


## PROCEEDINGS

(Sitting Members: Hugh Russel1, H. Theodore Cohen, Thomas Anninger, Pamela Winters, Steven Winter.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board and I believe we have no Zoning Board of Appeal cases to discuss; is that correct?
LIZA PADEN: No, we don't.
HUGH RUSSELL: And do we have any meeting transcripts?
LIZA PADEN: No.
HUGH RUSSELL: So, Brian, would you like to give us your update?
BRIAN MURPHY: Sure. Just to give an update, the Planning Board is meeting again next week on the 19th, and that will be another sort of action-packed meeting. We've got one BZA case on antenna replacement on 300 Mount Auburn Street for Mount Auburn Hospital. Then we have a public hearing on

54R Cedar Street, and I believe that's scheduled for $7: 20$. And depending on what happens with that, we are therefore scheduling MIT for I believe $7: 30$ so that if -- we don't know whether Cedar Street will be going forward or not. But that way there shouldn't be too much of a gap. The MIT discussion will be a continuation of the discussion on the MIT Zoning that, you know, with the Board is a continuation of that hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have two or three meetings in March?

BRIAN MURPHY: I believe we'11 have three in March. And the events, just so the Board knows, the City Council on Monday night, wil1 be Forest City Petition to a second reading as amended. And so the earliest they could then discuss it and ordain it shows will be the 25th. In addition, the City Council has scheduled two

Ordinance Committee hearings to go into the MIT Petition. The first one is at the end of February, I believe it's the 26th. I'11 confirm that. And that's at 4:30. And that's going to be focused on built forum primarily. Yes, it's on February 26th, specifically to discuss built forum including FAR heights, floor plates, open space, and parking. And that's on Tuesday, the 26th at $4: 30$. And then again on Thursday, March 7th at $4: 30$ another public meeting to continue MIT, the discussion on the MIT Petition to discuss uses, incentive zoning, community funds, housing, and sustainability. So that's sort of a parallel process that's going on to the Planning Boards next week. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

So we have a series of items for discussion on Kendal1 and Central Square. Am I correct that the first piece is the housing?

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes, that's correct. We thought we would start with housing, followed by transportation. We then assume that the Board might want a short break and then go into design guidelines. Our general best guess was that perhaps 30 minutes or so on housing, 30 minutes or so on transportation, and then probably want to go around, you know, 90 minutes for design guidelines. Obviously if the Board wants to get deeper into any of these issues, if people are prepared to do that, we've got Chris Cotter and his team from the housing staff and Stuart, Roger, and Iram from the planning side to talk about the design guidelines and Susanne Rasmussen is here to talk about transportation and housing.

HUGH RUSSELL: So one member of the Board asked me three minutes ago well, what's the goal for us to achieve this evening? And I said, the ultimate goal for design
guidelines is to have a final document that the Board adopts as design guidelines. And that this is one -- the guidelines discussions is one step along the way. I think we all hope it's a step near the end of the way, but we will see. And I'm not quite sure how the housing and transportation discussions fit into that and fit into the MIT Zoning Petition.

Can you give us some --
BRIAN MURPHY: Sure, I'11 start and then members can jump in if they like. The general goal is to really to just provide the Board with a little bit more context in terms of analyzing some of these pieces. Obviously housing in general has been a very hot topic in the City for understandable reasons. You can't look anywhere without seeing stories of properties that are going for significantly more than they're assessed. We are a (inaudible) residential real estate market.

And that's one issue.
In addition, we've got the tensions that go on between competing uses in a city that's 6.2 square miles. I noted that I think it was a week ago Sunday, the piece on the boom on North Dakota. Slightly different circumstances. I believe that their density is something like 10 per square mile. So, you know, maybe roughly, you know, 62 people for the size of Cambridge. So it's a slightly different approach to density, but that's certainly not the case here in Cambridge. There are competing demands for uses, and so it's come up a lot in the Kendal1 Square and Central Square context. And we thought it would helpful to give the Board a little bit of a take the lens back a little bit and provide kind of an overview and introduction to some of the work that our housing division does and talk about affordable housing primarily, but I'11 touch
a little bit on some of the housing challenges in general.

On the transportation side of things, again, this has been an issue that's been very, very pronounced in terms of a lot of the discussions in Kendall Square and Central Square. There was an article in the Globe last summer talking about the effectiveness of PTDM which was in Kendal1 Square and how we've actually had less of a traffic impact as had been anticipated from some of the early planning studies. But thought it would sort of be helpful to go a little deeper for the Board in terms of some the work that was done by Susanne Rasmussen and her team and Sue Clippinger and her team in terms of some of the preparations on traffic for K2 and C2. Again, to give the Board a better sense and better context.

So I would say that while those are not directly related to the discussion the Board
will have next week with MIT, the hope is that it provides you with a little bit of background information going forward.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
STUART DASH: Stuart Dash, Community Development.

What we felt just briefly talk about, and for members of the Board of looking back, we sort of often in our planning work we look forward 20 years and we sort of look back a little bit, and the question came up at the last meeting concerning MIT, is what is the city looking -- how does the city look at housing and think about housing over time? And the question from the Board was could we sort of respond to it a little bit, to the questions of does the city try to do an overall planning look at housing. And certainly Hugh was there back in ' 92 when we worked on the original growth policy document, which was not the first place the
city thinks about housing. Anyone who was here during the rent control certainly can attest that's not the only time the city has talked about housing and thought about it very deeply. And that was a good sort of demarcation point for us where we very explicitly brought together members of the public and the Planning Board to talk about housing. And the clear goal and vision for the city at that time was that a strong housing supply and also a strong housing to support the diversity that people value so much in the city.

And in the citywide zoning that we then added a number of the Planning Board members to that. I think Tom was here and Pam was also here and I think Bill part of that, where we explicitly said that we really wanted to encourage the housing supply. And if the tune of the -- what is the first of many places where we may rebalance the FAR's
for housing and for commercial to put an incentive into place, a very strong incentive to increase the supply of housing. And what we've seen over the last dozen years is a very strong housing to supply increase and a shift of -- a positive shift in the jobs housing balance which was one of the things we talked about a lot through citywide which was if we're going to have this many jobs, we have a responsibility to have a reasonable amount of housing to serve the percentage of jobs that we have.

And then as we went through ECaPs, the Eastern Cambridge Planning Study and the Concord/Alewife Planning Study, we took that same approach of encouraging housing and putting in place incentives for housing and in the context of those specific planning areas for Eastern Cambridge and for the Concord/Alewife area.

At the same time the universities got
into the -- into playing with -- there was a 1991 university study where the universities committed to work very hard to sort of do better on housing their graduate students. And they increased their housing supply for graduate students by quite a bit over the last decade. What's often seen as, I think you've heard is a moving target which is how many graduate students they actually have from that period of time. So they peaked up to sort of 50 percent, which was their goal, and then fell back down as the supply of housing -- the graduate students increased. And I think that's something that certainly we realize is something that has to be, along with the housing supply in general, sort of talked about on a continuous basis.

The change in the workforce ratio, I think we think of is very important when we talk about the citywide in terms of also traffic and giving the opportunity for people
who work here to live here. And it's not to say that when you build housing near jobs, everyone's going to live near their job, but just that you give that opportunity, something that's important for traffic. And we've seen an increase in the number of percentage of people who work in Cambridge, living in Cambridge, and increase in the percentage of people who live in Cambridge walking to work and not taking cars to work, and all those things sort of add up to a positive influence for us.

What I'd like to ask is Chris Cotter to come up and talk briefly about the specifics of the housing policy, the day-to-day policy that he oversees and that we'd tried to give you some sense of in that document for the planning of housing in Cambridge. CHRIS COTTER: Thanks, Stuart. Good evening. I'm Chris Cotter, Director of Housing for the City of -- Community

Development. So you have in your packet a document that we prepared, just to give you a little background on the City's housing goals, objectives, and housing programs that are -- that we offer. So I oversee the housing division, so we administer the City's housing programs. I know many of you are aware of many of those programs. The one supplementary piece, I did hand out was an income, a chart of income limits which we'11 talk about going through. I just wanted to give you a picture of the housing market because I know some of the questions came up in light of the discussions that we've had with the Kendall and Central Committee, so just to give you a sense as to, you know, what the housing needs are now as we see them given the housing market. But just a little overview for all of you. So I would say that the housing division, we oversee the City's programs to preserve and create affordable
housing primarily for low and modern income residents we have. We do have programs that are available for middle income residents as wel1. We'11 talk about those a little bit. And some of the accomplishments and some of the current needs that we see on issues that we're dealing with. As I think, most of you know, we work very closely with the Affordable Housing Trust and staff that Board. We're fortunate to have Bi 11 as a member of the trust, and so we see him on a regular basis talking about the housing needs and what the trust can do to preserve some of the socioeconomic diversity and the low and moderate income assist the housing to low to moderate income residents.
(Wi11iam Tibbs seated.)
CHRIS COTTER: So just starting off to give folks a picture, because I know that we're talking about the Kendall/Central Study Committees. And we talked a lot about
housing affordability there. We talked a lot about a growing need or a growing gap between what the housing market costs are and what's affordable to certainly low and moderate income households, but also now increasingly middle income households. So in your write-up you' 11 see that our most recent analysis of the rental market looking at asking rents in the city, saw some dramatic increases. And frankly, we've been seeing some pretty significant increases over the last couple of years after several years in which rents were flat, maybe even went down a little bit, but depending on the timing of the survey, but we've seen a dramatic rebound and are now seeing rents approaching all time highs. So you'11 note there that the rent that we have in our survey for a three-bedroom unit, which is where we think would be some of the greatest affordability gaps are particularly for families and those
looking for larger units. We recently eclipsed \$3,000 a month for a three-bedroom unit. That's almost 3200. That's the first time we've seen anything that high for a three-bedroom unit, and that's up just over 20 percent in the last two years. So, you know, it's a pretty significant jump. And similar to jumps that we've seen in other unit sizes. Two bedrooms are now up as well, over 20 percent. We're seeing rents there approximately 2800. And to give you an idea of income needed to afford those rents, when you're talking about a three-bedroom unit at almost $\$ 3200$ a month, you need an income that's roughly 135 percent of the median income in order to be able to afford that paying 30 percent of your income. And I did hand out the income chart. These are figures that are set by HUD and become kind of the eligibility limits for housing programs. Generally speaking most housing programs are
-- limits are 80 percent of median. You see that there. And as I said, we do have some programs that stretch up beyond that. You see for HUD 80 percent of median which is the federal limit for a family of four, 67,000. We, and for the inclusionary program raise that to an actual number for this MSA, this statistical area as defined by HUD. To get to a slightly higher number, try to make that program serve a broader range of households, getting up, you know, into the middle income range. And then as I've said, we've got home buyer programs that are available for middle income households at this point earning up to 100 percent median. So right now we're able, through our current programs, to assist households earning -- four-person households earning up to $\$ 94,000$. And we do have units in the hard stock of restricted units that serve families earning up to 120 percent. You know, generally speaking, though, they
tend to be restricted to lower levels, 100 or 80, but we do have programs that will reach out to say 113 or so for a family of four. So as I said, rents are going up. We're now seeing -- beginning to see a rebound or an increase in sales prices for condominiums. We just took a look at the -all the data now that's in for 2012, and saw about a five percent increase in the median price of a condominium. And, again, this is a measure that we use that has been flat for the last few years. It's now up to about $\$ 445,000$ after being in the 420 range for, you know, at least the last three or four years. So, again, it's to us signalling a time where we're entering a period where we're seeing housing costs beginning to increase rather dramatically. And I said, with the rental you're seeing that for a couple of years and increasingly becoming an issue for higher income households than are
typically served through affordable housing programs. The programs that we work with as I said, generally capture 80 percent. It comes with the funding that's used for those programs up through the state or Federal Government, and for programs that have got, that don't have that type of a assistance but receive funding from a trust or support from the city. We have raised those limits where we can.

But as I said, we're seeing incomes in the, you know, certainly dramatic reduction in the amount of housing that's affordable to families at 100 percent median now. Same thing, a reduction in housing even at 120 and, you know, not surprisingly we remain a city of impossible opportunities for folks at 80 percent of the realm. Which is not new, that's always been the case, but what we are seeing new is that the gap is now stretching into the middle income range.

So, we talked with the Central Square Committee a lot about what we're seeing and what we're hearing. We heard a lot from them about their concerns about housing, particularly about middle income housing, family housing. Heard a lot of stories of folks who know people in the community who are leaving, who are forced out because they weren't able to find, you know, affordable larger units. So they're looking at opportunities in other cities and towns. It's consistent with what we see. As you know, we oversee the city stock of affordable ownership units. So we are seeing an increasing number of folks now moving out of the city, out of that program. Success stories really, but folks who would love to stay in Cambridge but don't have the options given, given what's available in the private market. I mentioned the rents for the three-bedroom units. We're seeing similar
things on the sales side. The median price for a condo at 45 is what we looked at for our most recent analysis, that is reflective of a stock that is predominantly one and two-bedroom units, smaller units. There aren't as many threes in that number. So when you look at adjusting that number for larger units, it becomes even more affordable. I just took a look this afternoon just to see, you know, for a family looking for a three-bedroom unit, what was on the market. I found 65 units of listings of units of three bedrooms or larger, two of which were under $\$ 600,000$. So, you know, well beyond what's affordable, for certainly low mod and getting into the middle income range.

So I wanted to give you that backdrop, because I know that questions came as to how this is related to the Kendal1/Central recommendations, and where we talked about
public benefits and that context of the housing, that came from the discussion was seen as a having the potential for one of those benefits, along with many other worthy things of course. The one difference is when we talked about middle income affordability, that they're not other avenues to produce that other than, you know, really city -sponsored city initiatives.

The funding that we use to develop and preserve affordable housing is generally capped out at 80 percent. You know, you might be able to fund a couple sources that will go a little higher than that, but not public funding that's available to subsidize folks in that income range. So, you know, we saw it as an opportunity really just to see could there be something that could be done through Zoning that might produce a small supply of units that might assist some of the these families looking for affordable
opportunities, albeit they earn more than the traditional programs would allow, to see what might work. So in some sense it is trying to see if we can leverage some of the benefits that might come through the Kendal1/Centra1 recommendations to try to expand up the programs to folks who are really caught between what the affordable programs serve and where the market is.

You've got a lot more information here.
I'm happy to answer questions about it. I can briefly run through some of the City's programs. I mentioned the trust. That's the I think the biggest thing we do, is work with the trust where the city allocates, has
allocated the majority of the Community Preservation Act funds to support the preservation and creation of affordable housing. We spend a lot of time doing that working with local non-profit housing agencies, private developers, and the

Cambridge Housing Authority to do that. I know you're all familiar with the Inclusionary Ordinance which has been around now coming up on 15 years, and it's been a fabulously successful in producing more than 466 units during that time and really it's been, you know, cited within a number of studies as a national model where we are able to serve such a diverse range of incomes through that program.

You know, the City's commitment to housing really is second to none that I'm aware of. The City Manager right on down to the City Council, you know, for many years has had housing as a top priority. We've been fortunate to have very good folks in the affordable housing trust administering and helping us make the decision that the housing policies, and the needs continue. The needs have changed and will continue to evolve, you know, as I said, the low and moderate income
families that we see as the primary mission remain priced out of the market. Restoring, preserving some of that economic diversity in the city remains a goal. And you know, the growing need for middle income housing is something that we want to continue to have conversations with you all, with the City Counci1, and with the Affordable Housing Trust to understand what the benefits of that type of program might be and what some of the policy considerations, tradeoffs might be. I should mention that we're looking at this at a time when we're seeing unprecedented cuts in funding for housing programs at the federal level which are filtering down. We're feeling them here in federal funds the city administers. I think we have seen more than 20 percent cut in CDBG funds in the last two or three years. Those are funds that fund programs that we administer for low and moderate income families around the city.

Funds a lot of our staff time. We've seen approximately a 40 percent cut, I believe, in the Home Program the Federal Home Program that used for housing production. So, you know, we would be severely limited. We're obviously very fortunate to have the CPA funds in Cambridge, and are able to continue doing the preservation and creation of housing with those funds allow.

Going forward, you know, so the declining resources will remain a challenge. We also are faced with the impacts of that and the end of restrictions on a lot of units that have been long-term affordable resources. There are more than 800 units, affordable rental units, that are facing expiring restrictions before 2020. And so that has been our top priority for the last couple of years. We're fortunate in preserving more than 270 in the last couple of years, but those 800 remain out there.

How to preserve those homes for 800 families in a time when we're seeing funds dwindle is a pressing challenge and one that we're working to prepare for. That said, we expect that we'11 see similar issues for the CHA, Cambridge Housing Authority, also facing federal cuts. We, the trust was involved in and we assisted the CHA with CPA funds that were used to revitalize the Lincoln Way Development which I believe you saw through the permitting process and also the Jackson Gardens Development. The Public Housing Act, while they weren't facing expiring affordability restrictions really were facing the end of their useful life. And CHA has other assets in similar states of capital needs that got a pretty long list of developments that need capital reinvestments and they're relying on funding that they get from HUD and the Federal Government to deal with a lot of that inventory. And as those
resources continue to dwindle, I expect that we'11 both be working with them to help them strategize and access resources to try to deal with some of the larger developments that they have out there.

Another thing that we've been talking about a lot recently is the needs of an aging population and the Silverware Commission that met for about a year to talk about the needs of the baby boomers as they enter retirement and with the, you know, how do you best support them with a variety of choices as they look at that housing options, aging in place, and retirement communities. We have been working obviously on other senior housing developments. We've preserved some of those developments that have been facing expiring use restrictions, so it's something that we're also spending a little time. I could go on but I don't know if you want to focus more on that.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think maybe it's time for us to ask questions if there are questions. I certainly have some questions. Iram.

IRAM FAROOQ: If I could add one tiny thing. So Stuart and Chris have painted this picture, and I just wanted to connect it to your early question from the last time we met about this, which is how does this connect to the recommendations for Kenda11 Square and Central Square? And the two big problems, really, if you think about it in the housing sense, one is the pool of parking -- the pool of housing. The overall pool of housing and the supply side and how much the need is and how does that match with the demand? And then the second piece of it is affordability. And so both the Kendall Square and Central Square Committees have tried in slightly different ways to address those two. Both committees had talked about
one, creating incentives for housing in a similar manner as Stuart described with an FAR differential, and also using height which is something that we've only done in a few instances in the city. But, you know, Alex Twining who is in the audience, tells us oftentimes how much more valuable housing is as you go higher up in the building. And so that becomes a big incentive when you think about housing. So both Kendal1 and Central Committees have talked about that as a significant incentive to increase the amount of housing.

And then the second related piece that both groups have talked about is a middle income affordability component which Chris has mentioned very limited funding sources that we can tap, so how can we leverage private development to give us some of those middle income in a -- units in a method that parallels maybe the affordable housing, I
mean the inclusionary housing program? It would be a much more modest component than inclusionary than the low mod component, but both committees have recommended that.

And then the second piece, the piece where it's different is that in Kendall Square we've also proposed minimum housing amounts in some of the PUD districts. Now I think the Board is having a discussion on what that number ought to be in each one, and you'11 get to discussion that when we get to the specific PUDs. But that is a principle that's laid out here, review settings PUD that in North Point.

And then finally -- well, I think with the middle income units there is also the emphasis on family units, family size units particularly in Central Square. And then the final component I would say is the workforce or innovation housing. So, on the opposite side of the family size units is the small
units for people who may not need a lot of space but are much more willing to sacrifice space for the privilege of being able to afford something close to work or, you know, in a desirable location where they need to be. And so particularly in Kendall Square, the committee has recommended making sure that we eliminate any barriers to building microunits or innovation units to target that need. So just wanted to make that connection.

Thanks.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I'd like to start by asking, you've given us sort of a narrative of -- and I'm, I'm very curious to know if you were to do it on a more sort of numerical grounds, what would it look like? And here's what I'm thinking:

There are 100,000 people in the city and there's a bunch of people who have enough assets so that they can move in the free
market without any trouble. And I don't know what proportion of the city that might be. And then there are a bunch of people who live in housing from the -- with the Housing Authority and the private buildings that have agreements to make them affordable. And so my question about sort of that, and that's a number, and there probably aren't too many other people in the city who are in the same economic situations for families because there aren't resources available. So in some sense that number of housing units kind of determines the number of people in that income bracket in the city. Although income is sort of if somebody's retired, they may not have enormous income but they may have other resources. So, you know, we've got a bunch of students, some of which come from enormously wealthy backgrounds in this country and in other countries. Many of them from other countries. That's -- I mean you
can't get here from many places unless you have those kinds of resources behind you. And so in a way sort of a characterization of the student population, because it's a part -- a significant part of the city, which ones, which part of our city that were students aren't able to deal with the market as it is? And then there's sort of the grounds between the people who have -- who market the serves and/or the ones that the subsidized housing serves, those are the people in the middle. And you've painted a picture of increasing stress. What sort of numerically is that, and how many of those people are sort of families and how many of those are, you know, one and two person living groups? I mean, I think in my neighborhood the average size of a family are a group living in a dwelling unit is 1.2. So we have 50,000 dwelling units in the city, 100,000 residents. So it's, you know, that's
an unusual distribution.
And then, to sort of give us just a very interesting comparison, how does the city's income distribution look against the state's income distribution? Because -- and I would guess it's more polarized in some ways. That we have fewer low income people in the city because we have only a finite resource of housing for them. And we probably have more wealthy people than many parts of the -- than in the average of the state because we've got people who are, you know, living here, working here. There are many really successful businesses. And even though we're not, you know, like a suburb that is full of horse farms and estates, still there are many people who are very well balanced out.

So if something that's more numerical but isn't, you know, isn't, you know, 30 categories or 100 categories, it's just a few
categories, that would help me understand better what it is. I don't know how it -whether it would make any difference to what I could do about it, but it would help me to understand it. And that's something you might bring back to us at some point in time. WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, can I -HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, go ahead, Bil1. WILLIAM TIBBS: I just want to add to that. One of the things we hear an awful lot is the BPA Committee, the public hearings, people come up, in addition to that list of people, it's those people who don't live in Cambridge but would have liked to live in Cambridge but had to move out of Cambridge because they can't afford to stay here. Maybe they're lifelong Cambridge residents. That's a hard number to kind of estimate.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's what I was trying to get at with the statewide
comparison. But I think it's more, you're putting that -- that's a better focus to ask that question.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Could I add one -- and when you're looking at these numbers, I also would be interested if you could get some information about the number of school-aged children, public -- K through 12 aged children and how they fit within the different categories that you would be looking at.

HUGH RUSSELL: Steve.
STEVEN WINTER: I just wanted to ask Chris briefly how do we -- in fact, how do we preserve expiring use? What's the way that we do that? And positing the question so that we can all understand it, is there anything that any others of us can do to help the process? I honestly don't know how we do that.

CHRIS COTTER: That's a very good
question, and there are a variety of ways we do it, really it involves a lot of different partnerships. You know, we have been fortunate to work with committed tenants who've wanted to keep their buildings affordable for future generations, owners who have been willing to work with us rather than letting their buildings expire and take into market and realize the profits that they made in taking to market. And we've had resources available through the trust and other public funders and private partners to do that. There's a strong housing advocacy community in Cambridge which informs and is informed by a lot of the tenants in these units. Really what it comes down to in every case, though, is looking at the particular needs of each building where the tenants are, what the needs of the owners might be. A lot of times we may find an owner approaching retirement, looking to sell. Can we work with them
around the timing and try to take advantage of an opportunity that might present today, that might not be there six or eight years from now. So I think it's trying to be proactive. Being aware of the inventory of the expiring units. Understanding that in a certain sense everything's expiring because everything's got some amount of a time limited commitment. But when you get into, say, the final ten years or so, that becomes really much more of appropriate to look for that opportunity, make sure that others are prime to do that working with other public partners and other state and government agencies. I think the other thing that has been very helpful to us is the recently passed state statute called Chapter 40T which has allowed for notices to be sent and alarms to go off when owners are within two years of an expiring restriction, and/or they consider selling. The state then has a right to
appoint a designee who has a right to make an offer, first offer on the building, in an attempt to make a preservation sale. And in the back end that designee has a right to match the offer. We have successfully used that. The Chapman Arms Building in the middle of Harvard Square was one, that we thought when that time comes, that's going to be very difficult to preserve. It's half market, half affordable building in the middle of Harvard Square. Certainly not one that you can look to buy at a market, a price with a lot of strong competition, but given the 40T statute homeowners rehab was designated, we were able to work with them. They made an offer to the owner. As I said, it's been a long-term affordable housing so there was an interest on the part of the owner to, if it was in the same range, to keep it affordable as opposed to taking it to market. We're able to make that work without
them needing to go explore the market, which I think is good, because we certainly seen now in the couple of years where that essence, where that building has been preserved some incredible sales prices for multi-family buildings in Harvard Square really beyond our wildest expectations. So I think it's a combined commitment starting, you know, from the City Council, the manager down through the different city departments and agencies. Certainly the funding comes up through the commitments of the Affordable Housing Trust, partners like the CHA and the non-profits and then the advocacy and the interest of the tenants and the advocates and knowing, you know, in a city like Cambridge if there's a need to discuss or a need for something, the general support we want to preserve these homes for residents.

HUGH RUSSELL: A11 right, thank you very much.

BRIAN MURPHY: And just what we can do is one thing I'11 direct your attention to and we'11 send on to you is this on the CDD website there's a 2011 statistical profile that actually has some pretty nice summary of some of the data that you've been seeking. I mean, just to high1ight some of those things and, Chris, jump in if I'm misspeaking here. From '07 to '09 medium family income in Cambridge was 88,574 . For the U.S. it was 62,367 to just put it a little bit in perspective. You do have also household and family income distribution, 2007 to 2009, you've got less than $\$ 20,000$ all households 19.2 percent. 200,000 or more 9.3 percent. So clearly there is a range and it goes from 20 to $39,000,14$ percent. 40 to 60,000 , 13.1. And it goes from there. But I mean, there's, you know, without going into too great detai1, there's some information on that that I think may provide you with a
little bit broader context for some of the questions that you were driving at, Hugh, in terms of who are these -- who is our city? STUART DASH: In that respect I don't know that Cliff Cook our planning information manager who put together all those numbers for us has over the many years.

CLIFF COOK: We can get some
information that's again more up to date and probably directly more to the point as well for the questions that you've asked. I'11 be getting that I'm sure.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh. HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, Bill. WILLIAM TIBBS: I just want to say, and Iram, you talked about the idea of the pool and then the affordability as being key issues, but I wanted to see for me a key issue is an opportunity, because Centra1 Square has the opportunity to produce housing. Because I think that's an issue
that hits us every time we have a Zoning change or a project comes before us, particularly if it's housing could be there and for whatever reason somebody decides not to do that. And I think Central Square has a very different, as I remember from the stuff that you gave us about the ownership patterns and the opportunity, just very different in Central Square than they are say in Kendal1 Square where you have MIT as a large owner and then there's some banked interests there. So and I think for me that really is a big driver on this whole residential issue. Where is the opportunity and what can we do to encourage it? Not just in an incentive way, but really looking at where the opportunities are and seeing where they are happening. And I think we want to make sure that we don't miss the opportunity, because we allow non-residential things to happen in those areas. At least make sure that the

Zoning allows for that opportunity to happen.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Could someone just explain to me on this map what is the grey so-called non-residential process?

STUART DASH: We debated what color to do that non-residential are commercial buildings around the city, and we actually have a different map where they're colored but we're trying to highlight the housing. So in the different colors on that map are just the housing project in the colors, and in grey are all the commercial projects, whether it's Amgen or Biogen all around the city. And we showed the --
H. THEODORE COHEN: And are those things that have been permitted, under construction or just in any status? The grey.

CLIFF COOK: At least just the ones that are built or under construction. I don't think we have permitted in there.

STUART DASH: That's right, I think those are built or under construction as opposed to the housing ones which actually include permitted.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sometimes it's hard to determine exactly what the status of some of these projects are. And I don't mean that as a joke or a criticism, that's just, you know, MIT moved forward, permitted the building which is coming to Pfizer before Pfizer came along so they would be ready if somebody like Pfizer came here. So where is that in the process, you know? And -- but I think what's -- I think what your point was to show where the colored circles are and where the grey circles are. And is there a relationship? And the answer is, not, you know, some relationship but it's not, it's not one to one.

STUART DASH: Right. And I think, too, to show and many people mentioned this,
substantial amount of housing, new housing that's come along and there's in fact in construction and permitted and probably 1ikely to be constructed --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
STUART DASH: -- at this point. WILLIAM TIBBS: But for me it shows that, again, it gets to that opportunity area, you know, East Cambridge and North Point and North Cambridge are the areas where the opportunity is. And, if anything, if you look at the sheer number of grey circles there, it shows that there could have been housing opportunities there that for what various reasons may not have happened on that -- I'm not saying they are -- but for me this was a very good map to kind of illustrate the grey areas are the opportunity areas because those are the ones that are just there. And as we look at these two areas, Kendall and Central, we need to really focus on that.

STUART DASH: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: A11 right.
Transportation.
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: I'11 try in 10 minutes to do transportation analysis that was done for the K2-C2 project and in brief, what we did was calculate daily and peak trips resulting from proposed build out by 2030. And for the K2-C2 entire area we looked at analysis of future impacts at 12 different intersections near or close to the study area, and we conducted an analysis of future capacity of the transit system to absorb the projected transit trips in 2030. And then I'm not going to discuss this, but we also looked at parking and infrastructure recommendations for the entire area.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so I'm going to jump in and I would encourage other people to jump in because we tend to save questions for the end, we won't, it will be confusing
because there's a very wide -- so my question is in how much of Kendall Square gets developed by 2030? Is it 30 percent, 50 percent, 100 percent?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Iram will answer that question.

IRAM FAROOQ: We assumed 80 percent for the MIT area, 33 percent for Volpe, and about -- oh, and also 80 percent for the Boston properties CRA area. And I think 100 percent for things that are already permitted like Alexandria.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.
So, after Iram suggested those
percentages, we figured out what does that mean in terms of person trips? And, of course, it's all different whether it's retail, residential or commercial development. And what you can see on the chart here is the comparison of 2030 if the area was built out under existing zoning
compared to the K2-C2 proposal. And the big difference is the additional housing and retail trip generation.

Once we knew how many person trips were likely to occur, then we looked at what could we assume about how those people were getting to either to and from their homes or businesses or retail. And this is just the -- we used different assumptions for Central Square and Kendal1 Square. What I'm showing here is Central Square, and just giving you an illustration of how we're thinking of the future. We believe that there's good reason at the office of RND we'11 see -- we can see and affect a shift from people driving to -more people taking transit, and we think bicycling will assume a greater importance and a little bit greater increase in walking. If you look on the residential side, we think the transit will actually drop in favor of people walking or biking because we're adding
more housing and creating more -- both job and residential and retail destinations closer to each other.

And in terms of retail, we see it being pretty much the same. We're not, we didn't feel like we had reasons to believe that we could create a big difference in how people traveled to and from retail.

And this is just a chart showing -- on your left you see all the predicted p.m. trips, person trips. And we look at the p.m. peak hour because that is when you experience mostly congestion so we're not really that focussed on daily trips, because they're sort of spread out very unevenly over the course of a 24 -hour period. But in this peak, in the evening peak in particular is where you tend to see the most congestion. So that's what our analysis really is focussed on.

And the initial screen we did, which is the top right-hand box with car trips was
just with car and assumptions with what modes of transportation people use. We would expect to see 42 -- about 4200 trips distributed across the area in the p.m. peak hour, but under a scenario where we've reduced driving by 10 percent which we believe is very realistic both because of general trends that are happening. We see across the city that driving as a mode is decreasing slowly but steadily over the past many decades, but also because of tougher requirements about transportation demand, management programs that would be imposed under the new Zoning Regulations. We could assume conservatively that we could drop driving by another 10 percent. So the number of trips we have been distributing is the 3477 over the p.m. peak hour.

And the tool we've used to look at intersection impact is called Critical Sums Analysis or it has other similar names, but
often it's called Critical Sums Analysis.
It's a planning tool. It's not an
engineering tool. And it's, it's used to evaluate build out scenarios. And in particular, it's good for comparing different levels of build out, and that's what we're doing. We're looking in 2030 what would, what would the impacts be under current Zoning and how would it look different if we changed the Zoning to the K2-C2 proposal. So it's really a comparative tool. And as I said, we're focusing on the p.m. peak hour, not on daily trips. And this is the same methodology that we've been using for over a decade now. So it was, what we did under ECaPs as well, which gives us an opportunity to look back and see how do the numbers look compared to ECaPs. And I'11 just say we, we thought the world was gonna be worse in terms of traffic than it actually is. And that's been interesting to look back and see.

## So these --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yet it's not great.
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It's not great.
These are the intersections we analyzed. And originally we did the white circles so the 10 intersections, and we chose them because they were in and near -- they were in the study area and we have -- these were the same ones we looked at at ECaPs so we had the ability to compare. As part of the Central Square process we added two more intersections; the Bishop Alan and Prospect and Putnam and Western to get a better sense of Central Square. It seemed underrepresented and so we added those two. Notably and as has been discussed, these -this analysis does not include some of the big intersections along the main arterials as Memorial Drive and O'Brien Highway in particular, and we, we didn't include them because those are intersections that are so
heavily dominated by regional traffic that this particular traffic that we'11 be adding is such a small fraction for one thing of the traffic that happens at those intersections and they're also already very highly congested. So it's not terribly meaningful that we can say qualitatively that yes, if you add more traffic, they will get worse than they are right now. But we're not talking about adding 20 percent more or anything in that order of magnitude. And we certainly -- there's no difficulty in looking at them. We just felt that it wasn't as meaningful to include them.

Very quick1y, and I apologize to those people who have heard this before, but very quickly the methodology that we use is as we add up all conflicting movements in cars per hour and with conflicting movements, so an example is if I'm coming down Prospect Street and somebody comes on Bishop A11en and wants
to turn left, that's a conflicting movement. Whereas if I'm coming down Prospect Street northbound and somebody's going down Prospect Street southbound, those are not conflicting movements because we can pass each other without causing any delay. And then the benchmark we used is 1500 conflicting movements per hour. You start seeing -- you start being concerned about the intersection's operation. And so that's a cutoff we use. You can use another number. It's in and it has been suggested that 1400 is a better number. It's -- if you use a newer technical manual, it would, it could -you would be using 1400. We used 1500 because that's the number we've used before, and also it happens that in practically the analysis we did as you'11 see in a moment, it doesn't actually make any difference. You should have no more intersections passing the threshold whether you use 14 or 1500.

So this chart shows basically the outcome of the analysis. The far left column is existing conditions. So today these are the number of conflicting movements per intersection. You look at the one that says critical sum. Then we compared that with 2030 build out under existing Zoning, and then under the original K2-C2 and then finally with a 10 percent reduction in auto mode. And Iram wants me to do two things at once.

Okay, so this is existing conditions. This is the conflicting movements you're seeing today. This is what would be in 2030 under existing Zoning. This is K2-C2 without extra TDM. And finally, this is with a 10 percent additional reduction in the percent of people driving, also called the preferred scenario. And as you can see, there was one intersection, Broadway and Third, that slightly exceeded the threshold with the
reduced auto mode share and none of them are exceeding a threshold. And of course it's all built off of existing conditions. And there has been a decline in traffic in the area since ten years ago. So if you compare these with ten years ago, these would have been higher.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, at that intersection you can't do a lot of things.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Correct.
HUGH RUSSELL: So what are the conflicting moves? It is the left turn from Broadway to Third Street. That obviously conflicts with traffic going across. SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes. Third turning left to Longfellow Bridge conflicts with through. HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And left from Broadway onto Third Street.

HUGH RUSSELL: So the --

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And it just -there are a lot of people turning there. So it could have been -- like if nobody wanted to go on Third Street, then the conflicting moves would have been a lot lower. But it's a high desire for people coming Broadway going up Third and down Third and over the Longfellow Bridge.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, because you can't turn on First and you should have turned on Binney.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's not conflicting based on the signal operation.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Because they're controlled.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's conflicting based on the numbers.

HUGH RUSSELL: The desires.
SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's not a conflict, like, you know, you didn't manage
the signal. So it -- the planning tool ignores what you're doing with your signal.

HUGH RUSSELL: But in the sense what it means is that you've got to provide a lot of green for those left turn movements and you run out of time on the clock. Is that a way to think about it?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: We11, that's sort of, that comes down to the -- if we're talking engineering.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: But practically speaking, yes.

WILLIAM TIBBS: This is, you know, I must have been from a standpoint of all traffic studies, I just find that -- I always try to correlate whatever you're saying with the reality of what I experience. So can you talk about the Putnam and Western intersection? Because that's another one where the conflicting movements, as you
described them, are somewhat limited. One you have a lot of one way streets kind of going so you can only move in a certain way, but what little conflicting movement you have backs up the traffic. Like on Putnam Avenue from blocks on in and backs up the traffic on Western Ave. for blocks on in. So how does that -- queueing always -- may be queueing is not the issue here, but queueing is a big issue. But it's one that I feel -- the studies seem to not grasp for me at least. SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: In that situation it's not Putnam and Western. It's Memorial Drive and Western. That's where -and the Memorial Drive is given an advantage, that's why it backs up because you -- that box is, the box between Memorial Drive and Putnam is full. WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: If that was not full of cars, then there would not be a
problem with Putnam and Western. And it sort of --

WILLIAM TIBBS: Any way you look at it, though, that still becomes -- the Putnam and Western intersection is one that's very hard to manage. And your number kind of implies that it's not too bad because it hasn't hit 1500 yet. And so that's where the, that's where it doesn't, it doesn't correlate to me the reality of when you put all this stuff together and what the numbers say. I just don't want to paint such a rosy picture of some of these intersections which I know aren't rosy. But if you're saying that the effect of the Zoning that we're anticipating is not going to change it too much more than the way it is or might improve it slightly from where we're projecting -SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. WILLIAM TIBBS: -- that's one thing. But when it gets to what you said earlier
about the -- I remember when we were doing the citywide zoning, you know, you have an F. You can't keep adding to an $F$, it's just gets a worse $F$, but it's stil1 an $F$.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: That's right, exactly what you're saying, which is this is not judging whether we can accept the way Putnam and Western is today. This tells you how the K2-C2 compare to what is, what is allowed today. And I mean we can have a long discussion about so Putnam and Western, the problem is actually created over at River and Soldiers Field.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: That's where al1 the problems stem from.

And so one of the things that I wanted to mention is when we did this analysis, we added traffic from future development to existing traffic. We did not try to factor in that the positive trend that has been
going on in Cambridge at least, which is insist that the travel patterns of existing development has improved. So we have added 4.6 million square feet of development in Kendal1 Square without noticeable changes in traffic impacts. And that sounds nonsensical. But the way that it's possible is that the building that has been, that was there already, people who come to that building have now drive less than they used to. And you probably saw the article's front page story in the G1obe and the subsequent editorial showing people saying oh, yeah, I used to drive but now I take my bike because my employer gives me a benefit to ride my bike, etcetera. So there's been a change in how people travel to existing development. And that is why we're seeing these downward trends on some of the streets. And in Kenda11 Square and the same -- these are some graphs from the Cambridgeport area that we,
we have not taken that into account. So we haven't tried to, if you will, benefit from a positive trend that is measurable and we know that has occurred. We just said, okay, this is the way things are today and we're not going to add to it. We're not going to try to think that things are going to improve generally. So I just wanted to note that. WILLIAM TIBBS: Because that basically is saying that the TDM measures that we're doing are effective?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes. And there is frankly a general trend as well, like, people have -- even if they don't work in a place where there's TDM, the percentage of people who have started to change the travel behavior for other reasons, environmental or health or whatever their justification is.

So in conclusion, this analysis, as I said, is a planning tool, that is a comparative tool between existing and
proposed Zoning. Six intersections are predicted to experience more or the same number of conflicting movements. Six of them are -- will experience fewer, and that has to do with how development has been moving around. We are adding housing in places where under current Zoning there was commercial development. And the Broadway and Third is the one intersection where we're close to the threshold.

And then as you may have heard, we did an extra analysis of Mass., Prospect, River, Western intersection in the heart of Central Square because it's very unusual in that there are vastly more pedestrians than cars in that intersection. And Critical Sums does not take pedestrians into account. So people raised that issue correctly and we did, we used, we tried to do -- or we did a level of service analysis instead, and that as anyone who goes to Central Square knows, the
congested intersection, and that's something as development is proposed in Central Square, it has to be looked at very closely because that is, like some of the other intersections, has a lot of traffic and very, very many pedestrians.

And as I just mentioned, analysis assumes that existing travel patterns remain the same -- unchanged even though we know that's not what's been occurring. It's actually has been decreasing.

And then of course any -- once the Zoning's adopted as you know better than anyone, traffic studies and traffic mitigation is required even though, even if the Zoning says this project can go forward, it can't go forward if it hasn't complied with Article 19. So there is an extra screen on any project that is proposed even under the new Zoning. And of course most projects if they create parking, are subject to PTDM
and the Zoning has reduced parking ratios compared to what is under current Zoning.

So that is sort of the auto analysis. Then we did a lot of work on looking at Red Line transit capacity because the --
H. THEODORE COHEN: Before you go there, I was just wondering you said that traffic didn't get as bad as you had anticipated as it would. Do you have an explanation or hypothesis as to why that's the case?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It was what we were just discussing which is a lot of existing development, the travel behavior to and from existing developments changed in favor of sustainable modes over driving. So, generally there is, and you can see it in the census data as well, that people are driving less and using other modes more.

WILLIAM TIBBS: And can I ask you another question before you go there? And
again, going back to the ownership patterns, the TDM stuff can work when you have large projects and large developers who can offer all of those things and it affects a lot of people. And then in the Central Square area, other than the kind of, if we don't have a lot of opportunity for those, is there a smaller scale or TDM things that you can do or things that can you can do with existing -- people who are already there to help that trend go down?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So, we try to scale the requirements under PTDM in accordance with what the project is. Of course, if less than 20 parking spaces are created, they're subject on1y to a small PTDM, which is really a checklist that you just have to pick three measures from. So that's much less intense, and there's no annual monitoring or -- but once you get to 20 spaces or more, you're into a full PTDM
plan. And the reason why PTDM is not like a prescribed sort of measures is exactly so that you can fit the kind of non-residential development that it is. And there is great variety in what PTDM plans encompass in terms of measures.

Right. Sue was just saying that the Zoning that's proposed is highly residential. So of course residential is not subject to PTDM. Typically TDM measures are included in residential projects, but it's quite on a quite different scale.

All right?
So the transit analysis, we focussed on the Red Line because the Red Line is by far the most important transit measure or opportunity there is. And just some -- very quickly just to give you a sense of what we did. So we looked at both trend lines over time and how has transit ridership grown? So we had a sense of apart from what we're doing
in Cambridge. How does transit grow over time? And as you can see, most of our transit lines have been increasing in terms of ridership compared to five years ago. We also took a look at Kendall and Central, how much pressure there is in the peak hour and you can see that Central is both a residential and commercial area because you have almost the same a.m. and p.m. So people are leaving in the morning to go to work and some people are coming to work and vice versa, whereas Kendal1 still exhibits very clearly a job-dominated area and hopefully that is -- we will be changing that, but it still is very clear that -- and most people are -- not a lot of people get on at Kendall. A lot of people get off.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you go back to that?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I find very
interesting, I would be happy if anybody had an explanation, for the Kendal1 the fact that it increases, continues to increase from like 10 to 2 . Is there any explanation for that? SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So these are people leaving, these are entries. So people getting on at Kenda11 and going somewhere either towards Boston or the other direction. So, it -- the lowest number -- wel1, of course, like nighttime, but 10 is like not that many. And then some people start leaving and then it just builds and between four and seven, that's when you really see the huge departure. So who are these people that are leaving Kendall Square at eleven a.m., I'm not sure.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I would speculate that people who are just going to other places and meetings and appointments. You know, they're just using the transportation to move around the city. They're already in
their office and now they're going somewhere but they're not going home.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So people who arrive between six and eight, then leave during the day to go elsewhere?

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I find that very curious.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: There are also students, and their schedules tend not to be traditional work schedules.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: They're heading to the Kennedy School for a class.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And we looked at busses and just to see, and this is Central Square on and off. And just to give a sense of how important the Red Line is compared to busses, and it's obviously more than two-thirds of the transit ridership is on the Red Line versus all those different busses.

| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: And so on and off |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | means for the No. 1 bus when you enter the |
| 3 | edge of the study area on one end and then |
| 4 | leave it at the other end? |
| 5 | SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: No, these are |
| 6 | getting on and off busses. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 8 | SUSAN CLIPPINGER: In Central. |
| 9 | HUGH RUSSELL: Right. But like does |
| 10 | Bigelow Street count as Central Square in |
| 11 | your analysis? |
| 12 | SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: For this purpose |
| 13 | right here, this is really like just Central |
| 14 | Square. It's not like Landsdowne Street |
| 15 | or -- |
| 16 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Is that right at the |
| 17 | station? |
| 18 | SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It's only right |
| 19 | around the Red Line entry. |
| 20 | WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay. |
| 21 | SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: A11 the busses |


| 1 | that have a main stop either on River Street |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Extension, Mass. Ave. or Green Street |
| 3 | WILLIAM TIBBS: So it's within that |
| 4 | block? |
| 5 | SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. |
| 7 | But the boundaries of the Central |
| 8 | Square district and the commercial district |
| 9 | encompass maybe four stops on a No. 1 bus. |
| 10 | SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: And there are -- I |
| 12 | mean, from my not particularly happy |
| 13 | experience with the No. 1 bus, I would take |
| 14 | from my observation is, yes, the bulk of the |
| 15 | people that get on or off the bus do it, do |
| 16 | so at the station. |
| 17 | SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. |
| 18 | HUGH RUSSELL: But, you know, there |
| 19 | are a few of us who get off at Bigelow |
| 20 | Street. |
| 21 | SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: I mean, another |

reason why we did this was because we're very interested in can we get people who are riding a bus to Central Square and who really want to go to Kendal1 Square to stay on that bus if we convince the $T$ to extend it to Kendall Square? So that was another reason why we focussed on that bus.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Also there's some of some of those busses like the 47 that's the end of the line, so people are going on and off to an empty bus.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.
WILLIAM TIBBS: Whereas the No. 1, my unhappy experience is that it's coming from Harvard Square and it's already full. So you have all those 3900 people running to get on full busses, partially full busses. HUGH RUSSELL: But there are two empty ones right behind it. I mean, it's a classic study of a bus route that's too long. And the characteristics of a long bus route
in a congested area are is that vehicles tend to clump and cluster.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yeah, the bunching, it's a huge issue.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I mean they could, I mean in some ways solve the problem by forcing the bus to get ahead, to just stop and wait at a sign, that would not be popular with anybody on the bus or anybody at the next stop waiting, but that would space, it would force them to leave space periodically.

WILLIAM TIBBS: They do that with trains periodically. They just stop them and have them wait for a few minutes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: There's a lot of bus efficiency measures that don't happen because they're unpopular. For example, get on in the front and get off in the back. That would really help a lot. But it took the MBTA three weeks to try it and abandon it
again.
HUGH RUSSELL: We'11 have to go back to street cars in that line.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes, so the real
point of this is so what does it, what does the K2-C2 transit trips mean then to how the Red Line operates? And so we did an analysis of the additional trips that would be added from the K2-C2 build out, and basically the way it breaks down is we would be adding 680 new transit riders coming and going in Central Square in the a.m., and we used Central Square and we used a.m. because that is the worst in Cambridge in terms of transit on the Red Line. So getting on at Central, travelling towards Boston, that is the highest level of congestion of any place on the Red Line. So we used the worst case scenario.

So there are already 680 new, 680 new transit riders. Then we figured out how many
of those would be getting on Central, travelling in the inbound direction, which is the worst. And you can see we had some assumptions about how many on and off and how many Red Line were expressed and inbound and outbound. So that analysis concluded that on average we're adding 16 new riders to each inbound Red Line train to Central Square in the peak hour. And right now there are 112 boarding per train. So we would be adding 16 more people to that.

And here's the highly controversial chart of what that means. So what you're seeing in this chart is, as I mentioned, is that Central is the most congested. And the little orange on top of the blue bars at Kendal1 and Centra1, these are the new trips that would be added. And this is the seated capacity of the Red Line. So if everybody sits down, this is how many people you can fit on in the peak hour. And obviously we're
way, as everybody has experienced, we're way passed seating capacity, but we're not passed standing capacity. And this doesn't, this is per peak hour. So this, of course, you can still go down the Red Line at 8:30 in Central Square and the train comes and there's absolutely not one single spot for you to be in. So I'm not proposing or the analysis does not suggest that every single train has capacity. Some of them won't. And there is also bunching on the Red Line, there shouldn't be but there is. So you may have to wait for the next train. But what this chart illustrates is the K2-C2 is not going to significantly alter the situation. What is going to alter the situation and why we're al1 concerned about Red Line capacity is overall growth in the metro area which is going to overwhelm the Red Line in the long run. And one of the reasons that we've been working on -- well, unfortunately
unsuccessfully on the urban ring in the last 15 years is something needs -- transit capacity needs to be enhanced for the long term because you cannot have the level of economic growth that we're all expecting and anticipating and desiring without more transit capacity.

So we, as part of the study we did look at so what can you do about it? Because we know that by 2030 there's going to be a problem because of overall growth, and there's four different strategies that we're -- have looked at. And the first strategy is to shift riders to other modes. And I mentioned that if we can get people to -- you can get busses extended to Kenda11, we can get some people to stay on the bus and not go into Central which is the highest congestion point. And we also think that there will be people that can switch to bicycling, and of course, the introduction of Hubway really
helps with that. And then new and/or improved subway and bus lines in the urban ring is the prime example in Cambridge of what could really significantly help the Red Line.

The Red Line also needs to run at what is it's theoretical existing capacity and there's all kinds of problems. I won't go into a lot of the details, but we're running cars from 1969 that actually are not ready to operate every single day. The switching systems are old. A lot of things could be done to just maintain what is supposed to be current capacity. And you could improve it by upgrading power systems and potentially introduce the cars that have fewer seats, although that has, was not very popular. And the $T$ actually has removed most of them because it was unpopular, but among the riders.

And then finally a TDM measure is you
can shift people off the peak. This is what happens with driving. Many people say, okay, I'm not going to drive between eight and nine, I'm going to arrive at seven because I won't encounter the level of congestion that I will at 8:30. And of course we have a role in that through TDM pushing people to have flexible work hours so people can actually travel outside of the peak hour. And of course a more dramatic strategy is peak hour pricing on transit, and that's done in many other locales.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Washington, D.C.
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It's cheaper at seven and nine-thirty then eight-thirty. And these are all things that can be looked at, and funding is a huge issue. And the Governor actually has proposed a very aggressive proposal to raise funds for transit and with some luck, some of that or all of that will happen, so we can get
increased transit capacity because absolutely it needs to happen in the long run.

HUGH RUSSELL: Didn't the Red Line have a higher capacity 60 or 70 years ago? SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Did the Green Line have --

HUGH RUSSELL: The Red Line.
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: The Red Line? HUGH RUSSELL: With those old olive cars running at much shorter head ways? Of course they had shorter trains. I thought the head ways between trains were much shorter and it was a function of a control system because if it wasn't an automated control, it was a block system and there were -- you can -- I seem to remember in a report that I read somewhere that said more people travelled on the Red Line in World War II then are travelling on it now.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: I do know the commuter rail was a lot faster in 1815 than
it is now. And I mean, just to look forward, if a different signal system and switching systems were put in place, you could definitely increase the capacity because you could space the trains more closely. You can't add more trains because the platforms are -- the trains are already as long as the platforms, but if you could space them more closely and stil1 meet safety standards, you could definitely move more people.

HUGH RUSSELL: There's always room for technology.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes. And as long as somebody pays for it.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I also had this vision which comes out of my reading of science fiction where you convert the Green Line so that it's just all moving sidewalks. And, you know, the first 200 feet are running at two miles an hour, and then there's a two mile hour bump so that when you're in between
the station, you're going at like 15 or 20 miles an hour vis-a-vis the walls. And I mean it doesn't serve certain patrons, particularly people who are not as able as others, but there's a different -- completely different way to use that volume of space then is presently, you know, don't have trains, have continuous system.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. HUGH RUSSELL: So....

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: We're extremely focussed on the urban ring because it takes people out of the central subway system where they don't actually want to be. So the Sullivan Square, Lechmere, Kenda11 Square, Longwood is such the desire for the travel in that corridor is huge.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Right.
HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: But we can't get any traction with that project, at least not
at the moment.
HUGH RUSSELL: Un1ess there's enormous population south of that in Boston that could get to Cambridge or get to Longwood or get to the other areas. It's too expensive to build new systems, right?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And other projects have gotten ahead in the priority line.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, is that it?
SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: That's it.
HUGH RUSSELL: Shall we then take a break for about ten minutes?

STEVEN WINTER: I'd like to
compliment Susanne for the presentation. Terrific.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I guess behind Susanne is a team of people that have to share in that.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: I will let them
know.
(A short recess was taken.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Let's get going
again. We're going to be discussing the
Kendal1 Square and Central Square guidelines and Roger is going to key that up for us. ROGER BOOTHE: Thank you, Hugh. It's really kind of exciting to get to this point after a couple of years of so many processes with the K2-C2 groups, and some of those folks are here tonight. These guidelines really have been shaped by that process, by a lot of the input we had from Goody Clancy who we went through the process, and staff has been trying to be faithful to those plans as we've been these guidelines. And brought to mind that we've been doing Special Permits for quite a while here at the Board. In my case 33 years. And one of the -- I think Special Permit No. 2 had the walkway and the Broad Canal on the side that
got built first, and it took 25 years to get the other side, and that was Special Permit No. 141 with a lot of input from the Cambridge Planning Team and others trying to make sure that canal walk happened. So good things can happen through Special Permits and that's what the guidelines are here for is to help the Board and the public understand what the goals are and how to get there. And as Hugh and I were just discussing, certain things are rules in the Zoning. The guidelines aren't rules, but they're setting really strong goals that we care a lot about and they offer some more flexibility. So one of the things we talked about in the MIT Zoning was whether some of the things that have been in their Zoning should be in the guidelines. We've been meeting with MIT, and I think we're getting closer on how to work those things out.

I'd also point out that the Harleston

Parker Award is the Arts Society Architect's Award for the most beautiful building in Boston. And over the last five years four of them have been in Cambridge. They were all Special Permits. And it's really cool that one of them was by MIT. The Media Lab is the one that just got the award. There was the Kyu Sung Woo Dormitory at Harvard. There was the Genzyme building, and of course our own public 1ibrary. So neat that different sectors of our community have done such good work and they've all gone through the Special Permit process. So I think part of what we're looking for in the guidelines is to get some more Harleston Parker Awards, especially we need one in Central Square because we have a building there that's not so popular. So we need to work on that.

So the Kendall Square guidelines really are again building on so much of the work that we went through with the committee, and

I'm not going to do much PowerPoint here but up on the screen is the image that I hope everybody has a copy of the paper guidelines. I'm going to refer to page 5 here which shows the overall plan and the dark streets, Broadway, Binney Street, and Main are the main public ways. And then we have secondary public ways. And you'11 see what those refer to as you go through the plan. And also call out here are important existing open spaces such as Point Park, the Canal Way that I was just mentioning, the skating rink near the Genzyme building, and some of the Cambridge research -- the Cambridge redevelopment authority open spaces. And not shown on here will be the new open space over here on Binney Street, the two acre park in the neighborhood. And we're going to have a whole process looking at those open spaces as we go through the next couple of years, and that will be even more information to come
into the Board's review process.
So clearly how the buildings relate to the open spaces is an important part of this; walkability, university access, how the streets work. Again, these are things that we've been working on trying to get better and better at in the last 30 years. And certainly in Article 19, we set forth a lot of guidelines that these are really built on. So this is in a sense trying to get more depth into the way we're thinking about these things, building on the work that we've been doing. We've made mistakes over the years. We're trying to see if we can do better on all of these things. And I feel like we're doing better with all of this.

Architectural identity on Kenda11 Square on page 9 is important. We're not trying to dictate modernist buildings or historicist buildings, but we are wanting to say it's really important in trying to have
plans that have architectural quality in what comes out of the work that leads to scale and massing. In the middle of the document, around page 15 or so, we're talking about how to start making sure that we have visual interest, that the massing, if you look on page 16 and 17 , that there aren't just big chunks of buildings, but they had broken down and we went through a lot with Goody Clancy and the committee and looking at what were kind of proper distance as you might go before you have a break in the building, the relationship between buildings and setbacks and so forth. So we tried to put that in the guidelines. And we got to page 19, you see examples of tall, slender buildings. And certainly the Zoning encourages housing for the taller buildings and trying to think about how those can be gracefully done. And then on pages 20 and 21 are a series of images looking around Kendall Square that
talk about how these buildings become landmarks. And I have to say that I've been surprised sometimes, for example, about how far off you can see the museum towers now called residents, you can see them all the way from Inman Square, and I hadn't thought about that at the time. So we're trying to get better at thinking about how these tall buildings are going to be influencing our environment especially for starting to get taller buildings.

Towards the end of the document we spent a lot of time on the committee on how that's -- how the building meets the ground and how we get the activity that comes from the ground floor retail, how important that is. And so I think we've had a lot of experience in trying to make those ground floors work.

And in the end we have a little bit of a section on academic buildings because some
of the Kendal 1 Square area gets out of the traditional mixed use area and into the campus, but we still want to have a lot of the goals being met even though the different kinds of building. That's just a really quick overview.

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, I was kind of dreading opening my packet. I put it off for a long time, because things weren't really very clear six months ago. And so I was just delighted when I actually looked at the proposed guidelines, because it will seemed they reached a level of clarity that really exceeds any guidelines that I think we've ever done. And I think one aspect of that is the goals and measures structure. The goals are in a sense the real meat. These are the things that we're really trying to accomplish. And the measures are ways of thinking about how you would meet those goals, say suggestions of how you can do this
in way Safe Harbors, if you do this, then we would say that you've met this. And I think, and then a large measure, the distinctions between the goals and the measures is clear and correct at one place I would ask you to think about. The thing that is to me the most, in some ways the most important thing is to make it clear to the reader of the document that the goals and the measures are different. They're fundamentally different things. And so, if you look at the measures and you say, I've got to do all those things, then you'11 quickly get panicked because -and then if you look at some of the illustrations, you say, but that's ugly, but the diagram's illustrating how, how a principle works, and, yes, you really wouldn't want to do a building that was just a photograph of that and change the materials but then they illustrate principles.

So my first suggestion is actually a


That works for me.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
Because I mean I think the whole thing is great. And it's just bits and pieces.

So, for example, in the first paragraph of the introduction maybe where we refer to PUD, we should actually refer to PUDs. And Special Permit we should refer to Special Permits so that it's clear to everybody that these applied are going to apply to multiple things, not just the one.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: On the public
streets.
ROGER BOOTHE: What page are you on to?

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm sort of starting from that diagram and then it leads back to page 4. The secondary streets are kind of different south of Main and north of Main and east of Third and west of Third. And maybe
we need a paragraph that distinguishes what campus streets are like. And the things that are different, the conditions that are different, I know are that one person owns the whole district. So that means -- whereas you're writing the guidelines as if they're individual parties just dealing with parcels. And so another thing is there if you look at the grey smudges there, those are buildings. And most of those buildings are pretty fixed in terms of their long-term lives. They're not -- they may be upgraded and changed. But maybe like the corner of the Media Lab, MIT's not going to touch the urban design of that building for probably a very long time. And they probably will have to pay for it eventually. It's one of our longest Special Permits because of the funding.

PAMELA WINTERS: It was ten years. HUGH RUSSELL: It's an example of how you have to have faith and just keep
going, and they had the faith and we kept the faith.

So there isn't any retail down there now, and there's a lot of buildings that wouldn't be sensible to think there would be retail in. So there would have to be a different way of thinking about animating those streets. And the -- and I mean like, for example, when you're looking at the dimensional guidelines about diversity, you may want to think about whole blocks, you know? And consider, you know, the existing buildings as well as the new in-filled building, and that I think you have to -- you have to think in a bigger scale. And there might be buildings that aren't in a PUD, say that gets established. I don't know how, you know, MIT is going to -- how many PUDs they're going to establish in that district. I would assume because of the different time tables for the academic growth, they're
probably not going to come, you know, next year and say we're going to, you know, sometime in the next 20 years we're going to build a building in this place and we don't know what's going in it and we don't know how big it is. That's not a very productive way to have a PUD.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, I think we're hoping the PUDs will have some kind of logic to them.

HUGH RUSSELL: And then be a master plan.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, like a master plan. Use a ten acre Genzyme site where we have a lot of uses going on and open space systems. So you have, whole context relate to, so I think that's going to be important. HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So how that impacts the goals for the street, I think, are different. If you look at the third, it's called Third Square. If you were to
look carefully at the street goals, it would say all the street frontages, there should be retail or 70 percent retail. Well, I'm not sure that's -- it depends on the use. So I'11 get to that in a later comment.

I think in a way that's the biggest comment I have in this whole thing is this notion of trying to differentiate the campus streets from the other streets.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, do you mind if I comment on your comment?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
WILLIAM TIBBS: I agree with you because I think I mentioned earlier at one point that if you look at the development potential of those MIT blocks, particularly if you look at Ames Street and Carlton Street, there's only -- so if you look at the streets and even the massing, it, it can be a little bit more -- yes, I think there should be a differential. And then there's this
issue of what's an institutional. We have academic buildings, but there's clearly going to be some blend of academic and what we would call traditionally, you know, commercial I guess or at least biotech kind of blends there. And so those are your academic buildings suggestions fall into them or so -- just understanding that. And I think just by creating zones more institutional in nature with some specific things around it would be helpful. So I'm not quite sure what's the best way to do it, but I think you hit it --

ROGER BOOTHE: That could be an issue on the DOT site. You know, how DOT stays there.

## Iram, did you want to say something?

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. The one thing that I wanted to say is that, you know, just to the point that Bill just made about academic buildings and then there may be a
mix somehow in some -- along some of the streets, and we were actually trying to get to that by -- on page 30 have actually a section that deals with academic buildings. So if you had along, I don't know, along Hayward Street for instance, if there were a commercial building, it may be dealt with thought of differently than if there were an academic building.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
IRAM FAROOQ: So we were just trying to distinguish based on use rather than street, but certainly we could think about it either way.

WILLIAM TIBBS: It's almost like you need to define it. Is it a certain percentage of academic use before it's and academic building, or it's a commercial building and to get there, you know, it's 1ike --

IRAM FAROOQ: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: One thing I've heard somewhere is that -- this is now on page 7. There's a section on loading and servicing. And maybe we should add a measure in there to encourage consolidated off street loading facilities, because I think MIT wants to do that. And that would be a measure that would certainly increase the walkability.

Page 9, this is built --
ROGER BOOTHE: Hugh, if I could add to that one.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
ROGER BOOTHE: I think the potential housing site, Ames Street, that redevelopment authority is thinking about because right now there's a great maze of --

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
ROGER BOOTHE: -- parking and loading and so forth that we could probably get probably better disguised and make that street that much better. Some are time

## issues.

HUGH RUSSELL: And on page 9 there's a built forum page. And that I'm wondering to some extent if maybe measures $B$ and $C$ are actually more goals than measures.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: I think this is a -this is a difficult section to try to quantify. And it's just a suggestion of maybe a different way of thinking about it.

There's a lot of stuff on scale and massing, and anybody who wants to look at it and develop it would say oh, my God. But if the -- if you look at the goals, you know, I don't think anybody has any problem here with the goals. And I don't think actually people who are sitting facing us don't have a problem with the goals either.

ROGER BOOTHE: They're very much like the Article 19 goals.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
is --
HUGH RUSSELL: Right. What follows are, and if by making the difference between goals and measures clear, some of the anxiety over what the measures are may go away. That's not to say that if somebody comes with a building that is monolithic with satellites, we won't use the goal language and say, no, that's not really what we want. Here's the time for the Genzyme story which is the first building to be proposed and that development was the Genzyme building, and I think it broke half of the design guidelines that had been established.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Oh, yes, that's true.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I remember Roger coming to us when we first discussed it and saying that, you know, here's a building that breaks half the design guidelines, but it's a
great building and it achieves the goals. And so, you know, you can get extraordinary buildings that with somebody with, you know, infinite money and tremendous in terms of the architect, tremendous understanding and commitment to some very high principles and end up with wonderful things that you never expected when you were writing this. And we've shown not only in that building but in other buildings, that we can handle that.

ROGER BOOTHE: The Stata Center was another one that broke almost every rule. HUGH RUSSELL: There were fewer rules there, but I do remember. And I remember at the same time MIT brought two buildings, one of which I thought was wonderful, the Stata Center, which I stil1 think is bearable, which is the dormitory on Vassar Street. Which --

PAMELA WINTERS: Which building? ROGER BOOTHE: Stephen Hal1
building.
HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. Simmons Hall.
WILLIAM TIBBS: Simmons Hall.
HUGH RUSSELL: And maybe I don't think it's as horrible as I thought it was then. And it is in a place where nobody ever really has to see it much unless you're at MIT.

ROGER BOOTHE: Apparently the students love it.

JOHN HAWKINSON: I don't think that's accurate.

HUGH RUSSELL: That, what I was most concerned about that building is that it was an enormous effort to create an image and the quality of life inside was compromised as a result. And also a stark comparison between that building and the Pacific Street House which was being done at exactly the same time for two-thirds of the budget with better results. So just annoyed me that they
couldn't see that.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I pop in here?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I think I have a different design aesthetic -- architectural aesthetic than a number of people here. And I'm really glad Hugh started because I think, you know, you said the things that I wanted to say, which is that some buildings are great just because they're great, and some are ugly just because they're ugly. And it doesn't matter what guidelines they followed, and I really don't want us to eliminate the great buildings or the beautiful buildings because people are following guidelines too much. And I don't think, you know, there's anything wrong. I don't think they're dirty words to say tall or big or shiny or sleek. I think they all have a place and can fit in. And so I agree that a lot of things have to
be more goals rather than the methods because, you know, I do love the Hancock Building. And I actually do love the Stata Center and I do like the Hope Building. And a lot of the building, you know, the warehouse on Mass. Ave., I can't think, the storage building. You know, it's huge but it's gorgeous.

HUGH RUSSELL: Metropolitan.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes,

Metropolitan Storage. And I don't want to allow those buildings to happen -ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: -- because we're too worried about the guidelines and following exactly, you know, some of the proposals. And so, you know, I'm really concerned about that. I mean, I think these are great. I think, you know, they're -- a great outline for people to follow, but I don't want to lose --

ROGER BOOTHE: Now, certain7y over the years we have never treated the guidelines like rules, and we certainly heard that from both committees in different ways. They wanted us to think outside the box, trying to be imaginative. So I think the guidelines are there partly to say that we really care about getting something of quality, and this is how we see it going, but it's kind of what Hugh was saying, you know, these are measures we come up with that there might be others and the Board can take those into account, but we are trying to make it clear that we're expecting really good things.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think also the Stata Center might do quite well under these.

ROGER BOOTHE: It might do better on these than the old ones.

PAMELA WINTERS: Roger, I was just wondering, it reminds me of the Koolhaas, Rem


ROGER BOOTHE: And they were going across, but that's all he's been involved in. HUGH RUSSELL: Anyway, that building.

PAMELA WINTERS: That building, whatever it is. That building, I know that, like, half the Board loved it, half the Board hated it, and, you know, it was just -- it's really -- I found it very interesting architecturally. But do the students, have you had any feedback? Do the students like living there? Because that was one of our concerns.

ROGER BOOTHE: We11, Jeff Roberts was a student when they were developing the program. I don't know if you want to say anything about that, Jeff.

JEFF ROBERTS: I'11 say, I'11 say this. I can say a lot. We can talk about it later, but it's a good example of where things can become problematic when the design
isn't keeping in mind the larger set of goals that it's meant to accomplish. I think it's a -- I was involved in that project beginning to end as a student, and it's one where the design really got -- you know, it started with a set of community goals, and the design kind of ran away from that set of goals to a point where it became, it became an issue. But, yes, as mentioned, it is still a place and people like it. The community kind of tends to bond together somewhat in spite of the architecture. One of the challenges of living there helped in a funny way helped to build some community in the dorm that might not have otherwise have formed.

STUART DASH: Like a blizzard.
JEFF ROBERTS: There's certain1y unintended consequences. But it's a -- yes, I don't want to get too far off.

PAMELA WINTERS: No, that's fine.
ROGER BOOTHE: I personally hate the
building, but I think it's a really good thing it's there.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. Very diplomatic.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Getting back to what Hugh said, thought, one of the concerns I always had with the North Cambridge ones, and I think the way you've done it, I agree, is the good thing. The big fear is that we get a building that's made just like these blocks. And then they'd say, wait a minute, we're complying with everything you said we should do.

ROGER BOOTHE: We11, we won't let them do that.

WILLIAM TIBBS: And I think the word measures is good and I think I agree with Hugh that if you describe a definition of what the goal and measures are so that they -- because I think a lot of people weren't used to dealing with us or these things,
might just liberally say we're going to check off, here's a hundred feet here, and here's or whatever. And we just want to make sure that we do, we do get the quality. And just because they comply with everything that we -- the measures say, that that doesn't necessarily mean a good building. As I've said we've got, we have guidelines that and sometimes we get great buildings and sometime we get not so great buildings that comply with the buildings. I think North Mass Ave. falls into that category.

ROGER BOOTHE: Most really good
architects have really strong egos and are not going to take guidelines for an answer.

HUGH RUSSELL: We11, we have
actually three very good architects sitting in the room, or at least three that I recognize, and I'm not worried about them dealing with this. And I understand guidelines and the previous buildings have
merit.
ROGER BOOTHE: Right.
IRAM FAROOQ: Just one thing.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I wanted to
move on to the ground floor design guidelines.

IRAM FAROOQ: The only thing I wanted to say was that this section, one of the things you asked us when you were talking about MIT was are there any pieces that are proposed in the Zoning language that actually would fit better as design guidelines? And I think when you look at the floor plate limitations as you go over different heights, that's right now in the MIT Zoning, and that's one of the things we would recommend might belong better in a place like this.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think I would agree with that.

So now I've spent the substance of the a lot of the setback and the heights and all
of those regimes in part because I wish no buildings were over 150 feet and it's just not going to work. And a lot of what's in here is dealing with the fact that there are buildings that are over 150 feet tall that will be built, not too many, but some. And how to shape those buildings so that they are good neighbors in the city. And in part because I think a tremendous amount of effort has been done by consultants and staff to come up with specific numbers. So I feet that I'm not sure that I want to substitute my suggestions. But when I get to the retail page, there are a couple of places I do want to do that. And I'd like to move to that. PAMELA WINTERS: What page, Hugh? HUGH RUSSELL: I'm on page 23.

And I was thinking as I said before about secondary streets, and I think you should probably add residential entry and stoops to the list of measures that are part
of, you know, the measures that we'd expect on secondary streets because I think, you know, that was done at Third Square and is the right thing to do there. And to line it with the -- try to line it with retail would not be a good idea.

ROGER BOOTHE: No.
HUGH RUSSELL: And then I -- this is a question about the depth of the ground floor retail at the height. And the thing I look at is well, the 40 -foot depth and 18 to 20 foot floor-to-floor height is what the national retailers are looking for. But our goal is to have small locally-owned businesses. So if you make the space -- if you require people to make space that the national people want, it's more likely that they'11 come. Now, and then I thought about how many stores in Harvard Square are in 18 to 20 foot high floor? And it -- the Harvard Coop and what used to be the old coop where
the bank is now, I can't even remember which bank is now and I can't even remember what bank it is it changes so often, but those have big high ceilings. And when the Coop was there, it was a double height space. I think there might -- it's possible that it appears, and it might be that that one building. But I don't think there's a single other storefront in Harvard Square that has that kind of height. And I would also note that your illustration on page 27 of
storefronts shows, as far as I can calculate based on the height of seven foot doors, 13 feet, 18 feet, 16 feet, 13 feet, and 12 foot high. So I think the 18 to 20 is not the right guideline.

ROGER BOOTHE: We actually had quite a bit of discussion about this with Goody Clancy. They were urging us to have the higher heights. I wouldn't add Crate and Barre1, the old DR building, and that faces
pretty soaring some of that, you know. So, and that's a different scale that we're talking about in Kendal1 Square. So I don't know.

IRAM FAROOQ: One of the other things that 18 to 20 was also trying to make sure that we could accommodate restaurants and all of the equipment that might need to go with that because this is fifth floor to -- floor-to-floor?

HUGH RUSSELL: So I would be curious to know the --

ROGER BOOTHE: Floor-to-floor height.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: -- in the Twining
Building which has now three great restaurants in it, is there two feet between the first floor and the --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It might be 16.
HUGH RUSSELL: Which is generous but

I'm not saying make it 12 or 10 , but maybe it should be cranked down because I think in terms of the depth we've had this discussion again and again and again and again, and I guess I'm willing to -- well, right now the language says: Should average about 40 feet. That doesn't say every space has to be 40 foot minimum. And that's based on retail wisdom of what many retailers want to see. They're clearly --you know, the Novartis new building has retail at half that depth which in some ways is good because it stretches it out and it's not a fabulous retail location. So by having a 20 -foot deep space and getting good people and stretching them enhances the experience rather than have two empty storefronts and two busy ones.

ROGER BOOTHE: Maybe we should get a little more of that kind of language in there rather than the numbers. I'm always nervous about numbers in a guideline.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, I was going to suggest you had a little bit more flexibility in that -- part of what they're doing when they come to us and telling us what they think that should be based on what their they're trying to accomplish and then we can judge what's appropriate or not.

ROGER BOOTHE: And in a lot of places we are talking about food trying some uses, so we want them to be showing us that they can actually provide food. I think back to some of the failures that we've had on the East Cambridge riverfront where we weren't able to get food in because there wasn't enough -- in some cases height floor-to-ceiling but also not putting in the black steel to ventilate the restaurants so it was more like we want to, we want these spaces to work for restaurants in a lot of cases, but not everywhere necessarily. So we'11 work on that.

HUGH RUSSELL: And another very
small point on page 26, measure a -- I think we should also say that the percentage of transparency we're interested in is somewhere, it's in the zone that is maybe two feet above the sidewalk and maybe ten feet above the sidewalk. It doesn't do any good to have a lot of high windows and, you know, the Walgreens preferred mode which is to have no -- you can't see into the place, but they might have 50 percent glass, it's all up where you can't see in. I'm using the Brattleboro Walgreens as an example, but thank God it's not downtown. So I think that's just my editorial there. I think that's what you needed.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, good point.
HUGH RUSSELL: Tom. I'm actually done with my remarks.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Are you done with your list?

## HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Others have said what I was thinking when I read this, but I'11 say it in my own words. I think my approach to this is a little similar to what we did with the Bicycle Zoning just a few weeks ago. So the point about the Bicycle Zoning is that what I was worried about there was balance between something that was very controlling and something that allowed for some flexibility. And for the Bicycle Zoning, I was convinced in the end that something very prescriptive actually was exactly the right way to go because it actually freed you up from getting caught up in all sorts of details on a fight over bicycle parking and gave you a chance to really think about the architecture and the urban planning of the building.

Here I think the balance is different. Here I think that there is a, there is a lot
of thinking here that -- and learning, but it does to me at certain points have an overly prescriptive tone to it. And it's what Ted was getting at. I think it was what some of my other colleagues -- some of these measures really read like rules. Like you got to do this.

I'11 give you two examples that caught my eye and there may be many others, but I have to read through this rather quickly.

On page 12, buildings should have a clearly-expressed base, middle, and top. Yes, I understand what that means, but it almost sounds a little bit like you're telling kids in kindergarten how to build their blocks. It's a little bit much in the way it's perhaps worded, and I'm just afraid that people might over read that sentence.

The other example is which goes to that is on page 17, and this -- here the tone is different. It's not quite so strong. Used
variations in height to create varied roof 1ines.

ROGER BOOTHE: I'm sorry, Tom, you're on page $17 ?$

THOMAS ANNINGER: Page 17, measure A. Use variations in height. To me variations in height as a way of creating interest is somewhat controversial. You and I have both have talked many times about the continental European cities. They do not consider variations in height a virtue. If anything, quite the opposite. Paris is not that. Many of the cities in Europe are not that. They like a uniform line at the top of their buildings to create a certain calm and peace. And I think one of the things that Cambridge sometimes makes me uncomfortable is some of the variations in height that make for a very jagged edge and create an unpeaceful kind of feeling. So I think we have to be careful when we say things like
that. I see what you're saying, and I think it can be used tastefully and well, but I think we have to be careful not to overstate that one either.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. This is
certainly an issue that came up in the
Central Square Committee even more strongly where the committee was really pushing us not to have so much uniformity. Our old guidelines were pretty much saying very much the traditional cornus line, the setbacks, and so forth and they really wanted to see the variation. It wasn't as strong I think the Kenda11 Square Committee, but they -- I think we and Goody Clancy were worried about the bulky buildings, particularly if they get to being too bulky and they're monolithic. But I hear what you're saying. I think the language in any case should be we do want to read like a measure and not like a rule. So we'11 work on it.

HUGH RUSSELL: The -- again, thinking of the Twining Building probably because the people are staring at me, but if you look at the, think of the tower, the housing tower on Third Street, it shows you that it's quite a tall building, and I think the variation in height is in some ways more important when you get up to the taller buildings. And think about the -- what they did with that building. There's, you know -there's one mass that's a few stories taller.

ROGER BOOTHE: It's on page 9. HUGH RUSSELL: Page 9, right. And then there was the screen that introduced another kind of --

ROGER BOOTHE: The glass screen? HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. ROGER BOOTHE: It doesn't show on this picture very well, but you see a little tip of it there.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the other -- so
we're seeing it from a different side. It's more monolithic than it does from Third Street. But in some, you know, I think that articulation is it meets the sky has to be done in a bold scale. It can't be done in a weak scale. I'm just suggesting as a way to maybe explain the logic behind the requirements.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I think a more flexible way of doing it saying something where appropriate using the variation. That way we always have the, we have the conversation about is it appropriate or not. ROGER BOOTHE: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: But what's also kind of a revelation when Forest City came in with their massive mode1, and showed how like, you know, breaking the mass up into the three different volumes, you could, you could address the street in a much better way. So it's a measure that can be used to achieve
the scaling goals.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I agree with Tom about all those things, and especially in the section on tall buildings because I'm personally not a big fan of, you know, the changes in materials or fenestrations or colors or I think arbitrary changes in facades. But I think actually on page 18 where you're talking about tall buildings, while I don't necessarily like a lot of those things, you phrased it in consider doing this.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.
H. THEODORE COHEN: So it's much more, you know, a measured response. You know, we've got this goal in mind and, you know, doing this may be what a lot of us will like, but you don't, you know, just think about it.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I think language like that throughout would be helpful.

ROGER BOOTHE: I think in my mind I've been very worried about the very large massive biotech buildings and feeling like something has to happen to those buildings to humanize them. And maybe residential almost inherently has more gracefulness to it than some of these really bulky biotech buildings. So we should think more about that language.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I do want to say that, Tom, I really agree with you. I mean, I've only been to Paris once, and I was amazed at the uniformity of the line of buildings and the effect it had as you walked down the street. Because it's something that we don't experience that much here, but -THOMAS ANNINGER: Right.
H. THEODORE COHEN: On the contrary, I was just with a number of friends in Kendal1 Square going to some of the great new
restaurants there, and the number of people said why are all the buildings the same height?

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. Well, I'm not necessarily -- I'm agreeing with everybody saying we should have the flexibility. But I was impressed with that.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Can I say
something that I heard Hugh say about residential entrances on side streets? In a way that's all to the good. I think we do have to ask ourself the question as to how successful our push for residential entrances is at those early buildings at North Point. I'm not convinced was it Tango and Sierra that we really got what we wanted with those wooden doors? And they look a little bit contrive to me, and I think we have to be careful just how much we push for residential, broken down residential entrances. That too has to be done right.

I'm getting a look from somebody who designed it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
I think, you know, if right now those buildings are like point blocks in a park. WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: And when it becomes a neighborhood of streets, it's different. And I mean, I thought the ingenuity behind the -David's building. I've forgotten which one it is. But the way he really thought about it and came up with some completely unusual and new ideas, but when you actually get there on the sidewalk, it's pretty interesting, you know.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think you're absolutely right, that it is too early to judge. I think you're right.

STUART DASH: We're just getting people in them.

THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right. I
think that's a fair point.
STEVEN WINTER: Hugh, I wanted to add that as I recal1 the Central Square discussion about height was that we want to honor the old buildings and we want to honor that setting. But the height is okay where it goes as long as it's, as long as it plays and orchestrates with the rest of the streetscape, high is okay. I believe that's what they were saying.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, that's definitely what they were saying. And it's definitely departure from where we've been for quite a while and those guidelines.

STEVEN WINTER: That's what was exciting about it.

ROGER BOOTHE: And really pretty much were right on the Central Square guidelines based on the Committee's input.

STEVEN WINTER: Based on the standard heights I do think Paris is a
wonderful example. You know, they've also had a thousand years to get to the point where it works for them well. It could be our height is going to be 180 feet, and if you come back here in 900 years, we're all going to be the same height but it's going to be 180 feet.

ROGER BOOTHE: We don't have our houseman to help us out.

STUART DASH: We just changed the regulations.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, can I add? I had another area I wanted to --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, sure.
WILLIAM TIBBS: Can you talk a
little bit about the connectors? I remember when I first saw that --

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
WILLIAM TIBBS: -- it was
interesting. And the only reason why, and I may be going back, way too back in time, but

I remember a time when trying to get a connector in the city was very, very difficult. And I just want to make sure if we're saying -- I'm not saying whether -- I don't feel that there's a problem myself, but I just want to say are there other political issues that we need to or are we trying to avoid a political issue and it's going to hit us in the face.

ROGER BOOTHE: I'm not sure it's a political issue. The thing that we're trying to deal with is the desire for huge floor plates.

WILLIAM TIBBS: No, I understand that, but I'm trying to understand what was the resistance to connectors --

HUGH RUSSELL: I think these connectors would not be going across public ways.

ROGER BOOTHE: Exactly. We don't want them across public ways. The Draper

Labs Connector, that one was so hugely controversial.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, yes.
ROGER BOOTHE: I stil1 regret that
one. Some of the ones like the Broad Institute, you know, there's the existing Broad and the one that's been built now. And they have connectors right around the corner that don't go over public ways and those really read like two different buildings completely, and on several floors they're totally connected.

WILLIAM TIBBS: So the controversy is over public ways?

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, that's for sure, and I think we're all -- we all have longstanding policies in trying to avoid that because it blocks the sky and so forth and so on.

STUART DASH: We want people flat on the street.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. I want to reread it then just in that context.

HUGH RUSSELL: There's a very smal1 point, maybe we could just say they should be two stories above the ground and not the heights.

ROGER BOOTHE: Okay, do we have a number there?

HUGH RUSSELL: We have 35 feet or two stories.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yeah, no I feel better with stories. I'd like to remove a lot of the numbers to get -- to sound like we're being too descriptive.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Exact1y.
IRAM FAROOQ: If I could just say one thing. Just to be fair to MIT, I will say that they have expressed an interest in having some of this format exist over some of the streets within the campus, and I think it would be useful to get the Board's guidance
on what you all think about that. WILLIAM TIBBS: I brought it up specifically for that reason because I know from personal experience that even when MIT tried to do that on streets that were relatively within its domain, there was still a lot of controversy with the city about doing it. So I think we need to face that issue very straight on. If MIT's trying to basically say that -- MIT likes connectors. I mean their main group buildings are all connected, and I think it's a great idea as a person who's had to walk in the winter there. But I think that's an issue that we don't want to skirt passed. If they want to -- if they wanted to be over public streets but not major public streets, then I think that's something that we just need to talk about and see if that makes sense to us, and then get a sense as to what the issue is with the city. ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, I guess I
would --
HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's really simple.

ROGER BOOTHE: -- different than on a campus and a mixed use center.

WILLIAM TIBBS: But, again, the East
Campus is not the campus that we are thinking about. I mean, this whole conversation has been about the fact that we're changing the mode from the campus that's the Central Campus and the West Campus, and this is going to be something different with streets and people and commercial and institutional all mixed together.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: I would have no problem with considering connectors over Carlton and Hayward. I would have huge problems considering connectors over Amherst and what's the one that isn't labelled there? I guess down the river?

ROGER BOOTHE: It's making a passageway to the river --

WILLIAM TIBBS: Wadsworth.
ROGER BOOTHE: -- so that makes it more or less hospitable the less it's going to work.

HUGH RUSSELL: And writing up with the difference between the campus streets, we might want a place to put something like this.

WILLIAM TIBBS: That might be how you define a secondary street.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Isn't a connector over a public way ultimately up to the City Council?

ROGER BOOTHE: It is.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Because I mean, I longed for the connector between the Fogg and the Sterling Museum which was so spectacularly beautiful.

ROGER BOOTHE: That was certainly
not a universally held opinion.
H. THEODORE COHEN: No, it was not. It's not there.

HUGH RUSSELL: They managed to
convince half of the neighborhood association in the largest meeting ever held in

Cambridge, but they didn't realize the rules required two-thirds. So that we didn't do things by close majorities. Of course they now hate that building and so they're probably just as happy not to have a connector.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

ROGER BOOTHE: Okay.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. More?
H. THEODORE COHEN: Just a couple of small points. Should we, can we talk about cell towers and whether there's going to be any provision for them? And sort of the related matter is, you know, these are all great but do we talk at all about penthouses
and what goes on these beautiful roofs that we're talking about with the guidelines should be?

ROGER BOOTHE: That sounds like probably a good idea. That's always a hard one to get your arms around but we could take a crack at that.

HUGH RUSSELL: But in the sense the mechanical penthouse on a building becomes the top of the building, and we want it to be considered as the top of the building and not considered as --
H. THEODORE COHEN: Something on top.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Mechanical things on top of the building.

ROGER BOOTHE: We certain7y have that in our project review guidelines, and I think we've made pretty good progress on that in the last several years but we could address that more directly.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

And I think my last point was about interior signs. And we were talking about page 10 maybe it is, about transparency and obeying the spirit of innovation. I mean, do we really want a lot more Microsoft, you know, bearing weight as you come over the Longfellow Bridge staring you in the face? I realize it's in the interior and through the glass wal1. And I know we don't necessarily get to control the interior, but are we really trying to promote something like that? ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, that's a tough discussion. I mean, I think there is certainly something about the digital age that we're in now that you probably don't want to be ignoring it and totally covering it up. But the Microsoft thing is really a disappointment because it reads like advertisements and nothing else. So maybe I don't know. But it's a tough subject.
H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean it reads like a billboard that we probably wouldn't allow on top of the building.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: Is it better than a subway power substation which is right behind it?

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. I mean, certainly the Broad Institute tried to do something with their museum there, which maybe not everybody would like to see, but it's certainly a step above what Microsoft has done. But they're both in sort of the same, if you're -- you can talk about guidelines, they're both using electronics to try to make it -- the building more appealing from the outside. And I would think that not being overly descriptive, we probably would want to prevent that completely, but it would be nice that we had more assurances that it
was going to be successful. But I don't think we have easy answers on that.

IRAM FAROOQ: Could there just be some language that it shouldn't be advertising?

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, yes, that would be --

IRAM FAROOQ: That may be --
ROGER BOOTHE: Not advertising something that is really interesting, but one person's interesting is another person's advertisement. But let us think about that.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

STUART DASH: Which we're -actually, we have some language. The guy that back in the ill-fated sign ordinance that talked to that a little bit or talked about big areas that just, you know, lit up color or signage that basically weren't adding anything to the overall urban district and just a matter of advertising.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I want to draw
your memories back to the Manfredi renderings, the first renderings for the center of the Gateway to MIT. And while I wasn't -- I mean, I think if MIT really wanted to do that and they did it well and it was loud and splashy and colorful, I don't think we might, we might look at that and say, wel1, that's probably okay. You know? Like, like there's a dotted line there. And sort of on your land, and this is what, this is the message you want to send, then we're maybe a little puzzled by that, but....

ROGER BOOTHE: We11, yes, I mean, again, in the spirit of not wanting to choke out all creativity --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, sure. ROGER BOOTHE: -- we want to think about those things. You may remember probably Cliff Solbert's (phonetic) little electronic thing that went up in Holyoke

Center Plaza that lasted about two weeks before it was ripped out because everybody -it was animated, you know, electronic animation right there in Harvard Square. So these things are -- they're risky and, you know, MIT is a risky kind of place. And I guess we probably wanted to see some of that, and maybe we just have to try to make sure that we're understanding what the thing is really going to be like.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I mean 77
Mass. Avenue doesn't really communicate architecturally what's really going on at MIT. You know, a bunch of --

WILLIAM TIBBS: Sure it does.
You've got a dome, you've got the stairs, and you've got the new sculptures opposite.

STUART DASH: People have to find their way there.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess. It is more
-- I mean, 77, you know, looks like it's an
old academic building. And there's some probably very brilliant professors sitting behind that window, you know, with a slide rule and it's, that's not I think the modern story of everything at MIT.

ROGER BOOTHE: Do we want to address
Central Square or are we getting late now?
WILLIAM TIBBS: I'm going to have to leave at 10:00. If you all want to -HUGH RUSSELL: I guess Centra1

Square, I find is the guidelines, the problem's different. It's like Central Square, we're trying to guide in-fill rather than develop into other areas.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And it's all about in-fil1 and it's about opportunities and trying to push people to do things differently. So I mean I had a single mark on the Central Square guidelines, probably only because I didn't study them enough, but

I thought -- the only mark I have was 5,000 square feet big enough for a public market building in Central Square? And it says minimum of 5,000 . I thought downtown Brattleboro ended up with a public market space kind of by default that's probably four times that size. And that's kind of an interesting, usable space. The things go on down there, and mostly it's kind of empty and forlorn but every once in a while it's going to be fun. So that was my --

ROGER BOOTHE: We11, if I could just say one thing about the committee process. HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

ROGER BOOTHE: Again, they really pushed hard to get away from the old guidelines that seemed too stayed. And I read them over and even though I probably wrote them, they were probably a little too stayed. So they're wanting us to think about great new architecture that doesn't have to
be historicist, but also we had the desire to keep thinking about the historical pattern there because it is very important. We don't want Central Square to disappear because people love Central Square. We had the Red Ribbon Commission right before the K2-C2 process, and that big theme there was saying let's benefit from some of all of this economic activity that's happening in Kendall Square and how we bring that to Central Square. So I mean, this image up on the screen here, which I forget what page it's on in the guidelines, but it's got --

IRAM FAROOQ: 6.
ROGER BOOTHE: -- on the left side, the upper portion of the Holmes Building and its plaza which really doesn't have a popular following. And we've got on the right Lafayette Square which is amazingly popular, but it doesn't have architectural framing. That's kind of at the two ends of the square,
and I think those were really emblematic concerns of the committee is how to make something more at this square and then really respect what's happened at Lafayette Square. And, of course, we heard a lot about that and the discussion about the Forest City rezoning. And we still have some folks right here in the room who have taken on the request site, and so that's maybe a little bit more than in-fill because it's a big site. You got the city parking lot here. That's two big city parking lots were also big discussion in committee as to how those could be built with to still respect the neighborhood edges and so forth but have something more positive going on in it. So, I think that these guidelines really do try to respect a lot of the -- those -- that kind of thinking that came out of the committee. And it does once again allow for more height than we're used to been thinking about in

Central Square, but it's not really going to be wall to wall heights, you know? It's just too difficult to assemble sites and so forth. But certainly in the case of Quest, you know, I think we're going to be seeing something more visible at Lafayette Square. The good thing about this site is that we won't have to worry so much about the shading of the park since it's on the north side of the park, but then you do get back into the neighborhood issues and the needs to be sure to protect the neighborhood. So these guidelines do try to address these things, and probably don't have a lot of -- you don't want to get into a lot of detail perhaps or should I try to get through it?

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I think part of my reaction to this is that I think we really were impressed with the committee process, with the presentation that was made, the thoughtfulness that process came out
with. This is simply putting into guideline form what we've already heard, so in some ways I don't want to tamper. If it's not broken, don't fix it.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. We11, I think that's kind of the way we felt. At least we're trying to respect the spirit of that extraordinary process.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Did you say you had a five-minute run through of this that you wanted to give us?

ROGER BOOTHE: We11, I was asking whether you want to try to go through that?

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we should go through that. We're not going to have another chance if it's -- Roger does things really fast so I think we can do it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Great. I would love to have us at the end of tonight to sort of say, okay, we've had the major discussions on both of these and time to wrap them up.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And I think, you know.

PAMELA WINTERS: That's fine.
ROGER BOOTHE: Shal1 I do a run through?

Once again I think all these guidelines were trying to build on experiences we've had, especially the project review. And so much of what the Board looks at is where the building meets the street, trying to make sure that we have active sidewalks that would animate public squares where there are buildings next to it. That's a big thing that runs all through these guidelines. Streets and sidewalks is all about that. And on page 5 you see the Tavern on the Square that we've seen as a successful mode1 of trying to have zones in sidewalk where you have walking going on and cafe space and really animation. Seeing more and more of
that throughout the square. Again, that's a big theme of Red Ribbon, something the committee really wants to see.

So on page 6, which is what's up on the screen there, again, the Car1 Barren Plaza in my mind has really benefitted from getting active uses on that ground floor. There apparently is some change in the management. And we've heard indirectly that they might be getting something in there. I think that's essential. It's very hard to redo that process as much as everybody would like to, but that would be a critical thing to make it work.

The idea of this public room was something that, again, I think has its roots, this is on page 7. And the Red Ribbon Commission had resonance with the C2 Committee, the need for some kind of gathering space. And as we see these developments happen, try to think about
something that's not just internalized but something that has a place for people.

The ground floor design guidelines, again, similar to discussion we were having about the Kenda11 Square ground floors, how do we make sure those ground floors work, and I don't remember if we had as many numbers in here. I'd rather stay away from the numbers about the heights and the amount of space as we were discussing before, but certain1y trying to make sure that we don't wind up with spaces that are not really workable for these kinds of uses as everybody I think agrees are so important.

The built forum section has on page 11 there's an error actually that Section 3 is actually the same as Section 4. There's another section that -- Iram, can you pul1 that up on the screen? That's really just showing the area of Main Street near Newtown Court and it shows basically no change on the

Newtown Court side and maintaining the kind of setback regime that we have on the side where there's 650 Main Street building further on down. So you can see up here the proper Section 3. That's a real detai1. But I think as you have time to look at these and see if these make sense to you, and we can certainly still tweak the clarity and numbers and so forth. But it's really all about trying to keep the heights near Mass. Ave, have protection for the neighborhood areas and Newtown Court. And, again, the height is really allow for housing. So that's something that the committee felt very strongly about trying to allow, that would break through the traditional plane. So if you look at page 13 on the guidelines and you see the traditional plane is the 55-foot height. And then right now in our regime we have 80 feet by Special Permit. You could go up to 140 feet on a few sites. Again, I do
not think it's going to be more than a very few over the next decade or two just because of the ownership, but the committee felt strongly they wanted that kind of height possibility for residential.

On pages 14 and 15 we get into building facade, and this is where we had a really interesting discussion with the committee where they reacted against our old guidelines which all sounded very stuffy and conservative, and so I really like the juxtaposition on page 15 of having the historic building. We talk about what's really great about that, but then we have an example from Harvard Square of a really modern glassy building that has its own kind of character and interest. So we're thinking about Central Square as benefitting from having those kinds of juxtapositions. And again trying hard not to be too prescriptive in a lot of what was and that carries on page
16.

So, I think those are the main points and Central Square guidelines. Again, a lot of similarities in terms of thinking about the importance of the street and sidewalk and respect with public spaces.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Good job.
HUGH RUSSELL: So, I think what we're saying in a nutshell is we're endorsing the design guidelines as with no suggestions or reservations, and that we have a few areas to think about in Kendall Square so we're at 95 percent instead of 100.

ROGER BOOTHE: We11, I think the discussion was very helpful. I think we understand what you're saying. We'11 work on those things.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, great. Excellent work.

Iram will of course have the last word.
IRAM FAROOQ: I just want to say
next steps with what we're going to do from here on K2 and C2, and we'd like to -- our in-house Zoning team has started to write the language now especially for Central Square based on the Committee's recommendations of the Zoning language, and we'd like to start having those discussions with you, maybe come in once a month is what we're thinking, so that we can advance Central Square and then on Kendall Square. As you had earlier expressed that we use MIT as kind of the test case, and we wait for the MIT piece to wrap up before we bring you the language for the rest of the area. We feel like once we do that, we'11 be pretty set with the principles for the rest of Kendall Square.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does the -- do we have any sense of the redevelopment authority's process and the timeline?

SUSAN GLAZER: In terms of what?
ROGER BOOTHE: Processing timeline.

HUGH RUSSELL: The processing
timeline for the redevelopment authority to sort of get up to speed to become, you know, sort of --

IRAM FAROOQ: As an organization.
SUSAN GLAZER: Oh. They -- the redevelopment authority is continuing on with its work. They have advertised for a redevelopment officer redevelopment director, I'm not quite sure of the exact title. And we're receiving resumes until the 25th of this month, and then we'11 be reviewing them pretty quickly after that and hope to have someone on board, you know, fairly soon. But they definitely are continuing on.

HUGH RUSSELL: So maybe next year we'11 be in position to do the DOT Zoning or maybe earlier?

SUSAN GLAZER: It's hard to say.
One of the things that we'11 be doing in the next year is a strategic plan to, you know,
give a little more focus to their work.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Okay.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Hugh, before we break, if I'm not mistaken next week we tackle our second look at the MIT Zoning Petition?

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
THOMAS ANNINGER: Just what we do with that is something we might spend 30 seconds on, but there are parts of that Zoning Petition that we'd like guidelines, and there are parts that don't. And it isn't entirely clear to me just where Zoning stops and guidelines begin and how we navigate between those two as to what it is that we expect, but I -- any help you can give us in comments on it --

HUGH RUSSELL: Sounds like they're trying to address that issue directly with MIT.

## ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, I think we're

 making progress on that. And we're going to have a meeting with MIT before the next board meeting to kind of try to move that one step further along. But I think we heard your concerns, and we're hoping that we're getting MIT to where they feel comfortable with the Kendall Square guidelines and they can make that reference and the Zoning to move some of those things out of Zoning and into guidelines.THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't know where the right place is.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. We're still working on that but we're getting close.

THOMAS ANNINGER: But there is a line that I don't remember -- that I remember being somewhat confused about.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, we'11 try to clarify.

HUGH RUSSELL: What do you expect to
put in our packages about that in the next week?

IRAM FAROOQ: We have a Zoning memo -- we're going to have a memo for you that Jeff and the rest of the team are putting together that speaks about response to some of the questions that you had raised last time. It's our thinking that MIT wil1 have some modifications to talk to you about, because we've had conversations with them, and I think we're getting much closer on some of those areas where there was disparity even though overall there was a lot of consistency from the very start. And I think dealing with this question of what goes into guidelines, what goes into Zoning and we're, I think our hope is that what we come up with as guidelines will be embraced by MIT as their set of guidelines and gets attached to their Zoning as a collective piece.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think what Hugh

| 1 | might have been asking is are you intending |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | to send us perhaps a memo on some of these |
| 3 | issues that might help us go deeper into our |
| 4 | analysis of the Zoning than we were able to |
| 5 | do the first time? |
| 6 | ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. |
| 7 | THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that would |
| 8 | be helpful. |
| 9 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you very |
| 10 | much. |
| 11 |  |
| 12 | (Whereupon, at 10:15 p.m., the |
| 13 | Planning Board Adjourned.) |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
|  |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
|  |  |


| 1 | ERRATA SHEET AND INSTRUCTIONS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | The original of the Errata Sheet |
| 3 | has been delivered to Community Development. |
| 4 | When the Errata Sheet has been |
| 5 | completed and signed, a copy thereof should |
| 6 | be delivered to each party of record and the |
| 7 | ORIGINAL delivered to Community Development, |
| 8 | to whom the original transcript was |
| 9 | delivered. |
| 10 |  |
| 11 | INSTRUCTIONS |
| 12 | After reading this volume of the transcript indicate any corrections or |
| 13 | changes and the reasons therefor on the |
| 14 | Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. DO NOT make marks or notations on the transcript volume itself. |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 | REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE |
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| 19 | RECEIVED. |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
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