



# ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

## COMMITTEE MEETING

~ MINUTES ~

Tuesday, September 10, 2019

12:00 PM

Sullivan Chamber  
795 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02139

### Call to Order

Attendee Name	Present	Absent	Late	Arrived
Dennis J. Carlone	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Jan Devereux	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Craig A. Kelley	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12:04 PM
Alanna Mallon	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Marc C. McGovern	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12:20 PM
E. Denise Simmons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sumbul Siddiqui	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12:08 PM
Timothy J. Toomey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12:12 PM
Quinton Zondervan	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12:09 PM

Minutes Acceptance: Minutes of Sep 10, 2019 12:00 PM (Committee Reports)



**CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL ORDINANCE COMMITTEE**

COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE, CHAIR

COMMITTEE MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

SEPTEMBER 10, 2019

12:00 PM, SULLIVAN CHAMBER

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** The petitioners will be heard first. This meeting should be relatively short. We will then have public comment, and the Ordinance Committee will then deal with the petition as it's received.

We have received some communication from the public, and at least one of those people are here and I'm sure the neighbors will speak up on this project.

So unless I see otherwise, we'll have, ask Alexandria's team to come forward and give us an update and, of where the project is, and what your hopes are.

We're also welcomed by my co-chair, Craig Kelley, who has joined the meeting. Please.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. For the record, James Rafferty, offices at 907 Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge, appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Alexandria Real Estate Equities. Seated to my right is Joseph McGuire, senior vice president Alexandria, and to Mr. McGuire's right is Michelle Lower, L-O-W-E-R, also a vice president at Alexandria.

Thank you for scheduling this meeting this afternoon. We requested the meeting because of the timeline affecting this petition. The petition is due to expire on October

9th. And as I'm sure the committee is aware, we have spent several months making good progress with what we refer to as a working group, a group from the Linden Park neighborhood, the closest residential abutters to the site.

And the good news is the group has made tremendous progress. Last evening, while all of you were relaxing, they even had another meeting just to review this request. The, I won't speak for the group, they have sent a letter in but we feel encouraged by the fact that on the substantive issues around what we're proposing in the rezoning, there seems to be some willingness to accept that, with the significant caveat. And the caveat, of course, being the relocation of the Eversource, potential Eversource transformer.

Alexandria has perhaps taken the single most concrete step towards effectuating such a transaction by offering to acquire the parcel of land that Eversource paid significantly over its land value, based on its development.

As you know, it's in a residential district, they paid over \$12 million, \$12.9 million to be exact, just a few hours after a developer purchased it for less than half

that amount.

So, it has been reported to us that Alexandria's willingness to make Eversource whole has been a very effective instrument in allowing discussions with Eversource to continue, because they are simply, uh, then reported to us they would not be amenable to losing \$6 million or having to wait for fair market value or whatever that might be. So that offer is, has been communicated to Eversource and is a prominent component of discussions of which we are tangentially involved in.

We have been talking with the city manager's advisor on this, we are aware of discussions with Eversource and we continue to express a willingness to explore options with Eversource.

So in the light of the potential of something happening in the next month that might align the stars in a way that could come up with a real win-win on this issue, any opportunity to do something, while this petition is still alive, would require this petition to leave the committee today and to allow it to be forwarded on to the Council so that it could appear on the agenda of the City Council two weeks, not this Monday, but the following

Monday.

We recognize that this committee report is unlikely to be completed by three o'clock tomorrow, but the idea is to if we could move this petition to the full Council, there is a window, a very narrow window, for the first Monday meeting in October where the potential would exist for coordination of the proposal.

So we're going to continue to work with the neighborhood group on issues that were--we have between us, that most of them are set forth in the letter of commitment. They involve things like funding, legal fees for the neighbors, improvement, working out language around a Neighborhood Improvement Association, things that are admittedly outside the context of the zoning ordinance, but still very relevant towards its disposition.

So we would continue to do that, but we are here today to ask that the Committee forward the petition on.

Ms. Lower had prepared a small presentation with handouts to refresh people's memory about the components or elements of the petition and the process. If that's seen as helpful, we're happy to provide it and present it.

Otherwise, if committee members have sufficient recall

of the elements of this petition, we're happy to conclude at this moment.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Council members, would--first I want to welcome Councillor Siddiqui back, just a few hours from last night. Does, do Council, does the Council wish to look over this? It's pretty much, it is the same as last time?

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** That's correct. There is no new information. I think it's about six or eight handouts that describe the, the affair and height changes and a few other elements of the letter of commitment.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Vice Mayor?

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Well, if she went to the trouble of creating them and printing them, I'm happy to take one just to refresh my memory. I mean, I'll just add it to all the other paper that's piled up on the floor of my basement at home because I don't have a filing cabinet. Thank you, Michelle.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Thank you.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** Mr. Chairman, in light of that, could Ms. Lower have a few moments? I think it would take her about--

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Absolutely.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** --two or three minutes--

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Absolutely.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** -- just to walk the Committee and the public through this handout.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** If you wish to briefly go over the handout, that would be useful. Thank you, Ms. Lower.

**MS. MICHELLE LOWER:** Certainly. Thank you, Councillor. As you can see, this is identical information to what was presented on July 11th. It's a small excerpt of slides from that presentation.

Just to start with on the first page, it is just our contextual slide that shows, shows the current mast that we've been discussing with the working group and we previously presented there, with the 90 feet to the top of the occupied, highest occupied floor along Binney Street, with up to 115 feet to the top of the penthouse.

If you remember, that was a change where we committed to a 25-foot height on the penthouse on the Binney Street side. So that was a big change that we presented last time. That remains the same.



In the back part of the site, the north part of the site, we are as it has been for a number of months now, 60 feet to the highest occupiable floor with 20, with a 20-foot penthouse on top, up to 80 feet there.

So I think you can see, as we previously presented, it is within context of the--of the neighboring buildings on both the east and west. We feel that this is the proper building for the site, which is what we were always charged with from the Planning Board. So that is what we have on this slide.

Turning to the next slide, it's just an outline of the various changes that we've made from our initial petition which was filed in early December of last year, 2018, up until today. I think I'm happy to read these, but it's--the big changes are the elimination of the transfer of development rights that was in our original petition. That was just confusing, to be honest, and we weren't really looking to harvest any of that GFA.

We will be, we have committed to excluding the area of the Grand Junction Pathway, of the square footage along that. We will not be using that. That was taken out.

Limit the height increases to the industrial district,

which is the Binney Street side of the parcel. We are also excluding the commercial building from the residential district, which is the northern part of the site, so we will have no building in that, which is consistent to what we've been saying.

As I mentioned previously, the maximum height along the Binney Street zone is down from 120 feet to 90 feet. And that is the definition of building height, the zoning definition excuse me, of building height, which does not include the penthouse.

But you can see the final bullet here was the big change that we made at our last meeting where--where we will be limiting the rooftop mechanical equipment height to 25 feet along the Binney Street zone. So I think that's what we have on that slide as a brief update.

Next slide just outlines the public process that we've been through. We've been meeting together for a long time, we're actually about 10 days short of exactly a year when our first public meeting was with the Linden Park, and East Cambridge neighborhood was. I believe it was the last week in September last year, so we've been at this for a long time.

It's been a very productive process throughout and we really do wish to thank all the neighbors that have spent time. It's time away from their families, it's, um, but it's been very productive for us. We've learned a lot from them. I hope they've learned learn from us what we're really looking for. And we look forward to continuing that dialogue.

Briefly, it's--you've all seen this before, it's the community benefits slide, what we're looking at. The contribute--contribution of the Grand Junction Pathway land all the way from Cambridge Street to Binney Street, which includes a nice parcel of 686 Cambridge Street, a beautiful building, which would come down and allow for a--allow for a nice real entryway into the pathway along Cambridge Street, which we are excited about. We do have an agreement with the church at this point in time so that is the, was the final real connecting piece of land there.

Talk a little bit about union construction jobs as well as permanent jobs. The importance of the increased space in Kendall Square at an appropriate size. Kendall Square really does remain a very vital economic engine both for the state, the country, the city, as well as the world

as far as innovation goes with some of the--some of the work that's going on here with institutions like MIT, the Broad, others we all know about.

Incentive zoning fee, north of \$6 million at this point in time, as well as the enhanced Binney Street cross-section being, so increased sidewalk widths, as well as buffered bike lanes along Binney Street.

And then just one nice little image in the last page of what the Grand Junction Pathway would be from Binney Street looking to the south to--or excuse me, from Cambridge Street, looking to the south towards Binney street.

So, our brief update.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** And could you remind us the additional square footage that will result from--from this petition?

**MS. MICHELLE LOWER:** Correct, certainly. We are currently, the as of right is at about 160--163,000 square feet. With this petition, we are at about 398,000 square feet. I might be off by a couple of thousand--399,000 square feet, sorry, I missed 1,000. So that's what we're looking at, at this point in time.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Okay. And when and if this goes to Council, you'll have an outline of the values that you're proposing here, so that we will understand that if indeed the petition moves forward that the increase in land value will be compensated to the city, in part?

**MR. JOE MAGUIRE:** This is Joe McGuire from Alexandria Real Estate Equities, offices at 400 Technology Square in Cambridge.

Yes, Councillor, we are prepared to have--continue those conversations as to what--what that would be. We will be transparent with our costs for each--each of the benefits that we're--that we're bringing to bear and we will look forward to that conversation in closing before--before we have the final vote.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Yeah, that's what I want to make sure happens. Great, thank you. Councillors, assuming that's the end of the brief presentation, Councillors, any comments or questions? Councillor Zondervan.

**COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for bringing this back before us. I'm really happy to hear about the progress, both with the

neighborhood and your offer to Eversource. I really appreciate the effort there.

I--I basically have three conditions at this point that need to be met for me to move this forward. One, Eversource, which I think we all agree has to happen.

The Grand Junction land has to be conveyed to the city at the earliest possible opportunity, whether that's upon the zoning being granted, or the special permit, whatever we all agree to, but it cannot be contingent on--on an occupancy permit. That is just way too far in the future for us to wait that long.

And then the last, of course, is that I want a commitment to building net zero ready in--in your commitment letter or--or in the petition itself.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Thank you. Any questions on the presentation? I just want to welcome the mayor for joining us. Councillor Mallon, please.

**COUNCILLOR ALANNA M. MALLON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Through you. I also wanted to just echo my colleague's comments, because I do remember we had some conversations about the conveyance of the Grand Junction Path and when that might be possible. I'm just wondering if the panelists

could tell, talk to us a little bit about what the plan is for conveyance of that land. And if it's possible to move that forward before final occupancy? It--it would be our hope to kind of get that rolling and underway as soon as possible.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Yes, Councillor Kelley, please.

**COUNCILLOR CRAIG KELLEY:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I don't know, I have to take off in a moment so I may not be here when we move it forward, assuming we do.

I think my understanding from talking to the petitioner is a move forward is a calendar issue to make us able to do something in the future, if somehow an opportunity presents itself. So I wouldn't want anyone to think that a move forward is a vote of confidence in this, despite the fact I think we all really appreciate the big strides you have met in meeting neighborhood concerns and so forth.

So, if we get there at the end, great, but moving it forward today doesn't mean that we'll move it forward next time.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Thank you. I think

unless--yes Counc--Mayor.

**MAYOR MARC C. MCGOVERN:** I'm sorry I was late. You may have covered this already but just on the follow up to the Grand Junction, that piece. There was conversation at the last meeting about when that will be built out in the term of the--of the project. Did you--did you cover that? Is that something that--can we see that sooner rather than later?

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** The short answer, of course, is yes. The model we're looking at now, the template, is what was done with the Roger Street Park conveyance.

Candidly, the city through its law department imposed obligations upon Alexandria to convey the property in a certain condition, remediated condition. So we--we took the steps necessary to remediate and then convey. The conveyance was tied to a particular moment in the process.

So in this case, and then we've looked at that process as well. And in that process then the funding of the construction and design work is also scheduled.

So there are three seminal events typically in something like this. One is upon the adoption of the zoning. Second is upon the issuance of the special permit.



And third tends to be related to the issuance of the building permit. So given the multiple issues we have here, it would seem that we're--we're willing to take direction from the Council and perhaps the Council would be served by some input from the law department.

Because with all due respect to the law department, it was challenging to give the city. We gave you a foundry building. It took us a long time to get you to take the deed on that. We gave you 2.2 acres of land. It took us a long time to convey. And I used to jokingly say you're not easy people to give things to.

So in this case, the commitment is we're going, we have an agreement with the church that if the zoning is adopted, we're going to proceed and close on the land, or we're going to line it up in a way.

We have some commitments to the church before they'll convey to us. We're going to be doing some capital improvements around their plant, their physical plant. So that would begin, in fact that probably will begin in the very near future.

So but this, it's--it's interconnected. But I can assure you based on Alexandria's prior track record and

their eagerness to move this forward, we're perfectly amenable to coming up with a plan that works.

I think I've heard it said, "Well, Alexandria should do the work." I think that's probably not likely to occur only because once it's public land, and I know the council is very familiar with the 30-B bidding process these days, that I think whatever work gets done, they will, I'm guessing, certainly don't speak for the city, but the Council knows the process, that there'd be some community planning around the path, and then there'd be contracts around design and construction. We'll--we'll be standing ready to convey.

And I suspect this cost we're anticipating preparing from you, our expectation is we'll probably have some remediation work to do along the land.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** But to follow up on the mayor, you would be willing, let's say it's special permit timing, to convey the land if that's what the administration feels comfortable with?

Or, let me rephrase that. If the city realizes it's an advantage to have you build it, since it's not adjacent to the building, it's near the building, future building, but

it's on the other side, I could see an advantage to the city asking you to build it, whether they do that or not.

But you're saying you're willing to commit to a reasonable timetable, whether it's the special permit? I mean, you gain nothing by holding on to it as I understand it, once you have the special permit.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** Right. I would--I would say in these processes, the special permit is a very relevant event. And I think once the special permit issues, then I think all types of opportunities present themselves. And I trust many of you can appreciate that until the special permit is there, this does remain a speculative project.

So, but once the special permit were to be issued, I think--I think we can move forward and certainly in language about a willingness. When it happens, we'll probably as I say, be informed by larger issues being assessed by the law department.

But on our end, a willingness to do so, put a deed in escrow, do whatever.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Okay. I think--I think that addresses, yes. I want to welcome Councillor Toomey. I--my peripheral vision isn't as good as it used to be and

I apologize. So does the city--

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Yes, Vice Mayor?

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** I mean, were you going to ask a follow-up question on that? Or can I ask a follow up on that?

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Oh, please do. Please do?

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Thanks. So if we're talking about the special permit, assuming that the zoning does get passed on the timeframe that you want, are you pretty much ready to file for a special permit? You've been looking at these buildings for a long time, so you're not going to suddenly say, oh, gosh, we've got to design a building now.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** The next day is probably the--

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** The next day, okay.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** But we have not been presumptuous. We have not designed the building. But what you see here and some of the things, so it will be very shortly thereafter.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** So--

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** I'm sure Mr. Maguire can emphasis that.

**MR. JOE MAGUIRE:** We would try--we would try our best to, within six to nine months to have completed the special permit process, provided we have agree--agreement.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** So that would be sometime--

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** I think you have to talk right into the mic or people back home can't hear.

**MR. JOE MAGUIRE:** I was saying that within six to nine months, we would like to see us completed with a special permit process. It will take us probably four or five months in order--in order to have the building designed from where we are today and to file. And our guess is that there'll be probably at least two or three meetings with the--with the Planning Board, which usually stretch out over two or three months. So I'm looking at a six to nine-month timeframe.

And as I said, with a special permit, we would commit to providing the land to the city at that--at that time.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Okay. That's--that sounds good. So that's sometime next summer or thereabouts. I had another question, what was it? Oh, the--the letter of commitment is still being negotiated. We haven't seen that, or have we seen that?

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** No, no, you've seen that. Yeah.  
There's a draft.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Okay.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** We are actually, have been having some discussions with the neighbors about that but we're happy to recirculate that. But in the Committee Report from the last Ordinance Committee is a copy of the letter of commitment. We also shared it with the Planning Board, because there had been some discussion in the past about letters of commitment being seen, not shared with the Planning Board.

So this one isn't--it follows the model that has been used in most other letters of commitment. And again, I think when we leave here we can certainly begin to ask the law department to weigh in as well. But they contain the components of what we've been talking about for a significant amount of time around the Grand Junction and around other--other commitments.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Including the Eversource commitment that--that's in that?

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** Yes.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Okay.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** The Eversource, the commitment to purchase the Eversource land is in the letter of commitment.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Okay, so the letter of commitment would be finalized and signed at the same time the--

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** Yes, as is the case, and the petition would make reference to the thing.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Okay, thank you.

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** We would sign it prior to ordination of the petition.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Counselor Siddiqui?

**COUNCILLOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I had the same question about the letter of commitment. And while on the topic of neighbors, I guess I'll just ask. You said the--based on what was said at the last meeting with the neighbors was in July, but I assume you've been, the last August, been in touch?

**MS. MICHELLE LOWER:** As most recently as last evening. So yes, we are in very close contact with the neighborhood working group members.

**COUNCILLOR SUMBUL SIDDIQUI:** Great. Thank you.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Great. Does the city wish to say anything or make comment? No. Okay, so we're kosher there. That's good.

So I'm going to open it up, open this up to public comment. And there was no list put out but I--I can see pretty clearly. So I will ask Pamela VanDort, please come to the podium and make your presentation.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Pamela VanDort, 13 Cornelius Way, Cambridge, Massachusetts, spoke on the zoning petition received from Alexandria Real Estate Equities, Inc. et al proposing a Grand Junction Pathway Overlay District.

Ms. VanDort, representing the Linden Park Neighborhood Residents Association, highlighted the Association's opposition to the substance of the petition in its current form, referring to past discussions on density issues, while emphasizing the Group's desire to see Eversource moved out of the Linden Park Neighborhood.

Ms. VanDort noted the Linden Park Neighborhood Residents Association compromise to the density concerns raised in Alexandria Real Estate Equities proposal is



conditional on Alexandria's role in getting Eversource to move the substation out of the neighborhood and that absent an Eversource agreement and the relocation of the substation, the Group's position is that the project is too large and dense in this transition area.

Ms. VanDort then indicated because of the calendar procedural issue currently before the Committee, and in the interest of good faith negotiations with Alexandria and their dealings with Eversource to continue to move this compromise forward procedurally, the Linden Park Neighborhood Residents Association does not oppose solely the calendar move of moving this petition out of committee to the full City Council with the request that a requirement be added that in order for the Committee to vote on there issue, a commitment from Alexandria for the Eversource land parcel would be a precondition of having the project move forward substantively.

Ms. VanDort also requested any future meetings on this issue be held in the evening hours to accommodate the working hours of residents and permit them to actively participate in and attend future meetings.

Elon Levy, 148 Spring Street, Cambridge,

Massachusetts, spoke on the zoning petition received from Alexandria Real Estate Equities, Inc. et al proposing a Grand Junction Pathway Overlay District. Mr. Levy, speaking as Vice President of ECPT, indicated full support for the Linden Park Neighborhood Association in their negotiations with Alexandria Real Estate Equities.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Thank you. I see no one else present so I will close public comment. [Coughs.] Excuse me. So the issue is before us. Councillor Zondervan.

**COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have a question. I guess we can't directly address the public, but perhaps Alexandria could answer this. In terms of the agreement to the density conditioned upon Eversource moving, I'm guessing that part of that condition is that the Eversource site would become open space. Is--was that discussed?

**MR. JAMES RAFFERTY:** The short answer is there has been, the commitment from Alexandria with regard to the Eversource location is if they were to acquire it, they would make no effort to change the current zoning, which is Res-C1.

We would then explore, with input obviously from the

Council and the city, what might be seen as the best use of that, whether it be housing or open space. Ever--Alexandria would have no intention of constructing a commercial facility of any kind in that residential zoning district.

But I do think that opportunities would obviously be unearthed if--if in fact Alexandria was able to acquire that site. And then you'll recall that in our petition, we have a component of publicly beneficial open space in our zoning. So it might present a good planning opportunity to see how those two parcels, adjacent parcels, might work together.

But we wouldn't, our only--our only commitment is no effort to develop it commercially. Mr. Maguire has mentioned a willingness to explore a--a relationship with an affordable housing developer if the--the interest was there.

**COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN:** Great. Thank you so much.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Thank you. Any other comments from the Council? I want to say that the 236,000 square foot, additional square feet, times \$150 is \$35 million and change in value for the up-zoning and land

value costs, and we think we're pretty close to that. I-- that's why I asked about some detail on that.

So we're in a position to move this forward if the Council agrees. Is there a motion?

**COUNCILLOR TIMOTHY J. TOOMEY JR.:** So moved.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** With a favorable recommendation, Counselor? Counselor Toomey has proposed that we move this forward with a favorable recommendation. Counselor Zondervan.

**COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Do we have to move it with a favorable recommendation?

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** That is the motion.

**COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN:** Okay, so--so we could also move it with no recommendation?

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** We could do that, yes, or a negative recommendation.

**COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN:** Okay, so I would like to make a motion with no recommendation, and also, I would like to introduce an amendment.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Okay. Well first we have to do the first one--

**COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN:** Right.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Which is Counsellor Toomey's. And keep in mind that this is all based on the premise of what we just discussed, and that the Council will have the right--I can tell you, well no, the motion's been made so we have to vote. So I won't tell you what I was going to say.

**COUNCILLOR QUINTON Y. ZONDERVAN:** I--I also would like to amend the petition before we move it.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** I'm confused now.

**CITY CLERK ANTHONY WILSON:** So just to interject, before any Councillor can do anything, the motion that's on the floor has to be disposed of either in the positive or the negative. Depending on how the motion is resolved, then additional motions may be heard before the Council.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** So the motion is to move the petition forward with a favorable recommendation. And all those in favor, say aye.

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** I think we should do a roll call. If you--I'm sorry.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Roll call?

**VICE MAYOR JAN DEVEREUX:** Roll call, please.

**City Clerk Anthony Wilson called the roll on referring the petition back to the full City Council with a favorable recommendation as moved by Councillor Toomey:**

Vice Mayor Jan Devereux - No.

Councillor Craig Kelley - Absent

Councillor Alanna M. Mallon - Yes

Mayor Marc C. McGovern - Yes

Councillor E. Denis Simmons - Absent

Councillor Sumbul Siddiqui - No

Councillor Timothy J. Toomey Jr. - Yes

Councillor Quinton Y. Zondervan - No

Councillor Dennis J. Carlone - Yes

**Yes-4, No-3, Absent-2. Motion Passed.**

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** So I believe that completes our work.

**CITY CLERK ANTHONY WILSON:** That is correct.

**COUNCILLOR DENNIS J. CARLONE:** Yes. So thank you all for coming. We appreciate it. So we're expecting some discussions on the final agreement and we'll be getting input from neighboring neighbors as well as the city.

We will look at, if indeed it is approved at Council, the financial aspects as approved by the Council, and

everybody in this room wants Eversource out of a residential neighborhood so we're all counting on that happening as well.

So thank you all for coming. The meeting is over.

**The Cambridge City Council Ordinance Committee  
adjourned at approximately 12:38 p.m.**

**C E R T I F I C A T E**

I, **Susan Ireland**, a transcriber for Datagain, do hereby certify: That said proceedings were listened to and transcribed by me and were prepared using standard electronic transcription equipment under my direction and supervision; and I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the proceedings is a full, true, and accurate transcript to the best of my ability.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name this 15th day of December 2022.



Signature of Transcriber



### Public Hearing

1. A Zoning Petition has been received from Alexandria Real Estate Equities, Inc. et al proposing a Grand Junction Pathway Overlay District

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>REFERRED</b>	<b>Next: 9/23/2019 5:30 PM</b>
----------------	-----------------	--------------------------------

2. Communication from Pamela Van Dort regarding the refiled zoning petition for the Grand Junction Pathway Overlay

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ANNOUNCED</b>
----------------	------------------

3. Motion to refer the petition back to the full City Council with favorable a recommendation by Councillor Toomey

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ADOPTED [4 TO 3]</b>
<b>YEAS:</b>	Carlone, Mallon, McGovern, Toomey
<b>NAYS:</b>	Devereux, Siddiqui, Zondervan
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Kelley, Simmons