

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, September 4, 2012

7:20 p.m.

in

Second Floor Meeting Room, 344 Broadway  
City Hall Annex -- McCusker Building  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Hugh Russell, Chair  
Thomas Anninger, Vice Chair  
H. Theodore Cohen, Member  
Steven Winter, Member

Community Development Staff:  
Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for  
Community Development

Susan Glazer  
Liza Paden  
Stuart Dash  
Jeff Roberts  
Iram Farooq

---

REPORTERS, INC.  
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD  
617. 786. 7783/617. 639. 0396  
www.reportersinc.com

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## I N D E X

### GENERAL BUSINESS

### PAGE

1. Board of Zoning Appeal Cases 3
2. Update, Brian Murphy,  
Assistant City Manager for Community  
Development 28
3. Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s)  
31
4. Kendall Square Study  
Continuing Discussion 31

## P R O C E E D I N G S

1  
2 HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening, I'm  
3 just going -- I can't open the meeting or  
4 convene it until the fourth person who is  
5 duly appointed to the Board shows up to sit  
6 at this side of the table. And I'm sorry  
7 that you're sitting there and just having a  
8 good time chatting. It may be better than  
9 what follows.

10 Unfortunately one of our members is in  
11 Africa -- well, maybe that's fortunate for  
12 him. And two members are sick, and we have  
13 two vacancies, so that's why there are three  
14 -- and the fourth one we hope is on the way.

15 (A short recess was taken.)

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This  
17 is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board.  
18 The first item on our agenda is the review of  
19 the Zoning Board of Appeal cases which I  
20 believe involves just previewing three  
21 cellular cases.

1                   ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA:    Good  
2                   evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board.  
3                   For the record, Ricardo Sousa on behalf of  
4                   the Applicants.

5                   First Applicant is T-Mobile U.S.A.    At  
6                   our last application before this Board, you  
7                   asked that we do more of a slide show  
8                   presentation relative to the modifications.  
9                   So what I'd like to do first is just start  
10                  off with the first site that's going to be  
11                  heard by the BZA on September 27th, which is  
12                  1221 Cambridge Street.    I've also provided  
13                  you with some hard copies of those photo sims  
14                  as well.    And if I could take a step back.  
15                  T-Mobile is in the process of modernizing  
16                  their network.    They are going to be  
17                  utilizing a new antenna called an air antenna  
18                  which provides much better propagation for  
19                  their signal.    In addition to that, allows  
20                  them a much better platform to service  
21                  customers both from a telephone perspective,

1 wireless telephone perspective but also data  
2 transmission perspective. These new air  
3 antennas are the same size as the existing  
4 antennas that are on their sites now.  
5 However, they are thicker. They are eight  
6 inches thicker instead of three and a half  
7 inches thick. The benefit, however, is that  
8 the remote radio units that you're seeing  
9 other carriers propose, which are these  
10 one-by-one boxes that are typically tied to a  
11 jumper and then to the antenna, are all  
12 consolidated within the antenna itself. So  
13 that allows for the antenna to be much more  
14 efficient and give a much better propagation,  
15 but from a design perspective it's much more  
16 consolidated. Everything is all in one unit  
17 versus an antenna and then a jumper and then  
18 RRH or an RRU.

19 And the first application that we have  
20 before us tonight is 1221 Cambridge Street.  
21 And so, currently T-Mobile has six panel

1 antennas that are located on this building.  
2 And they're located on the facade of the  
3 building itself. And so we have two antennas  
4 here, two antennas here, and two antennas  
5 here. And those facade-mounted antennas are  
6 going to simply be replaced with new air  
7 antennas that are also going to be  
8 facade-mounted on the same locations. And  
9 once again as I said, they're the same  
10 length, the same width, they're just thicker.

11 And in order to deal with the thickness  
12 of the antennas, what we're going to be doing  
13 is taking out any pole mounts. So typically  
14 many of these carriers operate whereby they  
15 have a bracket on the wall, then they have a  
16 pole and then they have the antenna attached  
17 to the pole. As over time, both the Planning  
18 Board and the BZA have suggested that the  
19 carriers find a way to remove those pole  
20 mounts and replace them with low profile  
21 brackets. So that's what we're doing here on

1 this site as well. And that brings the  
2 exposure of the back end of the antenna to  
3 the building itself much closer and will help  
4 accommodate and help with the design as well.

5 And so once again this is a close-up.  
6 This is the existing configuration. Once  
7 again the antennas are located here, here,  
8 and here. As you can see on the new, the  
9 proposed, they're in the same locations.

10 And as you can see here, this shows you  
11 essentially what the profile is. We're going  
12 to be about eight and a half inches off the  
13 wall with a low profile bracket.

14 And one more. And this is the typical  
15 pole mount. We're going to be essentially  
16 removing that pole which brings the back of  
17 the antenna much closer to the wall. And  
18 that's something, as I said, that's been  
19 recommended and that we're going to be doing  
20 a lot more regularly.

21 What I'd like to do, and you have hard

1           copies of these photo simulations, but as you  
2           can see here, we have -- these are the panel  
3           antennas that are located here. These are  
4           different views from which we took the  
5           photos. But this is the before and the  
6           after. Sorry, my computer's very sensitive  
7           here. So as you can see, that's before and  
8           then after. Same locations, they're just  
9           slightly further apart.

10                   THOMAS ANNINGER: One more time,  
11           please.

12                   ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And once  
13           again this is another view. This is the  
14           existing and this is proposed.

15                   And you can see them on the hard  
16           copies, that might actually come out a little  
17           slightly clearer.

18                   As you can see, they're essentially  
19           swapping out. In fact, under the new federal  
20           legislation, under the Tax Relief Act,  
21           Section 6409. We made a case to both city

1           solici tor' s office and also to the bui lding  
2           commi ssi oner, Mr. Ranj it Si nganayagam, that  
3           thi s type of modi fi cati on shoul d be al lowed  
4           by ri ght.   However, they both fel t strongl y  
5           that i t shoul d come back before the Board  
6           si nce you approved the appl i cati on i ni ti al l y  
7           and that you shoul d make a determi nati on as  
8           to whether or not i t' s acceptabl e.   So that' s  
9           why we' re here toni ght.

10                   HUGH RUSSELL:   Okay.

11                   ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA:   So that' s  
12           the nature of the appl i cati on here for 1221  
13           Cambri dge Street.

14                   HUGH RUSSELL:   So the bottom li ne i s  
15           we' re bei ng asked to approve somethi ng that  
16           wi ll have no vi sual change but wi ll work  
17           better.

18                   H. THEODORE COHEN:   Well , I j ust  
19           have a questi on about the --

20                   ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA:   Sure.

21           Photo si mul ati ons?

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

2 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Sure.

3 H. THEODORE COHEN: On the one that  
4 shows the Hess sign.

5 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: This one  
6 here, sure.

7 H. THEODORE COHEN: So the existing  
8 in the upper right-hand corner.

9 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right  
10 there.

11 H. THEODORE COHEN: On the other  
12 side.

13 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Here?

14 H. THEODORE COHEN: No, here.

15 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: There are  
16 no antennas here.

17 H. THEODORE COHEN: No, but right on  
18 the edge when you go to the proposed, the  
19 next one.

20 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes.

21 H. THEODORE COHEN: Now, is there

1 one being added there or it's just that  
2 because it's coming out eight inches, what we  
3 didn't see before we're now seeing?

4 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: It's  
5 actually -- what's happening is they're  
6 giving us a little bit better separation  
7 there.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: It's jumped a little  
9 bit to the left.

10 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes. I  
11 think it's done for structural reasons for  
12 the new antennas.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: It moves over closer  
14 to the corner and on that particular point of  
15 view on the other photo.

16 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: As you can  
17 see, they're slightly more separated.

18 HUGH RUSSELL: Do we have any  
19 comments we want to make on this to the  
20 Zoning Board?

21 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And,

1 Mr. Cohen, I can look into that issue more  
2 specifically. And if this Board recommends  
3 and insists that we maintain some separation  
4 between the edge of the antenna and the  
5 corner of the building, we will do so.

6 H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I actually  
7 think it looks better if it's not right on  
8 the corner.

9 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: It's a good point.

11 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Sure.

12 H. THEODORE COHEN: Is it possible  
13 to do that, I would certainly prefer that.

14 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: As long as  
15 there's no structural reason why we can't do  
16 that, then that's something we will  
17 absolutely accommodate.

18 H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean, I  
19 presume you did it before.

20 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes. The  
21 nature of these antennas is that they are

1 heavier than the existing ones because the  
2 RRUs are built into the antennas. So that  
3 might be the reason why they pushed it out.

4 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Go on to the  
5 next one?

6 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: So that's  
7 the first one.

8 The next site is Seven Huron Avenue,  
9 which is a substantial residential building  
10 here in Cambridge. And T-Mobile currently  
11 operates three panel antennas on this  
12 building, and we're replacing them with three  
13 new panel antennas, here, here and right  
14 here. And so the nature as you noticed -- as  
15 we talked about before, our panel antennas  
16 are located much lower down on the building  
17 here than you typically see. And that's a --  
18 the reasoning for that is that greater  
19 frequency -- from a radio frequency  
20 perspective, our spectrum requires that our  
21 antennas be at a lower level.



1 Oh, no that's proposed.

2 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: What's existing?

4 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Existing is  
5 right there. So again same location. As you  
6 see, existing is there and proposed is right  
7 there as well.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: The bigger box is not  
9 you?

10 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: The bigger  
11 box is another carrier. I'm not sure who  
12 that is to tell you the truth. It's not  
13 T-Mobile. This is existing, and this is  
14 proposed. As you can see, the low profile  
15 bracket does help from an exposure  
16 perspective. And once again this is another  
17 one, and we're going to be going essentially  
18 in the same locations. And these antennas  
19 once again are painted to match and  
20 facade-mounted.

21 This is another vantage point here and

1 here's another view. Once again the same  
2 locations that T-Mobile is currently  
3 operating.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: My recollection of  
5 when we saw this originally, we did not like  
6 the buildings added midway up the side, but  
7 somehow it was approved in spite of that and  
8 I can't say that this is making things any  
9 worse.

10 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, as I  
11 stated earlier, this is a really difficult  
12 location for the carriers. It's very  
13 residential in a sense that there are a lot  
14 of single-family homes in the area. We need  
15 to provide coverage there. There's a large  
16 area that doesn't have any buildings. It's a  
17 cemetery almost across the street. And so  
18 there are very few tall buildings that had  
19 any height from which we could propagate our  
20 signal. And so this is a location that was  
21 selected and it was deemed appropriate by, in

1 my memory, the BZA clearly. I don't remember  
2 the specific recommendation of this Board.  
3 But I think the -- losing the pole mounts and  
4 going to the low profile brackets will help  
5 from a streamline perspective.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: That's grey paint  
7 that's covering over what, a metallic  
8 material?

9 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: I believe  
10 it's a brick material.

11 THOMAS ANNINGER: Brick?

12 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, it's  
13 typically painted a mat single color.

14 HUGH RUSSELL: It's a grey-brown  
15 brick.

16 THOMAS ANNINGER: All right.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, on to the next?

18 LIZA PADEN: Are there any comments  
19 for that one?

20 HUGH RUSSELL: No, I guess not.

21 LIZA PADEN: Okay. Just checking.

1 Thank you.

2 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And just to  
3 switch gears on you, the next or the last  
4 application is by Sprint. Sprint has been  
5 before you a number of times. It's also  
6 upgrading its network to provide better 4G  
7 which is fourth generation wireless services,  
8 much higher speeds, much better bandwidth.  
9 In addition to that, much better telephone  
10 service as well. So it's upgrading its  
11 network once again to substitute some old  
12 antennas for new antennas.

13 Sprint's antennas are one foot longer  
14 than their current antennas, and they do  
15 utilize RRH's. And so on this building, this  
16 is once again an existing Sprint site. It's  
17 located right at the corner of essentially  
18 River Street and Mass. Ave. It's a tall  
19 building. And we are proposing to remove  
20 three existing CDMA antennas and replace them  
21 with three new multimode antennas which

1 operates on both the 800 and 1900 spectrum.  
2 Once again, voice and data services. And  
3 we're utilizing the facade of both the middle  
4 penthouse and the back of the building for  
5 our antennas. What I'd like to do is just  
6 turn to --

7 THOMAS ANNINGER: Is this the Holmes  
8 building?

9 HUGH RUSSELL: That's across the  
10 street.

11 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Across from  
12 the Weaver Bank section.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: It's the old 13-story  
14 high rise in Central Square.

15 THOMAS ANNINGER: Diagonally across?

16 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: I think  
17 it's best, Mr. Anninger, if I show you some  
18 photos first. That's the building  
19 itself.

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Okay.

21 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: And so as

1           you can see, we're utilizing this middle  
2           penthouse for our antennas. There's one  
3           antenna here. There's one antenna on the  
4           back, and there's -- this one is actually not  
5           visible because it's in the middle of the  
6           penthouse there, this tall penthouse. So  
7           that's where we currently have three existing  
8           Sprint CDMA antennas. We're going to take  
9           those out. And in the same locations we're  
10          going to replace them with new multimode  
11          antennas and then paint them to match.

12                    HUGH RUSSELL: And the moral of the  
13           story is if you have a more elaborate  
14           building, the antennas get less important.

15                    ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Right.

16                    And this site has been up and running  
17           for a while. There are a lot of wireless  
18           antenna installations in this neighborhood as  
19           you can well imagine. There's a carrier up  
20           here on the Leader building. There's the  
21           new, the new Short building here, down on

1 Mass. Ave. on the Starbucks building.  
2 There's a carrier up on that roof or the  
3 building next-door. And so this provides  
4 coverage for both T-Mobile and Sprint from  
5 this building.

6 THOMAS ANNINGER: All right.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

8 LIZA PADEN: No comment?

9 HUGH RUSSELL: No comments.

10 STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

12 STEVEN WINTER: I have a question  
13 for my colleague, Mr. Anninger. Do you feel  
14 that since we've been reviewing and providing  
15 feedback to the companies, do you feel that  
16 the placement of this equipment has become  
17 more appropriate?

18 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we are  
19 seeing a greater effort in design and  
20 camouflage. I think people are taking it  
21 more seriously. I was sad to hear that you

1 didn't want to come back and show us some  
2 change. That wasn't a good sign, but putting  
3 that aside, I do think there's been some  
4 improvement, but it's marginal.

5 STEVEN WINTER: I concur. And some  
6 improvement of course is better than none,  
7 but I concur.

8 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: You have to  
9 add there are very few sites that are, you  
10 know, eyesores in Cambridge I have to say.  
11 There are a lot of sites where we are  
12 utilizing both the scrutiny with the Planning  
13 Board and BZA forces us to make a better  
14 design. The removal of pipe mounts, facade  
15 mounting, getting closer to the wall, not  
16 only is there design scrutiny here but  
17 there's design scrutiny at the BZA as well.  
18 They read your recommendation but they also  
19 add their commentary as well. They don't  
20 allow us to do new ballast mounts for  
21 example. You know, clearly it would be much

1 easier for a carrier to simply put a sled up  
2 on the roof and put the antennas up on a  
3 sled. That's just not allowed in Cambridge.  
4 I do think the carriers are making an effort  
5 to get better.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: I think the other  
7 good news is that this round of replacing  
8 antennas with antennas that are almost the  
9 same size but are much more effective and  
10 have much higher ability to communicate  
11 rather than proliferating more antennas,  
12 that's a really good move.

13 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: That's a  
14 very good point, Mr. Chairman. Essentially  
15 what will happen is after these carriers turn  
16 on these new antennas, they go get a gain, a  
17 better gain from each site. Better  
18 propagation. And there may be a need for  
19 fewer sites at the 4G level. Now there may  
20 be later on a need for additional sites, but  
21 this prevents some sites from being built, it

1 really does.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: And that's kind of, I  
3 mean that makes sense to the carrier, but it  
4 also is good for us in that we don't want to  
5 see proliferation.

6 So thank you very much. I guess,  
7 Steve, this was your suggestion I believe  
8 that we review things on the screen, was it  
9 not?

10 STEVEN WINTER: No, I don't believe  
11 so.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Whose was it? Was it  
13 Ahmed?

14 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Yes, I  
15 believe it was.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: Well, too bad he  
17 isn't here for the rollout.

18 ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Next time.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: I believe it does  
20 help us as we're all looking at the same  
21 thing at the same time.

1                   ATTORNEY RICARDO SOUSA: Thank you,  
2                   Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members of the  
3                   Board.

4                   HUGH RUSSELL: So, the next item on  
5                   our agenda would be Brian's comments.

6                   LIZA PADEN: I have one BZA case  
7                   that is the sign for 1075, the bowling board  
8                   residential building. And the Planning Board  
9                   had made comments on the sign proposal which  
10                  I'll refresh your memory, is the numbers 1075  
11                  at the top of the building. And so the sign  
12                  fabricator asked if I would tell you their  
13                  reasons for requesting a hardship. I said I  
14                  would tell you, but I didn't know if it would  
15                  change your --

16                  HUGH RUSSELL: We commented saying  
17                  we didn't like it?

18                  LIZA PADEN: You didn't like it. It  
19                  wasn't -- no other buildings in Putnam Square  
20                  have this. You didn't think that they needed  
21                  it just because they're a residential

1           building, and that they should do something  
2           more in keeping with the rest of the square.

3                         STEVEN WINTER: I might add in  
4           keeping with the rest of the building.  
5           Because it is a charming building and we  
6           don't want to glop it up.

7                         LIZA PADEN: Okay.

8                         THOMAS ANNINGER: I just drove by it  
9           the other day and now that it has come  
10          together.

11                        LIZA PADEN: Yes.

12                        THOMAS ANNINGER: And all the pieces  
13          of the puzzle come together, it actually  
14          doesn't look bad at all. I -- and I do think  
15          that this strip is very prominent.

16                        LIZA PADEN: Yes.

17                        THOMAS ANNINGER: And it's the first  
18          thing you look at. You don't see the color  
19          of blue and green. You see the strip.

20                        LIZA PADEN: Yes.

21                        THOMAS ANNINGER: And, therefore,

1 one ought to be very careful on what one puts  
2 on such a prominent strip.

3 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

4 H. THEODORE COHEN: What was the  
5 rationale?

6 LIZA PADEN: Oh, the rationale --

7 H. THEODORE COHEN: You did say  
8 you'd tell us.

9 LIZA PADEN: Well, I said I'd ask if  
10 you wanted to hear it.

11 Because the first floor is 15 feet,  
12 this would only allow a sign to be five feet  
13 above the canopy because there's a 20-foot  
14 height limit to the height to the top of the  
15 sign. And then given the depth of the  
16 canopy, it would be difficult to see the sign  
17 unless it's placed higher on the building.  
18 And that the angle of the street approach and  
19 existing traffic lights make any sign that's  
20 in a conforming location on the building  
21 obscured by the traffic lights, and that the

1 vertical orientation of the building corner  
2 does not lend itself to a horizontal sign. I  
3 think the point is a horizontal sign would  
4 meet the 20-foot, that's why they want to do  
5 the vertical.

6 From a functional and aesthetic  
7 consideration, locating the sign near the top  
8 not only increases the visibility but  
9 accentuates the vertical corner exposure of  
10 the building.

11 Okay, no change in your opinion?

12 HUGH RUSSELL: No change in mine,  
13 no.

14 LIZA PADEN: Okay.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: All right, so then  
16 next is Brian. Would you like to --

17 BRIAN MURPHY: Okay. Preview coming  
18 attractions. Next week's meeting where  
19 there's public hearings on 54 Cedar Street,  
20 in-fill housing, and 165 CambridgePark Drive.  
21 And under general business there will be more

1           discuss ion on Kendal l Square as well as the  
2           BZA i tems i ncl udi ng 131 Harvard Street whi ch  
3           is the NBC si te.

4                     No meeti ngs i n September 18th or 25th.

5                     October 2nd there wi ll be a publ ic  
6           heari ng on the Nano Peti ti on as well as a  
7           publ ic heari ng for the pri vate way, off  
8           street parki ng peti ti on. And i t wi ll be the  
9           fi rst heari ng for Maj or Amendment on Pl anni ng  
10          Board Permi t No. 179, North Poi nt.

11                    On October 16th we' ll have re-fi led  
12          Trol ley Square as well as 51 Cedar Street, a  
13          second heari ng for North Poi nt, as well as  
14          desi gn revi ew for North Poi nt for the  
15          resi denti al bui ldi ng that they wi sh to do.  
16          And that' s what' s schedul ed for ri ght now.

17                    HUGH RUSSELL: Li za, have you gotten  
18          resi ponses on the suggesti on for repl aci ng the  
19          November 6th meeti ng wi th October 30th?

20                    LIZA PADEN: So for that suggesti on,  
21          there are four peopl e confi rmed that they can

1           come on October 30th. One person can  
2           possibly make it work, and I'm still waiting  
3           the answers on two other people.

4                   HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

5                   LIZA PADEN: But the two people that  
6           haven't answered are both the people who are  
7           sick. So they may --

8                   HUGH RUSSELL: They must be really  
9           sick if they can't respond to e-mail.

10                  LIZA PADEN: I'm just saying they  
11          may not feel the... I should know the  
12          answer to that by next week.

13                  HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

14                  H. THEODORE COHEN: So just in terms  
15          if there were an October 30th meeting, then  
16          there's just one meeting in November?

17                  HUGH RUSSELL: That's right.

18                  LIZA PADEN: Yes. We can't meet on  
19          Election Day both by state statute and this  
20          room used as a polling place so there's  
21          nowhere to go.

1 BRIAN MURPHY: November 20th would  
2 be the other one.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Any  
4 transcripts?

5 LIZA PADEN: The August 21st  
6 transcript came in and was certified.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Welcome a  
8 motion.

9 THOMAS ANNINGER: Motion to accept  
10 the minutes of that meeting.

11 STEVEN WINTER: Second.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Discussion?

13 All those in favor?

14 (Show of hands.)

15 HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in  
16 favor.

17 (Russell, Anninger, Cohen, Winter.)

18 HUGH RUSSELL: And I believe we're  
19 now on item No. 4 of the agenda which I am is  
20 going to start it off.

21 So you're going to give us some -- give

1 us a presentation that might be how long do  
2 you think? An hour?

3 IRAM FAROOQ: I'm hoping no more  
4 than 15 to 20 minutes.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

6 The vice chair suggests that I explain  
7 the background as to --

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: A little bit.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: A little bit.

10 -- and had he said that earlier, I  
11 would have prepared myself to do that. But  
12 we are in a place where we have a very  
13 important study that's been presented to us.  
14 We have had a landowner, MIT, present a  
15 petition and do a lot of work and have a lot  
16 of meetings. We have a neighborhood  
17 association, along with some others, having a  
18 study done. And we're trying now to  
19 integrate all of this. In the previous -- in  
20 the last ten years or so what's happened with  
21 studies is there's a study done by a

1 consultant, the department works very  
2 closely, there's an advisory committee, the  
3 results come up in a very nice, neat report  
4 that covers all the bases. There's  
5 guidelines, there's Zoning language, and we  
6 sit here and we say oh, yeah, uh-huh, yeah,  
7 yep, yep, yep, go ahead. And sometimes we'll  
8 say well, you know, there's little things.  
9 This is different because of the history and  
10 the complexity, and indeed the importance of  
11 this particular petition -- for this study.  
12 And so we've been struggling to figure out  
13 what we -- what our role should be as a  
14 Board, and how do we integrate these  
15 different pieces? And we believe that trying  
16 to do the all-encompassing planning report  
17 that gets everything laid out properly,  
18 neatly in order with all the possible Zoning  
19 ramifications for everything, is too big a  
20 task to bite off. We've got tremendous  
21 amount of -- you know, there's a tremendous

1 overlap between the studies MIT has done, the  
2 studies that Goody Clancy did with the  
3 advisory committee, and with the studies that  
4 CBT did with the East Cambridge Planning  
5 Team. So the basic principles are if not --  
6 we understand what we think -- I mean, we  
7 believe we understand the basic issues. And  
8 so I think what we want to do is go on and  
9 start digging into the actual Zoning petition  
10 in an orderly fashion and then we can use  
11 that both to advance Zoning and also to sort  
12 of check to make sure that the general  
13 principles are clearly enough stated. And  
14 the obvious one to start with is what could  
15 either be called the MIT petition or could be  
16 called PUD 4 which is the NACA terms.  
17 Because MIT as you can see by looking around  
18 this room, is, you know, anxious to move  
19 forward. And so whereas the other parts of  
20 the district don't have the same, you know,  
21 urgency or there's some -- a lot of

1 procedural questions that relate to the other  
2 parts of the district that need to get  
3 resolved.

4 So, that's why we're trying to sort of  
5 focus in on the portion of the district that  
6 is owned by MIT.

7 Is that what you wanted me to say?

8 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes, I thought  
9 that was excellent. I would just say and,  
10 therefore, we the -- a couple members of the  
11 Board, essentially the Chair, asked Brian and  
12 Iram and the staff to help kick off this  
13 discussion by giving us first a good  
14 grounding of what we call taking a page from  
15 the CDT report, existing conditions, and then  
16 outlining the vision that has come from  
17 various reports, essentially Goody Clancy,  
18 but others as well, which then would lay the  
19 groundwork so that MIT could then talk to us  
20 a little bit about how it sees its vision as  
21 fitting into what the studies have done and

1           what the existing conditions are so that we  
2           can have a good kickoff discussion. We don't  
3           intend on trying to conclude anything  
4           tonight, but we did want to get a good  
5           running start on what it is that we're  
6           talking about, and we thought that would be a  
7           good way to do it. And, therefore, I think  
8           we're ready to ask for Iram to begin.

9                        IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you very much.  
10           And I'm Iram Farooq, Community Development.

11                        The two things that you really asked us  
12           to do as staff were one, to talk about  
13           existing conditions. And two, to provide  
14           some sort of grounding on comparative  
15           analysis between CBT study and the Kendall  
16           Square Advisory Committee or which was the  
17           Goody Clancy study. So I'm going to start  
18           off with much of the stuff that we used early  
19           on in our planning process with the  
20           committee, with the Cambridge Square Advisory  
21           Committee. And this is a series of existing

1 series conditions maps. I'm not going to  
2 dwell on them because much of this is fairly  
3 self-explanatory. But it's something, if you  
4 feel like I'm rushing through, please stop me  
5 and I can elaborate further.

6 So here we have the land use map. And  
7 as you can see, just traditional land use  
8 colors. Not surprising to anybody right  
9 within the core of Kendall Square, primarily  
10 academic, which is the blue, and commercial  
11 which is the red. This is -- the large green  
12 is the Volpe Center which is the government  
13 -- owned by the U.S. Government and hence is  
14 in a category all of its own. But then there  
15 are these yellow sections which are the  
16 residential components. And, you know, we  
17 tend to focus a lot on the Third Street  
18 residential, but there does exist some  
19 residential right along Memorial Drive at  
20 MIT's 100 Memorial Drive. And then  
21 Worthington Place which is now owned by

1 Archstone. And then there's a series of  
2 residential developments along the  
3 riverfront. So, you know, actually more  
4 mixed than one would anticipate, but at the  
5 same time predominantly commercial. And the  
6 areas that show up as pink are actually  
7 industrial. Everything is toned down outside  
8 of the study area. So this purple is  
9 actually supposed to be the same color as  
10 this.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: So one minor question  
12 I have is how come Amgen is purple and Biogen  
13 is red? Don't they have the same kinds of  
14 things going on?

15 IRAM FAROOQ: Yes, we have used -- I  
16 should have mentioned that this caveat. A  
17 lot of this data comes from the City's  
18 assessing database. So we tend to use  
19 whatever classification they have ascribed to  
20 a particular parcel of land. This has not  
21 been thoroughly field checked.

1 BRIAN MURPHY: Although what they  
2 may have to with is certain of the life  
3 science companies get, for state tax  
4 purposes, become categorized as a  
5 manufacturer and that may be the distinction  
6 there. I'm not certain but it's possible.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. I mean, it may  
8 or may not -- I mean, the power plant is kind  
9 of what you would think of as industrial,  
10 maybe some of the other pink things might be  
11 industrial, too. Okay.

12 H. THEODORE COHEN: Just a question.  
13 Was Volpe always U-shaped like that?

14 IRAM FAROOQ: Well, this is 303  
15 Third Street or Third Square as they called  
16 it. This used to be owned by NStar before--  
17 or the previous utility company, and then was  
18 sold for residential development right around  
19 the time we did the ECaPs studies around  
20 maybe 2000.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: So it probably means

1 it was never part of the redevelopment  
2 district because of that utility ownership.

3 IRAM FAROOQ: Right.

4 You had asked us to provide a map of  
5 property ownership. And, again, you know,  
6 the interesting thing here is that when we  
7 look within our core study area, we find that  
8 there are large consolidated ownerships. MIT  
9 being the largest in blue here. This is  
10 mostly Boston Properties with, you know, with  
11 some components that are CRA. And then a  
12 little piece that's Biogen and Whitehead.  
13 Volpe again shows up big here. And then  
14 Cambridge Street Redevelopment -- Cambridge  
15 Research Park, thank you. Which used to be  
16 unified ownership, has now been off to -- as  
17 it's developed, has been broken up and is now  
18 the largest piece that is Biomed realty but  
19 then, you know, Watermark is owned by Twining  
20 and then there's Constellation. And then  
21 another NStar parcel that could, you know, we

1 like to think of as soft at least, and it's  
2 -- it remains to be seen how soft it is.

3 And then right adjacent to and just  
4 right outside of our study area is  
5 Alexandria, which we didn't delve into too  
6 deeply because it has been planned and  
7 permitted but clearly keeping in mind that  
8 there is a lot of capacity there that will be  
9 coming online in the not too distant future.

10 So here is a look then at the Zoning  
11 Map which again reflects the  
12 industrial/commercial past as well as present  
13 of this area. And the little numbers here  
14 are actually building heights, the existing  
15 building heights for each of the buildings.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: The Zoning heights,  
17 are those height to the highest place on the  
18 building?

19 IRAM FAROOQ: It's height to the  
20 highest place on the building. It's done  
21 using the digital ortho photos. So if it's

1 -- it has mechanical equipment, it shows up  
2 here.

3 HUGH RUSSELL: Right, but I mean,  
4 it's the highest, like, significant part if  
5 there's a --

6 IRAM FAROOQ: Right.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: -- a cooling tower,  
8 you don't pick that. It seems to me that's  
9 the right -- that's the most important  
10 information. What is it that these buildings  
11 appear to be.

12 IRAM FAROOQ: Right.

13 So the tallest thing, the tallest  
14 buildings are the green building, which  
15 should be somewhere around here. So it's 300  
16 plus feet. There's -- thank you, I'm so glad  
17 to have MIT here.

18 Eastgate which is 270. The courthouse  
19 which is upwards of 300. And then of course  
20 the Marriott which is 270.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: The numbers are

1 bigger than the building, so it's hard to  
2 see.

3 IRAM FAROOQ: Well, actually so that  
4 is an interesting piece of it, that, you  
5 know, you have the really tall buildings and  
6 they are actually quite slender in the  
7 current manifestation. And sort of if you  
8 want to look at the tall, large buildings,  
9 the best example is the Marriott parcel here.

10 Another view of that with the base  
11 information being the district height limits,  
12 and, again, another kind of, the interesting  
13 piece that I think of when I see -- look at  
14 this map is that for Cambridge Research Park  
15 and also University Park actually, the  
16 heights are not constant numbers. They  
17 are -- they represent -- they're represented  
18 by a range. And I think that's interesting  
19 because it allows, I think, both of those  
20 PUD's, those districts allow flexibility for  
21 development, but at the same time also

1 ensure -- have, through different mechanisms,  
2 ensure some variations so that you don't have  
3 all really tall buildings or all medium size.  
4 So, it keeps -- it keeps it less monotonous  
5 as well. Which I think we've all been  
6 thinking -- it's been on our minds as we  
7 think about the area where there's going to  
8 be a lot of large buildings.

9           This, I apologize for the blurriness of  
10 this map, but this is a historic resources  
11 map. We just wanted to make sure it was part  
12 of the picture since we've talked so much  
13 about this assemblage of historic buildings  
14 at the MIT Press Building, Rebecca's, and the  
15 MITCO building. But essentially all the  
16 yellow buildings are potentially significant  
17 resources for Cambridge Historical  
18 Commission. They haven't included all of the  
19 buildings that are 50 years or older in here,  
20 just the ones they thought were significant.  
21 And then the ones that have a dot are

1           potential landmarks. The red buildings like  
2           the Red Cross building here are actually  
3           existing designated landmarks.

4                   HUGH RUSSELL: And I see there's  
5           none -- the MIT campus doesn't have buildings  
6           designated although we imagine the Historical  
7           Commission likes them.

8                   IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. They also, to be  
9           fair, they also contained their look to  
10          within our study area. So I'm sure they  
11          would have more things spread there.

12                   So the next piece that ties with height  
13          is FAR. And this is the as-built FAR on each  
14          of these parcels. So the darker oranges are  
15          more built up, and the lighter oranges are  
16          less so. And, again, a lot of density close  
17          to the T and as I think is fairly clear. And  
18          then again -- this is kind of the -- one of  
19          the precursors to when you think about the  
20          soft site map. So the lighter colors are the  
21          first place you would look at when you're

1           trying to identify the soft side. Some of  
2           these -- actually like I said, this is early  
3           -- well, we should -- this should not have  
4           been -- this is no longer soft because you  
5           permitted that.

6                   HUGH RUSSELL: Tall er.

7                   IRAM FAROOQ: That's right.

8                   So this --

9                   HUGH RUSSELL: And there's also  
10           another anomaly which is the extension to the  
11           Broad which is --

12                   IRAM FAROOQ: That's right, yes.  
13           Right here.

14                   HUGH RUSSELL: Probably will have a  
15           very large number on it when it gets done.

16                   IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. We can actually  
17           try to put that number here.

18                   THOMAS ANNINGER: Where is that?

19                   HUGH RUSSELL: Right here.

20                   IRAM FAROOQ: Where it says eight.

21                   And again, all of Alexandria shows up

1 as light here but not for long.

2 HUGH RUSSELL: Because it's put in  
3 with a current development rather than the  
4 permitted development.

5 IRAM FAROOQ: Correct.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: The permitted  
7 development would bring it up to three or  
8 four?

9 IRAM FAROOQ: That's right.

10 So, these are again, early drawings  
11 that Goody Clancy did, so they show -- this  
12 is -- the purples here are actually a  
13 combination of things that are permitted, as  
14 well as things at the start of our process  
15 that were -- that people were interested in.  
16 And so MIT's proposed project shows up here  
17 from back in 2011. The All Asia block shows  
18 up as well as Novartis which was not at that  
19 time permitted. So if you look at this full  
20 spectrum of what exists right now on the  
21 ground as well as what's permitted, and

1 combined with it what people were talking  
2 about, most of which is still kind of in the  
3 works, when people are still thinking about I  
4 think similar numbers, then we're looking at  
5 roughly five million square feet planned and  
6 proposed for research and lab.

7           And then this is a similar look at  
8 housing. We have done this map earlier on.  
9 If you think about what is a residential that  
10 you could walk to from the core of Kendall  
11 Square. This is the quarter mile radius,  
12 five minutes, ten minute walk, half mile.  
13 And then for an intrepid walker, you might  
14 walk to North Point or you could certainly  
15 bike to North Point. So we've shown  
16 residential all the way up to there. And our  
17 total number here is -- I think I did the  
18 math somewhere, but right in the core we have  
19 about -- we have about a thousand units right  
20 within the quarter mile that are already  
21 either built or permitted. And then if you

1           Look at the half mile radius, we're looking  
2           at another 900 units. So that's about 2,000  
3           units in this circle. And another -- and the  
4           rest of them, which is about six or seven  
5           thousand totalling. The rest of it goes all  
6           the way up to North Point.

7                   HUGH RUSSELL: And how many units  
8           are there in the East Cambridge low rise  
9           residential neighborhood?

10                   IRAM FAROOQ: We did not do that  
11           number, but that would certainly add  
12           significantly to this even if you assumed  
13           that each one is a triple decker with a unit  
14           on each floor. We can --

15                   HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a population  
16           in the East Cambridge neighborhood that  
17           somebody has on the tip of their tongue?

18                   IRAM FAROOQ: I don't have it at the  
19           tip of my tongue.

20                   STUART DASH: I think it's between  
21           10 and 15 thousand. It's about 3,000, in

1 that ball park.

2 H. THEODORE COHEN: So are you  
3 saying in a comparable area say of the half  
4 mile, quarter mile, or the half mile where  
5 we're talking here about 1900 units in a  
6 comparable East Cambridge there might be  
7 3,000?

8 STUART DASH: No. I'm saying the  
9 East Cambridge neighborhood actually extends  
10 beyond that radius quite a bit.

11 IRAM FAROOQ: So here.

12 STUART DASH: Right.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: But that is a, if you  
14 will, you could draw a 10 minute circle and  
15 encompass all of East Cambridge.

16 STUART DASH: Right.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: From someplace that  
18 not only isn't the center of a circle but  
19 isn't a center of a place essentially.

20 STUART DASH: As with many people in  
21 East Cambridge just through surveys, people

1 from East Cambridge walk further than 10  
2 minutes to get to the T station.

3 BARBARA BROUSSARD: It's about 15 I  
4 can walk from Cambridge Street to Kendall.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And that  
6 would, that would -- but if you were to try  
7 to walk from Second Street to Eighth Street,  
8 it would take you --

9 BARBARA BROUSSARD: Seven to eight,  
10 ten minutes.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. So the existing  
12 neighborhood is maybe ten minutes' walk.

13 H. THEODORE COHEN: And that would  
14 be about 3,000 units.

15 STUART DASH: Yes, I think within  
16 that ballpark.

17 THOMAS ANNINGER: What is this 2,371  
18 round dot in the water north?

19 IRAM FAROOQ: This one?

20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Yes.

21 IRAM FAROOQ: That's North Point.

1 That's the residential that's permitted at  
2 North Point.

3 THOMAS ANNINGER: I see. That's the  
4 total expected at North Point?

5 IRAM FAROOQ: Correct.

6 HUGH RUSSELL: And then I guess  
7 there's another little piece which is how  
8 many residential units are there in the  
9 campus area that's Eastgate on this map, but  
10 there are also some dormitories. What's the  
11 number?

12 STEVE MARSH: Would you say 900?

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would.

14 JEFF ROBERTS: I would say about 600  
15 students.

16 HUGH RUSSELL: That's a significant  
17 number in terms of the people who are going  
18 to be looking at sometimes towards Kendall  
19 Square.

20 BRIAN MURPHY: Just to add a little  
21 bit in terms of looking at the city census

1 data. For 2010 the East Cambridge  
2 neighborhood was listed with a population of  
3 9234, and for housing stock it was listed at  
4 5938 units.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, right. Because  
6 it's not so different than the rest of the  
7 city with less than two people per dwelling  
8 unit. Historically there are many more. So  
9 it's more like 6,000 units in that circle.  
10 Well, 6,000 minus the ones that have been an  
11 identified source.

12 And, I ram, you're -- so you're -- if I  
13 look in this legend I see the yellow  
14 buildings are roughly 2,000 units. Purple  
15 buildings are 2500 units. 3500 units are  
16 mostly -- the hotel rooms, and then there's  
17 the 6,000 units, 9,000 people in East  
18 Cambridge and 600 students. So if you add  
19 all of that up, it's 20,000 people roughly?

20 IRAM FAROOQ: Everything  
21 (inaudible).

1                   STUART DASH: And in a way that's  
2 only going in one direction. If you go that  
3 far up in Central Square, you get another  
4 numbs of thousands.

5                   HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And so it's  
6 just....

7                   IRAM FAROOQ: So, yes, this actually  
8 zooms out to the extent to a little bit of  
9 what Stuart was alluding to. But this,  
10 again, we put down some of the -- in addition  
11 to housing, you know, the only new housing  
12 that's coming is the Watermark II. Within  
13 the core area there's of course the things  
14 that are permitted development along Bent  
15 Street and so forth within the core. But  
16 there is a lot of commercial development  
17 between Alexandria, Biogen, 610 Main --  
18 sorry, that's not 610. And Novartis and also  
19 the new -- I messed up, the new RND building  
20 at Cambridge Research Park.

21                   So, you know, there's a lot happening

1 both on the commercial and the residential  
2 front already, and this is all in the  
3 pipeline right now and will materialize over  
4 the next few years.

5 So then here's an attempt to do a soft  
6 site analysis. Everything that is in the  
7 orange is pipelined, so it's already  
8 happening. The greens are coming online.  
9 This should actually, this green -- this part  
10 should be colored green. But really the --  
11 within the study area, the key areas are the  
12 MIT, you know, the things that you see in the  
13 PUDs; the MIT, Volpe. A lot of in-fill sites  
14 in the CRSHA BP area, well, not a lot but  
15 there's some. And then small opportunities  
16 in the Cambridge Research Park area, and then  
17 of course all of Volpe. And then some  
18 opportunities as you go towards Central  
19 Square.

20 So that's -- that's not complete by any  
21 means. As I'm looking at it, I'm spotting a

1           few things that we left out on this because  
2           we've talked about having some of these  
3           buildings maybe grow taller as a potential  
4           opportunity as well, and that's not noted  
5           here.

6                        HUGH RUSSELL:   And presumably  
7           you're, again, there's no color on the MIT  
8           core campus, but within FAR of two and a  
9           permitted FAR of three --

10                      IRAM FAROOQ:   Right.

11                      HUGH RUSSELL:   -- there's FAR there  
12           even if they're on building sites.

13                      IRAM FAROOQ:   Correct.   And we'll  
14           get to those numbers shortly.

15                      But now to the two plans that we're  
16           looking at.   And you've seen this so much  
17           over the last few weeks that I'm not going to  
18           try to describe this at all.   So there's the  
19           Kendall Square Committee plan and the four  
20           PUDs that are proposed with the related  
21           increase in both height and floor area.   And

1 then there is the CBT plan, which has very  
2 similar philosophy, but the actual numbers  
3 are different with a greater emphasis towards  
4 housing. And instead of kind of the Zoning  
5 districts, the Zoning approach here is that  
6 of the smart block which essentially says to  
7 carry different uses together in a  
8 proportion -- in a fixed proportion as you go  
9 along with development in the area.

10 So we took a crack, and, Jeff, I might  
11 turn to you since Jeff is the author of this.  
12 Looking at all of the four PUDs as well as  
13 looking at then the sites outside of the  
14 study area that the CBT study had identified,  
15 and then, you know, these two lines are  
16 really just the totals of the area and the  
17 additional sites.

18 So the overall land area that we're  
19 looking at within the Kendall Square study  
20 area is about 3.8 million square feet and 5.8  
21 for the CBT's analysis. So an additional of

1           2 million or so outside of the study area  
2           that they've identified in the various sites.

3                     Here we've -- the first set of columns  
4           refer to what is already on the ground now,  
5           non-residential, residential, and then it  
6           pulls out a percentage residential since we  
7           know that was something that the Board was  
8           interested in knowing about. And then what's  
9           allowed, the maximum allowed. So these  
10          numbers actually are cumulative. They  
11          include what's existing on the ground right  
12          now. The next page we go out and pull out  
13          just the next year.

14                    So here the residential and then  
15          non-residential is evaluated based on hundred  
16          percent residential or a hundred percent  
17          non-residential. So you couldn't combine the  
18          two. So it wouldn't be 6 million square  
19          feet. It would be either 3 million  
20          non-residential or 3.3 residential in case 1.

21                    HUGH RUSSELL: So that's because

1           there' s di fferent densi ties because we' re  
2           trying to encourage peopl e to bui ld housi ng?

3                   IRAM FAROOQ:   Correct.

4                   HUGH RUSSELL:   And so if you look at  
5           the total bottom line, it' s 16 million to 20  
6           milli on.

7                   IRAM FAROOQ:   Yes.

8                   HUGH RUSSELL:   And we' re thi nki ng i t  
9           will be some -- we' re trying to get i t as  
10          resi denti al as i t can be.   That seems to be a  
11          goal the ci ty has and that East Cambri dge has  
12          for the di stri ct.

13                  This i s the chart I asked for, but I  
14          just qui te can' t get i t i nstantly.

15                  IRAM FAROOQ:   Wel l apol ogi ze.   We  
16          were worki ng unti l the very l ast mi nute so we  
17          coul dn' t send i t to you ahead of ti me.   So i f  
18          you have questi ons after the fact, we' re here  
19          of course.

20                  I thi nk i t' s most i nteresti ng i n, you  
21          know, you menti oned that a l ot of housi ng i s

1 a goal , but al so addi ti onal commerci al  
2 capaci ty is a goal wi thi n the study area, but  
3 I thi nk i t' s most i nteresti ng i n these  
4 sel ected si tes outsi de of the Kendal l Square  
5 study area because those were si tes that CBT  
6 had pi cked parti cul arly for thei r  
7 appropri ateness for resi denti al . And i n  
8 thei r proposa l , the maj ori ty of those are  
9 supposed to go resi denti al . So we shoul d  
10 maybe when we get to that poi nt i n our  
11 consi derati on, we shoul d l ook at what' s  
12 permi tted ri ght now. And there seems to be a  
13 pretty good di fferenti al or a pretty good  
14 i ncenti ve for resi denti al ri ght now, but i t' s  
15 not a requi rement.

16 So thi s i s the compani on. A pi ece  
17 whi ch actual ly j ust focuses on the net new  
18 devel opment i n each of these di stri cts  
19 permi tted under exi sti ng Zoni ng, under the K2  
20 pl an, and under the CBT pl an. And you can  
21 see that the overal l totals i n each case are

1           pretty -- well, actually, let me look at this  
2           line. Where it's three point -- I'm sorry,  
3           where it's -- this is -- it's hard to compare  
4           with existing because again this is either  
5           the 1.6 of commercial or 3.4 residential.  
6           But it's easier to compare these two. Where  
7           the total development here is to 5.7.

8                     UNI DENTIFIED MALE: 3.7?

9                     IRAM FAROOQ: 5.7.

10                    UNI DENTIFIED MALE: Oh, together?

11                    IRAM FAROOQ: Yes, together.

12                    And here, too, it's very close. It's a  
13                    smidge larger. About 53 percent of the CBT  
14                    proposal is supposed to be residential where  
15                    34 percent of the K2 proposal is mapped out  
16                    to be residential. So, again, just something  
17                    to think about.

18                    HUGH RUSSELL: In the very broadest  
19                    terms the CBT wanted a million square feet to  
20                    be housing that in the Goody Clancy was  
21                    commercial.

1           IRAM FAROOQ:  Something like that,  
2           yes.  Although their proposal also has most  
3           of the sites outside the area going  
4           residential.  So that was -- I wasn't  
5           counting that --

6           HUGH RUSSELL:  Yes.

7           IRAM FAROOQ:  -- in our totals.

8           HUGH RUSSELL:  I got the idea that  
9           if we're doing apples and apples, we have to  
10          go to the second green line from the bottom.

11          IRAM FAROOQ:  That's right, that's  
12          right.

13          HUGH RUSSELL:  But it also means  
14          that the selected sites outside could be  
15          applied to either one.

16          IRAM FAROOQ:  Absolutely.

17          HUGH RUSSELL:  To the extent that  
18          they make sense.

19          IRAM FAROOQ:  Right.

20                 So here then, I'll credit Mingi Kim,  
21                 our intern, who did something that we just

1 have not had the in-house capacity to do  
2 before, is to do these 3D visualizations,  
3 taking the Goody Clancy model and taking the  
4 CBT model. Essentially what we've done is  
5 tried to do as close to -- as close  
6 comparison as possible. So, what you'll --  
7 the yellow is the residential here, and the  
8 -- kind of this orange color is the -- is  
9 commercial. And the big difference, as you  
10 pointed out, Hugh, and this is now just  
11 zooming in just on the MIT PUD, PUD-4, is the  
12 big difference is residential where the CBT  
13 proposal calls for a residential tower south  
14 of Main Street.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: And that's thrown  
16 into question because it's on the site of two  
17 historic buildings that there now seems to be  
18 agreement, need to remain at least for the  
19 portions of them that are on Main Street.

20 IRAM FAROOQ: Right.

21 H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I --

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: So from a CBT point  
2 of view, they're looking for another site for  
3 that yellow tower.

4                   IRAM FAROOQ: Right. The one thing  
5 that we've tried to keep constant on both  
6 plans had reserved a large parcel here for  
7 future academic expansion. And when we did  
8 the math, it comes out to -- well, actually  
9 we'll get to that. Roughly 400,000 square  
10 feet which is half of the capacity that --  
11 the academic capacity that is being -- that  
12 was being reserved at MIT's previous plan.  
13 So we're assuming that the rest -- I mean,  
14 both plans are that the rest gets  
15 accommodated through in-fill means or  
16 redevelopment of some existing buildings.

17                   So just zooming in to look at the  
18 residential --

19                   H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I interrupt  
20 there?

21                   IRAM FAROOQ: Sorry.

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: Is there  
2 anything -- if you can go back to the  
3 previous slide?

4 IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

5 H. THEODORE COHEN: That's fine.  
6 Just two. That's great.

7 Is there anything, you know, if we were  
8 to say endorse the CBT concept of the amount  
9 of residential versus commercial or vice  
10 versa, the K2 plan, that says that we  
11 similarly have to, you know, endorse the same  
12 concept of building size and where the  
13 buildings are located? I mean, if you look  
14 at the K2 plan and you got the two red  
15 buildings, the two red towers on Main Street,  
16 when if we simply said they should be  
17 residential buildings?

18 IRAM FAROOQ: I guess, well, I mean  
19 you could certainly do that, but I --

20 HUGH RUSSELL: You could do that but  
21 the problem with that is that those are --

1           there are actually three buildings there with  
2           potentially significant floor plates that  
3           would be suitable for the -- in the science  
4           type of users. And the one principle that  
5           has -- and everybody kind of agrees with, is  
6           there are few places where you could do that  
7           and you have to take those places -- those  
8           opportunities, because there aren't very many  
9           of them. And one of the major goals is to  
10          create, you know, three or four million  
11          square feet of additional capacity.

12                    H. THEODORE COHEN: So the  
13          commercial versus residential dichotomy is  
14          driven by the floor plate sizes of the two  
15          types?

16                    HUGH RUSSELL: Well, as I understand  
17          the Goody Clancy approach was try to identify  
18          the sites that could only be used for housing  
19          and maximize those. Try to identify the  
20          sites that could be used for commercial  
21          development and, again, try to find out what

1 the limits are that you can do on those  
2 sites.

3 STUART DASH: And I just want to  
4 add, Hugh, and actually a step further than  
5 that, the Goody Clancy worked with us and  
6 with MIT to identify that site behind One  
7 Broadway which was originally commercial and  
8 MIT's first plans.

9 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

10 STUART DASH: And we pushed and  
11 pulled back and forth and said we'd like to  
12 see more housing. That could be commercial  
13 building. We thought that could be a housing  
14 site that that made sense in a number of  
15 different ways.

16 H. THEODORE COHEN: So sites that  
17 have been identified as only for housing is  
18 because they're too small for commercial?

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I think that's  
20 part of it. And the question I think that we  
21 have to address is, does that produce enough

1 housing? And you can -- as Stuart just  
2 mentioned, you know, there's been a  
3 significant change to MIT's thinking because  
4 there, as I understand it, this point not  
5 opposed. In fact, they started -- they  
6 presented us material this spring that showed  
7 how that Broad -- that Broad Canal site could  
8 be developed. So, you know, that's a big  
9 step.

10 My, you know -- and then there's the  
11 question of housing for who? Like, you know  
12 -- and I think the yellow towers here were  
13 thought of, these are commercial, residential  
14 towers that anybody can rent in. But in my  
15 opinion, if MIT builds housing for their  
16 affiliates, the goals of getting more housing  
17 in this district are met. So it might be  
18 easier to get MIT to build south of Main  
19 Street if they met that goal because there's  
20 internal -- people inside the institute that  
21 want more housing for grad students in the

1 area. But I think they can't take -- they  
2 can't pre-empt those three major sites. I  
3 think that's the bottom line. It's not going  
4 to work for them to do that.

5 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we need to  
6 wait for MIT to tell us that.

7 HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

8 H. THEODORE COHEN: And I'm not --

9 HUGH RUSSELL: That's just my  
10 opinion.

11 H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm not focusing  
12 particularly on MIT. I'm just trying to  
13 figure out if buildings are fungible between  
14 residential and commercial. And I guess the  
15 point is that some may be -- some sites may  
16 be, but not all sites are.

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And it's a  
18 very different question when you get to the  
19 DOT site where there's --

20 H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

21 HUGH RUSSELL: -- potentially no

1           building on that site, but anybody wants to  
2           keep it for the long-term. I know  
3           significant buildings, but maybe perhaps some  
4           smaller ones. But there it's a whole  
5           different kind of a question, and that was  
6           one of the significant differences between  
7           the East Cambridge CBT study and the Goody  
8           Clancy, was how much of that site was going  
9           to be used for housing.

10                   THOMAS ANNINGER: We should let her  
11           finish.

12                   HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, sorry.

13                   IRAM FAROOQ: One of the interesting  
14           things that comes from your question, Ted,  
15           also is that there is no cap for housing. So  
16           any of the GFA could be used for residential.  
17           And we haven't in this case proposed the  
18           differential that we've -- that we used in  
19           citywide and since, and in many areas, but we  
20           could consider that we could build in some  
21           sort of incentive so that if the market

1 changes, would it make it more attractive for  
2 a developer in this area to go commercial --  
3 for residential instead of commercial. And I  
4 expect the differential would have to be  
5 extremely high for it to be equivalent market  
6 wise, but it may be something that the Board  
7 might want to think about as we go forward.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, those of us  
9 who have been on the Board through University  
10 Park know that there was at least one parcel  
11 there that switched twice --

12 IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

13 HUGH RUSSELL: -- between housing  
14 and commercial because of the way the market  
15 was going at the time.

16 Also, I discovered in re-reading  
17 everything, that part of MIT's original  
18 proposal was that essentially all housing in  
19 their area was not counted as FAR. So that  
20 was the incentive. It didn't take away. You  
21 could build as much as you could build and

1 meet the other goals and criteria. That to  
2 me is not a bad idea. And perhaps not only  
3 for them.

4 IRAM FAROOQ: All right.

5 HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, it's more  
6 like a form base zoning. If you could meet  
7 the forms, then you could build as much  
8 housing as you need. I think the commercial  
9 development is limited by the transportation  
10 and network.

11 IRAM FAROOQ: All right.

12 So quickly, here's just looking at the  
13 numbers for that. In the K2 Goody Clancy  
14 analysis you have 200,000 square feet, give  
15 or take. And in the CBT analysis, just  
16 because the two buildings, you get closer to  
17 450,000 square feet. And then in terms of  
18 commercial, there is a million square feet  
19 proposed in the Kendall Square, in the  
20 committee's plan. And then 775,000 --  
21 776,000 in CBT's analysis.

1           The 800,000 square feet of academic  
2           capacity is reserved in both cases, and as  
3           you were alluding to, Hugh, the K2 plan  
4           preserves the historic assemblage of  
5           buildings where that is lost in this version  
6           of the CBT plan. But, you know, you said  
7           that they're looking for ultra locations. So  
8           maybe there will be something else that  
9           emerges.

10           The one other thing that you had asked  
11           us to do is to take a look at what happens if  
12           all -- if the building -- if the height limit  
13           in this district were to be 150,000 square  
14           feet. So we took a crack at doing that. And  
15           this red line denotes the 150,000. And  
16           essentially we've gone, you know, we've  
17           numbered each of the parcels, gone parcel by  
18           parcel, and said here's what will remain and  
19           here's the square footage above 150,000 that  
20           would be lost. So it would be about 275,000  
21           square feet. If we -- both of the plans

1           actually propose residential going up to  
2           300,000. But if we were to have the 150  
3           limit for residential, we would lose -- we  
4           would lose a large chunk of the residential  
5           in this plan because the lower few floors  
6           that -- to match up with the garage are  
7           actually commercial. So you would have very  
8           little residential remaining less than 60,000  
9           square feet.

10                   And then we did the same exercise for  
11           the CBT plan where the only things that get  
12           lopped off as the residential because they  
13           had proposed a commercial height limit to be  
14           150. So here in this instance you would lose  
15           240,000 of the residential square footage.

16                   And that is it for my presentation.  
17           Hopefully that gives you a good basis for the  
18           MIT discussion.

19                   HUGH RUSSELL: So if we just come  
20           back to the last couple of slides.

21                   IRAM FAROOQ: Okay.

1                   HUGH RUSSELL: The -- if you take --  
2                   so that has commercial development 776,000.

3                   IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

4                   HUGH RUSSELL: And all of those  
5                   buildings.

6                   And then if you go to the truncated  
7                   version of -- I'm trying to see whether the  
8                   truncated version has the same amount of  
9                   commercial development as the CBT plan. You  
10                  can't see it in the numbers, but it makes  
11                  sense.

12                  IRAM FAROOQ: It's very similar  
13                  because it's 1,000 minus 275, so that would  
14                  be 725 as opposed to 776. And I think that's  
15                  coming from the fact that we had proposed  
16                  limits to the floor plates by limiting  
17                  adjacent dimensions in the design guidelines,  
18                  so that the idea would be that the building  
19                  gets narrower as it proceeds upwards. So  
20                  that's why it's a little bit less.

21                  HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So --

1                   THOMAS ANNINGER: This is really  
2                   very well done. Exactly what I was hoping we  
3                   would get.

4                   IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you.

5                   THOMAS ANNINGER: Thank you.

6                   HUGH RUSSELL: Our important  
7                   question is, I think, is there's whatever it  
8                   is, 275,000 square feet above 150 feet and  
9                   that's pretty important to the desire of MIT  
10                  and the mission of creating 3 million or more  
11                  square feet. It's 10 percent of that. Can  
12                  that be done without impacts? And I would  
13                  say impacts primarily within the public  
14                  realm.

15                  If the spaces between the buildings are  
16                  a little dark and -- but Main Street -- one  
17                  of the things that this plan is showing is  
18                  that the historic buildings, that it  
19                  preserved the character. I remember some  
20                  earlier provisions, things that David showed  
21                  us, on site 4 the building actually chewed up

1           some of the hi stor i c bu i l di ng.   There was a  
2           30 feet or so of the old bu i l di ng l e f t and  
3           p u t t i n g u s c l o s e r t o M a i n S t r e e t.   I d o n ' t  
4           k n o w h o w w e a p p r o a c h t h a t a n s w e r b u t t h a t ' s  
5           t h e b i g q u e s t i o n.   T h a t ' s f o r t h e c o m m e r c i a l  
6           d e v e l o p m e n t, a n d t h e s i t e i s h o w d o y o u --  
7           c a n y o u p r e s e r v e y o u r o t h e r g o a l s a n d g e t  
8           t h a t e x t r a s q u a r e f o o t a g e.

9                     A l l r i g h t, w h a t ' s n e x t?

10                    T H O M A S A N N I N G E R:   I t h i n k i t ' s a  
11                    g r e a t t r a n s i t i o n f o r M I T.   A q u i c k b r e a k  
12                    m a y b e?

13                    S T U A R T D A S H:   A n d s e c o n d a r i l y I  
14                    m i g h t a d d, H u g h, i s t h a t t h i s i s s o r t o f  
15                    t o w a r d t h e n e x t s t e p i n t e r m s o f w h a t ' s e v e n  
16                    b r o a d e r c o n t e x t.   I f t h o s e s a m e r u l e s a p p l y  
17                    i n a l l t h e P U D s, w h e t h e r i t ' s t h e c u m u l a t i v e  
18                    f i e l d a n d d o e s t h e s a m e d e c i s i o n m a k i n g h o l d  
19                    t r u e f o r t h e b r o a d e r c o n t e x t w h i c h i s w h a t  
20                    w e ' r e a l l l o o k i n g a t.

21                    H U G H R U S S E L L:   Y e s.   I ' m -- t o m e,

1 the task of the PUDs is so different. Three  
2 is can you find someplace to -- extra places  
3 to put housing. That's the task. And the  
4 DOT is can this underused parcel be put to  
5 use at a mix of commercial housing,  
6 government, and open space?

7 STEVEN WINTER: And circulation.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. And  
9 circulation. And how do we, sitting here as  
10 planners, make the best case that would be  
11 most convincing to the Department of  
12 Transportation and the who right now has  
13 control of that land.

14 STEVEN WINTER: Right.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: And we have the  
16 Boston Property sites, and, again, it's  
17 pretty much like well, they have, you know,  
18 one, they don't have a lot of commercial  
19 opportunities because they've been pretty  
20 successful in doing what we've asked them to  
21 do. And then it's can you reasonably get

1 housing on top of parking garages or tear  
2 down portions. And can you get a company  
3 that has a history of 30 years of not wanting  
4 to build housing to change their tune?

5 I mean, it got close before the Broad  
6 made their mark. It brought a situation that  
7 they couldn't -- none of us could refuse, but  
8 I'm sure Mr. Manfredi has a drawing for us.

9 Do you want to take a break?

10 THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we should  
11 take an honest five-minute break.

12 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Just a  
13 functional break.

14 THOMAS ANNINGER: And then come  
15 back.

16 (A short recess was taken.)

17 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, let's get  
18 started again. So who's going to lead off?

19 STEVE MARCH: Hi, folks. I  
20 appreciate the opportunity to be here  
21 tonight. For the record, Steve Marsh from

1 MIT. And I'm joined by David Manfredi and my  
2 colleagues Michael Lowe and Sarah Gallagher  
3 are here as well.

4 So let me just start with first of all,  
5 we appreciate the opportunity to come here  
6 and share some of our thoughts on planning to  
7 date and to continue the dialogue on the  
8 efforts in Kendall Square, on the potential  
9 of revitalizing this important district. I  
10 think as you know, we're striving to align  
11 our interests. We've heard that loud and  
12 clear from the Planning Board, and I think in  
13 large measure we've been working incredibly  
14 diligently over the last several years with  
15 the city planning staff and the neighborhood.  
16 And I think we've made tremendous progress  
17 here. It occurs to me that one of the things  
18 that's really special about Cambridge is the  
19 fact that we, you know, celebrate this  
20 innovation culture and this innovation  
21 district that's in Kendall Square and, you

1 know, so much a driver of our success has  
2 been collaboration. And I think one of the  
3 things that we're seeing here, is the reason  
4 we're seeing some alignment occur here is  
5 because I think there's a fair amount of  
6 collaboration as occurring with all the  
7 parts. This is a complicated problem.  
8 Multidimensional. It's not just an urban  
9 planning problem. It's an economic problem.  
10 It's a logistics problem. And it's got a  
11 variety of challenges. And I think we're  
12 trying to understand all that. And as we've  
13 had the dialogue, I believe that the  
14 conversation has gotten a lot more robust and  
15 a lot better as we've proceeded here.

16 Let me just say that we're, you know,  
17 not in a position to provide a lot of the  
18 specific details on our Zoning petition. As  
19 we have not filed it yet. We're still doing  
20 some work on it. But the same is true that  
21 we have basically been working on this

1 project in various ways for the last two  
2 years, and I think we are in a position to at  
3 least be able to comments and give some  
4 insights on the constraints and opportunities  
5 in Kendall Square as we have faced them and  
6 realized them over time here.

7 We've done an incredible amount of work  
8 over the last year. We've been involved with  
9 a lot of the stakeholders. We've certainly  
10 had feedback from this Board, both general  
11 and in specific terms. And, likewise, with  
12 the neighborhood and with the planning  
13 studies that have been out there. They've  
14 all been very helpful in focusing all of our  
15 attention.

16 The good news is that both the Goody  
17 Clancy and the CBT studies focus on  
18 transit-oriented development. We think  
19 transit-oriented development with density at  
20 the T makes a whole lot of sense for Kendall  
21 Square. You know, that is a pretty

1 conventional approach to urban planning today  
2 and trying to get transportation  
3 infrastructure to support development. And  
4 we think that's just a good idea in general.

5 I think in large measure we know that  
6 Goody Clancy, and as well as CBT, looked at  
7 some of the broader area. We fundamentally  
8 recognize that, you know, our development  
9 proposals have really been, you know,  
10 principally on four surface parking lots.  
11 And so, you know, we know Goody Clancy is  
12 looking at a broader area, and CBT has  
13 studied the broader area, too. But we  
14 recognize that these four parking lots really  
15 have an opportunity to make a significant  
16 contribution to Kendall Square. We're not  
17 certain that they can resolve every issue in  
18 the history of Kendall Square and/or  
19 Cambridge in this district but we do know  
20 there's an important role that MIT can play  
21 in being able to, you know, orchestrate

1 development in this area to make a real  
2 difference to Kendall Square. And one that  
3 we think could happen in a fairly doable  
4 period of time that would be, I think,  
5 impactful in our mind, we were thinking that  
6 this would be something that would be capable  
7 of being done within a decade.

8 I think tonight we're prepared to give  
9 you some examples of both where we see  
10 alignment and see some challenges in each of  
11 the four major areas. We talked about things  
12 like commercial, housing, and open space and  
13 retail. And we think that by looking at some  
14 of these specifics, you know, it will help  
15 further align us in terms of education and  
16 understanding, again, opportunities and  
17 constraints. And also I think it will  
18 provide a foundation for a continued dialogue  
19 which I think obviously is a complicated  
20 project will require substantially more  
21 dialogue as we go along here.

1           I will tell you, I lied awake last  
2 night, as I usually do after a long weekend  
3 and getting ready for work again and start  
4 thinking about all these things that come up  
5 for this week. And, you know, I really came  
6 back with a real sense of optimism on this.  
7 I'm convinced more now than ever that this is  
8 the time for Kendall Square. I think we have  
9 a great opportunity to make a remarkable  
10 transformation. And I think we're very  
11 excited about that prospect. So we hope that  
12 you share some of that excitement around it.  
13 It is a difficult problem, but we are excited  
14 and willing to take the challenge on it.

15           You know, we looked at both Goody  
16 Clancy and CBT studies, spent a lot of time  
17 with both, and these are some of the concepts  
18 that came up. This is from CBT. And you can  
19 see ideas of things like the pearl necklace,  
20 and smart intensification in terms of their  
21 urban transit-oriented lingo. And a really

1 important concept here is make Kendall Square  
2 humane. I've heard that so many times: Make  
3 this about people first as we try to create a  
4 new public realm and a new place where people  
5 can gather and enjoy it.

6 I think if you look at -- the next  
7 slide, Michael. Just the Goody Clancy, very  
8 similar themes in here, where, you know,  
9 people talk about shape around people and  
10 make sure that people are connected socially  
11 as well as physically in this dimension. We've  
12 been reminded by the neighborhood over and  
13 over again about thinking about this from the  
14 street up and not just from the bidding down.  
15 And I think that's actually been a very, very  
16 strong lesson in here.

17 We started this looking at, you know,  
18 looking at injecting vitality into this area,  
19 too. So we were happy to see Goody Clancy  
20 looking at that as a goal. We did focus on,  
21 you know, growth and density around,

1 reasonable walks from the transit node which  
2 we thought made a lot of sense. And the  
3 opportunity to provide space that we think is  
4 necessary for the innovation cluster to  
5 continue to grow and prosper. But at the  
6 same time we recognize we want to create a  
7 lively square. The whole concept of  
8 destinations. And I think really we heard  
9 this over and over again. That it is  
10 important for us to connect to the  
11 neighborhood. We want to make a mixing bowl  
12 here and not an island. And really the  
13 thoughts and the creativity around how we  
14 connect to all these places has been very  
15 encouraging.

16 I thought it might be helpful for me  
17 and David to just maybe go through and touch  
18 on several themes. And frankly some of the  
19 issues that we're considering and  
20 investigating. There are things here that  
21 are still at a very high level planning

1 phase. And some of this, if you look at  
2 this, is purely urban planning. You have one  
3 dimension. As you start going down into  
4 feasibility and contractibility and a variety  
5 of other things. We have a fair amount of  
6 challenges that we're still wrestling with.

7 Let me start with housing because I  
8 think that's an important one. We heard this  
9 tonight. You know, I think since our initial  
10 petition, we started out basically thinking  
11 about this as an innovation space and retail  
12 and creating some lively public realm that  
13 was going to serve as a center for Kendall  
14 Square. We heard about the importance of  
15 housing from the neighbors, from the Planning  
16 Board, from the city. We've heard it through  
17 the Goody Clancy studies and the CBT studies.  
18 I think where we are, we heard this message  
19 loud and clear, and I stated it last time I  
20 was here and I'll state it again. That we  
21 intend to accommodate significant housing in

1 our petition. And we believe we'll be in  
2 line with Goody Clancy in that respect. We  
3 continue to focus on One Broadway at that  
4 site to add this housing, and we're looking  
5 at ways to maximize housing at this site. At  
6 the same time we'll have to implement all of  
7 this. And I think it was interesting to see  
8 some of the facts and figures that were up  
9 there about the supply and demand conditions  
10 that are present around the housing side.  
11 We're still investigating some of the demand  
12 for this. We're working with our consultants  
13 to try to understand housing demand and how  
14 it relates to the vibrancy to the retail.  
15 We're also looking, you know, anything we're  
16 considering in terms of housing in Kendall  
17 Square, there are a number of factors to  
18 consider. And I think Iram's slide of  
19 showing sort of existing slide and permanent  
20 housing in the district and thinking about  
21 the rates of absorption there are things

1 we'll need to wrestle with along the way in  
2 terms of viability here. I was, you know,  
3 looking at the housing numbers, and jotting  
4 down quickly it looked like there were about  
5 750 units around the area beyond what was  
6 being implemented. 2800 units in North  
7 Point. And we were looking beyond that in  
8 some of our housing stuff with, you know,  
9 things like Alewife having almost a thousand  
10 units coming online. And we haven't even  
11 looked at what happens at the other end of  
12 the Red Line as it goes to the other  
13 districts. So what feeds on the Red Line for  
14 housing that supports our supply and demand  
15 overall. And then there is the issue of the  
16 vibrancy.

17 So we heard housing on the -- on other  
18 front should include innovation housing.  
19 We've gotten request and insights on, you  
20 know, things about family housing and  
21 townhouses. And I would say that we're still

1 listening to all of those ideas. And we're  
2 looking to incorporate a variety and mix of  
3 uses in what we do. And we will be  
4 ultimately constrained again by certain  
5 physical parameters, but I think we're  
6 excited about trying to make a number in a  
7 variety of interesting housing options at One  
8 Broadway.

9 We also heard interest in housing that  
10 supports the MIT community. And I think  
11 frankly I'm gratified to hear that in one  
12 regard is that people in the community have  
13 really been worried and concerned that MIT is  
14 capable of meeting its mission. And that's a  
15 very useful thought globally here. As we  
16 shift to looking at Kendall Square itself, we  
17 were just trying to get some of those numbers  
18 down for you earlier. We think MIT houses  
19 approximately 900 people in student housing in  
20 the immediate area, and there about 260 units  
21 that are available at 100 Memorial Drive.

1 And actually in Iram's slide you have that as  
2 owned by I think Equitable. You have to  
3 change that slide. I think MIT owns the 100  
4 Memorial Drive site.

5 Interestingly, I was looking back,  
6 since 2001 -- I joined MIT in 2000. In 2001  
7 one of the first tasks I got from the  
8 president was to build new graduate housing.  
9 Simply specific, Michael and I we were  
10 charged with implementing that. You know,  
11 over that period of time 1300 units in new  
12 graduate beds were developed. Today we house  
13 about 41 percent of our graduate students,  
14 which is frankly a higher percent of graduate  
15 students than almost any other urban  
16 university in the country. I think Harvard  
17 stands at about 34 percent. Interestingly  
18 BU, BC, and Northeastern I believe are at  
19 zero. So we're proud of the fact that we're  
20 housing a large number of our graduate  
21 students. And I think we also recognize

1 globally at MIT that going forward we need to  
2 invest in renovating existing plant across  
3 our campus which is becoming a high priority,  
4 and that will no doubt include, you know,  
5 investments in existing housing to make sure  
6 we're maintaining the adequacy of our housing  
7 plant over time.

8 So we are always evaluating the needs  
9 of our graduate population. And I think in  
10 today, particularly with things like the  
11 federal budget challenges, there are still  
12 some large unknowns out there about the  
13 trajectory, the research, and what exactly  
14 strategically will await us in the future  
15 here.

16 Comments on faculty housing, just  
17 briefly, rather than, you know, build faculty  
18 housing and tell our faculty where to live,  
19 we've had a basically faculty housing  
20 assistance program where we provide them  
21 financial assistance. And I think about half

1 the faculty have taken advantage of that.  
2 And half the faculty have chosen to live in  
3 Cambridge which we think is a good thing.

4 Just shifting from the housing and we  
5 talked a little bit about open space. We  
6 think we're in alignment on the concepts of  
7 the pearl necklace throughout Kendall. The  
8 concept of a variety of parks, knitting  
9 together a community that we think is a  
10 really strong and compelling notion here.  
11 Clearly the specifics need to be worked out.  
12 There's a lot of the some of the stuff we  
13 talked about earlier is we've got to require  
14 the collaboration of the land owners and how  
15 we execute that. We talked about our  
16 interest in doing things in the Broad Canal,  
17 Point Park, Main Street, and the Infinite  
18 Corridor which we think are all areas that  
19 could be some vast improvements there.

20 Both Goody Clancy and CBT consider  
21 these public realm improvements as major

1 component of neighborhood mitigation. And we  
2 agree. We actually think that these public  
3 realm investments should be dedicated locally  
4 to where the project is having its impacts,  
5 and we think it should be for the enjoyment  
6 and benefit of the surrounding community and  
7 the broad constituents of Kendall Square.

8 If we talk really briefly about height  
9 and density, you know, we're in general  
10 alignment with Goody Clancy and CBT and  
11 density around the T stop. We have a variety  
12 of heights as do they. And I think we all  
13 believe in the power of proximity. This has  
14 become a really important concept to us about  
15 getting innovators and collaborators next to  
16 each other. And we think, again, there are  
17 limited opportunities to do that. And we are  
18 concerned about that in the long term as  
19 well.

20 I think, you know, there were  
21 discussions earlier about, you know, density

1 and what it means to the project. I think,  
2 you know, our ability frankly to invest in  
3 housing, the public realm, the retail, the  
4 open space, the ability to think about things  
5 like innovation housing and a variety of  
6 these will require the resources that will  
7 depend upon the commercial end of the  
8 enterprise to support it. We're struggling  
9 with there will be a variety of things that  
10 have become important to the City and other  
11 constituents in here such as the historic  
12 assets. Integrating them and renovating them  
13 are going to come at a huge price, and we  
14 want to make sure that we are doing something  
15 that holistically is going to get us the  
16 benefits collectively of providing that  
17 appropriate Main Street that people have been  
18 so focussed on.

19 So I think, again, from our  
20 perspective, we've looked at this as a  
21 holistic plan as we start to evolve this, and

1 I think you heard me say that it needs to be  
2 economically viable. We don't want to waste  
3 people's time in bringing something that  
4 isn't going to actually be able to be  
5 implemented over time. So I would hate for  
6 this to be the Fan Pier that, you know, 20  
7 years ago went back and, you know, was  
8 revisited several times. Or even North Point  
9 that came back again after a decade. So we  
10 want to make sure that what we're planning is  
11 actually doable and we can deliver on the  
12 multitude of benefits we think we can  
13 generate by doing this project in Kendall.

14 Academic flexibility is another point I  
15 just want to touch base on really quickly.  
16 And, again, this is an area where I'm  
17 gratified to hear this, because I think the  
18 neighbors and the city has been very  
19 interested in making sure that MIT is  
20 preserving its academic flexibility. And as  
21 you know, MIT can't always predict which

1 direction it is going in. And one of the  
2 things that we really value highly is the  
3 ability to have some flexible environments so  
4 that we can operate and respond to the latest  
5 changes. You know, in order for us to  
6 provide the educational and research benefits  
7 that sustain our mission, we do need  
8 flexibility in our envelope as we go forward.  
9 And we've heard that over and over again.  
10 So, I think we're very aligned on a couple of  
11 these key concepts. There are some  
12 challenges in here.

13           And what I'd like to do is have David  
14 Manfredi come up and walk through a variety  
15 of these. And, again, I think we're at a  
16 position where we do not have our petition in  
17 front of you yet, so we're unable to comment  
18 specifically on that, but we can give you  
19 some sense of some of the challenges that  
20 we're facing and how we're trying to balance  
21 them.

1                   DAVID MANFREDI: Good evening. I'm  
2           David Manfredi from Elkus, Manfredi  
3           Architects in Boston.

4                   As we've worked our way towards a new  
5           Zoning Petition, we've had the benefit of all  
6           of this activity and the contributions of CBT  
7           and Goody Clancy and meeting with the  
8           neighborhood and coming to you in formal  
9           session and having you share some of your  
10          thoughts. So all of this has shaped what we  
11          have been thinking about.

12                  You just saw this a minute ago. I  
13          didn't know that Iram was going to show this,  
14          but you can see that what's designated here  
15          in purple is really one of the four  
16          quadrants, and that is the subject of what  
17          will be the Zoning Petition. And on the  
18          right is the illustrative build out that was  
19          in the Community Development study that  
20          reflects the Goody Clancy work.

21                  I want to, again, hit -- oops, I'm just

1 going to go ahead. I want to hit some of the  
2 same topics that Steve hit, but with -- try  
3 to put it in the context of the studies that  
4 Goody Clancy and CBT have been doing. How we  
5 have reacted to that, and how we think about  
6 it, and where there is alignment.

7 And generally there is a great deal of  
8 alignment, I believe, as Steve said. And if  
9 you start with height and massing and  
10 setbacks, what has been proposed and what you  
11 have heard before the Planning Board is a  
12 form based Zoning formula in which height and  
13 massing is related. So that there are a  
14 series of steps that started 85 feet and  
15 which a full block of development would be  
16 allowable with maximum length and  
17 perpendicular dimensions. And then there's a  
18 step from 80 to 120 where the maximum floor  
19 plate would be 42,000. And 120 to 250 in  
20 which it would be 30,000. And above 250 only  
21 residential would be allowable. We

1 completely agree. We completely agree with  
2 the approach and the numbers. And I think  
3 that what's important here is -- and I know  
4 I've had this conversation with the Planning  
5 Board before, how the kind of proliferation  
6 of science and technology buildings in  
7 Kendall Square that you've had a concern  
8 about -- at times you've probably had a  
9 concern about height, but I know you've had a  
10 concern about bulk. And I think this is an  
11 approach that gets at accommodating the users  
12 where they really want it, meaning it on the  
13 lower floors, and getting buildings that can  
14 gracefully, more gracefully meet the sky and  
15 can create opportunity for better light and  
16 air to the ground.

17 Our previous proposal had a 250-foot  
18 height zone. It actually had three height  
19 zones. It had a 250 height zone along Main  
20 Street. It had an interior kind of triangle  
21 at 200 feet, and then along the river at 150

1 feet. It was never our intention and not our  
2 intention going forward that we would build  
3 each of these developable parcels to 250  
4 feet.

5 Goody Clancy shows 250 feet allowable  
6 and only above -- only a residential would be  
7 allowable above 250. And as I mentioned,  
8 CBT has a different plan in which there is  
9 150 feet for commercial uses and then 350  
10 feet for residential. And as was pointed out  
11 by the Planning Board, there's a couple of  
12 conflicts there.

13 One, the conflict with the existing  
14 buildings on the site. And also we believe  
15 just a kind of simple use conflict, meaning  
16 that the best location for residential is on  
17 One Broadway. And we believe that for a  
18 couple of reasons.

19 The development over the last few years  
20 of the whole Third Street corridor as both  
21 residential and active retail at the base.

1 The opportunity to really contribute to that.  
2 And the opportunity to do on that block a  
3 really significant mixed use building. And  
4 I'll come back to that in a moment.

5 It was pointed out very clearly in the  
6 slides that Iram produced that there's a  
7 significant delta in what's available between  
8 150 and 250 and we know that that's going to  
9 be an object of your consideration. It  
10 should be noted, and I think everybody got  
11 it, so I'm not going to dwell on it, but that  
12 the 350-foot building -- 300-foot building,  
13 I'm sorry, that was in the CBT plan was at  
14 the location of the MIT Press Building.  
15 We've worked as I think everybody knows with  
16 the Cambridge Historical Commission and with  
17 Charlie Sullivan and we've looked hard at the  
18 preservation of these buildings. And as we  
19 continue to look at them, and it was pointed  
20 out that some previous proposals, we kept  
21 part of the building or proposed keeping part

1 of the building, we are studying now hard  
2 basically keeping the entire building  
3 envelopes, which the significance of that --  
4 I think you got completely from the drawing  
5 that Iram showed, what it means is that new  
6 development is actually set back off of Main  
7 Street. It is set back off -- basically off  
8 by the dimension, the perpendicular dimension  
9 of those buildings. So new development on  
10 this site and on this site is actually set  
11 significantly back off the street. And the  
12 only building that really would front Main  
13 Street is what we would call parcel two. I  
14 think our numbers are a little different than  
15 CD's number. But you know the site of the  
16 current Cambridge Savings Bank building.

17 The streetscape, and what that means is  
18 that the streetscape basically remains the  
19 same but for that one building for a depth of  
20 approximately 70 to 80 feet in terms of how  
21 those buildings meet the street, the heights,

1 the apparent street wall along Main Street.  
2 So I think when you -- I know there's -- I  
3 know there's different points of view on the  
4 historic buildings, on the existing  
5 buildings. Meaning some people treasure them  
6 and some people don't. But the fact is that  
7 the preservation of them implies a setback  
8 that is very important to kind of a  
9 pedestrian quality of the street, and I think  
10 that's important to think about.

11 I know that you're also aware that both  
12 the Kendall Square, Kendall Inn building and  
13 the American Red Cross building, their owners  
14 have expressed concerns about new  
15 development, taller new development, adjacent  
16 to them. We are aware of that. We are  
17 keeping that in mind and will be part of the  
18 -- it will be a consideration that's part of  
19 our Zoning petition going forward. Meaning  
20 in terms of both physical setbacks from the  
21 building and setbacks from the views of the

1 street to preserve those buildings. We  
2 appreciate the importance of that.

3 And I think we are in alignment with  
4 both Goody Clancy and CBT on the size of the  
5 floor plates. We started out talking about I  
6 think almost a year ago about how these floor  
7 plates have grown, and how the -- there is a  
8 tremendous demand in the marketplace for  
9 bigger floor plates for what Eric Lander at  
10 the Broad calls these ballrooms of science.  
11 I think we've made a -- which is a term I  
12 love by the way. We made a proposal back  
13 then that we thought we could hold the upper  
14 floors to 25,000 square feet which were  
15 actually smaller than many buildings that  
16 were proposed in Kendall Square. And I think  
17 that's consistent with what you've heard from  
18 CBT and from Goody Clancy. There is a series  
19 of other topics that I know are going to be  
20 considerations as you move forward and  
21 evaluate a Zoning petition in front of you

1 and -- beginning with a mix of uses. And as  
2 I think everybody has said, everybody  
3 understands that the mix of uses, especially  
4 at this site, what this relationship to the T  
5 is absolutely fundamental to activation to  
6 24/7, 365 kind of activation to a diversity  
7 of stakeholders bringing different people  
8 here for a whole variety of different  
9 reasons. I think it's also relatively  
10 important to point out that integrating  
11 housing and science in the same building is  
12 extremely difficult and has really very  
13 little precedent. Certainly works on  
14 adjacent sites, but in the same building  
15 really has very little precedent. We frankly  
16 have studied it hard in a number of places  
17 and find more reasons not to do it than to do  
18 it.

19 Steve talked a lot about housing and  
20 I'll just repeat that we've identified -- I'm  
21 going to talk a little bit more about One

1 Broadway, but we've identified One Broadway,  
2 we think, as the most appropriate site for  
3 housing in this quadrant of Kendall Square  
4 for its relationship to Third Street, the  
5 activity -- recent development activity on  
6 Third, the opportunities to enliven the Broad  
7 Canal, Broad Canal Way, make that a better  
8 corridor to Broad Canal, make that a more  
9 active, secure, lively edge. And that is  
10 what we have been studying. And as part of  
11 that, the third part of that is innovation  
12 space. Goody Clancy has suggested that there  
13 would be a requirement for innovation space.  
14 I think we agree, I think MIT agrees that  
15 innovation space is important in the kind of  
16 continuum between incubator and full-fledged  
17 researcher for life science activity. There  
18 is a middle gap there, and innovation space  
19 can fill that. And it goes to one of the  
20 things that we think -- one part of what  
21 we've showed you before, that we're really

1 very excited about, and that's -- that's the  
2 development along Broad Canal Way, and the  
3 development along One Broadway. CBT talks  
4 about the smart blocks. And I think this is  
5 the epitome of smart blocks. You've seen  
6 this view before. You're looking back  
7 obviously from the kayaks back to Third along  
8 Broad Canal Way, and you can see a little bit  
9 of the existing building back there, but the  
10 opportunity to line the north side of the  
11 street with retail that wraps around the  
12 corner to create some significant green  
13 space, expand, allow the activity of the  
14 kayaks to expand, get residential above that  
15 retail, get some incubator space as kind of  
16 an in-fill, and then residential above, it  
17 really takes what's there, exploits it,  
18 expands it, integrates a number of uses in a  
19 way that I think gets right at the heart of  
20 what CBT was trying to get at, and enlivens  
21 the public realm; brings people to the river

1 in a way that really is -- has been started  
2 on the north side of the street, and MIT has  
3 the ability to really complete on the south  
4 side of the street.

5 If we go back to the aerial, I do want  
6 to talk just a little bit about open space  
7 and retail. Steve mentioned that there are a  
8 lot of assets in this whole precinct, but the  
9 heart of Kendall Square is wanting. And  
10 there has been just -- excellent vision has  
11 been articulated by a number of very good  
12 professionals here, and I think CBT's kind of  
13 clarity about a pearl necklace really gets  
14 right to the point; that the assets are  
15 there. We need to figure out how to tie them  
16 together in a way that they are more usable  
17 and more accessible. And we've shown you  
18 before -- and MIT can contribute to this both  
19 in places where they control the real estate  
20 and maybe where they influence the real  
21 estate. And we've shown you some thoughts

1 about Broad Canal Way, about the -- about  
2 Point Park and how Point Park can lead to  
3 Wadsworth which can lead to the river by kind  
4 of a redesign of Point Park that goes with  
5 the redesign of the intersection of Broadway  
6 and Main Street. And then the -- we think  
7 the very big idea of what we've at different  
8 times called the Infinite Corridor Park,  
9 which makes the connection between Carlton  
10 and Wadsworth that really is an invitation  
11 into the campus and the introduction of  
12 really usable open space that can be anchored  
13 by food trucks, by art, by activity, by all  
14 sorts of programs that MIT can bring to it.

15 I think that all of these are  
16 consistent with the kinds of recommendations  
17 of CBT and Goody Clancy in their study of the  
18 wider area. And we think that the best  
19 public spaces, the best publicly accessible  
20 spaces are the ones that are lining with  
21 activity. And MIT can contribute to that in

1 a whole variety of different kinds of ways.  
2 We've heard strong preference for retailers  
3 that are independent, meaning that they are  
4 special, indistinct. And I think you all  
5 know that we've been working with Jesse  
6 Barcon, who brings lots of fresh ideas to  
7 what this retail can be, that it's not just  
8 more food. It's not just more cafes that  
9 spill out on to sidewalks. It can be  
10 convenience. It could be food in different  
11 kinds of ways. Meaning the food you bring  
12 home in different kinds of ways, but it also  
13 can be soft goods and it can be hard goods  
14 and it can be a kind of destination that way  
15 in its own right.

16 And so I think that that's, again,  
17 you've heard a lot of talk of that from the  
18 other professionals involved. And I think we  
19 all support each other in that kind of vision  
20 for Main Street, specifically for Main  
21 Street, but also for these other nodes; the

1 node of Point Park. The node at MIT Press,  
2 Carlton, the T. And, again, as Steve said,  
3 if there's place anywhere for whatever the  
4 appropriate maximum density is, it clearly is  
5 around the T for a variety of different kinds  
6 of reasons.

7 And lastly, and probably the least  
8 glamorous, is transportation. And you have  
9 seen, and we actually did a sketch very early  
10 on of a reconfiguration of Main Street and  
11 Broadway that changed the hierarchy and  
12 re-aligned Main Street so that it was on a  
13 continuous axis with the Longfellow Bridge  
14 and Broadway tee'd into it. It was  
15 interesting to see CBT come back to it.  
16 There are a lot of merits to that, but there  
17 are a lot of issues. There are a lot of  
18 stakeholders. We know the city has studied  
19 it. And so we like a lot of the ideas there,  
20 we don't think that it's essential of making  
21 Kendall Square truly successful as the kind

1 of destination -- destination-oriented  
2 environment that we think it can and will be.

3           And lastly probably the most mundane of  
4 all is parking. Parking has been studied.  
5 There is in the Goody Clancy report and  
6 Community Development, specific ratios. And  
7 we're completely supportive of those ratios.  
8 Those are all ratios that reflect an  
9 environment that is dedicated to pedestrians  
10 to making Kendall Square more humane, to  
11 pushing those ratios down, and making a place  
12 that is more about -- that puts a -- creates  
13 a hierarchy where the people come before the  
14 cars.

15           And so you've seen this sketch before,  
16 and that is what this vision is all about.  
17 It is about pedestrians. It is about  
18 continuous activity. It is about making  
19 attraction, and bringing all of these  
20 different stakeholders together. And at the  
21 same time maintaining an appropriateness of

1           scale, buildings to street, and height of  
2           buildings to with that street.

3                   STEVE MARCH: Thanks, David. I'd just  
4           like to make a couple of closing remarks.  
5           Again, we appreciate the time here today, but  
6           you know, fundamentally I think we've said  
7           over and over, we want to revitalize Kendall  
8           Square. We think it's really important.  
9           And, you know, revitalization for us after  
10          we've gone through a myriad of conversations  
11          with stakeholders around here is, you know,  
12          creating a public realm that is attractive  
13          and connected and unified. It's been  
14          apparent that the preservations of the  
15          historic structures along Main Street is a  
16          goal that people want us to try to  
17          accomplish. And we recognize that that is a  
18          challenge that we didn't originally have in  
19          our planning. That the concept of some  
20          unique residential as we think about how we  
21          make some innovation housing in this place

1 and how we're going to attract local  
2 retailers and the notion of start-up  
3 entrepreneurial space in here. These are all  
4 very important goals. They're all, quite  
5 frankly, not cheap. And we've been  
6 struggling with the way to balance all of  
7 these. We think they are worthy. We've been  
8 convinced by people along the way that these  
9 are things that are appropriate tradeoffs to  
10 try to make it a special place which is what  
11 Kendall Square is to us.

12 I think we've said from the get-go that  
13 we embrace the transient-oriented mixed use  
14 development. We have come to make more focus  
15 on the housing because we've heard that loud  
16 and clear. And I think at the same time we  
17 recognize that we need to continue to make  
18 Kendall Square competitive in the innovation  
19 dynamic. The world is not stopping. It is  
20 moving quickly. There are competitors. And  
21 it may not be the only thing we need to be

1 concerned about because all the other things  
2 are equally important, but it is not a minor  
3 thing. It is a serious dynamic that I think  
4 Cambridge is facing and MIT faces as we try  
5 to get the best innovators in the world here.

6 At the end of the day this process has  
7 been strong. The amount of effort that the  
8 various stakeholders have put in, their  
9 effort and time and their energy has been  
10 incredible, and I think it's resulted in a  
11 tremendous alignment on many, many aspects of  
12 what we've talked about here today about  
13 Kendall Square. So I would say that we hope  
14 to be before you shortly with our petition  
15 where we could share more details around our  
16 vision and details around many of the  
17 concerns and questions you may want to drill  
18 down on. So we thank you for the time.

19 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

20 So should we respond?

21 So, let me say that the one thing I've

1 heard from MIT is that I think requires some  
2 shifting of thought is the phrase "When we  
3 file our petition." And I would hope that  
4 when the petition gets filed, it's our  
5 petition. And how that happens, whose name  
6 is on it, those are things that, you know, we  
7 get lawyers involved in, but I think -- so  
8 that's my goal is to -- that doesn't mean  
9 that the next step might not be for you to  
10 come back and say here's how we see the whole  
11 thing fitting together. But I think it's  
12 best for the city if what gets filed has a  
13 built-in constituency of everybody that's in  
14 this room that I think will produce, make it  
15 easy for the Council to do their job.

16 Now, I wanted to just mention three  
17 things: I wrote up -- I spent last weekend  
18 and this weekend trying to get my head in  
19 order and figuring out what the questions  
20 are, so I just want to -- I'm not going to go  
21 through my list of 15 items on the PUD KS4

1 but I want to talk about three of them. And  
2 they're actually not the most important  
3 things, but -- so, I'm very curious to know  
4 what is the sort of use strategy for the  
5 historic buildings because it doesn't appear  
6 to me that they're very suitable for  
7 conversion to housing because of the ratio --  
8 because of the floor plates. And they may or  
9 may not be too useful for people who are --  
10 for the biotech users. So, like -- I  
11 understand, I guess, Steve's office is  
12 actually there. The Institute uses the  
13 buildings now. Maybe that's the answer. But  
14 I'm curious.

15 And another item is that both of the  
16 Kendall -- both the CBT and the GCA, there  
17 was an in-fill building of relatively small  
18 size that was adjacent to the Eastgate tower  
19 but created street frontage on Main Street.  
20 And CBT felt that was really important, but I  
21 was surprised to find that it was actually in

1 a Goody Clancy diagram, too, because of the  
2 need to change the character of the  
3 intersection there and to, I think -- I  
4 thought that was one of the strongest points  
5 of CBT was saying that this is an important  
6 space. It's got to look like an important  
7 space, and it shouldn't be like a traffic  
8 intersection with a park in the middle. So  
9 calling it Point Park sort of grates on me  
10 now, because I don't think that's the right,  
11 right image for that space. It's also an  
12 opportunity -- you know, it doesn't have to  
13 be a terribly large building, and of course  
14 it doesn't want to get considered with  
15 respect to the new open space around the  
16 Sloan School and that -- I don't know what  
17 the I guess in the process of being converted  
18 from the back door to the front door of the  
19 Sloan School in people's minds, that that,  
20 that beautiful courtyard that was constructed  
21 and a handsome building, you know, needs --

1           how does it get connected? Does it get  
2           connected only through the infinite corridor  
3           green space back a block, or does it also --  
4           I mean, it is kind of strange. It has a  
5           place to play. But I think building a  
6           building there, which might logically have  
7           retail on the ground floor and maybe a  
8           limited amount of housing on the upper  
9           floors, can't be very thick without screwing  
10          up Eastgate and taking away some of the open  
11          space that the residents of Eastgate are  
12          using now. So think about that.

13                   And then the last point I want to  
14          mention is the point that you've been working  
15          on, and in some ways, you see it as the most  
16          important goals which is giving MIT an  
17          important face facing Main Street. And of  
18          course there are important buildings that  
19          have been built on Main Street, but it's -- I  
20          think it was the CBT plan that said okay,  
21          here's what happens at 77 Mass. Avenue. You

1 know? That looks like something. And how do  
2 you get something that looks like something  
3 when you get off the T that tells you where  
4 to go. And it's, you know, I mean, it's not  
5 like you build a big building with a pediment  
6 and a big dome on it there, because that's  
7 where'd you'd want to get it back, not MIT  
8 space in those two buildings or three  
9 buildings along Main Street. So how do you  
10 accomplish that?

11 There was the first notion of you  
12 create a -- I call it the Time Square  
13 approach. You know? A place that is vibrant  
14 and lively, technological, 21st century that  
15 people are just drawn to and are drawn  
16 through. Now Craig has been doing some  
17 thinking about that. I just -- I don't know  
18 how that's going to come out, but I think  
19 it's very important that that be as strong as  
20 possible, as inviting, you know, because  
21 there are other strong places in this

1           vi ci ni ty. And, you know, all of our di agrams  
2           are centered on the one -- on the western  
3           entrance of the T stati on where the mai n  
4           ki osks are. But there are whol e centers of  
5           focus in the square. Thi s has to be one  
6           that' s real ly strong that says the MIT  
7           connecti on center of Kendal l Square, that  
8           shoul d be absol utel y obvi ous. But so anyway,  
9           that' s -- how that gets devel oped is what  
10          comes to my mi nd. You know, it' s real ly  
11          i mportant.

12                   Those are the three points that I  
13          wanted to hi gh l ight.

14                   Steve.

15                   STEVEN WINTER: Thank you,  
16          Mr. Chai r. And I want to echo the comments  
17          that Steve March made about the feel ing  
18          posi ti ve, feel ing l i ke we' re goi ng i n the  
19          ri ght di recti on. I compl etel y concur. I  
20          feel that we are, and I thi nk that we need to  
21          cauti ousl y, and i n an adul t fashi on,

1 celebrate that. This is moving ahead nicely.  
2 We are doing good work here. So let's not  
3 forget about that.

4 I think that one of the comments that  
5 Steve made was that transit-oriented  
6 development is common to all our plans. And  
7 I think for me that's what I want to start  
8 looking at. What's common to all of our  
9 plans? What are the things that we really  
10 all embrace together? And I think there's a  
11 lot of that stuff that's going on. I think  
12 that for all of us, and I was really, really  
13 happy to see this in all of the MIT work, is  
14 that this is about an appropriate public  
15 realm. There's other things happening, yes,  
16 of course, and urban planning is just one,  
17 one part, one initial part of this vast  
18 economic and realities and things that are  
19 happening in the buildings and the  
20 development of the companies and the business  
21 innovation ecosystems, but the

1 appropriate -- if we're all saying the  
2 appropriate public realm must exist in order  
3 for this area to have its character that  
4 we're looking for, we can't go wrong. We're  
5 really going in the right direction.

6 I wanted to mention the Boston  
7 Architect's Expo that's coming up, has some  
8 really interesting stuff. I don't know how I  
9 feel about this, but one of the clips is on  
10 micro housing. Micro housing there could be  
11 some interesting and innovative ways to  
12 provide housing for young people that we need  
13 to look at and that maybe we can all begin to  
14 experiment within the same way that we're  
15 experimenting the workplaces and work spaces  
16 for the innovation ecosystem. We know we  
17 have to do that.

18 I want to echo the fact that research  
19 and development and the business of research  
20 and the business of development, we all have  
21 to keep that right up front. That's, that's

1 what Kendall Square's all about. That's  
2 what, that's what MIT's all about. That's  
3 the driver. That's what we want to really  
4 focus on and support that effort. We -- it's  
5 a significant piece of the whole project.  
6 And for us to say well, the streets have to  
7 look like this. Okay, I'm there. Or the  
8 buildings have to look like this. Okay, I'm  
9 there. Another piece of common ground that  
10 we have is what are we doing to support this  
11 in a business innovation ecosystem? Are all  
12 the things we're doing supporting that? And  
13 I think that's an important place to be.

14 David, you don't have to answer it now,  
15 but I wanted to know if you felt that there  
16 was a negative in design and in the -- what  
17 the street would feel like to setting back  
18 the buildings on Main Street and to leaving  
19 the three buildings that we want to preserve  
20 and want to keep? Are there tradeoffs?  
21 Maybe they're okay. Maybe the tradeoffs are

1 fine, but should we really be aware of the  
2 tradeoffs that we're making when we want that  
3 to happen?

4 People come before cars, and I think  
5 also that there's links we can continue to  
6 make as we go along. For instance,  
7 Dorchester Bay Economic Development  
8 Corporation is planning a new food --  
9 processing and food center at the Old Pearl  
10 Meats, Boston and Pearl Meats, one of the  
11 things they're planning is a station for food  
12 trucks where food trucks can come in and be  
13 serviced. They can be -- maybe all inspected  
14 at once. It's a support system for the food  
15 trucks. So we need to link that in to the  
16 activity of the food trucks here. So there's  
17 other -- there's ways we can support the  
18 effort by bringing in other efforts and other  
19 ways it can happen.

20 That's it, Mr. Chair, thank you.

21 THOMAS ANNINGER: I guess I want to

1 talk a little bit about process. I think  
2 this has been a very good start to what we  
3 were hoping to achieve tonight. And I think  
4 we've done it. I like very much what Hugh  
5 said about working toward our Zoning  
6 petition. We feel a certain pressure.  
7 There's a momentum on Kendall Square, and we  
8 have to keep that moving. We're going to  
9 schedule again with the staff our next  
10 meeting on Kendall Square. That next meeting  
11 ought to be scheduled at a time when you can  
12 take the next step, whether it's before or  
13 after your petition is filed, I don't know.  
14 Perhaps still before, but -- so that whatever  
15 we file can continue to fall under this  
16 concept that Hugh calls our petition. Our  
17 joint petition, but it ought to be at a time  
18 when you can now take each of those headings  
19 that you went through David and put some real  
20 meat to each of them. I understand that you  
21 weren't able to do that, but next time we

1 can't keep talking at this level. So it's  
2 really a question when would you be ready?  
3 When can we schedule the next meeting to  
4 achieve that next round of, I'll call it  
5 negotiati on.

6 I don't know who wants to answer that.  
7 It is a question.

8 STEVE MARCH: I guess I'm the person  
9 that answers that one. You know, I'm going  
10 to be honest. I think we're in a situation  
11 where we hope it's soon, but we still have  
12 work to do and we still have some alignment  
13 to do, and I want to make sure that is --  
14 just like I think Hugh's comments about  
15 making this our peti ti on collecti vel y, I  
16 think that's a great idea. I just have to  
17 make sure that we have all the key components  
18 of this which unfortunately this is easier to  
19 actually look at this peti ti on as a macro  
20 level than it is when we start drilling down  
21 to make sure it's feasi ble. And that's where

1 I'm going to be a little bit of stickler with  
2 my own team and my own crew to make sure that  
3 what we are doing can actually be done. I  
4 think we're close on a lot of that, Tom, and  
5 that we're hopeful that it's very soon. I'm  
6 also giving an opportunity to the new  
7 president to take his time to come around and  
8 make sure that he has, you know, a full  
9 understanding and has had the chance to give  
10 everyone a shot at, you know, we're doing the  
11 right thing here, we're all confident, and  
12 comfortable about that. And all of those I  
13 think will come together I think hopefully  
14 quite soon.

15 HUGH RUSSELL: I think my other  
16 comment is that the something that happened  
17 here, but there's also discussions and work  
18 that happens between all of you; the staff at  
19 MIT, the staff at the Department that's  
20 offline, and I think that's going to be  
21 continuing.

1           Did you have further comments that you  
2           wanted to make?

3           THOMAS ANNINGER: No. The one thing  
4           that didn't come up that we touched on last  
5           time and that I guess I don't want you to  
6           forget, is the animation and the significance  
7           of having a lively open space and a lively  
8           street space should come up in connection  
9           with the Koch building. And I don't want to  
10          belabor the point tonight, but you know  
11          that's been raised before and it will -- I  
12          mean, all the words that David used apply  
13          there, too. It's an open space that is not  
14          the standard that you talked about. It's a  
15          street line that doesn't meet the standard  
16          that you're talking about, and somehow we  
17          have to find a way to get there. And so we  
18          need to add that to the list of things to  
19          address. I don't know whether the Koch  
20          Building is within your --

21          HUGH RUSSELL: It's not within

1           ei ther boundary.

2                   THOMAS ANNINGER:   It's not wi thi n  
3           the boundari es, but I thi nk we're goi ng to  
4           al low oursel f to step out of the boundary for  
5           thi s one?

6                   HUGH RUSSELL:   It might be somethi ng  
7           whi ch wasn't covered by the Zoni ng, but  
8           there's a strategy i n place and, you know --  
9           and then there's my favori te bui l di ng whi ch I  
10          thi nk i s cal led Li st Hal l whi ch i s i n the  
11          boundary whi ch woul d be ni ce i f one coul d  
12          ni bbl e some retail out of the corner of that  
13          bui l di ng.

14                   THOMAS ANNINGER:   Is that 400 Ames?  
15          Is that one across from Legal ?

16                   STEVE MARCH:   Yes.

17                   THOMAS ANNINGER:   Is that 400 Mai n?

18                   UNI DENTI FI ED MALE:   Yes.

19                   HUGH RUSSELL:   And i t coul d be i n  
20          the l ong term that that bui l di ng -- I don't  
21          know what the l ong term future of that

1 building is. We have to wait for 20 years  
2 for that to happen, and maybe that's what  
3 will happen. But it is detail.

4 THOMAS ANNINGER: It actually has a  
5 lot of potential, that building, if you're  
6 willing to really think about it. I think it  
7 could be a great square, Legal on one side  
8 and opening you have Koch and 400 Main, I  
9 think it's got potential for a significant  
10 space.

11 HUGH RUSSELL: I'm also going to  
12 encourage people to come down and hang out  
13 between Koch and Stata which is a space  
14 that's significant in size, was not --  
15 landscaped in a -- it's not a really  
16 intensive way, and it's sort of something  
17 where more uses can start to grow into that  
18 space as a part of this process perhaps, and  
19 so -- I mean, I think we have to draw lines  
20 around what we're going to do for Zoning now.  
21 And maybe some of the goals we have don't get

1 realized in the Zoning proposal but they're  
2 still goals and they can be in the more  
3 general planning document.

4 Ted, did you want to comment?

5 H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have a  
6 very few comments. I concur with most  
7 everything that's been said, but just as an  
8 aside when we're talking Koch, I think  
9 actually the building is very successful in a  
10 lot of respects, and that we need to remember  
11 that it was a pretty unpleasant parking lot  
12 before and it has really created a very nice  
13 quad area inside with the Stata building and  
14 with some of the other buildings there. And,  
15 you know, while it has some flaws on Main  
16 Street that, you know, I think can be  
17 remedied over time, I think a lot of it  
18 turned out very well and does a lot of very  
19 good things for the area.

20 The other comment I really had was that  
21 the concept of One Broadway being residential

1 seems to me very appropriate, but if there  
2 are objections to it or questions about it, I  
3 would really like to hear that either from  
4 staff or from other parties as to why that  
5 doesn't work or shouldn't work. And that's  
6 not saying that if we did do that as  
7 residential, that's to the exclusion of other  
8 residential in the PUD, but it does seem to  
9 make sense to me for the reasons that were  
10 stated, that it's across Third and it's by  
11 the Watermark and it's on the Broad Canal and  
12 it just seems to me that it would be a good  
13 spot for that.

14 The only other thing I'd really, you  
15 know, like to mention is that, you know, I  
16 think the open space and, you know, the  
17 gathering spaces are important and that I  
18 think that MIT's had a history of some  
19 really, you know, very innovative buildings  
20 and spectacular architecture and I want to  
21 make sure that the Zoning that gets developed

1 is not going to inhibit that and will allow  
2 for, you know, creativity and, you know,  
3 because, you know, the school, the university  
4 really has an opportunity to, you know, to  
5 spend money on interesting buildings just  
6 because it can. And I would really like to  
7 promote that.

8 HUGH RUSSELL: Any more comments?

9 Does the staff want to make any  
10 comments at this time?

11 BRIAN MURPHY: I guess the one thing  
12 I'd say is that we do have this on our  
13 schedule for discussion next Monday and I  
14 don't know if Liza's around or not.

15 IRAM FAROOQ: Tuesday.

16 BRIAN MURPHY: I'm sorry, that's  
17 Tuesday the 11th. I don't know where that  
18 discussion is going to be given where we are.  
19 I don't know if we have to keep it on the  
20 schedule or not or whether we should  
21 consider --

1           IRAM FAROOQ: Well, one thing with  
2 regard to that is it there are a few other  
3 components that you've mentioned such as the  
4 character of Main Street, for instance, or  
5 some of the transportation pieces, and those  
6 are things regardless of where MIT ends up,  
7 they might -- the Board might want to know --  
8 we talked with the transportation staff and  
9 Sue Clippinger is going to be here next week  
10 and she would love a little bit of that time  
11 to talk about the work that's gone on with  
12 regards to those pieces.

13           BRIAN MURPHY: So perhaps it makes  
14 sense to focus on those sorts of non-MIT  
15 specific issues that are still out there but  
16 relevant and germane to the discussion in an  
17 interest to moving things forward while  
18 recognizing that as Tom said, that we're not  
19 going to need for time.

20           HUGH RUSSELL: Right. My guess is  
21 that we will be starting a discussion at

1 maybe ni ne p.m. and so there won' t be a lot  
2 of energy on thi s side of the table to dig  
3 too deepl y at that ti me.

4 Okay?

5 So thank you very much. We are  
6 adj ourned.

7 (Whereupon, at 10:00 p.m., the  
8 Pl anni ng Board Adj ourned. )

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS

2  
3 The original of the Errata Sheet has  
4 been delivered to Community Development  
5 Department.

6 When the Errata Sheet has been  
7 completed and signed, a copy thereof should  
8 be delivered to each party of record and the  
9 ORIGINAL delivered to Community Development  
10 Department, to whom the original transcript  
11 was delivered.

12  
13 INSTRUCTIONS

14 After reading this volume of the  
15 transcript, indicate any corrections or  
16 changes and the reasons therefor on the  
17 Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. DO  
18 NOT make marks or notations on the transcript  
19 volume itself.

20 REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE  
21 COMPLETED AND SIGNED ERRATA SHEET WHEN  
RECEIVED.



## C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
BRI STOL, SS.

I, Catherine Lawson Zelinski, a  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, the undersigned  
Notary Public, certify that:

I am not related to any of the parties  
in this matter by blood or marriage and that  
I am in no way interested in the outcome of  
this matter.

I further certify that the testimony  
hereinbefore set forth is a true and accurate  
transcription of my stenographic notes to the  
best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set  
my hand this 18th day of September 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Catherine L. Zelinski  
Notary Public  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License No. 147703

My Commission Expires:  
April 23, 2015

THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS  
TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION  
OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE  
DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE  
CERTIFYING REPORTER.