


## PROCEEDINGS

(Sitting members: Hugh Russe11, H. Theodore Cohen, Thomas Anninger, Pamela Winters, Steven Winter.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is the meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. The first item on our agenda tonight is an update by Brian Murphy.

BRIAN MURPHY: Thank you, and last week the Ordinance Committee had a hearing on Forest City Petition. They will have another hearing next week on, I believe it's the 30th. Again, on the Ordinance Committee this Thursday will have its first hearing on the MIT proposal.

For us the next meeting of Planning Board is February 5th. That will be at the Central Square Senior Center to hear Town Gown reports.

We will also have two other meetings in

February. February 12th, we expect to give an update on some of the C2 Zoning, and February 19th wil1 be a continuation of the MIT Zoning hearing that took place.

We also have meetings March 5th and March 19th as well.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Liza, have any minutes come in since -LIZA PADEN: Since last week? No, they haven't.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
THOMAS ANNINGER: It seems that we have a very thin agenda on that February 12th date less than what's expected. What's the point of an extra meeting in February?

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I don't think the other people have heard that question. I can't answer it.

PAMELA WINTERS: What are we discussing on February 12th?

THOMAS ANNINGER: We have an extra
meeting in February which was scheduled way back when in contemplation of a heavy agenda, but what I heard is that it's pretty thin and maybe unnecessary after all.

LIZA PADEN: So, okay. The February -- yes, the February 12th agenda is scheduled to be a discussion about the Central Square Zoning and the design guidelines. And so we were going to make that a single item agenda so that the Board would have enough time to discuss the materials. The complication I see is that on February 19th, the following meeting is the MIT PUD Zoning wil1 come back to the Board, and then after that we start to have Special Permits that are being submitted for public hearing and I'm trying to keep them no more than two an evening. So, if we reschedule the February 12th meeting and put the Central Square discussion somewhere else, it will come under General Business, it will be after a public hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have a long night on the 19th to try to do them both and probably don't succeed.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I don't have any problem spreading them out over more days to make sure we have enough time for the issue. In other words, I don't have a problem with the meeting schedule as it is.

PAMELA WINTERS: And so we can get out of here before midnight, too.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. I think it would be good for Central Square to be a principal meeting rather than something late in the night when we're all tired and given a short shrift.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So I have no problem with the three meetings.

HUGH RUSSELL: It makes sense to me also.

So we're waiting for the clock.
(A short recess was taken.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, 1et's begin then with the City Council Petition for the interim regulations for medical marijuana uses.

Who is going to present that? JEFF ROBERTS: I'11 do that, Mr. Chair. So this is a -- I'11 try to be very brief. This is, as you mentioned, the City Council petition, and it stems from the referendum that was approved by a ballot initiative last November approving the medical use of marijuana in Massachusetts. And the law that was passed has a number of different rules that apply to -- sort of a framework of rules that would apply to how patients -- not only how patients would be registered but how operations would be registered to produce. In fact, there's a long list of things; acquire, cultivate, possess, process, transfer, transport, se11,
distribute, dispense, or administer marijuana, products containing marijuana, related supplies, or educational supplies to qualify in patients or their personal care givers.

From a Zoning point of view, one of the pertinent pieces in the new -- in the law is that it would be administered largely by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health which would have the ability to register up to 35 centers. And it defines a center as any not-for-profit entity that acquires or produces or distributes medical marijuana. And that the Department of Public Health would be able to register up to 35 such centers within the first year throughout the state with a minimum of one, and a maximum of five located within each county. And that the law states that the Department of Public Health has regulations or is required to promulgate regulations for how those centers
wil1 be administered and registered within 120 days of the enactment of the law, which was January 1st. So what that means is that by May 1st, the Department of Public Health would have regulations in place for how they would permit these establishments, these -whatever defined as medical marijuana treatment centers.
(Ahmed Nur seated.)
JEFF ROBERTS: So, as we've been looking at this, there was a City Council order that came to the staff to look at any issues regarding this regulation. And one of the questions that arose was how Zoning would apply? It was felt that it was important to not only to make clear what the Zoning Ordinance would treat a medical marijuana treatment facility as, and it was our view that it was important to treat it as a principal use, and to make it clear that the distribution of medical marijuana or the
processing or production of medical marijuana would not be interpreted to be an accessory part of any other existing operation that's a principal use under the Ordinance.

And then for the purpose of having time to look at the issues around the placement of those facilities and to see what the state's Department of Public Health would submit as the process by which the centers would be regulated and registered, that there should be an interim restriction on establishing those uses within Cambridge.

So the purpose of the proposed amendment -- I won't go through all of it, but I can answer questions about it, is to state what the purpose is, which is to establish a temporary restriction until the city has a chance to explore the issue and the state has a chance to make clear how they're going to regulate and permit the establishments.

To define what that -- to define what a medical marijuana treatment center means within the Zoning Ordinance, and to make sure that that definition is consistent with the definition in the state law.

To establish, as I mentioned before, that it would be considered a principal use, and to restrict the establishment of medical marijuana treatment centers for a period of nine months beginning the effective date of the law which is January 1, 2013. So essentially meaning that the -- that there would be a restriction in effect until the beginning of October.

So that is the purpose of what's been put forward. And the purpose of having it put forward by the City Council back in December was to make sure that it would be advertised and that hearings would be held before the law came into effect to make it clear to anyone who was curious or was
interested in knowing how the Zoning would apply, that there would be some framework in place at that time.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Are there any questions? Ted?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have a couple of questions. I have no idea how treatment centers or dispensaries work in other states. I'm curious when you're saying it would be a principal use and not an accessory use. I mean, in other places, say do hospitals or doctors offices operate as dispensaries?

JEFF ROBERTS: It varies state -- I know that it varies state by state. I can't go into much detail. I know that in many states they are treated as a separate principal use of medical marijuana dispensary is considered a distinct use and not an accessory use within some other larger pharmacy or medical or other type of medical
use, but that's one of the things that we would certainly look at. I know that in some, in some states, and some of the concern that we heard from different departments and from the City Council had to do with where they were, where they might be clustered in certain areas, and how that would impact land use in certain parts of the city.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. My on7y other concern is the expiration which is now totally open ended. I mean, I understand moratoria are legal and for study periods, but this says for a period of nine months or until such future time as came Cambridge City Council enacts a superseding Zoning regulations. So were the City Council choose to not adopt anything else, this will be in effect indefinitely and I don't know if that was really what the intent was. And I have a question whether that would really be, you know, viewed as legal to have an interim
provision that could last indefinitely.
HUGH RUSSELL: When I read that I thought oh, if the Council gets their business done quicker than nine months, but I think it can be read either way.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, right. I mean it could be the earlier of when they act or January 1st or nine months from January 1, 2013.

JEFF ROBERTS: We11, the intent was to make clear that it would be intended only to be in effect for nine months and that there would be a petition sometime either at that nine-month period or before then to -that would establish a permanent set of regulations.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes. I would suggest then that that language be clarified a little bit.

JEFF ROBERTS: Okay.
STEVEN WINTER: Is this a public
hearing, Mr. Chair?
HUGH RUSSELL: It is a public hearing.

STEVEN WINTER: I have no problems hearing the public and then bringing my comments in.

Tom?
THOMAS ANNINGER: No, that's fine.
I wanted to just ask what is the consequence of this principal accessory distinction? Why was that important?

JEFF ROBERTS: It was -- it really is a clarifying point more than anything else. A scenario that one could imagine might be someone operates a medical facility that is approved under some other principal use, for instance, a health -- someone is operating something that they say is a health clinic is the principal use, and that's a specific defined category in our Zoning Ordinance, and then might seek to be
registered by the state to acquire or distribute medical marijuana. And then might -- and as a Zoning matter, they might make the case to the city that they should be allowed to operate under the rules that apply to a health clinic because they would assert that that's their principal use, but that that the sale of medical marijuana is an accessory function to serving as a health clinic. Again, the point of this really is just to clarify what the intent is under the Cambridge Ordinance in terms of the treatment of these uses in terms of rather how the -how those uses would be defined under the Ordinance. There are certain things that we might not be able to anticipate in terms of what form a medical marijuana dispensary might take or how it might operate because it is a new type of function in Massachusetts. So the point is to just -- it's just to be very clear and to avoid any uncertainty.

PAMELA WINTERS: Could I just ask a quick question?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
PAMELA WINTERS: Do you need a doctor's prescription for the marijuana?

JEFF ROBERTS: According to the law, yes, a doctor's prescription would be required and there's a list, I don't -- I don't know, I could repeat the list, but there's a list of conditions that are listed as qualifying as allowed to be treated by a prescription for medical marijuana.

PAMELA WINTERS: But it would have to be from an MD?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.
PAMELA WINTERS: A licensed doctor? JEFF ROBERTS: I believe that's the case.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I guess it's the case that when regulations are written, that
will give some boundaries. And then when it starts operating, there will be more thrown about.

Okay. Then we should proceed to the public testimony.

LIZA PADEN: Nobody has signed up. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. James, would you like to speak?

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you. James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place. Given the Planning Board's eagerness to support every big biotech company that wants to build big, bigger and bigger buildings in Cambridge to allegedly come up with a cure for cancer, I would hope that you would be equally eager to help come up with a responsible way of making it possible for people to be treated who are currently suffering from cancer while we all wait for this cure. It's not just cancer, it's MS, it's other conditions. And just for the record, to remind people, the residents
of -- the voters in Cambridge voted in favor of this referendum. I just checked the results earlier. 37,237 registered voters in Cambridge voted yes. 9,761 voted no. So 75 percent of those who chose to vote one way or the other voted to support having allowing medical marijuana treatment centers.

I have a couple of questions about -first of al1, is Zoning the right way to regulate this? I think there's some serious questions that I hope you will consider. There are public health regulations that could be adequate. There are City Ordinances that could be adequate. I'm not sure necessarily that Zoning per se is necessary in this case.

I also think that there are questions about in the text as presented to you regarding educational materials. How are educational materials regarding medical marijuana going to be defined? And are you
going to have to need a permit to have educational materials about marijuana? That's not clear to me.

What about people who, as I understand it and under the current law, pending the resolution of the various matters involved here, there's -- you can get -- a qualified individual can get an exemption to grow up to 60 days' supply for their personal use under certain conditions. Is that now going to be prohibited pending this discussion? Is that maybe one of the purposes of this, is to actually prevent the implementation of that feature of the law which I think is an important one.

So I think that should be clarified.
I also think that, you know, I think it's important to think about -- I really appreciate the question raised by the member of the Planning Board Ted Cohen, I think there should be a restriction on the time
frame. I also think that there's a question about why shouldn't the health -- I don't think this was explained. Why shouldn't a health clinic be able to offer marijuana if it's deemed medical marijuana, and if you have to have a prescription. Why -- I would like to hear a better explanation for why there's a -- the rationale for treating it differently.

And finally I just want to point out that we live in a city where there's a CVS on nearly every corner, a Walgreens across the street. You can by 80 proof booze at liquor stores without a prescription all over the city, and you can get OxyContin with a prescription. And we even have needle exchanges in the city. So I think it's time for us to maybe grow up a little bit about medical marijuana and let's be among the first and best communities in Middlesex County to have a responsibly managed medical
marijuana dispensary and be a leader in this field.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak? In the back row.

COREY MASHBURN: How you doing? I'm Corey Mashburn. I live at 90 Antrim Street. I'm also on the board of directors for the Massachusetts Prevention Alliance. I'd like to just -- I heard the word prescription used. The medical marijuana is not going to be prescribed. It's going to be recommended. Marijuana is a federally illegal drug. So doctors cannot prescribe a Schedule I drug if that's what it's labelled. So I think a Schedule I drug means it's still on research. It's still illegal. That means doctors cannot prescribe a Schedule I drug. They can prescribed some Schedule II drugs and some Schedule III drugs, but they cannot prescribe
a Schedule I drug.
As far as Zoning, I think I like the proposal about the nine months. I think that the city should look at the correct way to put a dispensary in if they need one. As we're seeing in other states, Massachusetts Prevention Alliance, we've researched this for two years now. In other states we've seen that kids are using it in their school systems in California. They're allowed it in school because it's a medical -- well, medical use. And they're using it for ADHD. Now, in the state's ballot question it did say debilitating illnesses, which did have cancer, glaucoma, Crohn's, etcetera, and it also had other, other illnesses as determined by your doctor, which what does other i11ness mean? It could mean the flu. It could mean a cold. Mostly the dispensaries as far as we know it through our research, dispensaries allow a 60-day use, but I would ask the

Planning Board and the Ordinance Committee to look at what is a 60-day use? I'm 6', 3" about 250, 60-day use for me could be totally different than five-foot woman or a five-foot guy. So when you really need to look at that, I think DPH is going to be looking at that. I think that's where the proposal for the nine months is good because we need to look at what DPH's laws and regs will be, and then we can react to it as a city. Because we may not need one. As we're looking to other states, we saw Washington and Colorado legalize marijuana for recreational use. I would change the question on let's be the mode1 city and using -- about having dispensary on being a model site city on how we can better the system or how we could see, okay, maybe this isn't the way to do it. I lived in Cambridge since 2004. I like it here. I love it. I think we have things popping up everywhere; MIT, Harvard, and I
don't think a dispensary is the way to go. Thank you.

STEVEN WINTER: Clarification on the organization.

COREY MASHBURN: The Massachusetts Prevention alliance.

PAMELA WINTERS: Could you also tell me what your organization does?

COREY MASHBURN: We look at, look at all the health policies in the state around substance use, around mostly all substances. And we mostly focus on how it's going to affect the youth. But as we -- through our research, this is going to be affect a lot more than youth. If we let people grow it, it could affect the land, it could affect the economy. I think the city is doing the right thing in researching how it's going to affect the city. I think we should look at other cities in California and Colorado.

PAMELA WINTERS: So it's not just
marijuana that you look at it, it's other substances, too?

COREY MASHBURN: Yes, it's all substances.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.
COREY MASHBURN: You're welcome.
HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish to speak?

COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY: Good evening, board members. My name is Craig Kelley. I live at 6 St. Gerard Terrace and I am also speaking in favor of a nine-month moratorium. Mostly because I think this is far more complicated than any of us realize, and that point I've thought for quite a while, but it struck home the other day when there was a development proposal relatively near my house that is for a -- it's basically assisted living for formerly homeless women. And no one really would have thought that would have gone in, but it's approved under
the Zoning. It doesn't really seem to be a Zoning issue. And what the neighbors are going to have to think about is, you know, you've got 10 or 12 or 14 people where a family might have been before, and disproportionately they're going to be smokers. We didn't really think about what that was going to mean to the neighbors. It's a much more complex than saying there's a use to make it work and ways to make it work well. And I suspect the same with the marijuana amendment, it's a big thing that got passed and there are ways to make it work and there are ways to make it work well, but it's going to be super tricky to make sure it works well and doesn't all of a sudden become a big burden to people who are otherwise didn't really realize something was allowed under the code. So I think it's going to take much more study than we can do now, and I think it's going to take some serious
review of the final rules and regulations that come out of the various governing bodies. So I know that the will of the people, and I voted for it myself, is that we legalize marijuana. I suspect that that's more a commentary on the nation's drug war than it is actually on the desire to have people growing marijuana in your neighborhood, but those are all things that I think we're going to have to think about very seriously and I look forward to being part of the discussion.

Thank you very much.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I see no one.
So I was thinking about things that are regulated, and like we regulate fast food. There are places where you can do it and there are places where you can't. We
regulate places where alcohol can be served, and -- but not how those establishments operate, but where they can operate. The how is done by the License Commission and by the state regulations. So the idea that we would, in the city, decide that there was some places that were appropriate for use and other places that weren't is not a foreign notion. The problem now is that we don't really quite know what this use is going to be. So I think the moratorium makes a lot of sense. I hope that people can work through the complications and put an effective system, you know, in place that will not have, you know, bad impacts on other uses in the city, but I think right now we're not in a place where we can do our part in Zoning and therefore the moratorium makes sense. Tom.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I thought
Mr. Williamson touched on a point that I
wanted to make as well. It seems that the -somebody decided that the moratorium belonged in the Zoning Ordinance. I'm not sure that that was the only place it could be located in the panoply of ordinances that the city has. I think the moratorium could have found its home in another part of our legal system here in the city. I have no problem with a nine-month moratorium in the Zoning Ordinance if that's the easiest. So a nine-month moratorium if it has to be in the Zoning Ordinance, I don't know how or who decided that, but I would not -- I would hope that that does not set the tone for where most of these regulations will find themselves when we decide just how this will all play itself out. I hope somebody will give some greater thought to just where the regulatory framework for marijuana belongs. I don't think there's much in the Zoning Ordinance that speaks to that issue, and I think it
could almost all be somewhere else except possibly for its use which belongs in a table in the Ordinance but not much more. And I hope people will remember that when the time comes for the next round.

HUGH RUSSELL: Stuart, you wanted to say something?

STUART DASH: Just to clarify, this is a crusty part of our effort to where we're working with the Health Department and Public Works Department and we all got together to talk about this. And we expect the resulting work would involve all these departments and coming back to you, and if not you, other divisions, other divisions after it becomes clear with the study period.

THOMAS ANNINGER: But it was thought that the easiest and most what, efficient or logical place was the Zoning Ordinance?

STUART DASH: This was a direct approach to address the basic question, but
it's not the only approach.
HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: Thank you,
Mr. Chair. I have six points that I wanted to go over and I'm going to start with what really was not in order of importance, but the last point, I -- in regard to the deadline, I don't think we should be under any kind of a deadline to solve this problem. I like the fact that we haven't -- that it's open ended in terms of allowing ourselves the time required to deal with this extremely complex issue. This is a very complex issue. Something that we do well here in Cambridge is that we're very thoughtful and we're very mindful and we do that very well. But I don't want to do it particularly cross agencies, cross departments. I don't want to do that under a deadline. I don't think that's a good idea.

I would like to get a little more
research on the kind of criminal activity that was noted in Mr. Healey's memo attracting criminal activity or causing a general public nuisance in towns as noted like LA and Berkeley, California and Denver, Colorado. I think it would be interesting if we are doing this cross-departmentally, to get the public safety folks to find out exactly what that was.

I would like to get specific input and make a point of reaching out to the business community in Cambridge when we talk about this issue, also, and to get feedback from business ownership in Cambridge. And I think that if there are corporate entities which is what a not-for-profit is, if there are corporate entities that have -- that are lining up to do this. I don't know if there are corporate entities that are positioning themselves to do this. I think we need to talk to them as well. And as I said, I don't
know who they are or if they are identifiable at this point. I also think that, you know, we have some terrific hospitals in Cambridge; Cambridge Hospital, Mount Auburn Hospital, and I think we need to go to the medical leadership of those hospitals and get feedback from them as well on these questions that we have in terms of placement of these centers. And also, of course, provide the citizens an opportunity to inform the process for which we're doing.

I also am a little ambivalent about the principal use and what that means. And I don't want to argue it tonight or open it up, but I think that if we're going to call it -if we're going to say that it's a principal use, I think we need to be, we need to be able to say why we're saying that. And I haven't really heard why yet we're saying that.

And let's see, this may be off topic,
but one of the issues that the state of
California dealt with with medical marijuana was that it was legal to dispense it from certain locations, but it was not legal under federal law to transport it to those locations. And I guess what I would like to do is have some kind of a look at that again, if we're doing this cross departments, which I think is a terrific idea, let's get an answer on that and that's something that would concern me a great deal if we were, again, this is as Councillor Kelley indicated, this is part of the complexity of this issue. This is a very, very complex issue. I also agree that medical marijuana should be available to the citizens. And I also understand that the citizens gave it a green light and I respect all those things, but I think that we need to move very, very, very slowly here.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: So let me just see if I understand what you're saying. It sounds like you've laid out a series of issues that need to be considered at the point when a moratorium is lifted. Is that basically what you're saying?

STEVEN WINTER: No. No, these are issues that need to be considered prior to the moratorium being lifted.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, but should they be considered prior to it being in place? Oh, or --

STEVEN WINTER: The moratorium should be in place while these issues are being considered.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, that's what I thought you were saying.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
Pam.
PAMELA WINTERS: This sounds maybe like a silly question, but I'd like to know
where is the marijuana coming from? Is the government providing it?

HUGH RUSSELL: No, not the feds. That's one of the complexities.

PAMELA WINTERS: I used to do research, believe it or not, on marijuana at Mass. Mental Health, and we used to get these little, you know, vials that the government would provide. So I'm just wondering whether or not, you know, that the government is providing the marijuana or is it coming from individuals or, you know, is somebody making money off of this? Or, you know, where is it coming from? Or do we not know?

HUGH RUSSELL: At this point we definitely do not know the answer to that question. Again, that's one of the questions that comes in the moratorium.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: The law does --
JEFF ROBERTS: The law makes
provision for the cultivation of marijuana, where it's being sourced in order to be cultivated, that's I think an unanswered question as you said. I don't believe it's the intent for the government to directly -for the state in any way to directly control the production or distribution in a direct way, but it defines the centers that are allowed to cultivate, process, and distribute and administer marijuana as not-for-profit entities. So as that's defined under the state law. So that's all it says.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: You know, can you define that not profit? To who? To the providers? I mean, I'm just sort of had the kind of question where the marijuana is coming from. At some point we're going to need to know. Obviously, by all means maybe there's lobbyists involved pushing this petition. I
understand that the Massachusetts voters two-thousand -- what is it? In November of 2012? Voted for it as well as James Williamson saying 75 percent of Cambridge voted for it. And, you know, I'm not against it. Definitely I'm going for the nine month, but I do like to know, like Pam, who is, you know, I don't want to leave it with the government, you know, the government it's a non-profit and the government is going to provide the marijuana, right? I mean, it's just, just if we can be more clear as to actually how is it processed? Where is it processed? And who's benefitting? And if anybody, I think that would help.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, thank you. Maybe we should listen to again to what Tom had to say, which was there are lots of questions here. And we probably as a Planning Board, shouldn't be addressing most of them.

PAMELA WINTERS: I agree.
HUGH RUSSELL: And we may be very interested in what's going on, but I think ultimately the decision as to where this activity can take place in the city, it's really -- that's within the land use regulations, and trying to understand what the nature of the activity is the part that's going to require imagination unless you think it's going to be like some horror stories that have then been, you know, experienced in some places or some of the non-horror stories that have been experienced in some other places. So until we find out what the comparable is, we won't have a lot of insight as to what's the appropriate geographical limitation to place on it. But I would not think that we would get into the questions, through a lot of the questions are like where does it come from? I mean, we don't, we don't ask that of McDonald's, and I don't
think we really want to know. We don't ask that, you know, of Libby's Liquors. And so I think, you know, again, I think we all -we've heard the same thing from everybody, that this is something that we have to move towards as a society and as a city, and that we don't, what we don't know is a lot bigger than what we do know, and we'11 know more after the Department of Public Health issues regulations. Whether that's enough or not, we'11 find out.

PAMELA WINTERS: Sounds good.
HUGH RUSSELL: So I think we should favorably recommend the moratorium.

STEVEN WINTER: I concur.
PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I think it should be the language which deals with the nine months being the shortest time or the longest time, that should be clarified, so that Council knows what they're voting.

Is there anything else that should go into a recommendation?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't think so. I mean, I think we're recommending a moratorium on a particular use, as I said, for a nine-month or another specified period of time. And I suspect we'11 end up with an Ordinance, a Zoning Ordinance that just talks about the use, and that the, you know, the Inspectional Services and Public Health Department and a lot of other departments in this city will be dealing with the regulations, the implementation of it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so all those in voting to send a recommendation of that sort to the Council?
(Raising hands). HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

A11 members voting.
HUGH RUSSELL: Let's go on to the next piece of business which is a
continuation of discussion on the Forest City Petition to extend the Cambridgeport revitalization development district.

We've received a draft of a proposed recommendation, and I think we probably should address ourselves to that draft.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Hugh, I think we have to face up to this question of whether the public hearing is still open or not. I believe it is, and there may be some people in here who may want to speak to that issue. I don't know whether you want to allow testimony or not, but I think we have to think about that.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, I think the question is are we prepared to, based on the testimony that we heard at the previous hearing, prepared to move to a decision or do we want to hear more testimony?

I'm not in favor of just opening it up wide open. There's no new information on the
table, so I think we could decide that all we have to do is deliberate. And so what is the pleasure of the Board?

STEVEN WINTER: Tom, I'd like to hear what you have to say.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Well, I'm tainted
a little bit by the fact that I think George Metzger wanted to say something, and I thought if we could somehow keep it to a minimum, I would -- if we can manage it efficiently, I would allow for some further testimony if that's necessary.

AHMED NUR: I'11 second that.
HUGH RUSSELL: So we, about 20
people spoke on the 8th.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, it seems to me, my recollection of what we did last time was we heard the public hearing and heard the testimony, and I think the public hearing is still open, although I think we did vote to consider a recommendation to the

City Council of the petition and asked staff to draft a proposed recommendation unless there was something dramatically new and different from what we heard before, I would suggest that we just go forward and discuss the recommendation.

STEVEN WINTER: I concur, Mr. Chair.
PAMELA WINTERS: Yes, and I concur also.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Wel1, if we get stuck in our deliberation, well, we may have to seek some help from the other side of the table. But let's see what we can do.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Just for clarification, if the public hearing is still open is there, you know, a requirement that there be allowed public comment tonight? Or what's the story with that aspect of the question? It's at the discretion of the Planning Board if the public hearing is still open?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think -- so I guess the question is is it at the discretion of the Planning Board or is it at the discretion of the member of the public who might wish to speak? And I think if we find that we've heard adequate testimony, and it might be appropriate to have a motion to close the public hearing and go into deliberation.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY:
Mr. Chairman, can I --
STEVE KAISER: Mr. Chairman, there is new information in the three-page draft that you have from the staff. Very significant new information.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair, can we hear what Mr. Rafferty has to say?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY:
Mr. Chairman, I know the practice has been that during public testimony a person gets to speak once. If this is a continuation of a public hearing for which the Petitioners have
not offered any new information, it would seem consistent with the Board's practice for people who have not yet had an opportunity to speak, but to simply allow others who have spoken before to speak again would be the equivalent of letting someone speak twice during the same hearing which has not been the practice of the Board.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: How many people would contemplate speaking, three or four at most?

STEVE KAISER: Two.
THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that's a pretty good -- I was going to suggest the same thing, that there are some who may not have had a chance to testify last time, I would let them speak tonight and draw the line there. I think the answer to Mr. Williamson's question is, I think we have discretion on how to manage the situation of a public hearing, but I don't think we can
either close it or manage it in some way to confine it to certain questions or to certain people. And I think you have some discretion to guide us as the Chair, but I thought Mr. Rafferty's suggestion of letting those who did not have a chance last time speak might be a good solution.

AHMED NUR: Do we have a record of who spoke and who hasn't?

HUGH RUSSELL: I have a list right here in front of me.

AHMED NUR: Okay. I'm going to support that if you want to take a motion of that.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I'm -- you know, we as far as I'm concerned, we did leave the public hearing open, but had moved to the deliberate stage where it is generally not been our procedure to take further testimony unless questions come up in our deliberations where we requested it.

Certainly it's also been our practice that anyone could submit written comments, and I don't believe we received any further written comments since the last hearing that I am aware of. You know, I don't have strong feelings. I suppose if there are people who feel that there was some significant issues that were not raised in the prior hearing, rather than simply trying to reiterate points that have been already been made, I personally would be willing to listen to those. But I see no reason to reopen the hearing just to have a rehashing of what we spent several hours listening to already. HUGH RUSSELL: And we also do not customarily let -- ask people for their comments on deliberations.

So hearing that then, I will ask is there anyone who did not speak at the previous hearing and wants to be heard tonight? I see Steve Kaiser getting up by I
see his name on the list of people who spoke at the last hearing.

STEVE KAISER: I have a written comment to add to the record.

HUGH RUSSELL: Then you can submit a written comment to Liza and she will distribute it.

George, do you want to speak?
GEORGE METZGKER: Yes, please.
HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, you've got copies for all of us, great. Thank you.

GEORGE METZGKER: I'm George Metzgker, M-e-t-z-g-e-r and I live at 90 Antrim Street. I'm here as the President of the Central Square Business Association.

I'11 be very brief. I think the discussion was covered on all sides last time. The one thing -- the two points that I would like to make in a statement of support of this, which is a Zoning change not a project approval, is first of all, that there was much discussion
about the details of this proposal and we encourage approval of the Zoning change so we can move on to the large project review and actually talk about the substance of the project itself, which is a different matter.

And I'd also observed on the other times that this project has been put forth or this rezoning has been put forth, prior to the Central Square Advisory Committee's work which the business association wholeheartedly endorses, this proposal as it presently
stands has had significant change made to it in response of the goals and the aspirations of Central Square vision and we would ask you to look carefully at that in terms of an example of how this planning process now lead to better development.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?


HUGH RUSSELL: I'd say we're addressing to both.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay. I just want to be on the right track.

There's a line on page 2 of 3 that says -- and, you know, this may not be an issue at al1. The petition -- it's the one, two, third paragraph down on page 2 of 3 . The last sentence. The petition also makes development in this area subject to existing and future urban design guidelines for the area.

And all I wanted to ask is what, what exactly does that mean?

HUGH RUSSELL: Let me try to answer that. There is existing Central Square Overlay District that does have guidelines. There is a Central Square planning process which is well advanced.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And we would expect
that there would be guidelines that come out of that.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: And so the idea would be that any proposal that came before us for a project review would, we would look at all such guidelines that would enforce it at the time.

STEVEN WINTER: Including the key goals of the C2 study? Which is kind of where, that's where I would be comfortable with this.

HUGH RUSSELL: Uh-huh.
STEVEN WINTER: Yes, okay.
Mr. Chair, I just wanted to confirm that.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I have a question that -- I don't know if we can answer or if staff can answer, but this particular project is in part dependent upon the letter of commitment which has already been -- I mean, I guess it's been sent. I
don't know whether City Council has accepted it, and I don't know what the status is. There is one particular term in the letter that has, you know, a lot of people spoke about and has been bothering me, which is as I understand it, that if Forest City were to construct some other residential or mixed use project, that may include affordable units under the formula for that project, that those would be counted or could be counted as the 20 affordable units that's required of them under this proposal. And it seems to me that that is not fair and should not be a condition of it. But again, we were saying, you know, we were discussing that the terms of the commitment and the terms of what would be required of Forest City is something to be determined by the City Council. So I just don't know how we get a handle on that or other issues that may be in the commitment letter.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think this is the first time we have ever seen a commitment letter which is in its due to I guess to the repetitive history of this proposal. It got to the commitment letter phase. The Council didn't act, and now it's been re-filed with amendments. And so there's a commitment letter that's out there that's presumably is the result of the previous round. And we've -- we certainly heard lots of testimony from people before us who felt that there were aspects such as what you mentioned, that they would like to see the Council address in reviewing the commitment letter. I don't think we have to do that work. And now what do we say in our recommendation about the commitment letter? I think that's the second to last paragraph.

STEVEN WINTER: It's page 3 of 3 , the second to last paragraph.

Mr. Chair. Ted, I want to ask you does
the phrase "for the duration of Forest City's lease hold interest," doesn't that expand the length of time that affordable units will be in that environment? Maybe I need some help with this.

And does that mitigate our concern about sort of the so-called double counting of the 20 units for you, Ted?

HUGH RUSSELL: You know, I think, I mean as I understand it, the only Zoning possibility they have is the All Asia block. Everything else is built out. And with the development of the All Asia block their FAR development will be built out. Now if that doesn't happen, and then, you know, for some reason they don't proceed the way in which they're trying very hard to proceed, but if that doesn't happen, then there might be some eventualities that might come into play. If they don't build and I'm just -- let's say they decide they're not going to build a
biotech building and they want to build a housing building there, so does the city's review of housing affordability in that eventuality, what would the city's view be? I don't think we know. Do they have to do whatever's under the Ordinance plus 20 more units if they're building an entirely housing project? Is that fair? Is that appropriate?

You know, the letter of commitment is based upon a development program and the impacts of that program, and if that program changes radically, then I don't know what happens in the commitment letter. And so I do think we could go down a very long road to try to look at stuff that in fact the Council is looking at.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay, I hear you. HUGH RUSSELL: So I, the only thing I kind of regret is that we don't pass on to the Council a couple of the points about the commitment letter that we heard. Now, of
course, Councillor, I think you were here, weren't you, for the whole hearing? So Council -- one of the member was present.

COUNCILLOR VAN BEUZEKOM: They don't always listen to me.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I suspect you're having your own hearings on this, and I doubt that such an important point will be overlooked at the City Council hearing. So it may be unnecessary for us to pass that on. STEVEN WINTER: Then in that case I did have one more question, and that is also on page 2 of 3 , also in that same paragraph, the word demise is used, where we say to contribute a million-seven in community funds, to create retail space that can be easily demised to appeal to diverse tenants. So I'm hopeful that this is a use of a word which I've never seen before which is always thrilling for me, but is that the right word or is that a mis -- is that a typo?

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think it's a typo.

PAMELA WINTERS: You know, I was going to ask the same exact question, Steve. STEVEN WINTER: Okay. We can just look at that later just to make sure it's okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: We can pass that along as a grammatic consideration to the drafters.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Can we go back to the letter of commitment?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Because the Zoning, I mean, I think it is fair for us to comment on the commitment letter because the Zoning specifically says we're adding a section that says prior to the issuance of the Building Permit per Certificate of Occupancy, Inspectional Services will certify that all portions of the letter of commitment
dated December 6, 2012, are continuing to be met. So they've written into the Zoning that the terms of the commitment letter are met. Now, if, you know, my quandary is if that because of where we are now, the commitment letter is, you know, sealed in stone. You know, I don't know what City Council can do about it. But if it is not, then I think there's no reason why we can't comment to City Council that they might wish to reconsider one or more provisions of the commitment letter before adopting the Zoning signing off on it.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would agree in principle and I also would think that it would be -- it wouldn't make sense to think that the Council cannot address these issues and that they will address these issues. That, you know, they have the discretion to do that and they will do their job.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY:

Mr. Chairman, would the Board be assisted if we gave just brief context on that provision -- if you might want a context because I don't think it's been accurately represented in your discussion as to what those 20 units are about? I know Mr. Murphy knows the history.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess, do you want to hear that?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I'd be happy to hear from somebody. I mean, if I'm misunderstanding it and it's not a concern, then great.

BRIAN MURPHY: I can give you the background on the context where this 20 unit number came out. And that was when this proposal for the Zoning first came forward, there was discussion about possibly adding a housing component that would have included both market rate as well as the inclusionary units in that, that was the proposal that
included the housing that are now located next to the fire station. There was considerable reaction in the community to that proposal, and I think in the wake of that community reaction, there was the decision made to pull back from doing that. But, again, through the discussions in the Central Square Committee, there was generally speaking, I think, a desire for both more market rate and more affordable housing in Central Square; that was sort of one of the goals that was coming out of the committee. And so part of what I think happened with Forest City was that they looked at it and they said we will commit to getting the housing down. We can't specify where it's going to be since this proposed site didn't work out, but we will seek to do that at a site to be determined. I do know, for example, the Forest City was a bidder although unsuccessful for the Quest
properties. So the origin for this was really an attempt to sort of note that there was an initial willingness to add the market rate and affordable housing, and this was a provision to say somehow we will try to address this concern. And either we will do 20 units of affordable housing as part of a larger building, similar to what they would have done at the parcel next to the fire station, or we will somehow perhaps through scattered side pieces, provide that housing. And if we're unable to do so, they will contribute money to the affordable housing trust fund. So that's sort of the origin of it. So I think it was harkening back to that initial proposal and that's why that number is there. It wasn't that it was going to be separate and distinct. It was referencing the fact that those units would have been provided had they been successful, and in adding in the housing tower that would have
included both market rate and the inclusionary units.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I'm fine with that and, you know, I think it's great. My concern is that as I read this, and maybe it's a concern that the City Council already considered, is that if in building some other project somewhere, they were going to include affordable units and, therefore get, you know, some bonus under the Zoning, under the applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, that they should not be able to get that bonus and simultaneously count those as the 20 units, because I feel that's sort of a double counting situation.

BRIAN MURPHY: And I think that seems to me that would prevent -- had they done the proposals as they initially prescribed it, that's would have happened. That they would have built the proposal at

A11 Asia. They would have done the market
rate tower near the firehouse, and then included within that market rate tower would have been inclusionary units. So it would have been that same situation at that parcel, and that this is simply a response we don't want it there. Fine, but we still remain, you know, very interested in housing in Cambridge.

HUGH RUSSELL: The principle is that this commercial building has 20 affordable units attached to it just as a residential building would have affordable units attached to it under the law. And they are separate. So those 20 units are separate and will be produced through one of several possible mechanisms that are spelled out in the letter of commitment. So I -- if that isn't clear in the letter of commitment to a lawyer, then we would commend to the Council that it be clear because I think everybody agrees that's the principle. And you know when -- I don't
think you're suggesting they're going to try to weasel out of anything, just as a lawyer, things need to be clearly stated.
H. THEODORE COHEN: No, I'm not suggesting they're attempting to weasel out of anything. And I applaud what they're doing, but it just seemed to me the way the letter was written, from my point of view, it's double counting. And if you think that's -- if City Council was aware of that and that was an acceptable provision to them, well, then, that's up to them to make that decision. If you don't think that's what City Council had in mind, then I would just let City Council to be aware of that's a concern I at least have and would ask them to think about it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So that's one thing we want to have added to our decision.

Is there anything else people would like to add or change?

Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: Yes, I don't have anything to add other than -- as you know, I sat on the Central Square Committee, and Forest City was a big help in a lot of answering some of the questions that our Central Square Advisory Committee had. And I must say that I am proud to be a part of that study, and I think it works out and that this makes sense and I'm willing to support the efforts to the City Council to consider this.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, are we ready to proceed to a motion? Would you like to make that motion for the recommendation as amended?

AHMED NUR: Yes, so moved.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, is there a second?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ted was -- we need photo finish cameras.

| 1 | AHMED NUR: There's one on the left, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | smile over there. |
| 3 | STEVEN WINTER: We'11 check it out |
| 4 | on You Tube. |
| 5 | HUGH RUSSELL: There's no more |
| 6 | discussion. |
| 7 | All those in favor of sending this |
| 8 | favorable recommendation? |
| 9 | (Raising hands). |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: And it is all members |
| 11 | voting in favor. |
| 12 | Thank you. |
| 13 | ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you. |
| 14 | HUGH RUSSELL: We'11 take a break |
| 15 | and we'11 take up the rest of our business. |
| 16 | (A short recess was taken.) |
| 17 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, we're going |
| 18 | back into session, and the next item is the |
| 19 | 54R Cedar Street. |
| 20 | LIZA PADEN: So earlier this |
| 21 | afternoon I forwarded an e-mail to you from |

the applicant's representative Sean Hope, and the applicant Doctor Rizkallah decided that he would like to come back to the Planning Board to discuss the proposal further, but that based on a scheduling conflict, Sean Hope, the attorney, is not available to come this evening. So, they would like to reschedule it to the third February meeting which I think is February 19th. And they then requested the extension for the decision to be filed with the City Clerk to February 28th. And so I'd like to ask the Board to accept the extension request.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, has it been submitted in writing?

LIZA PADEN: I have an e-mail, yes. HUGH RUSSELL: That meets the rules of what we've been doing?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: This one here?
HUGH RUSSELL: I've seen the e-mail.

But usually -- the issue comes that if -that if the Board fails to act and the petition expires, then the petition is granted. That's the rules. So, if they come back and say oh, we didn't request that, where is your thing in writing? We want this permit. That's why we usually require a signed, you know, hard copy letters. But this -- the world is changing and if the staff feels comfortable with this method of communication, I would like myself to have something that's a hard copy and that's signed, and that way we have -STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I would like to comment that I thought it was unusual that at $2: 34$ the day of we get an e-mail saying that because of a prescheduled vacation they couldn't attend the hearing. This was a little distressing that we couldn't have heard this earlier. I'm happy to do whatever we need to do to help the
proponent deal with unanticipated scheduling issues, but it just seemed odd to me that we got it on the day of. And also, I do want to be very careful on how we do this, Mr. Chair, to make sure that we are doing it correctly.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Liza, your deadline was January 30th?

LIZA PADEN: January 31st, yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And is Mr. Hope gone until then?

LIZA PADEN: No, he'11 be back on Friday.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So we could agree to the extension condition on his submitting a signed request to Liza before January 31st.

HUGH RUSSELL: We could. And if we didn't get it, then we would have to call a special meeting I guess.
H. THEODORE COHEN: To deny the petition?
HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Maybe the motion should be then we would give the extension and if we do not --
STEVEN WINTER: Upon receipt of. HUGH RUSSELL: And if we do not receive it, then we would deny the petition so that it doesn't automatically get approved.
PAMELA WINTERS: That sounds good.
STEVEN WINTER: That's fine.
HUGH RUSSELL: You know, I don't expect there's a problem here, but I just think we need to cover.
I think the argument for granting extensions is always that when you ask somebody to do something and you want them to make changes, you've got to give them the time to consider it.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, or to take that point one step further, it is in our interests that -- I believe, and in the
street's interest and therefore the city's interest that what we've suggested to them be not only seriously considered, but hopefully accepted. The alternative, which is that he build as of right would in all likelihood be unfortunate for the street and all around. He would chop off in an awkward way, a part of his building in order to satisfy the 75-foot rule and build a three-story house when that's exactly what we don't want to have happen.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.
THOMAS ANNINGER: So I think the extension is a much better outcome, and I'm hoping and I'm convinced that this is just a formality to get Mr. Hope to agree to an extension. So I think we're doing the right thing by doing what we've just talked about.

PAMELA WINTERS: And I hope he's giving it some serious thought, too.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, is there -- is

| 1 | there any more comment? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | AHMED NUR: No. |
| 3 | THOMAS ANNINGER: So I move that we |
| 4 | grant the extension as requested subject |
| 5 | to -- |
| 6 | STEVEN WINTER: Upon receipt of. |
| 7 | LIZA PADEN: Right. |
| 8 | THOMAS ANNINGER: -- subject to |
| 9 | agreement by the present lapse date. |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: The Petitioner I |
| 11 | think needs to submit the written request. |
| 12 | LIZA PADEN: Right. |
| 13 | AHMED NUR: By the 30th. |
| 14 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. He's got to |
| 16 | submit it I would say sooner than that, but |
| 17 | it's a week. You can write up the denial |
| 18 | petition quickly though. |
| 19 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. |
| 20 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So there's a |
| 21 | motion to grant the extension. |


| 1 | H. THEODORE COHEN: And that |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | includes that if it is not received, the |
| 3 | petition is denied? |
| 4 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 5 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, any more |
| 7 | discussion? |
| 8 | On the motion, all those voting in |
| 9 | favor? |
| 10 | (Raising hands). |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: And six members |
| 12 | voting in favor. |
| 13 | And now we can go on to bikes. |
| 14 | AHMED NUR: I don't have one. |
| 15 | JEFF ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. - |
| 16 | HUGH RUSSELL: Not true. |
| 17 | JEFF ROBERTS: So we're back with |
| 18 | bicycle parking again. I'm joined by Cara |
| 19 | and Adam and Stephanie, and we have members |
| 20 | of the bicycle -- at least one member of the |
| 21 | Bicycle Committee who was also here the last |

time, but I neglected to acknowledge. And members of the Bicycle Committee have submitted material to the Planning Board on this topic.

So I sent a memo and we did our best to address the questions to try to clearly address the questions that were posed by the Board the last time. There are some revisions that were made to the text at the suggestion of the Board. Again, we are asking for this to be submitted as a petition to the City Counci1. It's not necessarily a recommendation or an endorsement which would, which would come at a later phase when the petition is officially being considered in the public hearing process.

I won't go through all the points in the memo, but I'm happy to walk through some of them or to give more detail if folks would like. I know that I did include, if you received printed materials, I included some
pages from this document which is the Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, Bicycle Parking Guidelines, which was a helpful document and Cara could in fact, if you'd like to hear more about it, I'm sure Cara could tell you more about it. She had some involvement in working on this. But I have some extra copies because I know that not necessarily everyone has received it. So you can take a look.

So at this point I'm happy to address any questions or explain anything in further detail and Cara, Adam or Stephanie could jump in.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Maybe we should ask Stephanie to --

CATHARINE HORNBY: Cara?
CARA SEIDERMAN: The bike committee individuals?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
CARA SEIDERMAN: Catharine.

HUGH RUSSELL: Catharine. Sorry.
CATHARINE HORNBY: My name is
Catharine Hornby, H-o-r-n-b-y, and I'm here
-- Tian Page (phonetic) is also here with the Bike Committee, and Randy Stern was been here the last time, and so there has been a sustained presence with the Bike Committee because this is something that really interests us. I guess I'd like to just make a few brief comments and then answer any questions you have. First to say --

STEVEN WINTER: May I trouble you to pull, could somebody help her pull the podium up just to make sure our reporter can hear it. Thank you so much.

CATHARINE HORNBY: The Cambridge Bike Committee is an advisory committee to the City Manager, and we were established in the early 90s as part of a both the kind of the planning function to make the city nicer and also an environmental function as part of
the Vehicle Trip Production Act. And among other our functions we often review proposals that come before the Planning Board and come before the City Council. What we find is often we're looking for better bike facilities, but each time we need to sort of articulate that, we need to say there needs to be adequate space and adequate design and adequate in number, in light of the usage, and it seems like each time it feels a little ad hoc, that there are these standards that the city is working toward, but they're not clearly articulated to the developers. And so if people aren't really entirely on notice about what's expected. So I think this bike zoning proposal we see as really valuable, as a way to just layout the starting point. To say here are the city's expectations; right? We think you should have adequate bike parking for new construction, and this is what we mean. And like all Zoning if there
are special circumstances, there's, you know, procedures around special circumstances. But at least to articulate this is what we mean when we say adequate bike parking. And I think that this is really something that's quite critical for, again, talking about new construction only to create to build the city where people can easily use their bikes and can easily turn to their bikes to go to the shop or to go to school or to go to work or just to go over to Fresh Pond and have a nice little ride. And I think, we think that this makes for a more liveable city, helps to reduce car travel, helps keep parking spots, you know, car sparking spots available for those who really need them for those who can't bike, and overall reduces traffic congestion. So I think it's part of a whole that's valuable.

HUGH RUSSELL: And you've, your committee has looked at the nitty-gritty of

> all these proposals and given it your blessing?

CATHARINE HORNBY: We have. And I think that, the proposal that's evolved. I mean even just in the few meetings that I've seen here I know there's been a lot of discussion about the appropriate treatment of three families, and so it's a proposal that's evolved. But yes, we've looked at -- we've looked at the standards and we think that in principle it's going in the right direction and we understand that it will evolve over time. But, yeah, we think that the way these standards are articulated seems appropriate. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Any other questions?

AHMED NUR: I just had a quick question as to do you have any comments that you want to make regarding to what brought you to the conclusion in which, you know, for example, safety perspectives. A lot of times
when bike hops too close to each other, a person comes up to you popping up a whee1 and wants to put the bike in a certain way and wants to get the bike a certain way. Any stories you want to say that maybe help you come up with this conclusion with regarding to the city laying out the foundation for, you know, bicycle parking?

CATHARINE HORNBY: We11, I guess I'11 say two things:

And I think certainly I personally have had the experience of trying to fit a bike into an awkward rack or a rack that's higher up and harder to deal with. I think there's another side of this, though, that the sort of the easiest population to get biking are people who are young and fit and comfortable on the roads and, you know, basically sort of male and 19 to 24 . And that's fine, that's great, but we're never really going to change the city if we only address facilities that
are, you know, adequate for people who can easily, you know, sling their $\$ 3,000$ bike up on to a rack. If we want parents and people who are a little bit older and people who maybe aren't strong enough or maybe have little clunkers of bikes that aren't easily lifted up over your head, if we want the most people to be biking, I think we need a facility, we're going to need racks (inaudible).

AHMED NUR: That was my point.
Because I've seen mothers with pulling wagons with their children and so on and so forth having a hard time in maneuvering around in these areas, so thank you.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think it's interesting that you are representing adults, older people, women, men. Can you just tell me a little bit about the composition of the Bicycle Committee and how people join? Do they get selected? Or how does it work so
that I have a sense of what the representation is?

CATHARINE HORNBY: Sure. Well, correct me if I'm wrong but they -- so members are appointed for two-year terms, and that the -- where there are openings, which is pretty much every year, those openings are advertised. For example, the way I found out about it, there was a little snip-it maybe in the Globe or somewhere, but it was just a little snip-it saying we're advertising for new members. And then people who -- and so there's an effort in advertising the fact that there's open positions. And City Manager staff, Cambridge, Cara and her folk look at applications and interview people, and I think they try to gather a range of perspectives. I mean, there are both Harvard and MIT have representation on the committee so they try to sort of bring in those big institutional perspectives. And in terms of
private, you know, non-institutional members we attempt a range of age and male and female and we try to -- it's challenging because people, you know, parents with young kids, and that's an important group, but it's also a group that doesn't have a lot of time in the evening and so are probably underrepresented on our committee. So I'm not going to say that it perfectly reflects the composition of the city, but that's the goal, it's a cross-section of the city and cross-section of age ranges.

HUGH RUSSELL: So are there more questions for Catharine?

STEVEN WINTER: I have questions here, yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: So for Catharine or for the staff?

STEVEN WINTER: They are for
Catharine.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

STEVEN WINTER: Is this also, is this the Cambridge Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee? Is that the longer name of this?

CATHARINE HORNBY: There's actually two separate committees. We occasionally meet together generally around Christmas so we can share food.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay. Because I wanted to say that from -- I do think there are two, and I I've heard the names of both, but from each, when I get something from each of those, I listen very closely because it's always very good, strong temperate perspective that has a stewardship for the whole city and everybody in it. So I wanted to make sure you could bring that back to your committee. So that's the perspective that I have of who you are. One of the comments in your letters, and I'11 read the sentence, this is your 1etter: In the future, in the context of new
construction only, racks that conform to the national standards built into the Zoning proposal would function better.

I get national standards. I understanding it. And then another letter I hear there's -- someone who said MIT, while they do wonderful things for bicycle, to support bicycle riding, they don't have very good facilities for holding these bicycles.

And I guess I'm wondering is there something that we can do -- some -- it seems odd to me that MIT would not be in the advanced guard of having bicycle parking facilities. What can we do as a city to get MIT's attention to say we need to you do better? Is it simply this, saying that you need to conform to the standards? Because I also noticed that a part of this has alternative bicycle parking designs in response to MIT's comments discussing the issue with non-standard bicycle parking and
flexibility. So it just seems like there's something working there that we haven't quite pushed in together. Do you have any perspective on that?

CATHARINE HORNBY: Well, I guess the perspective I have is I think MIT is acting in good faith. I want to put that out there. And I think that they are really trying to maximize the number of bike parking spaces. So I don't think there's anything like nefarious here at all.

STEVEN WINTER: No conspiracy theory.

CATHARINE HORNBY: I think that in doing that, in trying to maximize the number, I mean, I think that sometimes they sometimes kind of try to get more spots that realistically can be used, and I think that if the national standards apply. And the reason I reference the new construction is because I know there was some confusion on
that point a few meetings ago or sometime recently, and I think it's important to note that we're not saying that MIT has to retrofit all its bike racks, because I think that would be a big imposition. But as they bring new dorms on-line and, you know, as they're involved in new construction, I think to have bike racks that are really in accordance with national standards and really work wel1, I think would be a good thing. I think there should be an ongoing conversation, and I think there is. I mean, MIT's representation on the Bike Committee I think is a part of that, an ongoing conversation, both formal and informal, about how, you know, how can we support them, how we the city, and we the citizens support them and how can they improve their facilities from a bike perspective. It's ongoing conversation and I don't think there's a perfect solution that if we just impose
national standards on all racks that that's reasonable.

STEVEN WINTER: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you very much.

So maybe people who have had questions in the past or at least want to comment or query the experts here.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Go ahead.
AHMED NUR: You sure?
HUGH RUSSELL: Go ahead, Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: The question that I have, and this could be for staff is, I don't want to take the spotlight from the bicycles, but as someone who lives in Cambridge, I also see a growing number of mopeds and they tend to park also where the bicycles park. They're little ones that have -- they have stickers, they don't have plates on them, right. And for those of you who have been to Europe, you see in Rome, they become
nightmares. There's a parking lot full of them and you can't get to any of it. There's a concert. And while we're at this, I just want to mention in the back of our heads while we're talking about bicycle parking zoning, that we should -- the language should be clear as of to the -- for the lack of a better word, big sister of the bicycle, the mopeds, are they allowed to do that? And are they held by the same? Are they going to be ticketed? Is there going to be a completely different parking area for them?

HUGH RUSSELL: Who wants to field that one?

JEFF ROBERTS: Should be fielded -do you want to --

CARA SEIDERMAN: Hi. So for the record, Cara Seiderman, S-e-i-d-e-r-m-a-n with the Community Development Department Bicycle Program. And so, mopeds and scooters and all of those things are definitely
different vehicles and so you raise a good point about how those should be accommodated. They aren't thought to be the vehicle that would fit in the bicycle parking as articulated and defined here. And the Traffic Ordinance by the Traffic Department defines them very clearly and specifically and separately. So I know that the Traffic Department has actually been thinking about a little bit about how to redo exactly what you're identifying, and I think that it will require a different level of effort to think about how those should be accommodated, but it's a good point as our next project.

AHMED NUR: They have the bike lock and everything.

CARA SEIDERMAN: Right, right.
Well, it is something that should be -- once this is done, and we'11 take that up.

AHMED NUR: Sure.
HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.

PAMELA WINTERS: So I have a question and I'm just curious. Have there been any accidents? You know how bicycles will sometimes have those little carts in the back where they drag their babies in the back, you know? Have there been any accidents with that in the city where those bicycles have been hit?

CARA SEIDERMAN: You mean out on the street with the trailers?

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes. I look at that and I mean it horrifies me to see these --

STEVEN WINTER: I don't believe they're dragging their babies. I believe they're towing them.

PAMELA WINTERS: Sorry. Yes, I know, they're towing their babies. It's probably politically incorrect here. I just get so scared seeing these little kids, you know, being -- so have there been any
accidents do you know of kids getting hurt?
CARA SEIDERMAN: None that I know of. And we've actually been tracking bicycle crashes in the city for sometime, and I think that this is actually a phenomenon that happens nationally, not just here, that people are actually driving more cautiously around people who have them and it may also be where those people are riding and how they're riding. And the good news is actually the city's getting ever and ever and ever safer for every individual cyclist. As we've talked about here, the number of cycles has tripled, and the number of crashes is not anywhere near that. And as per -- and it's actually part of a whole phenomenon that's called the safety in numbers. And the more people that are out there, the safer it is for everyone. So with a system from that kind of perspective --

PAMELA WINTERS: We11, that eases my
mind because I see these, you know, these little kids in the back, and I'm like oh, my God. It just looks like an accident waiting to happen to me, but you've eased my mind on that one so thank you.

CARA SEIDERMAN: Sure.
And when we do see lots of people now biking with their kids to school, and it's one of the things we've been trying to do from the public perspective, is trying to make sure there's enough bike parking at the schools and that kind of thing. And so it's all part and parcel of this. But the city by the way, I'11 just make a side note, in general is getting -- is going the direction, not just for cyclists, it's I think having to do with the liveable city and we're actually having fewer crashes than ever before and it's been a trend that's been going down for a long time.

PAMELA WINTERS: Good, good. Thank
you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Tom.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay, I guess I'd like to say a few things. These are comments and questions.

I think my main interest and concern was presented to us has been is it balanced? And by balanced I mean is it, is it regulation that can be -- that is in the interest not only the bikers but of the developers and of the city and so on? And I feel personally that this is a complex area. It's got a technical level that I'm not competent to evaluate. I don't know anything about bicycle racks or spaces or distances or these kinds of things. I have a general assessment of how things are supposed to work, but I don't know enough to really comment on the technical aspect. So a question that I have had is have you had comments and process with developers as well
as bikers and as well as institutions who are not here participating in the process? The chairs are empty tonight. We don't have Mr. Rafferty and his many clients coming in to tell us this is too much. It is a substantial piece of regulation that in words alone. And it is quite technical. It is quite prescriptive. And there are -- and I think the memo that Jeff wrote, I assume it was Jeff, but I'm sure others participated in it, the most recent one we got was very good and was convincing and has helped me to see that this is in alignment with what other cities are doing with this rather interesting bicycle parking guidelines, and all that I find very convincing. I would have liked to hear from those who construct substantial buildings to say that oh, yes, this all makes sense, we understand it, and we can live with it, and this is not overburdensome. So that is a question. And then I have a yet a
comment after that.
CARA SEIDERMAN: We do -- thank you very much for your comments. And I think Stephanie would like to be the person who would respond to the discussions with developers, which we have had to give a little preview. Come on up.

STEPHANIE GROLL: Hi. Stephanie Groll, PTDM officer. We have a good number of PTDM projects that are approved with the number of bike parking spaces and the dimensions as we laid out in this proposal. So this is once again, it's just a reflection of what has been in practice for quite sometime now. And the PTDM projects are obviously agreed to by the developers and -yeah.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That doesn't quite get me there. Agreed to because they have no choice? Agreed to because they think this all makes sense? Tell me how that works. the negotiation process for approving the PTDM plans the bike parking is almost never quibbled with. It is seen as fair and something that other projects do, and in fact I just recently had a discussion with a developer was talking about how the number one thing tenants are asking for is good bike parking because they know that their employees need to have that where they are as wel1 as showers and changing facilities. But everybody wants to put in good bike parking because they know that that helps attract tenants. When I say good, I mean a broad enough dimension and the correct number. THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay.

I guess that answers my question up to a point. What would -- did you want to say something?

BRIAN MURPHY: No. I was going to sort of add that I think it's interesting
that when we do have more contentious disagreements on PTDM, as Stephanie was saying, it's almost always about something like what's the dollar amount of an MBTA subsidy? It really does come down to dollars. And in terms of this, this is sort of more of it becomes almost a selling feature for developers to do. But this hasn't been that controversial for -- as developers have looked at it because -although the bicycle parking that's currently on the books now would not suggest it. When you look at the last -- it's several of the Special Permits that have come through, they more closely approximate what's in this proposal than what's currently on the books, and I think the fact that you're not hearing -- it's sort of more like the dog that doesn't bark, it's not -- in my experience most of the developers that I deal with aren't too shy about complaining about things
that don't work for them, and this is not one that I hear from anyone.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I'd like to
comment on that, too, Tom. I was just thinking over the last four architectural projects I've done and none of them have provided this level of accommodation. And three of them are in -- two of them are in suburban locations. And you would think that, you know, you're out in the suburbs, you've got plenty of land and that's not always the case. And you know my -- and so if you're trying to provide 1.6 cars per unit as the absolute minimum to make your project work and you have to provide, you have to then sort of take 10 percent of those more spaces to get bicycle parking in. If you've got to cover them, that would be a difficulty. But things are different here in Cambridge. And I mean we saw, for example, in CambridgePark Drive a case where a
developer converted automobile parking spaces into bicycle spaces because he didn't need them. There are those cases.

So another project was a tiny project in Somerville which was only at seven units. And, again, there was a garage for people who were formerly homeless who had a garage for six cars which was completely unnecessary, but it was to the project history kind of complicated. It had been a condominium that had failed to go forward, and then was purchased by Somerville Community Corporation and with a subsidy from 14 different people. We got seven units or eight units. So if you're realistic, you'd say no problem, we can get this, you know, this big garage. Nobody's gonna put a car in it. We're going to put a bicycle in it. If you're going to try to, there are quite a few more variances basically. What's the sensible thing to do? I mean, we're requiring one bicycle rack in
which we could not, it was not literally space to put a Cambridge-approved bicycle rack in the garage. We put up a rack, but I know anybody who wants to park a bicycle there will just park it, you know? And if 10 people want to park bikes there, and somebody will buy a rack so they can secure the bicycles to protect them.

Another example is we just did a renovation of Central House which is a single room occupancy residence for 128 people in the Y . I don't know how a single room occupancy is counted in these regulations. They may not be counted. I can tell you that planning 128 bicycle spaces in the $Y$ building would have been difficult. And, again, you could -- there are, there actually are quite a few bike racks out in front of the Y right now, and there's usually an empty space, so unlike many other facilities. So there are projects have their own -- and the fourth one
is I'm doing a huge project in Natick. We've had to take out 30 cars in the garage to provide bicycle parking, and that -- but like where are you going to ride your bicycle if you're living in Natick? You're not going to ride to work. You could ride across the street to the mall because I bet there aren't bike racks at the mall of any significant number. So -- and yet developers will have difficulties complying with these things. There will be special cases that will have discussions, but it seems like this is the right regulation for Cambridge.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Do you have something you wanted to say? I have one more comment?

CARA SEIDERMAN: I'm happy to say I had something that was specific to the developer discussions.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Go ahead.
CARA SEIDERMAN: So just to also
support what's been said, we -- and I pointed to Adam, too, often talk with developers about the bicycle parking. And we also have spent a lot of time talking with places around the country about what their experience has been. I think there's a lot of -- I'm sure you know this, there's a lot of background that goes into this. We just don't make it up. And there are a couple of things that are fairly consistent. One is pretty obvious. Almost everybody said is what people want to know is what are the standards? Give me the books that I can fit it in. So having some consistency was very much appreciated.

The other thing is that in places where -- that are similar to Cambridge where there's lots more people bicycling and there's policies to support bicycling and what not, that the developers would -- were sometimes even ahead of game and would be
providing more bicycle parking than was typically required before the regulations caught up because they were seeing that in the market. And I know that we're the ones that get the calls sometimes for people who are trying to retrofit the buildings because they didn't quite have enough. My tenants want us to have more bicycle parking and so how do we squeeze it in? And we try to work with them if we can in the existing buildings. So many of the developers are the same and we've been having continuing conversations. And I would say it's more about let's figure out what's the best way to do it rather than discussions about whether we should do it or the numbers. It's, like, okay we're going to do this, where is the best place to put it? And how do we configure it? And those are the discussions that have been going on.

And we've had discussions with the
institutions. And Harvard is actually -their own policy is about bicycle parking racks that they're choosing, and their standards are consistent with these in terms of bicycle configurations. And so that's what -- and I mean I'm happy to give you lots of examples of different things that have gone on, but I don't want to take time from your next point which is probably also important.

THOMAS ANNINGER: We11, I guess
where I am is I support this now, but I didn't when I first read these draft regulations, draft Ordinance Zoning proposals. I was a bit overwhelmed by it. And it seemed to me to be too much. It seemed over regulation. And my fear was that it would become the center of attention in all development proposals, and that when people came before Brian Murphy and the staff, all they would talk about is bicycle
parking and they would ignore what to me is the most important, which is urban planning and architecture and all those things that we spend a lot of time on. I think that would be a bad use of allocation of time. If you have an hour and a half or two hour meeting with a developer and you spend 90 minutes talking about bicycles, then I think you would be missing the point. But I've managed to come around to thinking that all this detail is just precisely to avoid that. And that because you have all of this specificity, you answer all those questions so that you don't have to talk about it. And that's what I hope is the outcome of everything that we have here.

CARA SEIDERMAN: I would say all we hope to --

THOMAS ANNINGER: And, therefore, I see everybody nodding and of course that's what you want to hear. But I have come to
believe that and I have been convinced by the latest memo and so on and hence I think this is a good thing, but it took me a while to get there.

CARA SEIDERMAN: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Pam.

PAMELA WINTERS: So, Tom, just to comment on your comments. I think in all the years that we've been on the Planning Board, there's been very little argument among developers in terms of the bicycle spaces and the number of bicycle spots. Sometimes they will, they will want the bicycle spaces to be in a different spot than we want them. But in terms of the numbers, I think that they, you know, it's something that they really want to put into their projects.

Do you agree with that?
THOMAS ANNINGER: We11, I think to a certain extent we're dealing with a new phenomenon. I think this is fairly recent.

To talk about all those years, bicycles were not really the issue until I don't know how recently, Cara, you probably go further back than I do in thinking about bikes for sure. But ten years ago we weren't talking about this.

AHMED NUR: Some of us were.
STUART DASH: You've seen projects with these new numbers actually come before you the last year or so. So, Jeff, you might add in . The last three or four projects actually had been responding to these new numbers because we asked them to and they've been agreeable to, so you guys have seen it play out before you.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. And I think you couldn't have put it better. If you were at the meetings that staff had with developers, we do spend -- but, you know, without these kinds of standards in place that developers can look at and see that
they're incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance. We spend in what I would, I don't if the rest would feel the same way but it, an inordinate amount of time trying to get the developers to understand what the standards are and then to do the extra work that's required to meet those standards. But ultimately when the -- by the time you see the project, that process has played out and they've found a way to meet those standards, and they've successfully been able to do it within the overall context of urban design and other considerations that the Planning Board takes into account.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I guess my last point is I do ask you to take aesthetics into account as you do this. The one project where I had some question about aesthetics was on CambridgePark Drive. There's a beautiful new building on the reservation side. I forget the name of the architect,
it's across the street from Richard
McKinnon's project. And I thought there were too many bikes in front and I thought it ruined an absolutely beautiful facade. Those are tough balancing issues, and I don't think any of that is easy, but I ask you to think hard about that as you think about all these other issues because they're complicated. Good job.

CARA SEIDERMAN: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, thank you. I agree with Tom that I think it's been a question of balance. And as you know, I've been critical about a lot of things throughout this, but I truly do appreciate all the work that everybody has done, and staff has done. And I -- especially the most recent memo which I think was terrific and really crystallized a lot of the issues and clarified a lot of the issues. Although I
would like to speak to somebody after the meeting about the numbers and the CVS mode1 which I can't get to work out which may simply may be my math. But, you know, I do think it's a question of balance and I do think it's a question of aesthetics. And actually for new construction and new development I really have no issues at all except some of the aesthetic issues that I think the number of bike racks that we're dealing with can detract from the facades of a lot of the buildings. And I think it's necessary for us to all to try to figure out a way to improve it aesthetically just as we try to improve car parking issues.

You know, especially now that we've, you know, gotten rid of the single, two, and three-family residential requirements. I think the balance has back to an acceptable position for me.

My main concern is really about
existing areas; the Harvard Square, the Central Square, the Inman Square, where I'm afraid of the proliferation of bike racks. And I've been spending weeks now staring at bike racks and looking at things and seeing how bikes are dealt with, and so I have a couple of questions about text.

And one thing that's popped into my mind, and I just wonder why, is there a reason why parking meters can't be used as bike racks? I mean, you know, if they had a circle on it, something like this. We already have parking meters all over the place, why can't they be used for bike parking too?

ADAM SHULMAN: Hi. Adam Shulman, Cambridge Traffic Department. So I can try to answer that, but one of the big issues is -- I think there's a bunch of issues, but one of them is that when bikes are locked to the meters, it makes it very, very difficult if
not almost impossible for the people who are collecting money from the meters to get the money out of the meters. So there's a problem with that. And there's also a problem with people getting access to the meters if there's bikes parked to the meters so it makes it not -- so it makes it difficult for people to get to the meters on top of just if it's parked to the meter, it's probably also not a good spot and it might be even blocking you access from the vehicles to the sidewalk. So it's just not a good, it's not good for managing the meters. It's not, you know, not good for safety. It's just not a desirable place, it shouldn't be at meters.

HUGH RUSSELL: Plus it if it gets too close to the street, people drive over the wheels and bend them.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, except that I see all these other --

PAMELA WINTERS: You get dents in
your car doors as well.
STEVEN WINTER: I was going to say you get damage to the cars, too.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I can understand all that, although I see all these other bike parking meters that are at the same place as the meters. There's a meter here and a meter here and there's, you know, an inverted $U$ right between them. So I don't, you know, the issues about getting access to the cars and being damaged seems to me it's the same issue. So I -- that's, you know, I just threw that out because, you know, I could argue all your points. You know, now they're using electronics to read the meters and all sorts of things. It just seems to me there's a proliferation of things in the tree launch and the sidewalks, and if we already have meters why can't we use them? But, you know, that's sort of an irrelevancy.

I do have some questions from me and I
really think the latest red line has clarified lots and lots of the issues.

I guess I just ask the -- the thing that I had probably the most trouble with is the long-term bicycle parking and how that really works. And I just ask if you'd look again at 6.104 .1 where it talks about long-term bike parking shal1 be provided within the building containing the use or uses that it is intended to serve, or within a structure whose pedestrian entrance is no more than within 200 feet. Because I just don't quite understand how that fits in with the following section on how short-term and long-term parking is working and also the public contributions.

Now in Section 6.104.2.b about public contribution, it says the city shall have the right to install bicycle parking on the sidewalk adjacent to the lot.

Doesn't the city have that right
already?
JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. But often I think it's just to -- that point is just to clarify that there are different options for providing short-term bike parking. If it's made the for public contribution, one, and probably what you consider the most conventional if it's serving that particular use, you put it on the sidewalk adjacent to that use. And then as you were saying, there might be alternate, as you mentioned in previous meetings, there may be alternate options where you create pooled parking in certain locations. The idea would be to give the city sort of maximum flexibility to do that. So it's really just a clarifying point. I know that there are, you know, there are some circumstances where property owners may -- despite the fact that the city does have the right to put them there, property owners sometimes might object. And
so part of that makes it clear that because it's meant to serve that particular use, that the city does have that option to make sure it's located in a place where it will serve that use.
H. THEODORE COHEN: But I assume, say, if the city wanted, you know, if we -using this building as an example, which you did, if somebody was required to put parking and the city decided to put it across the street, the city has the right to just put spots on in the sidewalk there, don't they?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, they do. And the point of the regulation is to provide flexibility. In fact, we talked about that a little bit since our last meeting and looked at the experience of Portland. And I know Cara's been in touch with people who work over there, and they've -- and they have a similar provision to provide that public contribution. And what they found was that
really that the best thing to do was to make the contribution contingent on the owner and then give the city maximum flexibility to, you know, to put it wherever they thought it was most appropriate.
H. THEODORE COHEN: A silly question probably, the wire wave racks unacceptable.

AHMED NUR: Nice.
CARA SEIDERMAN: I'm happy to share a picture that brings a thousand words because they don't work basically.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, great.

CARA SEIDERMAN: I'11 -- if you don't mind me, I'11 pull it out. You can ask the next question.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure, okay.

In Section 6.105.2 about bike lockers. Although bicycle lockers are allowed to store more than one bicycle for the purpose of meeting the requirements of 6.1 , a single bicycle locker may provide only one bicycle
parking space.
Why?
JEFF ROBERTS: We11, just the -- by the functioning of the way a bicycle locker functions, you put the bike in and you lock it and then you only have access to that, to that space. So from a functional perspective, a single person with a single bicycle, even if there's room, physical room to fit two bikes into a bike locker, unless it's an -- unless it's a household or a family or people who are sharing that space at the same time, only one person can practically use that locker at any given point in time. So someone couldn't bike park their bike in a bike locker. And even if there was more space, someone else couldn't come in and just and put their bike in next to it because the locker would be exclusive for use by that, by the first user.

PAMELA WINTERS: Unless they were
like a married couple or something like that, right?

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. If two people were coming together using it at the same time, then they could use that. And it would, it might be more convenient or it might save space, but from the perspective of a resident or a commuter or someone who is using that, those bicycle lockers, it wouldn't be practical to assume that multiple people could use that same locker.
H. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I guess that gets to the sort of the balance question and I see this proliferation of one-bike lockers someplace creating, you know, really an unappealing looking thing where there could be a larger shed or locker that could handle a half dozen bikes.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. And if within the -- if there is spacing within the locker to accommodate the -- to accommodate what's
described as the suitable racks, distance for racks and if the locker were accessible by multiple people, then that would, that would be appropriate. That that would meet the standards for a bike shed that then multiple people could use. And you could have multiple bike parking spaces within that.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So if we had a larger structure that people could then lock their individual bikes into something -JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- that would be an acceptable bike locker?

JEFF ROBERTS: Right.
CARA SEIDERMAN: So, what I have there are pictures of bike racks that are prolific including what we call radiator racks and wave racks, and these are -- I'm sure as some of you may have tried them or seen them, they don't support the bicycle horizontally unless you park it horizontally
which then you've taken up the entire rack. They actually don't support the bikes. They fall over. People don't use them. People misuse them. I know that many architects love them because of the aesthetics, and I have no argument with that. It's just pure functionality of them.

HUGH RUSSELL: The aesthetics before the bicycles arrive?

CARA SEIDERMAN: There are aesthetically pleasing racks that do work, and we do have -- in fact, in Kendall Square there are going to be some earth bike racks that are going to be installed soon that were part of the one percent for earth project. And so you'11 see some very interesting racks.

One thing I would just throw out there about the bike lockers is that what's very -what's interesting here is that I don't know of any place that's actually used them. It's
something that as you rightly identified does take up more space if you did it individually than some other things that are actually more practical, but it is a phenomenon that we want to permit but it's not chosen. I don't think we've seen any projects that have used them specifically.

HUGH RUSSELL: I don't know of any. CARA SEIDERMAN: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean it may not really be a bike lock. I'm not quite sure what it is. But down by South Station there is this large caged-in area where they have dozens of bikes. Now they also have two, you know, rows, and I don't understand how they get the bikes up to the higher level, but it seems like just this whole giant caged-in area is locked. And I imagine people walk their bikes to the individual lockers.

CARA SEIDERMAN: Right. So that
would be a cage. The locker -- if I could find another picture of that. It's basically like a box.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, yes. I think Jeff showed us pictures last time.

If we could go to 6.108.3 about findings and approval for Special Permits.

STEVEN WINTER: I'm sorry, what was the number again?

PAMELA WINTERS: So what?
H. THEODORE COHEN: 6.108.3, page 12
of 14 . I'm just somewhat troubled by the language that the Planning Board would have to make a finding that what is proposed is equal or superior to the bicycle parking that would be permissible under the regulations, because I think a lot of the times the Planning Board would be asked to issue a Special Permit because you couldn't really give something that was equal or superior to, and that we would be considering whether
something was good enough which gets down to in the subsection B, you know, the Board will determine the bike parking plan will satisfactorily serve the needs of the expected users. And I would be happier with some sort of satisfactory serve language rather than equal and superior to. It just seems it goes to the issue of why you would be rendering a Special Permit more appropriately.

STEVEN WINTER: It could be a very subjective term to define as well.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. But I think our having to define -- a future Planning Board equal to or superior to might be difficult under certain circumstances. Those were really my comments. I'm, you know, pretty content with things now and I appreciate, you know, everything you've done.

HUGH RUSSELL: So my favorite bike rack is owned by the Berkelee College of

Music but it's on Boylston Street just before you hit the Fenway. And it's my favorite bike rack because it's very close to Boston Conservatory where I bicycle with my husband frequently to go to concerts and things, and there's always space in it because it's not very well located to Berkelee.

One feature of this bike rack, I think it, the spacing is not great, but because there aren't, you know, it's not maxed out. You can sort of deal with the fact that in theory it could be congested and bad but it isn't, is the bikes are parallel to the sidewalk in a space is probably 15 feet between the sidewalk and the building. And then there's landscaping at both ends. And there are -- so there are two or three sets of bicycles with adequate maneuvering space. The parallel arrangement is actually -produces a more attractive installation because instead of seeing the ends of seven
bicycles, you see the side essentially of one bicycle or maybe you can see through it to the next one. It's, I mean, that's an option they picked I think because of the size of the space that they had and they're trying to maximize the number of bikes, but it actually looks better. And I think that's something that we can keep in mind.

## THOMAS ANNINGER: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: When people come to us, you know, to say have you thought about this? The other advantage is if the access is off of an aisle, you can actually do some screening in front. Could it be a wrought iron fence with a sign that says don't block your bike to it.

The other comment I would make is that I noticed today that there were a lot fewer bicyclists on the road. And I was thinking like why am I bicycling with a, you know, 15 mile an hour head wind at 20 degrees? And
the answer is that although it's more -- it's less comfortable than walking in those circumstances, it's so much quicker that your overall experience is decidedly better to, you know, spend six minutes -- where there's a little worse as opposed to 15 minutes where it's unpleasant. And also whether there's any kind of slush on the street, you're actually above the slush when you're on a bicycle. And if it's not too deep it's not a problem. Climate change will probably take care of this phenomenon. But this is sort of interaction between bicycling and climate change.

So someone raised their hand before. Steve and then Ahmed.

STEVEN WINTER: Just to concur with the comments of my colleagues, and also I think we are setting the bar high here. And I think that's great. It's terrific. We're in the position that we can do that here, so
we ought to do it, and clearly we have. I also think that these changes give us lots of options and I look it for that. It gives us lots of different ways to go. And I also think that we're going to learn a lot when we -- this becomes promulgated and we move forward. We're going to learn a whole lot about street furniture, about how people use them, about all kinds of things. So this is just a good to go.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.
AHMED NUR: Just a comment and a question because I see the end as time gets closer. And that is on figure 2-25 on page 2-36, this is a sample bicycle parking layout 1ot. I just wanted to know have you considered, Mr. Chairman, you can correct me if I'm wrong. I haven't seen a blueprint for -- the blue code for parking lots minimum is it, what is it, 19 by 9 or roughly around there?

HUGH RUSSELL: In Cambridge parking spaces can be eight and a half by 18.

AHMED NUR: Okay.
So according to this figure we could barely fit one, two, three -- two bicycles side to side and front and back. And I'm wondering, everything seemed to be okay. I like the 30 -- I like the 30,60 inches and the 48 -inch clearance off the wall, but front tire to the back tire of the next bicycle, 48-inch minimum that's at four feet, I wonder if that is -- thanks, Thomas.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Sorry.
AHMED NUR: That's okay.
I wonder if that would have been 36 inches would be better than at 48 inches I suppose? Have you, I mean just only to be fair to what Thomas brought up earlier which is the developers to look into in terms of parking space.

JEFF ROBERTS: We11, the standard in
the Zoning is that's recommended, we just -it's sort of described typically in feet is a five -- when you have the bike parking that's sort of turned 90 degrees turned in, is a five-foot standard, and that's been important especially in indoor bicycle facilities in order to, in order to maintain enough clearance in order to get bikes in and out. I can't say that just in terms of the scaling, and we talked about this at one of the previous meetings to think -- when you start to -- when you start to compare the auto parking with the bike parking under Cambridge's standards, you get to as high as I think 17 bike parking spaces fitting in, you know, for -- per every one auto parking space. And that's when you consider all the aisles, all the access, egress, when you compare the, when you compare one to the other. So we've kind of been using that as a general standard, is the amount of -- if you
want to think about the amount of space you should need to have a certain number of bike parking spaces, take the number of auto parking spaces and divide it by somewhere around 15.

AHMED NUR: Okay. Not according to this, that's why I looked at it.

STUART DASH: And if you look at -JEFF ROBERTS: We11, that's on1y showing I think just a small snapshot of it. When you look an entire facility, it scales differently.

AHMED NUR: Okay.
STUART DASH: And keep in mind if you imagine pulling your bike out in that situation, so that you're not -- as you're pulling your bike out just before you can turn your wheel to start to arc it, you don't want to be bumping into someone else's bike and rattling around like that. And that's what happens when you're too short a

## distance.

AHMED NUR: Okay, al1 set.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Are we ready to recommend this be filed as a Planning Board petition?

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.
AHMED NUR: Yes.
PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I say this, not allowing you to take under consideration the points that Ted has made, but this proposal that seems to be coherent, it's well thought out. There may be some tweaking that you will do before it comes back to us. So if so, is there a motion to that effect?

AHMED NUR: So moved.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
PAMELA WINTERS: Second.
HUGH RUSSELL: And second.
So any further discussion?
All those in favor of filing this?
(Raising hands).
HUGH RUSSELL: And al1 members voting in favor.

JEFF ROBERTS: And can I ask,
Mr. Chair, anything in particular that the Board would like communicated with that to the Council or should it just be a standard thing?

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I think it's important to let the Council know that the Bicycle Committee has been an active part of this. It's important to know that we've discussed this --

STEVEN WINTER: A number of times. HUGH RUSSELL: -- a number of times. And that this is really the, you know, it's like the tip of an iceberg. There's been an awful lot of ground work, an awful lot of thinking. I think that they, you know, the fact that these kinds of regulations have been tested against the development proposals
that have come forward against the PTDM plans that people make. And so this is -- and this way it's different than virtually any other kind of Ordinance that's -- that comes forward. They amount to what we've been working on. And when I say we, looking at the people who have been doing most of the work.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.
JEFF ROBERTS: Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

Is there anything more to come before us tonight? If not, then we are adjourned. Thank you very much.
(Whereupon, at 9:55 p.m., the
Planning Board Adjourned.)
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