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## PROCEEDINGS

(Sitting Members: Hugh Russe11, H. Theodore Cohen, Steven Winter, Tom Sieniewicz, Steven Cohen, Catherine Preston, Connolly.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Now that we have a Chair we can start. The first item on our agenda is an update. And Iram is going to give us that.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you, Hugh.
So this is, this week the big attractions are related to the Connolly petition. That tomorrow night there is a panel discussion on getting to Net Zero at the public library. And then on October 10th the City Council is holding a round table discussion also on the topic. And that will be in the Sullivan Chamber at three.

## In terms of your agenda coming up,

 meetings coming up are October the 1st --we11, that's today. 22nd and 29th. Those are the remaining two October meetings.

In November we have the 12th and then the first week, first Tuesday we're not having a meeting because of the election. So the next meeting will be in the Sullivan Chamber. So everybody should please make note because that's an unusual location for us, and that will be the discussion of the medical marijuana zoning. So we've tried to save that as the only item on the agenda. We expect there will be interest.

## Thank you.

(Pamela Winters Seated.)
H. THEODORE COHEN: How come we're not meeting on the 15 th?

HUGH RUSSELL: The election.
LIZA PADEN: The 15th is the special election.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Oh, okay.

*     *         *             *                 * 

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, the next item on our agenda is Board of Zoning Appeal cases.

LIZA PADEN: So the agenda for October 10th is -- has got the two cases that you've already started to review for Bell Atlantic antennas. So there's the rest of the cases if anybody has any questions. I don't see any issues. Most of it is setbacks and window locations.

Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I just had a question about 207 Prospect Street. It's case 10513. I could not understand the language. "To reduce the setback of parking area for three legal spaces." What does that mean?

| 1 | LIZA PADEN: So in the Residence C-1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | District there's a requirement that you can't |
| 3 | park within a certain distance of the |
| 4 | building. And so this, this building is -- |
| 5 | the lot's not wide enough but the building is |
| 6 | sitting on it to have the width that you need |
| 7 | to have. |
| 8 | STEVEN WINTER: Is it a business? |
| 9 | LIZA PADEN: They're converting it |
| 10 | to residential. |
| 11 | STEVEN WINTER: So it's not |
| 12 | currently a business, because it was |
| 13 | packed -- it looked like a used car lot. It |
| 14 | was packed with trucks. |
| 15 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. This is the |
| 16 | Pan -- |
| 17 | STEVEN WINTER: Robert Pan? |
| 18 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. So he's |
| 19 | converting to a residential building again. |

So in order to have the driveway work, the driveway will be here and then there will be the three parking spaces, but it's not going to meet the setback requirements.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay, I get it now, I understand it. Thank you.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: We might want to comment on that case that we would think it's a good idea to convert the business use into a residential use in a residence district.

STEVEN WINTER: I'm fine with that.
HUGH RUSSELL: And let the Zoning
Board take that as a -- well, we don't have to comment on the technical parts of it that we're not really familiar with, but we should make it happen.

Is there any update on the Bell
Atlantic cases? the revised plans for the installation at the Sancta Maria Hospital. So they are proposing to reduce the height of the antennas on the facade and to finish them in the flashing if that's, if they're still protruding into the flashing.

And the other case, which is Kendall Square, there's a meeting that's been set up which probably will be rescheduled because they're not ready yet with the alternative design.

## HUGH RUSSELL: That sounds

 encouraging.LIZA PADEN: My understanding is that the Sancta Maria Hospital case did not have to come back to the Board if they redesigned it in such a way that they didn't break the roof line. That was my

| 1 | understanding. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | HUGH RUSSELL: That's right. |
| 3 | LIZA PADEN: Okay. |
| 4 | HUGH RUSSELL: I think we prefer |
| 5 | that they were down in the brick area. |
| 6 | LIZA PADEN: Right. |
| 7 | Is that it for the BZA cases? Okay, |
| 8 | thank you. |
| 9 | * * |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: The meeting |
| 11 | transcripts? |
| 12 | LIZA PADEN: We don't have any new |
| 13 | trans -- I'm sorry, we do have a new meeting |
| 14 | transcript. It just came in. It's July -- |
| 15 | the second meeting in July, 16th. It's the |
| 16 | second meeting in July I know that. |
| 17 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. And it's |
| 18 | certified as being an accurate transcript? |
| 19 | LIZA PADEN: Yes. |


| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a motion to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | approve? |
| 3 | STEVEN WINTER: Motion. |
| 4 | HUGH RUSSELL: Steve. |
| 5 | Second? Pam. |
| 6 | All those on the motion? |
| 7 | (Raising hands.) |
| 8 | HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members voting in |
| 9 | favor. |
| 10 | * * |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: And now we have our |
| 12 | next item on the agenda is scheduled for 7:20 |
| 13 | is a public hearing. So we will wait until |
| 14 | it's closer to 7:20. |
| 15 | (A short recess was taken.) |
| 16 | HUGH RUSSELL: So now being after |
| 17 | 7:20 we could take up the next item on our |
| 18 | agenda, which is the Major Amendment for |
| 19 | Planning Board case 231A, 150 Second Street. |

Mr. Galluccio.
ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: Thank
you, Mr. Chairman. I am available for questions. I did want to just note that there are responses to questions that were asked of the Traffic Department as supplemented by the applicants before you this evening and happy to answer any questions.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I think I've seen Sue's October 1st memorandum since I believe today is October 1st. And I didn't review it before today. I found a copy on my desk.

And then you summarized your memo in yours.
ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: We were asked to supplement the answers as they related to question 1 and question 4.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
And is this -- procedurally this is the
second hearing on a Major Amendment. We have a determination that we asked these questions.

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: That's correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I think what we should do is make sure we understand it and we'd ask for public testimony and then we could proceed.

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: And, Mr. Chairman, I think there was also a communication from the East Cambridge Planning Team and I'm happy to speak to that as wel1. The matter is somewhat interesting because there were previous conditions associated with the Special Permit that we 1eft intact which I think are helpful to the community's concerns. It was a little difficult, I think, because we added new
conditions to deal with some of the off street parking as recommended by Traffic and Parking. It was a little unclear that some of the original conditions that require the developer or owner of 159 First Street to provide up to one-to-one off street parking if so demanded. So that, that check is already in place and we left that alone. But it was a little difficult to explain. We were going to secure the lease for up to 15 which brought -- which brought it to a 0.68 , but that the old condition was still in place up to one-to-one. And I'm not sure we did a -- I did a great job of explaining that at the first hearing either. So I accept responsibility for that.

HUGH RUSSELL: So as I understand it, there are three numbers, and the first number is the actual number of spaces in the
building. And nobody's certain at this point in time whether that number will be sufficient or not. And there's enough that you're required to at least 15 spaces until we rid you of that because the Traffic and Parking Department is reasonably confident that that's the higher limit that would be expected. But should they be wrong and you the owner lease to people with more cars, you're still under the obligation to lease more spaces to satisfy that up to one to one. ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: That's correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
And that's basically -- that's the entire story here.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.
STEVEN WINTER: And we're sticking to it.

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: And
Mr. Chair, obviously it would make much less sense if there weren't the availability of -I mean, it's a pretty unique geographical location where you can argue that availability. The original Special Permit had language that talked about surveys and the ability for them to monitor so that they could have a sense of what that actual demand is.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so we agree to go forward to public testimony?

Would anyone like to speak on this matter?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Since I asked the questions, I'11 just say that I really appreciate the responses from counselor Galluccio and from Sue Clippinger. It's exactly the kind of detail that I was
looking for and gives me a lot of assurances as to how this has been thought through. So thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there any member of the public that would like to speak? (No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: I see no one.
So I think the sense of the Board, unless I'm misjudging it, is to proceed to vote to grant the Major Amendment. And then we should think about how we can do that to make it the most -- make their process correct.

We have conditions from the Traffic and Parking Department. And what do we have to do to grant the Major Amendment procedural1y?

JEFF ROBERTS: I'11 take that as a question for me. Jeff Roberts, Community Deve1opment.

So what's being requested is a Major
Amendment to the final development plan that requires making the findings of Article 12, that a typical final development plan would be subject to, and I can make those available if you can't find them. But in addition there is a Special Permit under Section 6.35.1 which is the reduction in required parking. And in the original Special Permit included that with a reduction to what the ratio was before, and this is going to require issuing a Special Permit for the further reduction to the ratio I believe 0.56 .

HUGH RUSSELL: That's al1 described in the paperwork.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: So our findings would be that we do not expect to see adverse
impact on the parking resources because of the plan that's in place that allows the -in two stages, more spaces than are actually in the building. We could cite some conditions, we would find that the list does not alter the basic concept that we previously approved. And the only change is to the parking arrangements.

Okay, so Jeff, what you just said was that we already made those findings in the preliminary determination?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. In the preliminary determination the Planning Board made the -- there's a list of three findings that I just handed to you. HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. JEFF ROBERTS: Those were made in the preliminary determination. Those can be essentially --

HUGH RUSSELL: Reaffirmed.
JEFF ROBERTS: -- reaffirmed in the
final development plan. And then the actual approval of the Major Amendment is an issuance of a Special Permit subject to conditions that the Planning Board would set.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So we have essentially two Special Permits; one, the reduction of the required parking under 6.35 -point something or other. I'm kind of wandering my way through this, but I think we're almost there.

So 6.35 .1 is a reduction of required parking. So we would find that the lesser amount of parking will not cause excessive congestion, endanger public safety or reduce parking availability by other uses or adversely impact the neighborhood.

We find there is available surplus off
street parking in the vicinity.
There is a reasonable proximity to two MBTA stations. And we might also comment that this arrangement is a -- in a way -it's a decoupling of a shared use of off street parking spaces which was the previous way it was handled in the permit which is, and we believe that's appropriate for the two different uses in the two different buildings. And I think that's the findings we need to make for 6.35.1.

So I need a motion to go along with those findings to grant the Special Permits. STEVEN COHEN: So moved. HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second? I think Catherine's hand was up a fraction of the second.
H. THEODORE COHEN: She's the expert.

| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: What was that game |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | show? |
| 3 | Okay. On the motion, all those in |
| 4 | favor of granting the Special Permits? |
| 5 | (Raising hands.) |
| 6 | HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members are |
| 7 | voting in favor and they're granted. |
| 8 | Thank you very much. |
| 9 | ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: Thank |
| 10 | you. |
| 11 | * * * |
| 12 | HUGH RUSSELL: And now we've got |
| 13 | another ten-minute break for the next item on |
| 14 | our agenda. |
| 15 | (A short recess was taken.) |
| 16 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I think we're |
| 17 | going to get started. The next item on our |
| 18 | agenda is a continuation of the hearing on |
| 19 | the Connolly petition. And I'd like to |

preface this discussion with remarks.
This petition is in a long tradition of petitions that have been presented, and what's the same about it is that a group of committed thoughtful people see a matter that could eventually be addressed through the Zoning Ordinance and they make a stab at -make a proposal that addresses the issue. And so we've seen it, for example, when MIT said we want more Zoning, more Zoning potential in Kendall Square or the proposal that we just approved in Central Square. And at some point in that discussion it becomes clear that the issue is not a simple matter. It requires a lot of thought. And so we do it the Cambridge way, which is we generate a committee that tries -- is constructed, they're usually fairly large, maybe 20 people sometimes. They -- we try to balance, and I
say we because I'm speaking as a member of the city rather than as the Planning Board. Manager appoints all committees. And so, you know, there's an effort to get everybody at the table representing all points of view, have some technical expertise. Sometimes the matter is sufficiently complicated that the City hires consultants to work and aid that committee. And after a time, usually over a year, but the committee goes through it -(inaudible) has been kind of has been kind of a sort of the senior staff person for some of these committees, and so that's how we do it in the city when we find a complicated matter has many different points of view and something that is serious that needs to be done. So I think that's the case with this petition. And so I think our role is to say yes, this is a serious matter. This is
worthy of this -- a full process. We can't decide it ourselves and we, you know, we will be probably represented on that committee, we usually are. We'11 take part in it. If there's any recommendations, they will then come back to us and we will generally, you know, forward those to the Council favorably although we don't sometimes make comments.

So tonight I don't wish to get into long detailed discussion on the merits of this petition because I don't think -- I think we don't have the ability to say to the Council no, this is exactly the right thing to do about, you know, climate change in the city. So what should we be doing?

I mean, obviously we have to complete the hearing. The proponent has gone through a proposal and they've made some proposed changes to it. And as I looked at it,
they're very thoughtful changes. I think they will help the committee that's going to start working on this, but I don't feel like we should try -- anybody should expect us that we're going to solve this or should expect that we're going to recommend a petition of this importance to the City Council without the full process of the representative committee.

So I would then -- so my request to the people who are speaking to us is that understand that situation. Don't try to convince us that you're right, because I think you've already convinced us that you're addressing an important subject that needs to be addressed. You don't have to convince us anymore about that. And we're not going to weigh in on whether you're right or wrong because we don't have the expertise. There
are certainly interesting and attractive ideas in this proposal. So I -- rather than spending an hour and a half pointlessly talking about this at this Board, I would ask you to be brief and to understand the context in which we're dealing with this. We have scheduled this item for 45 minutes on our agenda. I've taken five of those minutes, so I would like to complete this discussion in 40 minutes.

So, Mr. Connolly, I believe you would like to start off.

ATTORNEY MICHAEL CONNOLLY: Thank
you, Chairman Russe11. And I can say for my part the petitioners agree with you and we fully appreciate your recognition of this issue, and we're not here to ask you to vote yes or no. We've been involved in a detailed process that's involved meetings with
community stakeholders, very productive meetings with Community Development Department and city staff. We worked together with the City Council to support the idea of a Net Zero task force as you mentioned. So we are looking at this as really a wonderful process that has played out over the past few months. And I'11 mention while I am standing here that tomorrow evening Mayor Davis is hosting a forum on the issue of Net Zero at the Cambridge Public Library at six p.m. And she's actually brought a number of the experts whom, you know, who you referenced in your opening to come and speak to us and talk about this issue.

But while we're here, I'm happy to present or begin to present these changes that we've worked on very carefully both in
our committee and with stakeholders and experts. And we've introduced a number of structural changes.

One of the first complaints that we heard was people seem to confuse Net Zero energy buildings with a Net Zero emissions standard. And so the first change we made is we adjusted the purpose of the Net Zero review, and instead of asking applicants to maximize energy efficiency and instead of asking applicants to maximize on-site generation of renewable energy, we've slightly changed it and we've said just strive to maximize it. So what does that mean?

Well, we followed the parking and traffic guidelines of Article 19 and we introduced this notion of Net Zero emission indicators and we picked a number of items.

You'11 hear from Quinton, he'11 go through them in a minute. In theory this is what would allow you to review a project and determine whether or not it's passed that initial bar, whether or not the applicant has indeed strived to maximize energy efficiency and has strived to do as much on-site generation as possible.

In addition, another concern we've heard is about renewable energy. What is renewable energy? Is renewable energy too expensive? Is renewable energy too cheap? And so we've added a number of options and alternatives both local and national and we also have some prices to show you that this is something that can definitely be done. So without further adeu --

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so I guess
you're ignoring my statement which was we

| 1 | didn't want to go paragraph by paragraph |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | through a petition that we don't believe is |
| 3 | appropriate to recommend because of the |
| 4 | procedural questions not because of the |
| 5 | substance. |
| 6 | So I guess I'm curious how many people |
| 7 | in this room want to speak? |
| 8 | (Raising hands.) |
| 9 | HUGH RUSSELL: So -- okay. So |
| 10 | that's maybe eight or nine hands. So that |
| 11 | will take about 25 minutes. So we've got |
| 12 | until 8:30. We've got 35 minutes. So I |
| 13 | would ask you to limit your remarks to ten |
| 14 | more minutes. |
| 15 | ATTORNEY MICHAEL CONNOLY: Sure, |
| 16 | absolutely. We're not going to talk that |
| 17 | much longer. And we're just happy to present |
| 18 | these ideas because they have involved a |
| 19 | great deal of thought. So without further |

adeu let me turn it over to Quinton who will turn it over to some of the ideas.

QUINTON ZONDERVAN: Thank you. And thanks, Mike, for all your hard work and for that introduction. Quinton Zondervan, Z-o-n-d-e-r-v-a-n, and I apologize, we're not here to waste your time. We're going to be very brief and we're going to be very efficient and we're just going to high1ight the changes so that the people in the room can understand what we're proposing so you can understand and then we wi 11 proceed from there.

So as you may recal1, we present a framework for how to get the Net Zero which we call reduce, produce, and purchase. And reduce means to make your building as energy efficient as you can. Produce means to produce as much renewable energy on site at
the building as you can. And then purchase means to purchase renewable energy off the grid to make up for the difference.

So what we did as Mike mentioned, we changed the standard from maximize to strives to maximize and that's through it all cases so we won't go through that every time. And then we introduced specific indicators taken from the LEED standard, which you're already familiar with, to be able to measure the actual efficiency improvement to the building design. And then we also removed the ASHRAE reference because that raised some more concerns about legal applicability.

In the produce section we added specific indicators including installing solar photovoltaic or other renewable energy installations on the majority of the unencumbered roof space. And then we also
specified installation of ground source heat pumps or a report on why that's not applicable in that particular project.

And then finally on the purchase component we clarified what we mean by renewable energy, and specifically the issue of renewable energy certificates which is very contentious and confusing and so we gave some specific examples of what kind of renewable energy certificates would be acceptable, and also to state the preference for local renewable energy that is sourced in New England itself.

And as a specific example, we just wanted to put this in there as a Massachusetts Energy Consumer Alliance which provides New England Wind and New England Green Start products which are renewable energy products that are available to
consumers in Massachusetts at very affordable rates. The New England Wind is four cents per kilowatt hour above the NStar basically. And the Green Star is 2.7 cents about the NStar green rate. So again, we just wanted to give -- show this as an example of local renewable energy that is available for purchase on the grid today.

So that's the conclusion of our presentation and thank you very much for your attention.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. This is not -I would ask you to not applaud after every speaker. It's not the way we do things here.

So who would like to speak? Is there a sign-up sheet?

Susan Ringler.
SUSAN RINGLER: Good evening. My
name is Susan Ringler, S-u-s-a-n

R-i-n-g-1-e-r. I live at 604 Green Street. I'm just here to voice my support for the Net Zero and I also want to stress the urgency of the climate situation. And how I understand that it's important to study things, it's also important to act because there are some very, very large buildings soon to be in the pipeline in Cambridge and those buildings will be around for 50 or 75 years and we really need to be building for the future and not the past which it's really important that we start very quickly here in Cambridge to build buildings in a way that is sustainable and that we not wait too long to think about doing them, but that we take a few important steps now. And I think the Connolly petition is taking a few important steps and I encourage you to take many other steps later on.

Thank you very much.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
John Pitkin.
JOHN PITKIN: Thank you. John Pitkin, 18 Fayette Street. I will be brief. I support the Net Zero petition. Just for the Board's sake, I'd like to ask everybody who is here supporting it to show their support by standing or showing the card. There is tremendous public enthusiasm for taking action on this measure. You understand that. But I just thought it was important to see who's here tonight. Maybe it will speed things up later down the line. Everybody doesn't have to get up and speak.

I want to commend Mike Connolly for taking the Net Zero Committee's recommendations and put them into Zoning language. A lot of thought has gone into it.

And I want to address what Chairman Russel1 said in the beginning as he would recall and as you might recall there was an earlier petition known as the Pitkin petition that was also very comprehensive and wound up getting referred to a task force as we are talking about tonight. But I will also remind you that parts of that petition passed initially. And I would urge the Board not to consider this an all or nothing proposition and to consider the importance of expressing some opinions about what's in here and what seems to be more -- well, it's not necessarily an indivisible hole. And any advice, any opinions that the Board can give to guide the City Council and the task force or task forces that will be formed will be extremely valuable. So please pay attention to the care -- I ask you to please pay
attention not just to the general issues, but the specific proposals and do voice an opinion on that even if perhaps it's not pass or don't pass. So with that, I would say we need your input as soon as possible.

The U.N. Climate Panel has confirmed what we said in our presentation two months ago. There is a carbon budget and we have to do something about it real quick.

Thank you very much. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Stu Butler (phonetic).
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: Jeanne Semivan. JEANNE SEMIVAN: Hi, my name is Jeanne Semivan, S-e-m-i-v-a-n. I live at One Richdale Avenue and in light of the statements earlier and the scope of all of this, I just want to keep it very brief to
say that I support the petition and to whatever extent you have procedural concerns to also just echo the sentiment of please voice those and voice any opinions you have on the underlying substance of this petition so that we can move forward with something that is appropriate in every respect to achieve the greatest amount of action on this as much as possible as soon as possible. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Kristen Hoffman.
KRISTEN HOFFMAN: Hi, good evening.
I'm Kristen Hoffman. I live at 205 Walden
Street. I'm just here tonight to voice full
support for the petition. I've worked on various sustainability projects, green building design and even the Net Zero building that's going up with the school department. But I'm here with the resident
cap on tonight, and I'm just saying that I do fully support the Connolly petition. I think that Cambridge is a city that can be a full-fledged leader for this kind of new development and this kind of innovation. Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Frank Gerratana.
FRANK GERRATANA: Hi. I'm Frank Gerratana. I live at 632 Mass. Ave. I'11 spell the name for you. G-e-r-r-a-t-a-n-a. I was one of the original signers of the petition, and I think the Connolly team has done a really great job of addressing all the concerns raised by the city administration to make sure that the petition is workable and that it's all -- do a lot for the City of Cambridge in the future. And also I think that Cambridge has always been a leader in

| 1 | environmental issues. I think that where |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Cambridge goes other cities follow, and I |
| 3 | think that if anything is to happen with Net |
| 4 | Zero, you know, on a larger scale has to |
| 5 | start in a place like Cambridge. So I really |
| 6 | encourage the Board to do whatever it can to |
| 7 | help move this through. |
| 8 | Thank you. |
| 9 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. |
| 10 | Matthew Schriner. |
| 11 | MATTHEW SCHRINER: Matthew Schriner, |
| 12 | S-c-h-r-i-n-e-r. I wasn't sure if it's |
| 13 | allowable for me to ask a question of the |
| 14 | Board or whether I can only speak. |
| 15 | HUGH RUSSELL: You can speak and if |
| 16 | there's a question in your speech, that's |
| 17 | fine. You may not -- can't expect |
| 18 | necessarily expect to get an answer. |
| 19 | MATTHEW SCHRINER: I heard that one |

of the objections I think within the City Council was sort of the question of competitive pressures from other towns, and I wasn't sure if this Board was charged with considering that as an issue. My -- I say my feeling is that we have lots of office buildings. I don't feel too much fear about that, but if I could hear what the Board's recommendation around that could be or maybe cannot be, I'd be interesting in hearing. HUGH RUSSEL: Okay, thank you. ELLI YARDEN. ELLI YARDEN: My name is Elli

Yarden. I live at 143 Pleasant Street. I deeply regret the failure of the City to provide adequate public -- common public spaces where differences can be resolved in a rational way. I don't think it's the obligation of the Planning Board to provide
it, but nevertheless I will address some of the objections which have been made to putting in plan zero.

One set of objections, more ridiculous objections, is that there are better ways of doing things. I have studied the documents on this which refer in one case to a combined academic civic project and so forth. There is nothing in this project that prevents other actions from taking place. There are many other actions needed. This one has a distinctive feature, and that is that it demands from all developers. And especially from the Planning Board that it start looking at full cost accounting or full environmental cost accounting. This is not being done. I don't know that the Community Development Department is equipped for it. I do not know that this Planning Board has the people on it
who have the kind of knowledge that is required to deal with climate change, its ecological consequences, and its consequences for the urban environment. Let that be as it may. I am sure that there are other ways of choosing Planning Boards even under plan E.

I suggest that this Planning Board start doing research.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. Ben Pignatelli.

## BEN PIGNATELLI: Ben Pignatelli,

 P-i-g-n-a-t-e-1-1-i. Thanks a lot. I really appreciate the public service. I come from a family of public servants, but just as with my family, I've got to push back and challenge and say we need more. We need to act a lot faster. And the irony in Cambridge is so strong to me. We invite all these big drug companies in and these big buildings tomake quality of life way better, but every building that we build these days makes us less healthy. I mean, that's just a fact.

And I think it will help the economy. It will help the tax rolls here in Cambridge. It will help the economy in Massachusetts. And, yeah, this petition may not be ready right now, but I've been on awful lot of webinars for the new building institute for years now and they're a good resource to learn more. And it would be great if they were on board with this petition, too, the new buildings institute could offer a lot. But if we wait until everybody's on board with this, it's not change. It's just business as usual.

Thank you very much. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Carolyn Shipley.

## CAROLYN SHIPLEY: Good evening.

Carolyn Shipley, S-h-i-p-1-e-y, 15 Laure1
Street, Cambridgeport.
I want to mention a very interesting report I came across today and it says ask the climate question. It's from The Center For Clean Air Policy. Actually someone can tell you but there will be this forum at MIT where people from center for clean air -actually, Steve Wrinkleman will be at -- he's from the Center for Clean Air Policy. They asked urban leaders to ask the quiet climate question. I think that's what we're here for. They want to know who is going to be the champion of adaptation. It could be a Mayor, a county commissioner, a city department, or Planning Board or someone like Mike Connolly who took the initiative to create the Connolly Net Zero petition. He's
a real adaptation champion.
The U.N. just released its report last week saying that we will pass the tipping point within a decade or two and has set guidelines for all countries to do something about their emissions. Yet there are some countries that have more carbon emissions than we do, but someone has to start it. And we have to start somewhere.

I was thinking that if I were running for City Council, I would have a campaign slogan which would be 3-D. Considering the fact that parts of Cambridge will be flooded according to a CDD report by 2050 from a storm surge, my three D's would be that I would ask the cities to build dams, dikes, and docks for our boats because we won't be using our cars. I urge you to be the adaptation champions, to do something about

| 1 | starting us on the way to saving our |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | environment. We're not making it up. A11 |
| 3 | scientists -- there's another report I think |
| 4 | in The Globe today about another report by |
| 5 | the union of concerned scientists. Most |
| 6 | scientists say we do have a problem. So I |
| 7 | urge you to be the climate adaptation |
| 8 | champions. |
| 9 | Thank you. |
| 10 | HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. |
| 11 | Does anyone else wish to speak? We'11 |
| 12 | take the man in the blue shirt behind the man |
| 13 | in the blue shirt. |
| 14 | PARAG SHAH: Parag Shah, P-a-r-a-g. |
| 15 | Last name is S-h-a-h. And I apologize I'm |
| 16 | not actually a resident of Cambridge, I used |
| 17 | to be a resident of Cambridge and echoing |
| 18 | comments made earlier, I now live in Boston |
| 19 | and I would tell you that, you know, other |

communities are watching. I think this is a potential leadership position that Cambridge can take on this issue. It's something bold, a little different, and I think the steps are lined up to be taken. So I just wanted to play that out there, that I think Boston's looking. There's a new Mayor coming on board. I know at least I've mentioned it or whispered into the ears of one of the two remaining mayoral candidates, so, you know, we're hoping to piggy back on what the Cambridge leadership does here. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Yes, Ma'am.
MARK JAQUITH: Good evening. For the record my name is Mark Jaquith, J-a-q-u-i-t-h. I reside at 213 Hurley Street. Chairman Russell just told us that
the Board recognizes this issue, knows where we need to go. Everybody out here recognizes the issue, knows where we need to go. I just urge you to use your office to help us get there.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I would make a correction. I think we don't know, specifically don't know where we need to go. We know the end goal. We don't know how to get there. And that's --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you speak up?

HUGH RUSSELL: I can try. I can get closer.

Did the woman sitting next to you wish to speak? There's a woman who has her hand up. Is that Pebble?

PEBBLE GIFFORD: Yes. is Pebble Gifford and I live at 15 Hilliard Street. And I looked at this issue as a matter of pride. And I am very proud that Cambridge has taken a leadership position in this, and I hope it continues to. I was curious tonight to see how many times I could find on Google Cambridge's zero -- what is it? Net Zero emission highlighted or identified. Three pages and I ran out. We're on many news sites. Political had something on it. There were a whole bunch of them. So we've already gotten recognition for not doing anything, and I'm -- and we've also gotten some knocks because word is out that the politicians and special interests are trying to kill it. That's in the news, too. So I urge everybody just to take a look and see how much coverage this issue is
getting already.
Now we can be proud of that, which I
am. And once again Cambridge can take the aggressive position and try and get this thing going and established and I would hope that the City Councillors could take pride in it and not knock it and the Planning Board, the same thing, if we can work it out. And I think if there's a will to do it and pointing out the way is the issue. And what I'm very disappointed in, and I'11 mention it, is we're the perfect city to do this. We're the people's republic and we can do things on the radical side and get away with it I guess. But I am not happy about is MIT's role in this venture. I understand that they have designed and created some of the systems that will be put into these buildings to enable them to be zero, Net Zero emission. But yet,
they're taking the opposite task. They have a task force that exists to kill this, this program, to kill it. And I think that's so irresponsible. This is one of the leading scientific educational institutions in the country. They should be getting blasted for doing this. They're much more concerned now. I think they had a major change in course and let's focus where funds are concerned, where students and student housing and student issues, they've formed these task forces or these groups that are interested in the commercial development to be incubators or the innovators. Or whatever it is you want. And I've even heard a rumor, maybe it isn't a rumor, maybe it's the truth, they want Central Square to have buildings with bedrooms for people to come and work in these new ventures. They're already here a lot of
them. That's their attitude towards Central Square. I suggest that they should move out, move on, do anything. We shouldn't let them get away with taking that position if that is the case.

Once again, I'11 just say that I think this is a matter that Carolyn said to be proud of. There should be some heros in this. There's already one hero, Mike, who's done it this far. And I think there's a chance here for Planning Board to be heros and the City Council to be heros. Wait until you see. There won't be three pages of Google notices about Cambridge and this petition, there will be 10 pages. And I think that's something we should shoot for. So let's go with it. A lot of questions, get them answered, and let's go with it.

Thank you.

## HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

SUE BUTLER: Thank you very much.
I'm Sue Butler. I live half a block from here. I own two buildings that are increasingly on geothermal and photovoltaics and carbon negative. My household electric bill is zero for the year and it covers my whole household use and all of the pumping for the baseboard hot water systems in my tenant's apartments. I think you should support this excellent petition.

Mike Connolly, thank you very much.
It's very important that we take a
position now in order to solve the problem. The problem is that there are 400 parts per million of carbon dioxide and many other greenhouse gasses in our upper atmosphere, including water vapor which gets there from the increasingly violent storms that go five
miles high and throw water vapor into the upper atmosphere along with a number of other compounds. It means we're heating up. It means we are in the beginning wobble of a catastrophe. I work as a nurse, also as co-principle investigator in the lab for probabilistic reasoning where we study errors of judgment under uncertain conditions. When I first started as a nurse, I worked in intensive care. I took care of people who were very, very, very catastrophically i11. I know what you have to do to save someone who's got a bad lab value. I worked for a year in surgical oncology on a cancer ward. Occasionally a patient did not survive. I took care of their family. But I witnessed failures of complex systems. 400 parts per million carbon dioxide in our atmosphere is a lethal dose of carbon dioxide to our planet.

You can stand and take a position and make this Net Zero happen and you might make a difference. A lot of us are trying not to think three words: It's too late. I don't know if it is or not.

Last fall I submitted an article to a peer reviewed engineering journal on my efforts and my thoughts on sustainability and what is required. I did not expect it to be accepted. I'm not an engineer. It was accepted. I talked to my boss in the lab, I say well, they were going to let us know by May or Apri1. And mid-May I hadn't heard. And I called my boss up, I said, they haven't rejected it. Shocking. He said not only have they not rejected it, they were very, very impressed.
I'11 read you a little bit from the
first page and a little bit from the last
page. (Reading) Ray Emerson wrote in 2003
-- that's ten years ago -- delays in dealing with environmental problems will ensure both amplification and the magnitude of effects and their extension in time beyond some point of deterioration or depletion, full recovery may not be possible. As difficult as preventing or slowing some types of environmental changes may be, reversing them after they have occurred will be much more difficult, and in some instances perhaps not possible at all. That's what we're facing. I put one sentence in there. I was sure they were going to cut it out. And in the editor's comments appended to the reviewer's comments, he said don't cut it out and add to it. I wrote this a year ago, maybe more. My phrase was two words: 100 percent now. And the editor added to that:

Must be the new standard for all buildings; homes, business, industry, and government buildings. You could take a first tiny step now that might help a few other people make commitments to make the changes that we need to make to try to reverse, not avert. We're in the thick of it to try to reverse a catastrophe. And I hope you wil1. I'm sending you copies.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak? Yes, the woman in the green shirt.

AUDREY SCHULMAN: I'm Audrey
Shulman, S-c-h-u-7-m-a-n. 21 Acorn Street.
I have two kids, as many of you might have kids or grandkids, every day I make sure that they try to eat appropriately; have a little milk, maybe have a vegetable or two. I make sure they do their homework. I hope they go
to college some day. I hope they have a full and happy life. I do all these things in hopes that they will have that full and happy life. Climate change is something that can change that, and there is a great Nobel Prize winner whose name I can't remember now who said the way you judge a society is by how it hands down -- you know, what sort of society it hands down to the next generation. And I think we will be judged. The only thing we can do, the most loving thing we can do for the next generation is to give them an intact planet. And you guys have a really small chance to do one teeny thing to help out. I really recommend you do it.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
JOHN MASSIE: Hi. My name is John Massie, M-a-s-s-i-e. I live in Porter Square
on Hancock Street right on the border between Cambridge and Somerville. I have the great fortune of actually working in the energy efficiency field on the residential side of things. And what I do every single day is I talk to residents of Cambridge as working in an outreach capacity about energy efficiency and about the environment, about climate change. And the amazing thing that I've seen in the last year and a half is how many hundreds, if not thousands of residents are jazzed up about wanting to do something about climate change. Whether it's insulating their home or installing solar panels or heating systems, whatever it is. Just getting an energy assessment. Just screwing in CFL light bulbs. People want to do this. They want to make a difference. So the point I would like to do make is I think Cambridge
residents are ready for this. I see it every single day. It gets me excited for what I do. And I would really encourage you to give back to those residents that are really fighting this fight by passing this petition. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Man in the check shirt or plaid.
SPENCER LAWRENCE: Hello. My name
is Spencer Lawrence,
S-p-e-n-c-e-r L-a-w-r-e-n-c-e. I also live on the border of Cambridge and Somerville in Porter Square. Happy to know that guy. And I want to thank you guys for your time and thank all of you for showing up for this important discussion. I work in energy efficiency industry and day after day I see firsthand examples of how utilizing efficiency and renewable energy in buildings
is in the long term economic interest of the building. It also creates jobs. It's, you know, helped create a job for me, for my roommate who just spoke, and for lots of other people. But beyond the economics, this is really, you know, an ecological imperative that this happens, and to address one tiny subset of the ecological importance of this -- I'm going to take a quick poll of the audience. Who here likes or has ever been to a national park? Raise your hand. (Raising hands). SPENCER LAWRENCE: Great. Did you have a good time? Awesome. Okay.

We11, today's the 123rd anniversary of the Yosemite National Park which is a beautiful national park that I've had the good fortune to go to. And I wanted to share a quote with you today from Jonathan Jarvis
who is the director of the National Park Service. In 2010 Jonathan Jarvis said, quote: I believe climate change is fundamentally the greatest threat to the integrity our national parks that we have ever experienced.

So, I just want to leave you with that and implore you to act quickly in support of this important measure.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Yes, sir.
SAM SEIDEL: Thank you all and good evening. Sam Seide1, S-e-u-d-e-1, 381 Broadway. I just want to express my continued support for the petition. I know there's a lot of work to happen. And I think the task force is a good way to start that work. It's going to allow us to broaden the picture because not only is this a complex
ecological problem and perhaps a design engineering problem, but it's a very complicated human problem and political problem giving all the forces at play here. So I would just urge you and all the other powers that be that are in this room that you have sufficient representation on that Board because you will have the -- ultimately have the difficult work of interpreting what that Ordinance means or whatever comes out of that whole process, and so just make sure that there are enough sets of ears there to remember what was said and why it was said that way. All right.

Thank you very much.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Yes, Ma'am.
MONICA RAYMOND: My name is Monica
Raymond, R-a-y-m-o-n-d, 57 Brookline Street.

Isn't Cambridge wonderful? So many learned references? I didn't actually come out today intending to speak, but as I'm listening, I had -- I had three thoughts:

The first one is that some things are thinkable until they become unthinkable. For example, slavery was considered okay. Right? Smoking inside a room was considered okay in my lifetime. It's pretty hard for me to understand actually how knowing what we know about anthropogenic climate change, it's considered okay to still build buildings that have closed windows and rely on fossil fuel for their ventilation systems. This is called traditional architecture. It's not traditional architecture. It's very short lived. It's just the last 100 years there's all kinds of things we know about architecture and city planning that we don't
do anymore because of this. And this is something that is just going to seem insane. And to me it already does seem insane. So, to me the Net Zero petition feels like it should be a fete accompli (sic) because what we're doing right now is crazy. So it has to stop. So that's the first thing.

The second thing is that developers, architects, unions, they're gonna rise to the moment. Someone just sent me an article last week about an electrician's union in San Diego that's collaborating -- the union is collaborating with Net Zero development there. The electricians are learning the systems. So why would we turn down the opportunity to be a place -- and it's not like we're going to be pioneers for the world. This has already been pioneered in Germany and the Netherlands, but in the

United States no. Why would we turn down the opportunity to be the place where we're learning how to do these things? Where our builders and our unions are learning the skills that they need to really build for the 21st century in a rational way?

And the third thing is why would we walk away from basically the novice, the good feeling, the possibility of pride and praise that we would get for being a city that pioneers this in the United States? It just seems to me like a no brainer to figure out a way to go forward with it and I hope you will.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Yes, sir.
STEVEN MILLER: My name is Steven Miller, M-i-1-1-e-r.

I also didn't expect to speak here today. I think one of the common worries about an Ordinance of this type is that it will put us at an economic disadvantage. They'11 go to Somerville. Whoa, right?

The good news, I think, is that what makes Cambridge special and unique is not moving. We're in an incredible lucky situation that the things that give us the economic advantage are stuck here. They're trying. I mean, Harvard's trying to move to Boston. But it's not there yet. And it probably won't ever be fully there and neither will MIT. I think we have the chance to take advantage not to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs but in fact to take advantage of our advantages. If you can't take advantage of your advantages, you are really in trouble, because when you're in
trouble, then you can't do anything at all.
This is the time to move, when things are going wel1. And in fact, I think a bigger threat is something that I as a person whose house is five feet above sea level and whose basement when I dig down, actually has sand, I think we're more threatened by the rising tide of storm surges than we are by making a smal1 percentage increase in the cost of initial construction which by every experience over the long haul more than pays itself back with the lower operating cost for the long term. I think the threat for us economically competitively is not taking action to make our local environment and our world safer. If you really want things to move, if the climate keeps happening, they're going to go to Vermont, not to Somerville. And I think we're in a lucky position. And I
urge you with whatever authority and power you have, and I understand it's bigger than you, but you've got a little piece of that pie, take a stand, move it forward. The people who are behind this petition, it's evolved. They seem very open to evolving it further. I'm sure it needs to evolve further. We all need to learn, but if we don't push it forward, it won't evolve. So I urge you to take whatever action you can. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Does anyone else wish to speak?

AARON KING: My name is Aaron King. I live at 40 Essex Street. I'm here as one of the main petitioners just to, you know, relay that, you know, one reason that I would -- became a part of this petition is that this topic is really the most important to my
generation, you know, and that's clear that, you know, your kids in high school and college and young 20s, you know, they are most interested in this issue politically. So I just wanted to start creating this platform, you know, help push this conversation forward in Cambridge. You know, and this issue of development, talking about, you know, getting new companies here and creating jobs as well as balancing low income housing. You know, these are all very important issues, but I also just really hope that we consider environmental impacts and efficiency. And so I hope you guys continue to think about this as you look at developments that are coming to Cambridge. Thank you. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. JOHN RATLIFF: My name is John

Ratliff, R-a-t-l-i-f-f, and I live at 218 Thorndike Street in East Cambridge. And the more I've listened to this discussion, the more the question has risen for me. If Cambridge doesn't do this, what city will? We're really at a place that's the envy of most other communities in terms of the number of people who want to move here and build and construct the competition for being here for a lot of advantages that we have that we're not gonna be losing by taking this step. And no one would feel able to move if people in other cities are faced with the same question of who's gonna lead and they're at a much bigger disadvantage than we are with a lot less demand, with a lot less possibility of making the change without paying some kind of a cost.

Any time we take an important step
forward in this kind of a world, it's always a fight against inertia. It's a fight against the way business is always done.

It's a fight against people who think they have a stake in what they know because it's moving forward. And we've pioneered in a lot of those areas, some have been mentioned tonight, the smoking and other areas like that, and always there's the opposition from people who are afraid of making the change. There's a lot more to fear out there than the risks of moving this petition forward. And unless some community takes a stand and begins to move against that much bigger threat, then none of us will have a very bright future ahead of us. And Cambridge should take that step and should take the lead.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Yes, sir.
GEORGE MOKRAY: My name is George Mokray, M-o-k-r-a-y, 218 Franklin Street. There's a poem by Diane DiPrima called "Rant" and she says the only war that matters is the war against the imagination. The only war that matters is the war against imagination. The only war that matter is the war against the imagination if all other wars are subsumed in it.

I publish a weekly of looks at what's happening at MIT, Harvard, and other colleges and universities in the local community about energy and other things. I go to a lot of these things and I see many incredible ideas come forward, but I also see failures of imagination, failures of connection time after time after time after time. As the
great American philosopher Pogo said: We are confronted by insurmountable opportunities. Al1 right?

I think that Net Zero buildings, Net Zero emission buildings possible. I know that some are being built, even 71-story buildings, 22 -story buildings in China and Vienna, these things are happening now. I know that builders in New England are building low and modern income Net Zero energy, positive energy buildings, all right? Affordably now. Almost like cookie cutters. They've developed the technology and they know how to do it not only here but in Canada and in more extreme environments.

Net Zero emissions to me is not only energy and carbon. We should be thinking of Net Zero emissions for everything. All right? As if you were camping, leave the
site better than when you arrived. We need to be thinking that way not only in terms of climate change, but in terms of all pollutants. And the imagination, the failure of imagination that I see here is that we're only settling for Net Zero. We should be thinking, as we've seen how the idea of Net Zero has focussed our energies, we should be thinking about net positive. We should be thinking about becoming energy producers with our infrastructure here of cleaning up the environment, of changing things. And we can do that. There is enough knowledge. There's enough experience. And there is only a lack of imagination.

Thank you for your time. Thank you for your thoughts.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone else wish to speak?

## LEE FARRIS: Good evening. My name

 is Lee Farris, spelled L-e-e F, like Frank-a-r-r-i-s, like Sam, and I live at 269 Norfolk Street in Cambridge. Thanks for giving us all an opportunity to share our thoughts. I speak in support of the Net Zero petition. I want Cambridge to be the first. I think that rather than hurting us, it will build our reputation long term. I think it will result in good buildings, and I think as a person who has put solar panels on my roof and seen my electric bill turn around, it's a great feeling, and I think that's a reasonable thing to ask of all of our large buildings. And I particularly would also like to, you know, that would also apply to universities and other organizations when they do large buildings. So I think that would be great for the whole city.Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
Does anyone else wish to speak?
CHARLES TEAGUE: Charles Teague, 23
Edmunds Street. I hope you appreciate as much as I do the effort Mike Connolly put into revising the petition. I have to commend him. He took -- diligently went through the staff memo and I think really, really applied their comments. Something which you all know I never do. So, I -- many people recited the argument which I think should carry the day. They recited the leadership argument which I think should carry the day. But I was just going to give you the back envelope, engineering argument which is that from the City's owned document is that 17 percent of the emissions of Cambridge are from transportation. And being
in the back of the envelope, we cut that in half and say the cars are doing about half of that. So 82 percent of the emissions are from buildings or it's ten times from the buildings. And we look at cars, the lifetime of a car when you go to replace it with a new technology car, it's about ten years. A building is 100 years, another factor of ten. So the Board has been very conscientious about reducing cars in Cambridge. You could reduce all the cars and it's not gonna matter. It's 100 times more important to address the buildings. Now, this is just back of the envelope, but I just want you to just think about that because the Board puts so much effort into cars and we just have to start focusing on what's on the -- what's really important.

Thank you.

| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Does anyone else wish to speak? |
| 3 | (No Response.) |
| 4 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. |
| 5 | So, colleagues. |
| 6 | STEVEN WINTER: Yes. |
| 7 | HUGH RUSSELL: I set out an approach |
| 8 | an hour or so ago and we've heard a lot of |
| 9 | very thoughtful people in that time. What |
| 10 | should we do? |
| 11 | TOM SIENIEWICZ: We11, I really |
| 12 | appreciated the remarks and actually find |
| 13 | myself in this wonderful position where I |
| 14 | think there's broad sympathy, if not |
| 15 | concurrence from everybody sitting on this |
| 16 | side of the table behind these microphones |
| 17 | and everybody sitting over there. The extent |
| 18 | to which anybody kind of antagonism was |
| 19 | outlined, I don't feel it. I think that we |

as a community have come together in a real fantastic way here. But there are a bunch of questions that need to be studied and need to be addressed before we can responsibly draft a piece of legislation which is not our role after a11. That happens at City Council. We simply advise on issues of city planning and issues of planning. So I have a number of questions which I would like to perhaps forward or pitch them into the public debate and into the formal legislative debate which relate to, I guess, questions that we're supposed to be experts at which is cities and city planning and physical space. So that's one suggestion. Maybe as a Board we could, you know, throw some questions out into the debate that could be dealt with by the really thoughtful people that are here and could be pitched to the legislative bodies and
committees that are working in front of us.
h. THEODORE COHEN: We11, I concur with what my colleagues have said, and I probably concur with most everything that the public has said. Certainly this is something that I am enormously concerned about, but it may be that I lack imagination and that I don't know the right way to go about it and what the right answers are or the right solutions are right now and how we balance the different concerns we have. One speaker talked about, you know, higher density, greater population, having more mass transit. I think there are a lot factors that have to be studied, and I don't feet competent at this point to say that this is the correct legislation that is going to solve all the problems or even some of the problems. And so I think I'm interested in what's going to
come out of the debate that the Mayor and the City Council are having tomorrow, and the follows up and the task forces that are going to be constructed because I think there are enormous questions that have to be answered, and either I lack the imagination or I
certainly know I'm not scientifically competent to answer it myself. And to know that at this moment that this is the correct legislation that we have, should have. I look forward to the task force and the City Council and the other governmental bodies moving forward as quickly as possible. And if it ends up being another Zoning Petition, then it comes back to us and we wil1 then have the sufficient information to try to determine whether, you know, it is the right Ordinance or the right Zoning Ordinance or whether it should be some other form of
legislation that the City adopts. But I think I and everybody else on this side probably agrees almost 100 percent with everything that's been said tonight.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's kind of hard to top those two comments.

STEVEN COHEN: I hesitate to say anything, but perhaps a bit of a rejoined journey I guess. I think we've heard eloquently from a number of speakers. In fact, greenhouse gasses present a problem, and we've heard the passionate plea that something needs to be done about it and that we should do something about it. But I didn't hear a clear or coherent explanation as to how this particular petition would actually, you know, have a positive, measurable, significant impact in alleviating the problem. We agree, all of us, that
there's an issue and a problem. But the difficult question that is presented to us today is whether this proposal will in fact be effective in addressing that problem. And frankly, again, as everybody has acknowledged, we're not scientists. I'm not a scientist. I don't understand all of the issues well enough to speak with tremendous confidence, but I mean the goal of this petition is to mitigate the greenhouse gas problem. But my understanding from the, you know, wonderful memo that was prepared for us and from other readings, is that the likelihood of any of the buildings or any of the taller buildings anyway, commercial buildings that we'd like to address, the likelihood that they would actually be Net Zero in the sense, you know, that they will produce more energy than they consume, well
that in and of itself is very unlikely. So the key mechanism here to address the gap is that the operators of the building either purchase renewable energy on the grid or they purchase RECs. Wel1, my understanding from the memo, again, is that on the grid renewable energy is not readily available to large commercial users. So, you know, we're then purchasing RECs. And I'm trying to figure out, you know, how RECs work. We11, you know, it's not clear, you know, how they're going to be priced, who benefits from them. It's not clear how whether a building owner who purchases these RECs how that actually benefits the residents of Cambridge or how it actually addresses or alleviates or mitigates the problem that we're trying to address here. I mean, they're about market factors in there. I mean, it's, it's just
not clear. And it really comes down, you know, I think I think to the availability of RECs and the cost of RECs. The availability of renewable energy on the grid, the cost of that energy. And ultimately I just, I guess I'm a bit confused. I'm a little bit skeptical. And I end up feeling that this ends up being largely, if not primarily, a symbolic statement, a symbolic political statement, a moral statement, and it's good to make, you know, such statements on important subjects such as this. But in this case making this statement seems to be possibly imposing substantial costs on some people, very few people actually, but a substantial cost on those few people. It seems to be imposing administrative burdens on certain people, including this Planning Board and other, you know, city agencies.

And while I cannot tell you what the consequences ultimately of this proposal would be, it seems clear that those consequences are to a large extent, you know, unknowable. Unknown and unknowable at this point. So for all of these reasons, certainly at the very least I agree with you, Mr. Chair, that this should go to a committee that brings in not only greater scientific expertise, but economic expertise to do the analysis here and to figure out what are we really accomplishing or would we be accomplishing here?

Now, if we had to build that was talking about simply increasing the energy efficiency of buildings, by all means. If we want to require that buildings have geothermal heat pumps in the future, great, I can understand that. I mean, there are a lot
of specific things that we can do in the city or make amendments to the Building Code or so forth. But frankly, so much of this proposal is tied into buying RECs or buying renewable energy on the grid, that that's what really creates the total unknown and unconquerable to me. So maybe it's a lack of imagination, but I think it's a lack of facts and the lack of any variability to anticipate what those issues will mean down the road.

So, long winded way of supporting your suggestion that this go to a committee of people who are much more representative of the disciplines and expertise than we have and that are necessary to really make some sense out of this entire topic. STEVEN WINTER: Just a brief comment, Mr. Chair.

HUGH RUSSELL: This is not a debate
at this point.
STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, I want to mention -- and to my colleagues as well, that there is so much good intentions in the room right now and we have to remember that. That when this issue comes up, we are filled with good intention despite some elements of negativity and doubt. But I think that's our strongest value. And I think we really need to be able to work with that. I think that the idea that there needs to be a larger dialogue with deeper content depth in the participants is exactly where we need to go. However, I also think that this Board can continue to play a role that encourages the outcomes of this inquiry to be as bold as we can be always and to have the kind of reach that we are used to having in Cambridge which is to go beyond where people are and to
really say we're gonna go farther than that. We are really going to do that. We know we can do it.

And the other thing is, and I think we need to continue to annunciate on this Board in the process, not fear, but that we have a resolve to make this work out. That our resolve is very, very strong. And I think that with that annunciation needs to recognize the strength of the comments from our younger folks tonight that there is a great strength there that we can tap into and have work for us. So, yes, I concur with my fellow Board members that we need to keep, we need to keep on this issue but it needs to be a larger dialogue.

PAMELA WINTERS: So I wanted to agree with what my colleagues had to say and I'm just curious as to when this task force
or committee will be starting.
Iram, I don't know if you know that. And also I would -- my hope is that the universities, the institutions, the business community, consultants, and the staff will all be involved similarly to the rezoning petition that I participated in. I'm hoping that will happen. But do you know when this will be happening?

IRAM FAROOQ: So we received a Council order on this topic just two weeks ago and the Council would like to wait for -had asked us to wait for this hearing as well as the panel discussion that they have tomorrow and the round table discussion that they have so that we have a better sense of what is the -- what's the direction that the Planning Board and the City Council want us to go in, and what -- we'11 know a lot more
about some of the technical considerations that come up. So that will help guide us in framing who is going to be on the petition.

But definitely the City Council has guided us in getting that set of people that you mentioned. And in addition to that, also making sure that there is the technical expertise that other Board members have alluded to to make sure it's a really comprehensive picture guided by real knowledge and thinking.

Thanks.
PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm going to
follow up on Tom's suggestion. So, and this is sort of my take on what we would like to see. It's -- geothermal energy is really, it's a heat bank strategy. Basically you take excess heat in the summer, you put it
into the earth, and then you draw it out in winter. Now there are other kinds of geothermal, but around here that's basically the way it works. So that's advantageous because it doesn't put more heat into the atmosphere in the summer, it puts it underground, and then when you need it, you withdraw it. And it's not without its challenges as the City Hall Annex shows, but it's -- a system has been functioning, it's no longer functioning as well as it was, but you know, we'11 figure out why and we'11 fix it. And it seems like that is something that say Harvard University is way ahead of the rest of the city. That's pretty standard in almost all of the Harvard buildings because it makes so much economic sense and it's a logical thing to do. So we would like people to do that, it may be difficult to do on the
scale of very small buildings, but this particular petition is aimed at large buildings. It's expensive to draw wells here because geothermal is apparently the most economical way to build buildings in Texas where they have a lot of drilling technology and maybe better rock that's easier to drill in. I'm not sure about that.

Another thing that occurs to me is that using roofs to collect solar energy is just like, again, another thing that makes tremendous sense and it's what we can do in the city on some roofs. I've looked at the study for my house and there's a patch about four feet square that I could put a solar collector on, and -- because I'm in the shadow of the Longfellow School. But so it makes me, you know, but the Longfellow School gets all of the sunlight. And yes, maybe a
collector would stick up and eliminate my four foot square patch, but the old climate protection plan which I was told was defunct this week, talked about an urban forest strategy. I don't think that idea is defunct. You grow trees, sequester carbon on the short term, they provide shade, they invert, you know, change the microclimate and we can do more on that. And there's an opportunity, I think and I think that the Connolly petition says that we've got an opportunity with these very expensive biotech buildings from every significant
improvements. Because the kind of a building that costs hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of dollars a square foot to build, a lot of these changes that make them better users of energy are insignificant in the overall cost. And now -- but the greatest opportunity is
really -- in the city is the existing housing stock that was built in, my house 130 -odd years ago, and has been upgraded a few times. Like, for example, when they put in heat, that would have been better I guess before, right? Well, they had, I think they had coal stoves for heating when the house was built. But there's a -- if you try to get a sewer permit in lots of parts of the Commonwealth above the surface size, you have to do I\&I. And I\&I stands for infiltration and --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Inflow. HUGH RUSSELL: -- inflow.

And what this says is that if you're going to put more wastewater into the system, you've got to get rid of extraneous water that's leaking into the system that's equal to twice what you're doing. So you could -it might be better to think about instead of
purchasing renewable energy credits, saying to Pfizer or whatever, well, gee, you're not doing as well as you should, so fix up 100 houses and that will produce an effect here. And, you know, what does that mean, fix up 100 houses? I mean, in the I\&I program you actually go into private and public property and you, at the developer's expense, do that. Maybe in a -- this kind of a program it's more like a technical assistance program. You know, it's a system that gets created. Now those are sort of some of my ideas that I would forward to the task force. Will that accomplish the goals, just those four ideas? I rather doubt it. Should they be part of the system? Probably should be.

So. Tom, do you want to go back to your list now?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes, there have
been a lot of great ideas. Steve's got some and you've articulated some wonderful ideas. My questions, I think are some of the obvious ones. You know, what's the present value of the initiative? And what's the pay back time in and that could be measured by some other context. But if we say okay, you've got to make the most efficient envelope you possibly can, that might have a real deleterious effect on the built in environment. For instance, when buildings start rotate themselves and they had advantageous solar orientation which might be contrary to our street grid and contrary to our historic pattern of our neighborhoods, so (inaudible) that you might end up with, you know, not a great urban form for buildings that we're emphasizing energy efficiency and Net Zero over some of the other qualities that we hold
really dear here in Cambridge. So that's a question I might have about that.

Your point about the urban forest also led me to a question about well, okay, so then what are your rights to sunlight across your property? If you have to generate energy to reach your Net Zero, are you going to therefore ask the City to remove street trees so that you would have sunlight so you could take advantage of solar? And maybe an absurd question, but it's the kind of question that needs to be addressed and thought through. Maybe not within the context of the actual language of the Connolly Petition, but through the legislative processes.

Yes, so I have Pebble pride, too. So I'm -- I think we should be leaders, absolutely, on this issue. And I think we
can come up with some pretty amazing ideas in a pretty intricate way in which to deal with these issues. I will say that Steve's question about whether Zoning is the right forum, Zoning is a blunt instrument. Now dealing with it in great deal of detail for over 20 years here in the city, it describes a pretty gross environment. I mean, it's very hard to do things precisely, and maybe it is another type of Ordinance or law or regulation that actually should be governing this rather than Zoning. CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think, I think that the thing that strikes me most about this Ordinance is how it doesn't or I don't see how it interacts with existing regulation through, for instance, the stretch energy code. And I think that those kinds of interactions really need to be further
flushed out and those tools employed
alongside with and what has been laid out here, I think there's some amount of this that is probably best done through the State Building Code and which we may be leaders in advocating for and promoting just as we did with energy, but that really adoption on a much wider scale than just the city is probably appropriate. There is some really innovative thinking here about what to do to get beyond that, and I applaud that innovation. And I'm -- just because I'm not there on how it works and how it would interact with other city departments and how we as a Board would assess whether or not criteria had been adequately made, I mean in some respects going from a -- a binary system of you either maximized it or you didn't to a you strove to maximize your energy efficiency
or you didn't, puts a lot more discretion on the Planning Board and leaves it a lot more open to what do we think is enough. I think we need a lot more guidance on that. It is not clear to me what's enough. I don't have the technical expertise of building systems to know what's enough. And while I think we can certainly rely a lot on city staff for that input, you know, I don't know whether or not that ongoing capacity for continually updating and evaluating those things are there yet. And I think the City Council, in considering how we build the capacity as a city to evaluate that, needs to be discussed. I think that, you know, if we're going to actually make that kind of discretionary evaluation, we do need to have the either in-house expertise or an on-call engineer or someone who can advise us on it, because I
personally don't feel equipped to make that kind of discretionary judgment on where we go -- which is why I gravitate to the stretch energy code because I think a building inspector anywhere in the state can tell me did you meet it or did you not? And when we get into the more discretionary aspects, just like we did with traffic and it was an excellent point that folks brought up, you know, that's a place where the Planning Board has long relied on the expert advice and the assistance of traffic engineers initially with an on-call engineer who provided analysis for us, and, you know, over time the City has built that in-house expertise. You know, those are the kinds of things that we need to be considering as we look to do this and essentially give a lay board the discretion to evaluate a very technical
subject.
HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm very pleased you brought up the traffic analogy because I think that's right on. I was speaking with Iram earlier about this, and it's like now when there's a traffic question, we have in-house people who are smart. We have experience -- some of which the experience that you gathered and did in one section of that management, and that you really need to be that smart about all the aspects that need to -- I'm getting stuck on my prepositions here. But all the aspects of energy management relating to climate change and then the dire consequences for the city. And so I agree with that.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I just have one other question that must have come up in the deliberations already. I mean, which is not
many people that show incrementalism, do you put this in over time? I know that every major architectural firm, many of which appear before this Board have signed up for something called the 2030 challenge which is a promise to make all of their buildings Net Zero by 2030. They're supposed to be 60 percent on the way already. I wonder if that isn't a model that we might consider. In environmentalism sometimes if you have to pump down the road because technology doesn't exist fully or the doesn't exist at the moment. 2030 is not that far away. There is absolute urgency about the issue, but maybe that's a model, an increment in these huge problems that you deal with them incrementally.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would remind us that we took a tiny step in the building on

Mass. Avenue where we looked at the glass curtain wall and said -- at which faces north, and said no -- now their response wasn't dramatic, but it went from 100 percent glass to about 80 percent glass, and I don't know what's behind the spandrel, but maybe there will be insulation behind the spandrel portions. I would certainly hope so.

So are we ready now to ask the staff to make a recommendation, write up a recommendation based on our discussion? The gist of which is we believe the task force process is needed to address the -- these matters. We don't know if there are interim measures that could be taken all that courses during the work that might be either administrative or regulatory. And we can, we can change the information we ask people to think about when they come before us and --

I'm sorry, I'm progressing.
And then we've had, we responded to the imagination challenge, I think, by demonstrating as (inaudible) said that we're really not good at this. And I thought that was one of the most accurate pieces of characterizations of the Planning Board, yes, we are not, you know, climate scientists or energy experts.

So I -- that would be the subject of the motion to not recommend adoption as submitted. To recommend that a task force process be engaged to get something that can be adopted, and that hopefully our suggestions and comments --
H. THEODORE COHEN: I concur with that and though I would suggest as part of our recommendation is that the task force and the City Council or whatever entity is taking
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it up, proceeds with all deliberate speed and moves as quickly as they can with this matter.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I think another important thing rising to the challenge, some of the voices today to act, we preface that by saying that we advise that an Ordinance be drafted, that it supports and focuses on this crisis of the pollutants coming out of the buildings. And the Net Zero, I don't know what the solution is, but we -- we're in favor of that and we support legislation to be drawn up in whatever form is appropriate to address this issue within our city limits.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, that's -- would you prepare such a recommendation?

IRAM FAROOQ: We will do that. HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Thank you all for coming and helping to
raise our level of understanding on this
issue. We'11 take a short break and go on to the rest of our agenda.
(A short recess was taken.)

HUGH RUSSELL: We're going to get
started again. The next item on our agenda is a hearing on the Major Amendment Planning Board case 85, One Education Street.

It appears Mr. McKinnon is here to explain it to us.

RICHARD McKINNON: I don't suppose I
could ask for equal time?
Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of
the Board. I'm here on behalf of EF tonight to -- this is the first building, the existing EF building, to ask that that building be granted the right to have educational uses in there as well as office
uses.
With me, Emma Rothfeld who has done the work that you received through DLA Piper; Martha Doyle the President of EF; and then Shawna Sullivan who is the new director of public information. She's the one that's got us doing things like having 5,000 people on the ferris wheel two weeks ago out at Point Park. And we had 2,000 people at our movie nights on the park. And we're doing a lot of good things. It's been a nice period for EF .

As you know, EF has a second building that's under construction at North Point. When EF decided to -- that it just had to expand and have a North American headquarters, it was courted pretty heavily by Chicago, Denver, and Miami. And happily for us they decided to stay in Cambridge. And between the two buildings it's a major
commitment. They've got three hundred -will have 386,000 square foot campus. And considering when Mr. Russell and I first encountered them, they were a tenant at One Memorial Drive on half of a floor, so they've come quite a way in Cambridge. They've been a great company.

The second building has already been granted by the Planning Board, the right to have both educational uses and office uses. And tonight we're basically asking for the same thing for the original building. We're not exactly sure exactly how those uses will be split between the two buildings, but what we have -- we do now is that we're here for the very long haul and we've got a lot of space and it will help us tremendously to have flexibility as to how we manage those uses between building 1 and building 2 .

And flexibility we need. We've already had to hire 100 people for the new building even though it's not going to be ready until next spring. So they're scattered around across campus, different campuses elsewhere. We, we -- it appears it's going to be hiring 600 to 1,000 new employees that we hire when we're in front of -- yeah, it's very good news.

So I what I'd like to also mention to the Board is that we're not asking obviously for any additional square footage, any additional parking spaces. And all of the requirements that exist under each of the Special Permits will continue to exist, and we will continue to be obligated to follow all of the conditions of the TDMs and the PTDMs which were updated in 2011 and applied in fact to both buildings. So that's a quick
summary of what the request is and why.
HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.
Question for staff. Is it absolutely
clear that we have to do this by Major Amendment rather than Minor Amendment?

JEFF ROBERTS: Just give me one second to get to the right page. As I tend to do, I'11 refer back to what the text of the Ordinance says. So we're looking at an amendment to the PUD final development plan, just what's being requested, and amendments of the final development plan shall be considered major or minor. Minor Amendments authorized by written approval of the Planning Board, and Major Amendments considered as an original application for a Special Permit. We just went through that earlier tonight. So it requires two public hearings, and for the Planning Board to issue
a Special Permit or authorize a Major Amendment.

The Planning Board shall decided whether proposed changes are major or minor. And I'11 skip down where it describes major. Well, actually it says minor. Minor Amendments are changes which do not alter the concept of the PUD in terms of density, floor area ratio, land usage, height, provision of open space, or the physical relationship of elements to the development. Minor Amendment shall include, but not be limited to, small changes of location of buildings, open space or parking or realignment of minor streets.

And then Major Amendments represent substantial deviations from the PUD concept approved by the Planning Board. Major Amendments shall include, but not be limited to large changes in floor space, mix of uses,
density, lot coverage, height, setbacks, lot sizes, open space, changes in location of buildings, open space and parking, or changes in the circulation system.

So, in this case what's being requested is the authorization of a change in the mix of uses and it's typically, you know, it can be a bit of a grey area to what level of or type of use change could be considered major or minor. It's been our practice to advise that any, any change in the permitted uses to a substantial extent, which in this case would be, you know, would pretty much go throughout the entire building, is treated as a Major Amendment. And it's -- and often that's what's asked for by the proponent as a way to make sure that all legal questions are completely resolved.

We've had past cases where I'm actually
thinking of -- the -- we just issued a Minor Amendment on the 245 First Street. The prior amendment on that, which was 2003, which I looked out, was an authorization to convert a general office use to a technical office use. So it's a similar -- in some ways can be viewed as a sort of a subtle change in use, but it's still something that was treated as a Major Amendment in order to make sure that the building owner, the user wasn't in violation of any issued Special Permit. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. It seems strange that the building is approved for Education First cannot do education as a matter of right.

RICHARD McKINNON: They did not have a very smart developing consultant at the time.

HUGH RUSSELL: Al1 right. So now
let's proceed then under the assumption that we have to make a preliminary determination tonight and decide if there are any conditions that have to be opposed.

So the first step would be to ask does anyone wish to speak on this matter?
(No Response.)
HUGH RUSSELL: I see no one who wishes to speak on this matter.

Is there any information we need in making our preliminary determination? Is there anything more that we want to know?
H. THEODORE COHEN: I have a couple of questions.

Just, is it anticipated that the educational use and the office use would be simultaneous or would be one during the day and one during the evenings?

RICHARD McKINNON: There will be
times when they will be simultaneous I'm sure. One of the things that EF did was they bought the old Arthur D. Little Business School. It's now the International School of Business so that goes on at the same time as office uses go on.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And parking, we have to refresh my memory as to where the parking is.

RICHARD McKINNON: The parking is within each of the buildings.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Within each of the buildings?

RICHARD McKINNON: Right. And it's fairly limited parking. It's 136 for this building, which is a building of about 158,000 square feet. The SOV numbers on this building have been tremendous. EF just happens to have a tremendous number of
workers that simply don't use cars. They come by bike and they come by public transportation. So, but we're not, we're keeping the exact same parking that we have.
h. THEODORE COHEN: I understand that.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: If I remember correctly, educational use, and just checked with my colleague here, this corner of the Ordinance here, educational uses have less smaller requirement for parking, are considered less intensive. I guess that's the question for the proponents.

RICHARD McKINNON: That's right. And that's the opinion of the Department of Traffic and Parking as well. And one member that knows a lot about this.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.
HUGH RUSSELL: And as I understand
it, the request is to allow educational and office use, and the other miscellaneous uses that are already in the thing without any limit or proportion.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, if we -is it necessary then for us to understand the projected percentage of classroom use in that mix? Or do we simply provide permission to do either to the extent which the proponent wishes?

HUGH RUSSELL: If we thought there was significantly different impacts between the two kinds of uses, we might go there, but it seems to me that probably the impacts are quite similar. There might be some time of day impacts that are a little different. It might be, you know -- but in the context of 150,000 square foot building, you know, is at the point that EF gets acquired by MIT and
they turn it into a 10,000 classrooms, that might be change. I just don't think that's the eventuality is likely. It may be the reverse acquisition.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.
TOM SIENIEWICZ: So it seems to me at least following the logic of the parking thought in the Ordinance that the educational use is less intensive than what they 've got on the site today. That notwithstanding, through questioning, we learned that educational use may extend the hours of operation within the EF facet as compared to what exists today because there might be night school, right? The business school or you want the possibility to have classes at night or not? Maybe you could.

MARTHA DOYLE: I'm Martha Doyle, Chief Administrative Officer of EF. Because
we're an international company our hours actually are longer anyway than the school hours, because we're servicing every country in the world. So we're already there kind of a lot. And our students actually are there 1 ess.

Another point on the driving and parking and so forth, the majority of our students are international students and so they're here from other countries and they don't have cars. I mean, they usually rent spaces in Cambridge and they all walk, bike. They don't bother buying cars when they're here as students. So it's actually quite a reduced impact. And we do a lot of one on one education, too, so it's also not your standard, you know, it's not like a high school. Our average age is 29 for the business school. And we have some adult
education programs, and that average age is around 50. So it's a little bit different than the school.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I would like to actually ask that because a final small study be done to look at the automobile utilization in the garage and the provision for bicycle parking and see if in conjunction with this change it might be prudent to change, to enhance the amount of bicycle parking because our own thinking on the subject has changed a lot since the first permit was given, and I believe we're hearing testimony that there might be -- it might make sense to shift space and that might be a way for us to, you know, if you say oh, we want to convert, you know, 10 car spaces to 70 bicycle spaces, we could in the context of this permit accomplish that thing.

MARTHA DOYLE: Well, I just -- I'm sorry, I just wanted to give one piece of information in our PTDM. Our PTDM was done for both buildings together for this exact reason so that we could sort of study the impact of both buildings as one unit almost. And so one of the things we promised to do was to purchase 20 bicycles that could be loaned to students that are housed, and they're actually housed in the new building but they could be used by the current building or the new building. And so that's just one piece of this puzzle. We looked at bikes for both, for both buildings kind of together if that's helpful.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, in the context of the answer that might be a perfectly good answer in saying we've actually considered this question and for the second building --

I just think it's, you know, I like to know that.
H. THEODORE COHEN: In a similar context, do both buildings have retail uses in them?

RICHARD McKINNON: There is a provision for retail uses and we expect both will. In the existing buildings is now a restaurant which is going to expand greatly and be right on the ground floor with outdoor seating as you may recall in the new building. We'11 be having a health club as well as salon on the first floor of the existing EF building. So each building has ancillary retail. We might also actually retain a small restaurant cafeteria on the ground floor of the existing building. So each of the buildings has set aside for retail. One of them is 14,000 square feet,
the new one. And I think the existing one is 8,000 square feet, Mr. Chair.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And wil1 the educational use impact on the retail use at a11?

RICHARD McKINNON: No, no. We expect to continue having them. And right now it's a pretty small component, but as I said, you know --
H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm waiting for the restaurant in the new building. I walk by it all the time and say it's going to be there. I'm waiting for it.

RICHARD McKINNON: Yes, yes, I know. I know. Very much so. So no, no, the restaurant -- it's moving, there are no if's and's or but's about that. But we're just not quite sure how it's going to be used by people in the exist building. It's going to
take a little bit to run the two buildings together I think for us to get a better handle. And I'm sure ten years from now it will be quite different, just as everything has been from EF as they've grown in Cambridge. STEVEN WINTER: Just one comment if I could, Mr. Chair.

I just -- I'd like to remind the Board that this, the proponent added elements of pedestrian permeability to the new building, and I think that shows they're really good neighbors and value the walkability of that part of town. So I just wanted to make sure that we all remembered that the proponent had done that. Added pedestrian permeability to the newer building.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Will the
students be skateboarders, too?

RICHARD McKINNON: I'm hoping. I
will be. Yeah, well, as you know, we worked very closely with DCR, with Kara Seiderman and folks here at CDD and the skate park people to really have a tremendous sense of getting around out there by bike and by walking. It was a big, big part of the challenge out here to do that and to do it right. In fact, we just recently got sign-off on everything from the City of Cambridge on all of the final specs for the bicycle paths, etcetera.
H. THEODORE COHEN: Just one last comment. As I've been going out to that area all spring and summer long and I take people from all over the area and from out of town, and I think it's wonderful and incredibly underused and under discovered.

RICHARD McKINNON: It's amazing.
H. THEODORE COHEN: And I think bringing in students will do nothing about enliven the area and make it a more popular area.

RICHARD McKINNON: We11, we hope so.
I mean, I'm right next-door and it's amazing to look out at such a big park and so few people in it so often. I mean, it's really been one of the reasons why Martha and Shawna have just brainstormed on ways to like -- the ferris wheel was great. It was a lot of fun. But 5,000 people that probably didn't know much about that park sure as hell learned a lot about it in two days last week getting down there. And the same thing with the several thousand people that came to the movies.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, let's do it.
The application which covers various
criteria for approval of and most of the comments about the criteria is there's no change, and so I think we would make a preliminary determination to approve this and refer to the findings that have been suggested. You can rely on those findings. STEVEN WINTER: So moved Mr. Chair. STEVEN COHEN: Second. HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. On the motion? (Raising hands.) HUGH RUSSELL: A11 members voting in favor.

RICHARD McKINNON: Thanks very much. And just procedurally it says that we'11 be back on the 22nd. Liza had asked us actually to push ahead so that you could do the medical marijuana hearing. So I don't think we're coming back. Is it the 29th, Liza, for the second hearing?

LIZA PADEN: You're on for the 29th at 344 Broadway and I'm sending out new notices and mailings and newspaper notice.

RICHARD McKINNON: Great. And we changed the signs, too.

Thank you.
HUGH RUSSELL: Great.
The last item on our agenda is the Walker Petition. And this is an unusual matter because the Walker Petition is a re-file Phillips Petition. I understand that the City Council is not going to take action on it. They have not scheduled a required hearing. So the suggestion is that we open the hearing and then close the hearing.

Mr. Teague is representing the petitioner.

CHARLES TEAGUE: So we're going to open the hearing and close the hearing? say what you'd like to say and then we can move on.

CHARLES TEAGUE: Well, I'd like to close the hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm going to coach you a little bit.

CHARLES TEAGUE: Okay, please.
HUGH RUSSELL: I think what we said in our recommendation that we said up here at the table was there's one important matter in this petition which deals with the setback from buildings to the Linear Park. And because of the way in which the side and rear yards are determined in the city, it's possible to have a building that would be too close to the park. And so I think we're in an agreement that that's something that needs to be fixed. Because of the Council action
this isn't the right vehicle to do it, but maybe there will be another petition that would simply fix that, establish a minimum setback. Charles, you said 25 and I don't remember what we said.

CHARLES TEAGUE: It was 25 , yes. HUGH RUSSELL: 25 isn't -- that's only the other side of this room. For a small parcel it may make sense, but for a larger parcel, it probably doesn't make sense.

But anyway, okay.
CHARLES TEAGUE: There was also -- I
was also looking through this, and at the very end of it, it was something I always thought was a typo in the Zoning Ordinance which is in Section 19.46 areas of special planning concern. Special District 2 always seemed that it should have been in there when

I cross-referenced it through the rest of the Zoning Ordinance, and that's one other thing to consider as a minor, as a minor correction, you know. If we're putting in changes. But other than that, that's what I have to say.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm wondering if we should file the setback petition.

STEVEN WINTER: Should we ask for a recommendation from staff?

HUGH RUSSELL: If we're agreed that that's a good idea. I mean, if we file it, it's just simpler. It doesn't -- then people can come and address it.

STEVEN WINTER: Just so I'm not being misunderstood, by recommendation from staff I would mean for them to look at research and analyze the question and then respond to us.

| 1 | HUGH RUSSELL: Exactly. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | STEVEN WINTER: Okay. |
| 3 | HUGH RUSSELL: I mean I think given |
| 4 | the legislative calendar for the year it's |
| 5 | not something we would do until the beginning |
| 6 | of next year because it can't be acted upon |
| 7 | this year. So we -- okay. |
| 8 | So does anyone else wish to be heard on |
| 9 | the Walker Petition tonight? |
| 10 | (No Response.) |
| 11 | HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So we'11 close |
| 12 | the hearing and we'11-- and if we want to |
| 13 | send a report to the City Council, it would |
| 14 | be to say what we just said that we'd like |
| 15 | staff to consider the question of filing the |
| 16 | Planning Board petition that would address |
| 17 | the one or two issues. |
| 18 | STEVEN WINTER: I think we need to |
| 19 | inform them, Mr. Chair, yes. |


| 1 | ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | The original of the Errata Sheet has |
| 3 | been delivered to Community Development |
| 4 | Department. |
| 5 | When the Errata Sheet has been |
| 6 | completed and signed, a copy thereof should |
| 7 | be delivered to each party of record and the |
| 8 | ORIGINAL delivered to Community Development |
| 9 | Department to whom the original transcript |
| 10 | was delivered. |
| 11 | INSTRUCTIONS |
| 12 | After reading this volume of Planning Board indicate any corrections or changes to |
| 13 | Board, indicate any corrections or changes to testimony 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 | REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE |
| 17 | COMPLETED AND SIGNED ERRATA SHEET WHEN |
| 18 | RECEIVED. |
| 19 |  |
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