

Carvello, Maryellen

From: john paul <jpx_bus@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 7, 2018 11:33 PM
To: City Council; City Manager
Subject: Re: East Cambridge, Parking Garage_Courthouse proposal

Dear City Councilors and City Manager,

Property in our city is expensive (obviously). The First St Garage is in very poor condition in some areas, and vastly out of date for the current market.

Why, therefore, would we even consider the option of leasing out spaces in this building which the City of Cambridge will need to provide very costly renovations - and for a wealth private company like Leggat McCall? Take a walk through it - look at the stairs rusting nearly completely through, the elevators in poor shape and ground floor areas which are poorly planned, vastly under utilized, and completely hostile in their use and design to it's surrounding neighborhood. This is a rotting, nasty old building, vastly out of touch with the current Cambridge and what Cambridge can and will become.

The reality of the space for the proposed "urban market" does not begin to resemble the developers market hype - They have shown images of large scale market halls in European capitals, however the stark reality is that it does not offer much more in terms of space and opportunities than the average Store 24 mini-mart. Really, few people with any professional insight can believe the proposal is anything other than a cheap means to try to deceive the public to build a project in the courthouse which will burden, not enhance the neighborhood nor the city of Cambridge.

The whole current City owned parking structure needs to be brought into the 21st century in terms of relevant urban design, and to meet the demands of the current East Cambridge/Kendall Square real estate market. It may be much more in the interest of the city of Cambridge to allow a developer to rebuild that site at a higher density, and with additional major program added for affordable housing, and/or office space, and/or lab AND parking - while working out a deal for the City to retain use of and control of a major portion of the new building's parking component.

I believe a concept study from some East Cambridge Planning Team members lead by Chris Matthews, a principal at Van Valkenburgh Associates, have developed concept studies exploring an exchange of density taken from the vacant courthouse tower and adding that density to the parking garage site. If you are not familiar with it I urge you to contact the ECPT about it. I believe you will find many folks in the community to be in favor of such an idea. I also believe if the city government looks at both the liability of the current parking structure in its failing state, and for the potential for the location, that you will find a great deal of sense in this idea or something very like it.

Thank you for your consideration,

John Paul

Spring Street.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Robert Lindamood <rlindamood@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 6, 2018 7:32 PM
To: City Manager
Subject: Fwd: Sullivan Courthouse Project

>
> Please find our thoughts below about the current Sullivan Courthouse Project. A paper copy of the letter is in the mail.
> Thank you for your consideration.

>
> Robert and Judy Lindamood
> 29 Otis Street #104
> Cambridge, MA 02141
>

>
>

Robert L Lindamood

November 6, 2018

Cambridge City Council
City Hall
Cambridge, MA 02139

RE: Sullivan Courthouse Project

Having had substantial involvement with several mayoral administrations over the past several years, my wife and I offer these comments.

1. We commend this set of city leaders in their efforts to address and resolve this problem.
2. Having explored—rolled it over, dig into it, etc., etc., etc. – the problem with such competence, it is time to bring it to resolution.
3. That would be for the city to lease the 400 (+ or -) parking spaces to Leggat McCall and finish the purchase and sales agreement. Let Leggat McCall complete the project.
NOW!

Sincerely,

Robert and Judy Lindamood

Drs. Robert and Judy Lindamood
29 Otis Street, #104
Cambridge, MA 02141

Cc: Cambridge City Manager

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Steve McAveaney <stevemcaveaney@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 6:57 PM
To: City Manager; Lopez, Donna; Toomey, Tim
Subject: Loss of parking spaces

Hi there,

My name is Steve McAveaney. I live on Thorndike St. and want to encourage you to prevent the developer from taking away the parking spaces from the First St. Garage.

Last winter, my wife was pregnant. We used the monthly rental option for the garage, and it helped us tremendously. She was not able to fight for sparse parking on the streets. Now that we a baby, we will use the spots more often. And we do expect to need them.

Why?

There are a number of forces putting pressure on our ability to enjoy Cambridge to the fullest by having a reasonable time parking our cars. You are aware of these forces, and the pressure they place on taxpayers and voters. But I thought I'd list them here for clarity. All of these add up. The problem is only getting worse.

- Space savers– the city chooses not to enforce the current laws prohibiting space savers. So when there is a storm, ignorant people who leave chairs in spots for 8+ hours at a time benefit, while conscientious people who follow the law lose out.
- Construction– there has been near constant construction on and around Thorndike St for the past two years. Half the parking goes away with little notice. For those of us without driveways, that makes parking very difficult.
- New cross walks take one to two spots at a time. We see cross walks moved a few more feet away from the intersection. One spot is lost. Nobody counts, but those of us struggling to find parking every day are worse off.
- Curb cutting from new housing– we lost a couple of spots on Sciarappa at Charles a few years ago, we lose others here and there. Not the biggest driver in terms of quantity of spots lost, but still worth mentioning as one of many factors contributing to parking woes.
- Street cleaning– part of city living, of course, but still worth noting that 50% of East Cambridge's parking goes away for 2 days a month. There are a little over 20 week days in the average month. So for ~10% of the month (2/20), half our parking is gone. Can the First St Garage help alleviate this? Definitely.
- Cambridgeside Galleria parking garage turning into retail– this will happen in a few years, but you need to plan for this now! Employees and shoppers will further contribute to the lack of parking in East Cambridge.
- General economic development, housing increases, and new workers– Over the next 30 years, we all agree that there will be more workers in the East Cambridge area, from the First St Garage building and elsewhere. There will also be more housing units (like across from the Twine Building). These people will need parking. You should be thinking ahead and providing a buffer for this influx. It is required to help keep Cambridge a livable city.

I encourage you to think of the residents as you evaluate options. We care, we vote, and we are watching closely. Please do the right thing and maintain our current parking options.

Sincerely,

Steve McAveaney

-Steve

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Michael Hawley <mike@media.mit.edu>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 6:20 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna; east-cambridge-planning-team@googlegroups.com
Subject: My comments tonight re: First Street Garage

RE: Further Study Needed on First Street Garage (Policy Order POR 2018 #272)

I support the proposed policy order:

YES, of COURSE, further study is needed for the First Street Garage.

An analogy. Suppose you own a small Honda Civic. Suppose your family is upsizing with twins and puppies on the way and a mother in law is moving in. Is now the time to let a car dealer talk you into buying a two seat convertible? No. You'll need an SUV. Your bigger family plans shape smaller needs like what car to buy, how big a house to get. Obviously.

The issue on the table — the municipal garage — isn't all that different. You do the big picture planning first, then work on the smaller plans. Obviously.

This is a busy public garage serving crucial needs in a busy and growing neighborhood. Can City planners really make big changes to it without a well informed understanding of the surrounding needs and the ways they are likely to grow in coming decades?

The garage could change in many ways. Could get bigger. Or smaller. Or go away. It could contain a minimart or become a supermarket or a community center. It doesn't matter. For a moment, forget about whether or not a private entity is involved at all. The question is: can you make big changes to that garage in a bubble without first understanding the larger context? Locking in a big private lease for 30 years is a big change: it would effectively prevent potentially important and valuable changes from ever happening.

Voting for the policy order means that, yes, you feel the City must have a well informed understanding of the surrounding context, including traffic and planning analysis, public needs, alternative ideas, and then design accordingly.

Voting against the policy order means you feel it's fine for the City to make big changes in a public asset, as if the neighborhood needs around it don't matter.

Personally I think this policy order is as close to a no brainer as you can get. But let me add three quick points.

First:

Many citizens are adamant that comprehensive planning and analysis must be done. This is a growing neighborhood, swamped with traffic, parking and safety pressures. There is not a surplus of parking: there is a deficit. And that deficit will grow as traffic increases and available parking decreases. The letter from ECPT wasn't just a mild "thumbs down": it unanimously condemned what the City management has done so far, issuing an RFP at the behest of a private company. Condemned!

Second:

The real driver of this disposition process so far is not public need. It is not what the burgeoning neighborhood should have. The sole driver is a private company. Their proposed lease would REDUCE the availability of public parking in a growing neighborhood. Putting private greed over public need to control the disposition of a crucial public asset smacks of corruption. How can any citizen vote for that?

Third:

If you say, as some have, "This is really about the Courthouse" — does bringing in that hot mess somehow make it all better? Does it make it fine for the City to actively override the will of the community? What if the developer walks away tomorrow? Why can't they just build a smaller building with on site parking and not cause a public headache?

Finally, assuming you approve the policy order, you will also likely conclude that the RFP for parking is a waste of time. It is exceedingly unlikely that plans for the garage would not be revised, perhaps dramatically. Since that is the likely result, neither the City nor any proponent bidder should waste one more second or one more penny on an RFP that should be dead on arrival.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Connolly, Mike - Rep. (HOU) <Mike.Connolly@mahouse.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 3:30 PM
To: City Council; Clerk
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Support for Policy Order #3 (and information from DCAMM relative to the Sullivan Courthouse disposition)

To the Honorable, the City Council:

In support of Policy Order #3 on this evening's agenda, I want to provide an update on recent conversations with the state's Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM) and offer some perspective on the future of the Sullivan Courthouse site and the First Street Garage.

As you know, the City is pursuing a disposition of parking spaces in the First Street Garage because permitting requirements for the redevelopment of the Edward J. Sullivan Courthouse site cannot be met unless Leggat McCall Properties (LMP), the Commonwealth's chosen private developer, secures a substantial amount of additional parking within close proximity to the Courthouse site.

Last week, I attended a public meeting at the Multicultural Arts Center in East Cambridge where the City's request for proposals to dispose of parking spaces in the First Street Garage was discussed. The meeting was crowded beyond capacity, and the City's present course of action was met with near-universal opposition.

As State Representative, I want to be clear that I follow the will of the community, and I honor the decisions of the City Council. If the City Council ultimately decides to dispose of the parking spaces necessary to facilitate LMP's speculative redevelopment of the Courthouse site, I will work with all concerned stakeholders to help ensure that the chosen scheme is implemented.

With that said, I want to take this opportunity to encourage the City Council to strongly consider voting "No" on the proposed disposition of parking in the First Street Garage, and I want to outline how a refusal to provide LMP with City-owned parking will, in turn, provide the City and its residents with a tremendous opportunity to reshape the future of the Courthouse site and directly address some of our most pressing needs as a community.

Based on my most recent discussions with DCAMM, I can advise that the Commonwealth's Purchase & Sale Agreement with LMP for the Courthouse site is due to expire on December 31, 2018.

The P&S agreement has already been extended multiple times, and currently DCAMM is in discussions with LMP to negotiate yet another extension because it is anticipated that the City will not have completed the disposition of parking spaces in the First Street Garage until sometime in the new year.

When and if the City Council approves the disposition of parking in the First Street Garage to LMP, then DCAMM expects to go straight to closing on the Commonwealth's sale of the Courthouse site to LMP.

If, however, the City Council does not approve the disposition of parking in the First Street Garage to LMP, then LMP would likely have no way to proceed with their speculative redevelopment of the Courthouse site.

DCAMM confirmed that in the event LMP fails to secure the necessary parking for the proposed redevelopment of the Courthouse site, then DCAMM's current iteration of the disposition process for the Courthouse site would come to an

end. In other words, if the current LMP deal for the Courthouse site is frustrated due to a lack of required parking, then DCAMM would not revert to any of the other bids it received for the Courthouse site circa the year 2012.

Instead, DCAMM would likely initiate a new disposition process for the Courthouse site, pursuant to M.G.L. Ch. 7C, Sec. 34. Under this process, the City of Cambridge would have an opportunity to express its interest in the Courthouse site for a public use, as part of a process that grants approval for local public use of surplus state property.

Under this scenario, there would be a 90-day appraisal process, whereby the Commonwealth would determine the value of the site in light of current conditions and any planned public use. DCAMM has advised that it is possible the value of the site could be determined to be as little as one dollar (\$1) given that the building is in need of remediation and could be subject to public use restrictions.

Also, DCAMM has advised that there is the option of pursuing a "Sales Partnership Model." This approach may be utilized when a municipality would like to partner with a developer on a redevelopment plan, one that could potentially include a mix of public and private uses. Under this scenario, which requires legislative authorization, DCAMM would negotiate with the City for some amount of payment that would be proportional to the financial potential of the deal. DCAMM has already implemented the Sales Partnership Model in North Reading, Medfield, and Westborough. The advantage of either of the two scenarios mentioned above is that they would provide the City and its residents with a much better opportunity to proactively define the future use of the Courthouse site.

As you know, LMP's proposal to refashion the Sullivan Courthouse into a privately-owned, commercial office building (with a relatively small mix of additional uses such as housing) came about after a very contentious process that largely ignored the voices of East Cambridge residents. In fact, when given an opportunity to vote on various proposals for the Courthouse site, members of the East Cambridge Planning Team ranked the LMP proposal as the least popular of all the proposals that were submitted. In spite of this remarkable fact, the Commonwealth nevertheless agreed to proceed with LMP's unpopular proposal for the Courthouse site.

By voting "No" on the parking disposition at the First Street Garage, the City Council could finally give the East Cambridge neighborhood (and the city as a whole) a real opportunity to shape the future of the Courthouse site. The City could potentially acquire the Courthouse site for a direct public use and invest in its redevelopment; the City could potentially engage the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority to help facilitate the remediation and re-use of the site, or the City might pursue the Sales Partnership Model to advance a proposal that is more responsive to the concerns of local residents.

As discussed above, I intend to honor the decision of the City Council in this matter, whatever it may be. With that said, I would welcome the opportunity to work with the City and all interested parties to re-start the Commonwealth's disposition process for the Courthouse site. For any of this to happen, the City Council would first have to decide against leasing parking to LMP. Given the soaring value of land in Cambridge, a new disposition process for the Courthouse site could go a long way toward further advancing our goals relative to affordable housing, community space, non-profit space, affordable retail space, and public open space.

I stand ready to work with you and all interested residents to advance a new vision for the Courthouse site – one that puts the needs and concerns of East Cambridge residents and all local residents ahead of the Commonwealth's interest in a financial windfall and the City's desire to maximize commercial tax revenue.

Yours in service,

Mike

Rep. Mike Connolly

26th Middlesex District – Cambridge & Somerville

Massachusetts State House

24 Beacon St.
Room 33
Boston, Mass. 02133
(617) 722-2060

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Beth Simon <beth.simon92@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 3:20 PM
To: City Council; City Manager; Lopez, Donna
Subject: 0-3

To whom it may concern:

I write in support of policy order O-3 on the November 5, 2018 City Council agenda. I hope you vote to pass this policy order. As a long time resident of East Cambridge I am concerned by the rate of large developments approved by the City with little input from the residential community and consideration of the impact this development is having especially concerning greatly increased traffic and greatly reduced parking availability in our neighborhood.

I am unable to attend the meeting tonight but wholeheartedly support further study and investigation before approving the long term parking leasehold to a developer in the City garage used by many of us in the neighborhood.

Thank you,

Beth Simon

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Abby Fechtman <abby.fechtman@icloud.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 2:54 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna; Bethany Stevens
Subject: Support for Policy Order

Dear City Councilors,

I write in full support of policy order O-3 on the November 5th City Council Agenda for all of the reasons that my neighbor, Bethany Stevens, states in the letter below.

Thank you for your support of this policy order and for your support of the East Cambridge community.

Best Regards,
Abby Fechtman
116 Thorndike Street

> --

> Dear City Councilors,

> I write in support of policy order O-3 on the November 5, 2018 City Council agenda. I hope you vote to pass this policy order, and I ask that you continue to take steps to ensure you are making an informed decision as to whether the proposed disposition of the 420 parking spaces in the First Street garage should be tied up for 30 years in a lease with a private developer.

>

> I know that the developer is resorting to the often used strategy of employing scare tactics and underscoring the downsides of the courthouse building remaining empty if the lease is not granted, however, the premise that the current proposal is the only choice the City has to see this building abated and the site reactivated is short-sighted. This has not been a decades long process as the developer exaggerates - the employees moved out in 2008, the State did not decide to sell it until 2011, and it was continued to be used as a jail until the middle of 2014. The City is only now considering the impact of leasing 420 spaces from the city owned garage - there was no consideration of this during the special permit process for the courthouse site, just the requirement that the developer obtain the necessary 420 spaces to support this oversized development. The current conditions and expected future conditions cannot be ignored in determining whether to enter into this 30 year lease.

>

> I am not convinced that the benefits offered by the developer are sufficient to mitigate both the impact of this oversized office building and the impacts of leasing 420 parking spaces for 30 years to a private developer, nor am I convinced that entering into a 30 year lease with the private developer of 420 spaces and 7,000 sq. ft. of retail space would be the best public use of this city owned property.

>

> I appreciate the support of the four city councilors who sponsored this policy order, and hope that the policy order passes unanimously to ensure the City Council considers the disposition of the 420 parking spaces to a private developer in context of the current and expected future conditions of First Street. This should be done irrespective of anyone's position on whether the current proposal for the courthouse redevelopment is the best course of action.

>

> I am counting on your support to ensure the immense and rapid changes to East Cambridge enhance, rather than destroy, the livability of this great neighborhood.

>

> Bethany Stevens

> 100 Spring St.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Silvia Dalla Torre di Sanguinetto <silvia.dallatorre@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 1:51 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment Project

Dear City Councilors,

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city has continued to see rapid development and change. It can no longer remain a blighted property with a chain link fence – that is a hazard to its surrounding community and an unacceptable state for the wider city of Cambridge.

As a taxpayer to the city and the state, I want to see the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. Its current redevelopment plans, under Leggat McCall, will also provide a number of public benefits, including affordable housing and community space. I look forward to the City's leadership to ensure this project moves forward.

Thank you
Silvia Dalla Torre
150 Cambridge St, Apt A304

+1 857 270 4004

www.conscioux.com
Empowering Plant-Based Weight Loss

Carvello, Maryellen

From: john paul <jpx_bus@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 1:02 PM
To: City Council; City Manager; Lopez, Donna; East Cambridge Planning Team
Subject: East Cambridge, Parking Garage_Courthouse proposal

John Paul
90 Spring Street

Cambridge, MA 02141

Dear City Councilors and City Manager,

There are reasonable options for righting the wrong of the existing courthouse, outside the narrow scope of the current Leggat McCall proposal. Creative and realistic options have been developed by concerned and qualified citizens. These have been vetted in East Cambridge Planning Team meetings, and if you are not familiar folks will be happy to review them with you.

With regards to tonight's meeting, PLEASE also consider the following:

1. The City owned garage is essential for snow emergencies, especially with the upcoming loss of spaces at the CambridgeSide Galleria.
2. It is very useful to neighborhood residents like me for long term (monthly) winter parking
3. Most importantly, PLEASE read and seriously consider the contents of Bethany's letter copied in here. I could not say it any better:

Dear City Councilors,

I write in support of policy order O-3 on the November 5, 2018 City Council agenda. I hope you vote to pass this policy order, and I ask that you continue to take steps to ensure you are making an informed decision as to whether the proposed disposition of the 420 parking spaces in the First Street garage should be tied up for 30 years in a lease with a private developer.

I know that the developer is resorting to the often used strategy of employing scare tactics and underscoring the downsides of the courthouse building remaining empty if the lease is not granted, however, the premise that the current proposal is the only choice the City has to see this building abated and the site reactivated is short-sighted. This

has not been a decades long process as the developer exaggerates - the employees moved out in 2008, the State did not decide to sell it until 2011, and it was continued to be used as a jail until the middle of 2014. The City is only now considering the impact of leasing 420 spaces from the city owned garage - there was no consideration of this during the special permit process for the courthouse site, just the requirement that the developer obtain the necessary 420 spaces to support this oversized development. The current conditions and expected future conditions cannot be ignored in determining whether to enter into this 30 year lease.

I am not convinced that the benefits offered by the developer are sufficient to mitigate both the impact of this oversized office building and the impacts of leasing 420 parking spaces for 30 years to a private developer, nor am I convinced that entering into a 30 year lease with the private developer of 420 spaces and 7,000 sq. ft. of retail space would be the best public use of this city owned property.

I appreciate the support of the four city councilors who sponsored this policy order, and hope that the policy order passes unanimously to ensure the City Council considers the disposition of the 420 parking spaces to a private developer in context of the current and expected future conditions of First Street. This should be done irrespective of anyone's position on whether the current proposal for the courthouse redevelopment is the best course of action.

I am counting on your support to ensure the immense and rapid changes to East Cambridge enhance, rather than destroy, the livability of this great neighborhood.

Bethany Stevens

100 Spring St.

John Paul

Wilson HGA

374 Congress Street, Suite 400

Boston, MA

D 617.366.1855

Wilson Architects is now part of HGA! Learn more: hga.com/news

<<https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.hga.com%2Fwilson-architects-joins-hga%2F&data=02%7C01%7Cmcarvello%40cambridgema.gov%7Ca075015db21c4a3b391a08d64348c67f%7Cc06a8be784794d73b35193bc9ba8295c%7C0%7C0%7C636770377173835225&sdata=X%2F%2F8ahfgtdS7vPeuBEQtetGbPbXKvCb8Xw0TvLk2SN0%3D&reserved=0>>

Carvello, Maryellen

From: marie elena saccoccio <saccocciom@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 12:51 PM
To: City Council; City Manager; Paden, Liza; Peterson, Lisa
Subject: Policy Order O-3 - First St Garage - 30 year lease of 420 parking spaces and retail space

Dear City Officials,

I originally signed up to speak at this evening's council session, but cannot be present. Hence, I am submitting this comment and hopefully, though late for inclusion in this evening's record, it will become part of the ultimate record on the issue. Please note, my opposition is not based on reconstruction of the courthouse, or visions of a park or yoga studio, or farmer's market or grocery store, or affordable housing. I would welcome back the actual courthouse in a heart beat as a practicing attorney. I point out that there are yoga studios everywhere and we as Bostonian's have one of the oldest outdoor farmer's markets in the country in Haymarket Square, literally minutes away.

I was present and spoke at the meeting last week at the Multicultural Arts Center and wish to re-convey my opposition to the 30 year lease of 420 parking spaces in our First Street Municipal Parking Garage:

Prefatory Comment:

In the 1980's I was appointed as community representative by Mayor Vellucci to sit on the Advisory Group for the construction and leasing of the First Street Municipal Garage. My representation of community interests spanned several years. During that time the garage was constructed and leased. For many years that building was a highly used and desired location which housed the VFW and a very busy restaurant. There was also a florist and travel agency located there at some point. The VFW hall was consistently rented out for political fundraisers and weddings and showers and holiday parties. There is now no comparable affordable space to rent for a large group. The demise of use really stems from a fire in the restaurant section of the garage. Thereafter, the city never remediated and made no attempt at supporting or maintaining the structure. Before long the VFW closed and the City failed to issue an RFP to lease a very usable and sizable space.

There is No Surplus Parking:

To be sure, parking is a commodity in East Cambridge and things will only get worse. At the heart of the deal our City Officials are seeking to lease more than 60% of available parking in our municipal garage. I say more than 60% because any retail established there will require parking as well as was confirmed at last week's meeting. What was clear that night is the presenters simply do not live here and are unaware of actual need and use of the parking garage. Living across the street from the Multicultural Arts Center I am acutely aware of their absolute reliance on the Municipal Garage for parking. Essentially they are a performance center and rental hall for weddings and all sorts of events which occur mostly in the evenings or on weekends. I cannot imagine them functioning without the municipal parking available. Also, you may be surprised to hear that our churches also use and advertise the municipal garage for important events. St. Francis of Assisi certainly refers people there as does the Mormon Stake on Binney Street. While I am sure some on the Council will be dismissive of that as any justification for use, the churches are integral to the neighborhood and provide many secular functions to the neighborhood and varied groups. St. Francis of Assisi has opened its doors free of charge to two choral groups and even Massachusetts Association of Court Appointed Attorneys. Availability of reliable parking at the municipal garage is essential.

I am on the Foundry Advisory Committee as the neighborhood representative. I wish to point out that the Foundry will be a functioning performing arts center, replete with artisan studios and programming for children, adults and seniors. As you well know it was designated a historic landmark and as such enjoys special protection of the building. It was absolutely determined that the Foundry cannot be excavated for parking because the structure would not support it. I specifically asked if it were just present cost or whether at some future time underground parking could be possible. Emphatically the answer is "No, at no time could the building be excavated."

I suspect no one on this email needs to be reminded of the overall need, especially in winter, for community access to this garage for parking. I have neighbors from Harrington Wellington who park in this garage during storms. I also would like to point out that it is especially useful for seniors in that the parking is free and allows them easy access to the waterfront and the many events on the river front. At times we have even used the municipal garage for health aides for my elderly mother. While Cambridgeside offers parking as well, it is pricey and soon to be dramatically reduced. To make matters worse our Greenline is relocating across the artery, an extremely challenging walk day or night and certainly not a path I can envision for our seniors or disabled.

In sum, "Just say no" to Legatt McCall's request. Perfection of their Special Permit was never our job.

Respectfully submitted,

Marie Elena Saccoccio, Esquire
55 Otis Street
Cambridge, MA 02141
BBO#552854
617-64-8403

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Joseph Rose <cambridgemoxie@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 11:03 AM
To: City Council; City Manager
Cc: Lopez, Donna
Subject: Letter of Support for Order O-3

Dear City Councilors and City Manager DePasquale,

I write in support of policy order O-3 on the November 5, 2018 City Council agenda. I hope you vote to pass this policy order as a measured and reasonable step to ensure an informed decision can be made as to whether the proposed disposition of public parking spaces in the First Street garage should be tied up for 30 years in a lease with a private developer.

Thank you as always for your diligent work to help our community.

Sincerely,

Joe Rose
72 Spring St

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Ellen Adelson <ellenadelson@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 10:25 AM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna
Subject: parking spaces in First Street garage and private developer

Dear City Councilors,

The letter below was submitted by my neighbor in East Cambridge. The sentiment is mine as well and I am using her effective words to express my thoughts...

I write in support of policy order O-3 on the November 5, 2018 City Council agenda. I hope you vote to pass this policy order, and I ask that you continue to take steps to ensure you are making an informed decision as to whether the proposed disposition of the 420 parking spaces in the First Street garage should be tied up for 30 years in a lease with a private developer.

I know that the developer is resorting to the often used strategy of employing scare tactics and underscoring the downsides of the courthouse building remaining empty if the lease is not granted, however, the premise that the current proposal is the only choice the City has to see this building abated and the site reactivated is short-sighted. This has not been a decades long process as the developer exaggerates - the employees moved out in 2008, the State did not decide to sell it until 2011, and it was continued to be used as a jail until the middle of 2014. The City is only now considering the impact of leasing 420 spaces from the city owned garage - there was no consideration of this during the special permit process for the courthouse site, just the requirement that the developer obtain the necessary 420 spaces to support this oversized development. The current conditions and expected future conditions cannot be ignored in determining whether to enter into this 30 year lease.

I am not convinced that the benefits offered by the developer are sufficient to mitigate both the impact of this oversized office building and the impacts of leasing 420 parking spaces for 30 years to a private developer; nor am I convinced that entering into a 30 year lease with the private developer of 420 spaces and 7,000 sq. ft. of retail space would be the best public use of this city owned property.

I appreciate the support of the four city councilors who sponsored this policy order, and hope that the policy order passes unanimously to ensure the City Council considers the disposition of the 420 parking spaces to a private developer in context of the current and expected future conditions of First Street. This should be done irrespective of anyone's position on whether the current proposal for the courthouse redevelopment is the best course of action.

I am counting on your support to ensure the immense and rapid changes to East Cambridge enhance, rather than destroy, the livability of this great neighborhood.

Thank you,
Ellen Adelson
92 Thorndike St.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: David Iannetta <iannettadc@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 10:16 AM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse Project

Dear City Council,

My name is Dave Iannetta and I live at 147 Hamilton St. I am excited about the Sullivan Courthouse redevelopment project and eager to see it developed. As a 12 year resident of Cambridge, it has been a surprise to see the property vacant for as long as it has.

Please support this because it will improve the neighborhood and provide benefits for Cambridge and the surrounding community, increasing the tax base of the area and opening options for retail and restaurants, something that part of the city could greatly use.

I look forward to hearing about this project moving forward.

Best Regards,
Dave

David Iannetta
147 Hamilton St.
Cambridge, MA 02139

Carvello, Maryellen

From: CARL FANTASIA <newdealfish@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 10:08 AM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: First Street Garage RFP

To all distinguished City Councilors,

My name is Carl Fantasia, owner of New Deal Fish Market on Cambridge Street. I am the third generation owner of a business that has been serving the East Cambridge Community for 90 years. I urge you to approve the RFP for the First Street Garage and Retail Space.

In 2002 I began my full time journey with the fish market, after leaving a career in the energy industry. I took the leap because I saw great opportunity in this neighborhood that was ripe for change, yet I also valued what made this a great neighborhood for many decades. First floor, independent, retail businesses have been, and continue to be a vital component of all inner city neighborhoods. In order to ensure the survival of first floor retail, there needs to be a customer base to support those businesses. Since the Middlesex County Courthouse vacated, many small business owners lost a vital customer base that patronized businesses during most of the daylight hours. Certainly, other office buildings have been erected and filled in recent years but some of the Cambridge Street businesses still have not been able to enjoy the patronage they had from visitors and employees of the courthouse. It is my belief that the redevelopment of the courthouse will provide a robust customer base and allow small businesses to once again flourish. For this reason I again urge you to approve the RFP for the First Street Garage.

I fear that failure to allow the redevelopment of the courthouse, in the current proposal, will lead to the erosion and decay of a building that will have an adverse effect on the residents and community as a whole. Finally, as a Massachusetts tax payer, I prefer to see the use of funds resulting from the sale of the courthouse to go towards necessary services and infrastructure, than to be sidelined. Thank you for taking the time to address this important issue.

Carl

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Kyle Pearson <kjpearson5@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 10:01 AM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse

Dear City Council,

Hello, my name is Kyle and I live at 54 Pearl St. in Cambridge MA.

As someone who lives and pays taxes in the area, I think it is a travesty that the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse redevelopment is being stalled. The building has been vacant for ten years. What is the City waiting for? Let's redevelop the site, so that

- a. The neighborhood will be more vibrant, with improved amenities and retail
- b. The City will go from collecting no taxes on the site, to collecting significant annual revenues, and
- c. The community will gain a variety of benefits from the developer, including increased affordable housing.

Also, I heard that some people are requesting that the building be turned into a park. As a taxpayer, I find this to be outlandish. Why would we ask the State to forgo the \$35 million in potential revenue from Leggat McCall that will be paid as soon as the redevelopment moves forward? And how is the neighborhood going to raise \$50 million to demolish the building and abate the asbestos in order to create a park?

Please support the redevelopment.

Thank you,

Kyle Pearson

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Abigail Lewis-Bowen <abigail@different.com>
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 7:35 AM
To: Lopez, Donna
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Fwd: Policy Order O-3 - First St. Garage - 30 year lease of 420 parking spaces

To the City Clerk and by copy to the City Manager:

I intended to copy you both on this email to the City Councillors regarding an agenda item on tonight's agenda.

Thank you,

Regards,

Abigail Lewis-Bowen
80 Thorndike St.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Abigail Lewis-Bowen <abigail@different.com <mailto:abigail@different.com> >
Subject: Policy Order O-3 - First St. Garage - 30 year lease of 420 parking spaces
Date: November 5, 2018 at 6:20:30 AM EST
To: Cambridge City Council <Council@cambridgema.gov <mailto:Council@cambridgema.gov> >

Dear City Councillors,

I am writing this morning to express my appreciation and support of the Policy Order O-3, which, in recognizing significant changes to the Kendall and East Cambridge neighborhood over the years, asks for an independent traffic and planning study in order to allow the Council to make an informed decision as to the best use and greatest public benefit of the municipal parking garage on First Street.

I would like to express my appreciation to Councillors Zondervan, Devereux, Siddiqui and Carlone in their response to the concerns expressed at the community meeting last week.

I encourage all councillors to listen carefully to the concerns of neighbors who are not simply advocating for "No courthouse," or "A park," but who are advocating for a comprehensive and intelligent review of the massive amount of development and change going on in the Kendall and East Cambridge areas.

I would also ask that councillors support this policy order with a view to an innovative and thoughtful approach to redevelopment in this area, keeping in mind the City Council's goals for 2018, which include seeking to increase

affordable housing for varying income levels, deepening community engagement and supporting opportunities for businesses of all sizes.

Thank you for your attention,

Regards,

Abigail Lewis-Bowen
80 Thorndike Street
Cambridge, MA 02141

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Michael Hawley <mike@media.mit.edu>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 10:55 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Lopez, Donna; City Manager; East Cambridge Planning Team (east-cambridge-planning-team@googlegroups.com)
Subject: Further Study Needed on First Street Garage (Policy Order POR 2018 #272)

Councillors:

I write in support of the proposed Policy Order ("Further Study Needed on First Street Garage).

This one isn't even a close call. I hope it will be adopted unanimously. Here's why.

Any contemplated disposition of city property should be based on careful consideration of a number of issues: other possible uses; persuasive financial analysis, as well as analysis of non monetary benefits and detriments; situational analysis (traffic, parking, urban planning); public input, to ensure that the community needs are being met; and so on. That thoughtful gathering of ideas and analyses is logically (and lawfully) supposed to precede and inform the design of proposals for disposition of public property in order to assure the highest and best use. This is a kind of due process.

Well, that certainly hasn't happened here.

With the First Street Garage, the City manager turned this process on its head:

A developer asked to lease a big part of a garage; so the City essentially tailored an RFP for that developer, and launched it almost as if it were a foregone conclusion. Only after the horse was out of the barn did the City ask for public input, announcing a community meeting on stupidly short notice. That announcement made clear that public input wouldn't affect the actual issue (whether or not to lease a lot of space in the garage). Among other things, the City is required to inform concerned persons of such meetings. Did they notify, say, all the folks who park in that garage? No. Shortly after issuing the RFP, the City published an addendum suggesting that a bid would be considered "highly advantageous" if the bidder were to pay a fee of \$1m or more in advance. Does this sound like "pay to play"?

That public meeting, incidentally, was a debacle. It overflowed the room, and the RFP and overall disposition bungling were strongly rebuked by virtually everyone present. Many community members are irate. ECPT's condemnation of the disposition process was unanimous.

So: should the City shortcut a disposition process by issuing an RFP at the behest of, and designed solely for, a private entity?

NO.

To do so is just plain wrong, if not beyond wrong.

The proposed Policy Order may be the mildest antidote. Millions of square feet of new/imminent development have swamped the neighborhood with traffic, parking and safety woes. Of COURSE a comprehensive, independent planning and traffic study in the vicinity must be done. It should have been done before even starting to think about disposition of the First Street Garage. How can such a disposition be considered without a sense of the dramatically changing context? This is a no brainer.

In light of that, the current RFP should be scrapped. Pursuing it for one more second is a waste of time and money for the City. There is no remote indication that the goals of this RFP represent the greatest public benefit. Far from it. After all, it was requested by a big private owner, designed expressly for them, and primarily benefits them. There's not a great deal of public benefit in it. But this RFP is also a waste of time and money for any bidder. Why would anyone submit a proposal for an RFP that will almost certainly be obsoleted by the planning study and traffic analysis?

Michael Hawley

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Yan Ma <yanma0802@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 10:31 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: 40 Thorndike Redevelopment

Dear City Councilors,

As a resident of Cambridge, I'm writing in regard to the redevelopment plan of the Sullivan Courthouse under Leggat McCall.

During the long and twisted process to decide if and how to move forward on this, the building has remained vacant for the past decade, and potentially so for the next few years, too. I wonder why while its neighborhood - Kendall Square and many other parts of our city have continued to see rapid development and change, it can still remain un-utilized and almost becomes a potential Hazard. As a taxpayer to the city and the state, I would like to see the Courthouse to be transformed and serve the public again in a new fashion.

More importantly, what would be the vision for the building and the entire east Cambridge? I pledge the city to provide the answers to these questions with actions. To my understanding, the current redevelopment plan, though not fully developed but will provide a number of public benefits, including affordable housing and community space. I am in full support to the redevelopment and I look forward to the City's support on moving it forward. Thank you,

Sincerely,

Yan Ma
Resident on Dana St. @ Cambridge St.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: susan donovan <su.donovan@verizon.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 8:35 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: 40 Thorndike Street

Dear City Councillors,

I'm writing to express my support for the proposed development at 40 Thorndike Street, which I've heard may be derailed because of an inability to get the council's approval to use parking spaces in an existing garage.

The new building certainly seems like a really attractive alternative to the deserted, ugly tower that's there now and appears to include some nice amenities for the neighborhood. Although I can see why people would prefer that it be a park (after all, who wouldn't?), I've heard that the cost to demolish the building and remove the asbestos there would be so terribly expensive (maybe as much as \$80 million?) that putting a park or low-rise building on the site simply wouldn't be economically feasible. I'm all for more parks, but aren't there empty lots all over the city where it would cost taxpayers a lot less to put one in? Why spend all that money for one park in one neighborhood, when you could fund parks all over the city with that much money? That doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

If this development falls apart, the neighborhood could be stuck with that blighted building for a long time to come. Perhaps there are good arguments against the new building that I don't know of (and I'd be interested in hearing them), but I'm not seeing them.

Sincerely,
Susan Donovan
551 Franklin St. Unit 1
Cambridge MA 02139

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Jennifer McConnell <jenkmc@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 8:00 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna
Subject: Policy Order O-3 - First St Garage - 30 year lease of 420 parking spaces

Dear City Councilors,

I am unable to attend tomorrow's meeting so I am sending an email in support of policy order O-3 on the November 5, 2018 City Council agenda. I hope you vote to pass this policy order, and I ask that you continue to take steps to ensure you are making an informed decision in regards to leasing 420 parking spaces in the First Street garage to a private developer for 30 years. East Cambridge is growing at a fast pace and our current parking needs and expected ones cannot be ignored in determining whether to enter into this 30 year lease.

I appreciate the support of the four city councilors who sponsored this policy order, and hope that the policy order passes unanimously. I welcome the development of the courthouse building but strongly feel that the neighborhood cannot afford to lose those 420 spaces given the elimination of spaces at the Galeria and continued development of First Street.

Jennifer McConnell
94 Thorndike St

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Dabney Hailey <dabney.hailey@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 7:07 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna
Subject: Policy O-3

Dear City Councilors,

I write in support of policy order O-3 on the November 5, 2018 City Council agenda. I hope you vote to pass this policy order, and I ask that you continue to take steps to ensure you are making an informed decision as to whether the proposed disposition of the 420 parking spaces in the First Street garage should be tied up for 30 years in a lease with a private developer.

I know that the developer is resorting to the often used strategy of employing scare tactics and underscoring the downsides of the courthouse building remaining empty if the lease is not granted, however, the premise that the current proposal is the only choice the City has to see this building abated and the site reactivated is short-sighted. This has not been a decades long process as the developer exaggerates - the employees moved out in 2008, the State did not decide to sell it until 2011, and it was continued to be used as a jail until the middle of 2014. The City is only now considering the impact of leasing 420 spaces from the city owned garage - there was no consideration of this during the special permit process for the courthouse site, just the requirement that the developer obtain the necessary 420 spaces to support this oversized development. The current conditions and expected future conditions cannot be ignored in determining whether to enter into this 30 year lease.

I am not convinced that the benefits offered by the developer are sufficient to mitigate both the impact of this oversized office building and the impacts of leasing 420 parking spaces for 30 years to a private developer, nor am I convinced that entering into a 30 year lease with the private developer of 420 spaces and 7,000 sq. ft. of retail space would be the best public use of this city owned property.

I appreciate the support of the four city councilors who sponsored this policy order, and hope that the policy order passes unanimously to ensure the City Council considers the disposition of the 420 parking spaces to a private developer in context of the current and expected future conditions of First Street. This should be done irrespective of anyone's position on whether the current proposal for the courthouse redevelopment is the best course of action.

I am counting on your support to ensure the immense and rapid changes to East Cambridge enhance, rather than destroy, the livability of this great neighborhood.

Dabney Hailey
100 Thorndike Street

Dabney Hailey, Principal
HAILEY GROUP
haileygroup.com
617.816.5619



Carvello, Maryellen

From: Chris Matthews <cmatthews@mvvainc.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 7:02 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna; East Cambridge Planning Team (east-cambridge-planning-team@googlegroups.com)
Subject: FW: [ECPT] Policy Order O-3 - First St Garage - 30 year lease of 420 parking spaces

Dear City Councilors,

I write in support of the policy order concerning the First Street Garage. The disposition of public 420 parking spaces in the garage to support a highly unpopular private development seems a disservice to the city taxpayers and the neighborhood. We had a unanimous vote at a well-attended ECPT meeting against the disposition process – an extreme rarity in my 15 years as a board member! To handcuff the garage and the courthouse together for 30 years seems misguided given the white-hot property market in this part of the city, and the huge changes along First Street, including the recent proposal by Cambridgeside to add half a million square feet of development and to reduce parking by 800-900 spaces. Since 2013 we have a new economic reality, a new city council, a new city manager, and new leadership in the East Cambridge Planning Team. I therefore thoroughly support the council order to study the highest and best use of the garage in neighborhood context, and hope you will do the same. We eventually hope to work with the Council to determine what combination of uses to meet the 2018 City goals would serve us best on the courthouse site, including affordable housing, a community center and a public garden for seniors. This could be done through a transfer of development rights to the large PUDs ringing the neighborhood. Our aim is to get this done quickly. The alternative route has been mired in rancor and legal challenges, and I can't see any of that changing until other alternatives have at least been considered.

Sincerely,

Chris Matthews
26 Sixth Street

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Beth Stevens <beth100springstreet@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 6:03 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna
Subject: Policy Order O-3 - First St Garage - 30 year lease of 420 parking spaces

Dear City Councilors,

I write in support of policy order O-3 on the November 5, 2018 City Council agenda. I hope you vote to pass this policy order, and I ask that you continue to take steps to ensure you are making an informed decision as to whether the proposed disposition of the 420 parking spaces in the First Street garage should be tied up for 30 years in a lease with a private developer.

I know that the developer is resorting to the often used strategy of employing scare tactics and underscoring the downsides of the courthouse building remaining empty if the lease is not granted, however, the premise that the current proposal is the only choice the City has to see this building abated and the site reactivated is short-sighted. This has not been a decades long process as the developer exaggerates - the employees moved out in 2008, the State did not decide to sell it until 2011, and it was continued to be used as a jail until the middle of 2014. The City is only now considering the impact of leasing 420 spaces from the city owned garage - there was no consideration of this during the special permit process for the courthouse site, just the requirement that the developer obtain the necessary 420 spaces to support this oversized development. The current conditions and expected future conditions cannot be ignored in determining whether to enter into this 30 year lease.

I am not convinced that the benefits offered by the developer are sufficient to mitigate both the impact of this oversized office building and the impacts of leasing 420 parking spaces for 30 years to a private developer, nor am I convinced that entering into a 30 year lease with the private developer of 420 spaces and 7,000 sq. ft. of retail space would be the best public use of this city owned property.

I appreciate the support of the four city councilors who sponsored this policy order, and hope that the policy order passes unanimously to ensure the City Council considers the disposition of the 420 parking spaces to a private developer in context of the current and expected future conditions of First Street. This should be done irrespective of anyone's position on whether the current proposal for the courthouse redevelopment is the best course of action.

I am counting on your support to ensure the immense and rapid changes to East Cambridge enhance, rather than destroy, the livability of this great neighborhood.

Bethany Stevens
100 Spring St.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Gautam Jadhav <gjadhav@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 4:22 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment

Dear City Councilors,

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city has continued to see rapid development and change. It can no longer remain a blighted property with a chain link fence – that is a hazard to its surrounding community and an unacceptable state for the wider city of Cambridge.

As a taxpayer to the city and the state, I want to see the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. Its current redevelopment plans, under Leggat McCall, will also provide a number of public benefits, including affordable housing and community space. I look forward to the City's leadership to ensure this project moves forward.

Thank you,
Gautam Jadhav
Child St, Cambridge, MA 02141

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Jocelyn R W <ruoyiwang0510@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 4:15 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: About the sullivan courthouse

Dear City Councilors,

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city have continued to see rapid development and change. It can no longer remain a blighted property with a chain link fence.

As a taxpayer to the city and the state, I would love to see that the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. Its current redevelopment plans, under Leggat McCall, will also provide a number of public benefits, including affordable housing and community space. I look forward to seeing that this project moves forward.

Thank you,
Ruoyi

A resident at the magazine st, Central Square, Cambridge, MA 02139

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Ran Cao <rancao@mit.edu>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 2:51 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; City Manager
Subject: Partition for approval of Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment project

Dear City Councilors,

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. The current status of the vacant building is not only hazardous to our community but also a loss to the wider city of Cambridge when the city is undergoing rapid development brought by the many development projects, such as that of Kendall Square.

As a taxpayer to the city and the state, I want to see the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. The choice is simple. Accept the Leggat McCall plan (approved with a Special Permit since 2013). The redevelopment plan is beneficial to our communities in different aspects, not limited to these listed as follow: millions in tax revenue, abatement and redevelopment of a vacant blighted building, and public benefits that include affordable housing and active retail. Otherwise, the city will be looking forward to the vacancy of Sullivan Courthouse for longer future, a problem which would be even more difficult to tackle in the future.

The Leggat McCall's plan of repositioning the Courthouse structure into a mix-use development will take upwards of \$50 million to demo and abate. That is not to mention the more than \$30 million in revenue that benefits the State and residents from the sale of the building. All these economics benefits would make the community much better off than turning the structure into a park

In addition to the reposition of the Courthouse structure, Leggat McCall's bid for parking is also an opportunity for more public benefits to be gained. In exchange for spaces in the First Street Garage, the city's request for proposal requires any bidder to make additional contributions to community enhancement. This is yet another opportunity for the surrounding community to benefit more from this project's redevelopment.

I look forward to the City's leadership to consider the proposal brought up by Leggat McCall and ensure that the project moves forward!

Thank you

Ran Cao
MSRED candidate, 2019
Samuel Tak Lee Graduate Fellow, Research Assistant
Email: rancao@mit.edu
Cell: 617-631-3927
Address:
MIT Center for Real Estate
105 Massachusetts Avenue
Samuel Tak Lee Bldg. 9-343
Cambridge, MA 02139

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Alan Greene <azotates@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 12:27 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna
Subject: Support for Policy Order #272 Concerning he City Parking Garage on First

Dear Members of the Cambridge City Council,

As a concerned Cambridge Resident, Taxpayer, and Voter, I am writing in support of Policy Order #272. What I do not want to see taking place is the disposition of 420 parking spaces from the City's own Street Garage to a private developer, be it for one year or 30 years, the latter of which is the absurd proposition in this case.

Yours very truly,

Alan Greene
82 Fifth Street

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Carol O'Hare <cbo1066@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 12:00 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Lopez, Donna; 'Charles Hinds'; 'Walter McDonald'
Subject: City Council: 1st things 1st - 1st St. Municipal Parking Garage, PO 3, 11/5/18 (2018 # 272)

Dear Mayor McGovern, Vice Mayor Devereux and City Councillors:

We stand with our East Cambridge neighbors in opposing the rush to RFP long-term leasing to a private developer 420 parking spaces in the city's First St. parking garage.

So, we support the sensible request of Policy Order 3 that the City Manager "conduct a comprehensive, independent planning and traffic study of the neighborhood and use of the First Street Garage, and include it in the disposition report as required by 2.110, Section B.6, so that the Council can make an informed decision as to whether the proposed disposition is in the best public interest."

Our city administration must set the example of robust community outreach and input + appropriate study, analysis, planning and reporting to the Council, the Planning Board and the public, especially residents of E. Cambridge, before pursuing any long-term lease of 420 parking spaces in the city's First St. parking garage.

If the city itself engages in a nominal, simply base-touching exercise without real substance, how can we expect more of private developers on other projects?

Thank you, as always, for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Walter McDonald and Carol O'Hare
172 Magazine St.

Cc: Donna Lopez, City Clerk – Please file this with the Official Record



Virus-free. www.avg.com

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Lu Zhang <neargor@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 4, 2018 10:03 AM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Proposal Redevelopment of Sullivan Courthouse

Dear City Councilors,

I recently came across to know that there's a redevelopment proposal by Leggat McCall about Sullivan Courthouse, right in my neighborhood, that caught my attention. The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city has continued to see rapid development and change. As an architect, it is one of my favorite brutalist buildings in Cambridge, it has been abandoned for years, which is the last thing I want to see. It can be redeveloped with new functions, that benefits more to the city, and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Again as a taxpayer to the city and the state, it's my wish to see Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. And I'm happy to know that there's a series of redevelopment plans, under Leggat McCall (that I happen to work with them before and trust their reputation), will also provide a number of public benefits, including affordable housing and community space. In my opinion, this would be a great chance to energize the east Cambridge area, which right now seems a little bit uninviting. I wish the city council would kindly consider the proposal for the redevelopment of the courthouse.

Thanks so much!

Lu Zhang,

284 Harvard st, Cambridge. MA

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Susan Markowitz <susanmarkowitz@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 3, 2018 12:32 PM
To: City Manager; citycouncil@cambridge.ma; Lopez, Donna
Subject: Support Further study needed on First Street Garage

I support the proposed council order for further study on the First St Garage.

The City Council resolved that it would listen closely to the concerns of East Cambridge residents and consider the overall impact of the Sullivan Courthouse redevelopment project. The voices of the community are very clearly opposed to this disposition.

Last month the East Cambridge Planning Team voted unanimously in opposition to the proposed disposition, and another overflow community meeting showed a clear majority of opposition. We need an independent planning and traffic study of the neighborhood and use of the First Street Garage.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Susan Markowitz

20 Oak Street

Cambridge, MA 02139

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Elizabeth Allegrezza <eallegrezza@milfordma.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 4:51 PM
To: citycounsel@cambridgema.gov
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Sullivan Courthouse

Dear city councilors,

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city has continued to see rapid development and change. It can no longer remain a blighted property with a chain link fence – that is a hazard to its surrounding community and an unacceptable state for the wider city of Cambridge.

As a taxpayer to the city and the state, I want to see the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. The choice is simple. Accept the Leggat McCall plan (approved with a Special Permit since 2013) and get the following for the community: millions in tax revenue, abatement and redevelopment of a vacant blighted building, and public benefits that include affordable housing and active retail. If the city takes no action to move forward Leggat McCall's request for parking, the city is supporting the ongoing vacancy of the Courthouse property for years to come.

The reality is that the Courthouse structure will take upwards of \$50 million to demo and abate. That is not to mention the more than \$30 million in revenue that benefits the State and residents from the sale of the building. Any scenario that envisions the Courthouse turned into a park or its density sacrificed will never generate enough economic gains to offset costs and offer any public benefits.

As part of Leggat McCall's bid for parking, is there also not an opportunity for more public benefits to be gained? In exchange for spaces in the First Street Garage, the city's request for proposal requires any bidder to make additional contributions to community enhancement. This is yet another opportunity for the surrounding community to benefit more from this project's redevelopment.

I look forward to the City's leadership to ensure this project moves forward.

Thank you

Elizabeth Allegrezza

105 Inman St

Sent from my iPhone

* * * The Milford Public Schools does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, gender identity, religion, national origin, English proficiency, sexual orientation, disability or housing status.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Stephen <sgardiner@centerpoint.org>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 4:20 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment

Dear City Councilors,

My wife and I moved to Otis Street in 2009, and we have lived in the shadow of the vacant Sullivan Courthouse ever since. Not only is it a monstrous eyesore, but it presents serious environmental and physical risks as it deteriorates without appropriate resolution. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and Cambridge overall have continued to see rapid development and change. How can the City leave unresolved any longer this blighted property behind its chain link fence?

As a taxpayer to the City and the State, I want to see this property redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. The choice has been made after exhaustive community input, Council debate and various court appeals: Move forward with the Leggat McCall plan (approved with a Special Permit since 2013) and get the following for the community: millions in tax revenue, abatement and redevelopment of a vacant blighted building, and public benefits that include affordable housing and active retail. The minority of community residents that are now voicing their opposition to Leggat McCall's request for parking, using their specious argument to derail the entire project. If the City fails to move forward with the project's parking plan, the City will effectively be supporting the ongoing vacancy of the Courthouse property for years to come. I urge the City Council and the City Manager to approve parking for the Leggat McCall redevelopment project when appropriate under the pending RFP.

As part of Leggat McCall's bid for parking, is there also not an opportunity for more public benefits to be gained? In exchange for spaces in the First Street Garage, the city's request for proposal requires any bidder to make additional contributions to community enhancement. This is yet another opportunity for the surrounding community to benefit more from this project's redevelopment.

The reality is that the Courthouse structure will take upwards of \$50 million to demo and abate. That is not to mention the more than \$30 million in revenue that benefits the State and residents from the sale of the building. Any scenario that envisions the Courthouse turned into a park or its density sacrificed will never generate enough economic gains to offset costs and offer any public benefits. All of this, of course, has been successfully litigated, and the time is now to get the redevelopment started.

Thank you for your leadership in the East Cambridge community and for the benefit of all of Cambridge as you decide to move forward with this important project. Stephen & Ann Gardiner

Stephen H. & Ann H. Gardiner

29 Otis Street #209

Cambridge, MA 02141

T: 617.374.0088

C: 617.699.0763

E-mail: sgardiner@centerpoint.org <<mailto:sgardiner@centerpointfoundation.org>>

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Qi Zheng <qzhengus@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 5:36 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: Cambridge Resident in Support of the Old Courthouse Redevelopment Proposal

Dear City Councilors,

Hope this email finds you well.

I'm writing to voice my support for the Leggat McCall redevelopment plan of the old Sullivan Courthouse. As far as I know, the courthouse has been vacant for a decade, while the surrounding area saw rapid development that changed the city dramatically.

As a fellow East Cambridge resident, I don't want to see the old courthouse remain an abandoned property. Instead, I'm very excited about the Leggat McCall plan to redevelop it into a mixed-use space that gives Cambridge residents like me more community space and shopping options. Furthermore, I believe that accepting this redevelopment plan will create public good - more affordable housing, more retail traffic, more tax revenue, and a building that simply fits better into the area both in appearance and through its function. In particular, I disagree with the charge that the redevelopment plan is too big - how is the old courthouse sitting vacant better? With so many benefits to local residents, I don't see a reason why this plan should be further delayed.

I also took my time to research the alleged controversy surrounding Leggat McCall's bid for parking. I learned that the city is requiring additional contributions in exchange for spaces in the garage. It is an obvious win-win situation, and a necessary reallocation of resources in the economic sense. I can't see how public benefits could be lost there.

In conclusion, I believe it's time to take action - accept the redevelopment plan, and stop denying Cambridge residents the value that this redevelopment can add to the community. With that, I look forward to the City's leadership to ensure this project moves forward.

Best Regards,
Qi Zheng
Leighton St. & Glasswork Ave., Cambridge, MA 02141

--

--

Qi Zheng
Statistics and Economics / UChicago '17
qzhengus@gmail.com / qiz@uchicago.edu

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Farhad Khamsi <khamsif@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 5:21 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Sullivan Courthouse

Dear City Councilors,

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city has continued to see rapid development and change. It can no longer remain a blighted property with a chain link fence – that is a hazard to its surrounding community and an unacceptable state for the wider city of Cambridge.

As a taxpayer to the city and the state, I want to see the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. Its current redevelopment plans, under Leggat McCall, will also provide a number of public benefits, including affordable housing and community space. I look forward to the City’s leadership to ensure this project moves forward.

Thank you

Farhad Khamsi

29 Otis Street Unit F-403
Cambridge MA 02141
617-913-0862

***** Farhad Khamsi *****

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Emylee Patenaude <emylee@richlinedigital.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 4:03 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: 40 Thorndike

Hello,

My name is Emylee Patenaude, and I live with my husband and our 9 month old son at 76 Thorndike Street. We walk by the old courthouse at 40 Thorndike Street every day. In it's current state, it's a total eyesore, and it's such a shame that the space is not being used more thoughtfully. Today, I saw a proposal from Leggat McCall and I have to say I was impressed with their plan for redevelopment. I would especially love to see more affordable housing options in our city. I support this project, and all others that will add to the vibrancy of the neighborhood we're raising our son in.

Thank you,

Emylee Patenaude

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Meng, Zi <zmeng@gsd.harvard.edu>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 4:03 PM
To: CityCouncil@CambridgeMA.GOV
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: Support for 40 Thorndike

Dear City Council,

Hello, my name is Kevin and I live on Kirkland Street. I am excited about the Leggat Project and want to see it developed. Please support this because it will really improve the neighborhood. In the meantime, I want the developer to consider additional affordable housing on the site, or more contributions to the City's affordable housing pool.

Thank you very much,
Kevin

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Peter Lee <petera.lee@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 4:00 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment

Dear City Council,

My name is Peter Lee. I own a condo in Cambridge on Regent street, have worked in Kendall square since 2007, and am 33 years old. I am writing to support the redevelopment of the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse.

During the past decade I have been surprised and pleased to see much of East Cambridge dramatically transformed from a run down post-industrial neighborhood into one of the nation's most vibrant hubs for technology and innovation. However, I have noticed that the lack of office space is forcing Cambridge businesses to consider relocating to other neighborhoods of Boston, holding back this neighborhood's historic transformation and limiting its productivity. My understanding is that the redevelopment of the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse will convert an ageing eyesore into high-end, environmentally friendly office space consistent with East Cambridge's emergent role as a national hub of innovation and thus help relieve the office space bottleneck.

As a taxpayer, I am also interested in the fiscal implications for the city of Cambridge. My understanding is that the three options are to (1) do nothing and leave the building vacant, incurring maintenance costs to the city of \$1million/yr, (2) convert the building to a park, costing the city \$50million, or (3) convert it into high end office space, resulting in \$35 million of immediate revenues and a larger tax base going forward. Option (3) would seem to provide the City of Cambridge with the most resources to make further investments in infrastructure and quality of life without raising taxes and accordingly seems most sensible.

Please support the Leggat proposal.

Best regards,
Peter Lee

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Ladan Khamsi <khamsi.ladan@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 3:42 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: 40 Thorndike Project

Dear City Councilors,

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade and is a reminder of ugly local residents infighting. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city have continued to see rapid development and change. The Courthouse can no longer remain a blighted property with a chain link fence – that is a hazard to its surrounding community and an unacceptable site for the wider City of Cambridge.

As a taxpayer to the City and State, I want to see the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. The choice is simple. Accept the Leggat McCall plan (approved with a Special Permit since 2013) and get the following for the community: (1) millions in tax revenue, (2) abatement and redevelopment of a vacant blighted building, and (3) public benefits that include affordable housing and active retail. If the city takes no action to move forward Leggat McCall's request for parking, the City is, for years to come, supporting the ongoing vacancy of the Courthouse property and the groundless logic of those opposed to the project.

The reality is that the Courthouse structure will take upwards of \$50 million to demo and abate. That is not to mention more than \$30 million of loss in revenue that would benefit the State and residents from the sale of the building. Any scenario that envisions the Courthouse turned into a park, or its density sacrificed, is unrealistic and will never generate enough economic gains to offset costs and offer any public benefits to make a viable choice.

Moreover, as part of Leggat McCall's bid for parking, there is also an opportunity for more public benefits to be gained. In exchange for parking spaces in the First Street Garage, the City's request for proposal requires any bidder to make additional contributions to community enhancement. This is yet another favorable chance for the surrounding community to take advantage from this project's redevelopment.

I look forward to the City's leadership and my representatives' direct involvement to ensure this project moves forward in a timely fashion.

Thank you
Ladan Khamsi
29 Otis Street
Apt 403
Cambridge, MA 02141

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Richard Krushnic <rkrushnic@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 2:49 PM
To: City Manager; City Council
Subject: Approve order for further study of First St. Garage parking disposition

I support the proposed council order for further study on the First St Garage.

Given that the City Council resolved that it will not simply consider whether the RFP's agreed-upon price represents the fair market value of the city-owned parking spaces and ground floor retail space in the First Street Garage, but rather, would will listen closely to the concerns of East Cambridge residents and consider the overall impact of the Sullivan Courthouse redevelopment project; the Council must pass this order. Disposition of a leasehold interest of 420 parking spaces and 7,000 square feet of ground floor retail space in the First Street Garage is a major city decision. The voices of the community are very clearly opposed to the disposition; and in addition the enormous actual and future certain development in the area since 2014 clearly demand a reassessment:

Last month the East Cambridge Planning Team voted unanimously in opposition to the proposed disposition, and another overflow community meeting showed a clear majority of opposition. The over 3 million square feet of office space has been added in the area since 2013, with another 5 million square feet of mixed-use space coming within the next 5 years, and the announced renovation of CambridgeSide, which will eliminate 800 parking spaces, all argue that the disposition must be reexamined, and indicate that it is a bad idea. We need this independent planning and traffic study of the neighborhood and use of the First Street Garage.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Yanan He (Holly) <yananhe1993@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 2:47 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager; Clerk
Subject: Request on Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment

Dear City Councilors,

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city has continued to see rapid development and change. It can no longer remain a blighted property with a chain link fence – that is a hazard to its surrounding community and an unacceptable state for the wider city of Cambridge.

As a taxpayer to the city and the state, I want to see the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. Its current redevelopment plans, under Leggat McCall, will also provide a number of public benefits, including affordable housing and community space. I look forward to the City's leadership to ensure this project moves forward.

Thank you

Yanan He
3 Sumner Rd, Cambridge, MA 02138

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Ali Malihi <ali@backbaygroup.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 12:10 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: 40 Thorndike Street, Cambridge, MA (The Sullivan Courthouse & Parking)

Dear City Councilors,

My name is Ali Malihi and I run a Boston based venture capital business for the past two and a half decades out of Boston and Cambridge. My business is highly sensitive to knowledge based economy of Massachusetts and I have chosen to live in East Cambridge as it is a hub of innovation as the Kendal Square (M.I.T.) and other academic centers of excellence in Cambridge have created an enviable ecosystem. We analyze many metrics in the east and west coast ecosystems and are proud of what Cambridge has done.

The Sullivan Courthouse has sat vacant for the past decade. Meanwhile, Kendall Square and our city has continued to see rapid development and change. It can no longer remain a blighted property with a chain link fence – that is a hazard to its surrounding community and an unacceptable state for the wider city of Cambridge.

As a taxpayer to the city and the state, and a beneficiary of the innovation hubs with, I want to see the Courthouse redeveloped and put back on the tax roster. The choice is simple. Accept the Leggat McCall plan (approved with a Special Permit since 2013) and get the following for the community: millions in tax revenue, abatement and redevelopment of a vacant blighted building, and public benefits that include affordable housing and active retail. If the city takes no action to move forward Leggat McCall's request for parking, the city is supporting the ongoing vacancy of the Courthouse property for years to come.

The reality is that the Courthouse structure will take upwards of \$50 million to demo and abate. That is not to mention the more than \$30 million in revenue that benefits the State and residents from the sale of the building. Any scenario that envisions the Courthouse turned into a park or its density sacrificed will never generate enough economic gains to offset costs and offer any public benefits.

As part of Leggat McCall's bid for parking, is there also not an opportunity for more public benefits to be gained? This is what we call the externality benefits to the immediate community. In exchange for spaces in the First Street Garage, the city's request for proposal requires any bidder to make additional contributions to community enhancement. This is yet another opportunity for the surrounding community to benefit more from this project's redevelopment.

Moreover, as added externality benefit, I compare the Leggat McCall plan and vision for this location to the best plans in California (Silicon Valley, San Diego, etc.) and the east coast; it beats them hands down. The fact of the matter is that a more modern infrastructure could only lay further foundation for the smart city of future that Cambridge wants to become. Any scenario that envisions the Courthouse turned into a park or its density sacrificed will fall short of supporting such a foundation for the future.

I look forward to the City's leadership to ensure this project moves forward.

Thank you

Ali Malihi

Ali Malihi
17 Otis Street
Unit D-410
Cambridge, MA 02141
(617) 543 9730
ali@backbaygroup.com

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Kiefer,Savanna L. (BIDMC - Neonatology) <skiefer@bidmc.harvard.edu>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 10:26 AM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Support for the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment

Dear City Council,

Hello, my name is Savanna Kiefer and I live at 134 Spring Street in Cambridge MA, just a few blocks away from the abandoned courthouse at 40 Thorndike St.

As someone who lives in the area and walks by that building every single day, I think it is a travesty that the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse redevelopment is being stalled. This building has been vacant for ten years. What is the City waiting for? Let's redevelop the site, so that:

- a. The neighborhood will be more vibrant, with improved amenities and retail
- b. Cambridge will go from collecting no taxes on the site, to collecting significant annual revenues
- c. The community will gain a variety of benefits from the developer, including increased affordable housing.

Also, I heard that some people are requesting that the building be turned into a park. As a taxpayer, I find this to be outlandish. Why would we ask the State to forgo the \$35 million in potential revenue from Leggat McCall that will be paid as soon as the redevelopment moves forward? And how is the neighborhood going to raise \$50 million to demolish the building and abate the asbestos in order to create a park?

Please support the redevelopment.

Thank you,

Savanna

This message is intended for the use of the person(s) to whom it may be addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, any dissemination, distribution, copying, or use of this information is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please permanently delete it and immediately notify the sender. Thank you.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Megan Kelly <mkelly@wayfair.com>
Sent: Friday, November 2, 2018 10:03 AM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: Support for the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment

Dear City Council,

Hello, my name is Megan Kelly and I live at 134 Spring Street in Cambridge MA, just a few blocks away from the abandoned courthouse at 40 Thorndike St.

As someone who lives in the area and walks by that building every single day, I think it is a travesty that the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse redevelopment is being stalled. The building has been vacant for ten years. What is the City waiting for? Let's redevelop the site, so that

- a. The neighborhood will be more vibrant, with improved amenities and retail
- b. The City will go from collecting no taxes on the site, to collecting significant annual revenues, and
- c. The community will gain a variety of benefits from the developer, including increased affordable housing.

Also, I heard that some people are requesting that the building be turned into a park. As a taxpayer, I find this to be outlandish. Why would we ask the State to forgo the \$35 million in potential revenue from Leggat McCall that will be paid as soon as the redevelopment moves forward? And how is the neighborhood going to raise \$50 million to demolish the building and abate the asbestos in order to create a park?

Please support the redevelopment.

Thank you,
Megan

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Valerie Beilenson <vbeilenson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 8:24 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse (40 Thorndike)

Dear City Council,

My name is Valerie Beilenson and I live on Concord Avenue in North Cambridge. I have been a resident in Cambridge for over ten years. I am writing to express my support for East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse, also known as Forty Thorndike. The building has been abandoned for too long and I am enthusiastic about reviving the space and particularly the potential for new retail in the area. I support Leggat's proposal and appreciate their responsiveness to community needs in those spaces, such as affordable fresh food and produce and a daycare.

I also appreciate that they have incorporated a pocket park and are being thoughtful about how to redesign the exterior of the building so it blends in more with the surrounding architecture.

Please support this project.

Thank you,

Valerie Beilenson

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Weichen Zhu <weichen.zhu@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 6:18 PM
To: City Council
Cc: City Manager
Subject: East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse

Dear Cambridge City Council,

My name is Weichen Zhu and I live on Putnam Ave, in Area 7, in Cambridge. I have been a Cambridge resident for 8 years.

As someone who lives and pays taxes in our awesome City, I think it is an abomination that the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse redevelopment is being stalled. The building has been vacant for ten years. What is the City waiting for?

I would love to see redevelopment on the site, so that:

- a. The neighborhood will be more vibrant, with improved amenities and retail
- b. The City will go from collecting no taxes on the site, to collecting significant annual revenues, and
- c. The community will gain a variety of benefits from the developer, including increased affordable housing.

Also, I heard that some people are requesting that the building be turned into a park. As a taxpayer, I find this to be absolutely ridiculous. Why would we ask the State to forgo the \$35 million in potential revenue from Leggat McCall that will be paid as soon as the redevelopment moves forward? And how is the neighborhood going to raise \$50 million to demolish the building and abate the asbestos in order to create a park?

Please support the redevelopment plan for the site!

Thank you,

Weichen

--
Weichen Zhu
US Mobile +1 781 547 1755
weichen.zhu@gmail.com

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Krister Anderson <krister.b.anderson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 2:41 PM
To: City Council; City Manager
Subject: East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse Redevelopment

Dear City Council,

I live (Broadway & Highland) and work (Harvard Square) in Cambridge and appreciate the city's thoughtful approach to development, particularly when balanced with needs for the city's heritage, affordable housing, and the best use of the city's limited land. It is in this spirit I am writing to support the redevelopment of the East Cambridge Sullivan Courthouse.

Based on my understanding of the project, the redevelopment would revive a vacant building, moving it to the Cambridge city tax base and offering amenities to surrounding area. What stands out particularly is the mixed income housing. I know housing is an important issue for the council, particularly affordable housing, and this could be an excellent opportunity to work with the developer to expand units of this type in the area.

While I am a renter, increasing the tax base could potentially reduce residential taxes, helping to bring down rents. Alternatively, revenues could be deployed to other housing projects.

Finally, there is a question of best use. This isn't a new building. Rather it is a thoughtful way to use an existing building that brings tangible benefits to the city as a whole and more immediate community. I would encourage your support going forward.

Thank you,

Krister Anderson

Carvello, Maryellen

From: Michael Harrison <mharrison121@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 11:20 AM
To: Peterson, Lisa; Gianetti, Lee; Carvello, Maryellen
Subject: 1st Street Garage Website?

Hello,

My apologies for the wide email distribution. At a community meeting on Tuesday, Lisa Peterson indicated that the city would provide a website with the presentation on it as well as a location to post questions (and receive answers) before a 11/7 deadline. I was wondering where I could find this location as the deadline is slowly approaching.

Thank you.

Carvello, Maryellen

From: George Sommer <georgesommer@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 10:33 AM
To: City Manager; City Council
Subject: Sullivan Courthouse Meeting - Tuesday, October 30th

First, I and other Cambridge residents appreciate the effort all of you made to organize Tuesday evening's meeting at the Multicultural Arts Center. Although the room was a bit too small for the crowd who wanted to participate, the greater problem was the total lack of civility by many of the participants. Anyone who supports the Leggat McCall redevelopment was immediately insulted and shouted down, a completely unacceptable situation. While Deputy City Manager Ms. Peterson made an admirable and brave effort to control the crowd, it was extremely difficult to maintain order.

However, I wanted to send a follow-up message to the meeting to ensure that my voice (and I believe the voice of a majority of East Cambridge residents) is heard and recorded.

I fully support the Leggat McCall plan to redevelop the Sullivan Courthouse Building. This is a good project that will provide many community benefits and a huge economic gain for the City.

Still, there was a group attendees who are still convinced that, if the Leggat McCall plan is blocked, the State will decide to take the building down. Any rational person knows that this will not happen. Blocking the Leggat McCall plan will result in the building remaining, a permanent eyesore and eventually a health hazard.

The main focus of Tuesday's meeting was to get views on the disposition of the **420 parking spaces in the 1st Street garage**. Many of the attendees appear to have forgotten that the garage was built to serve primarily business interests and visitors to the courthouse building. It was *never* intended to resolve parking problems for East Cambridge residents. So, it is difficult for me (and others) to understand why we are discussing these parking spaces. East Cambridge should allocate these to the proposed building and move on.

So, the message is – get this Leggat McCall project going so that we can have an attractive and vibrant center to this neighborhood.

Regards,

George

George N.J. Sommer, III

29 Otis Street – Apt F208

Cambridge, MA 02141

Cell: 978-394-9418

E-mail: georgesommer@comcast.net