that the acreage number of open space is close to the 100,000 square feet requirement but more analysis needs to be done on each space as well as the criteria used to calculate the total. Mr. Crawford agreed that a careful design needs to be done since an alley way affects the quality of the open space experience and closing the building up to the sidewalk will not necessarily get people to come inside.
A clarification was made that the existing open space is counted as publically accessible open space and has a 40-year governance (from 1982 or 1983). Mr. Evans stated that the open space requirement is for the MXD as a whole. The distribution of the open space was done by the master developer in the ’80s. Now there’s a more fractured ownership, so the actual footage and how place-making is affected should be addressed.

Mr. Kinnon confirmed that the suggestions made tonight by the CRA Board will be brought to the Whitehead architect/developer and that the CRA will have more opportunities to evaluate the project.

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

This agenda item was truncated in the interest of time for the following Executive Session. In the October board meeting, the CRA Board analyzed the objectives written into the Kendall Square Urban Renewal Plan against the goals of the K2 plan. Mr. Evans distributed a summary statement to the Board which incorporates a qualitative analysis and the East Cambridge Planning Team’s plan and simplifies suggestions to revise the objectives.

In the packet is the fully amended and restated Kendall Square Renewal Plan which is the legal document today. The most dramatic change is the land use section. This document will be posted on the website. We will continue to do a qualitative review, as well as other metric analyses, with our amendment process to monitor our achievement objectives. Mr. Evans asked the Board to review the document and send feedback.

The meeting was moved into Executive Session for the purpose of discussing terms of the proposed lease of the Foundry Building at 101 Rogers St. from the City of Cambridge for the purpose of redeveloping the building through the Demonstration Project Plan. It will not reconvene to open session.

A role call to start the executive session was taken:

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