Process update

Topic-focused Working Groups

Meeting #1, May
- Reviewed existing conditions, issues, and opportunities
- Set preliminary goals

Meeting #2, June
- Refined goals
- Reviewed existing City policies
- Developed strategies and actions

Meeting #3, July
- Refined strategies and actions
- Identified indicators and targets

Prioritization Survey

Advisory Committee

September
- Reviewed synergies and conflicts
- Provided feedback on proposed and prioritized actions

Topic-focused Working Groups

December
- Identify a final list of actions to include as plan recommendations (both near-term and aspirational).
- Identify a final list of 3-5 indicators that are most effective and feasible to track progress along goals.

Topic-focused Working Groups

Winter ‘18
- Discuss overall actions within the context of the citywide plan and scenario analysis
- Set targets based on the preferred scenario.

Community feedback

Fall ‘17
- Public engagement on goals

Community feedback

Winter ‘18
- Public workshop on scenarios
Today’s agenda

Meeting objective: Gain consensus on actions that will be written into the plan as recommendations, and select 3-5 indicators that the City will measure on an ongoing basis after the plan has been released.

- Session overview
- Actions: Discuss Working Group feedback on the Priority Matrix developed by City and consultant teams. Identify a final list of actions to include as plan recommendations. *(Facilitated exercise)*
- Indicators: Present indicators recommended by the planning team that are most effective and feasible to track progress along goals. Discuss indicators and identify a final list of 3-5 to be included in the plan.
- Next steps
Essential Definitions

**GOAL**

- **Goal**: Broad, aspirational statement of what we want to achieve.

- **Strategy**: Approach or approaches that we take to achieve a goal.

- **Action**: Specific policy, program, or tool we take to achieve a strategy.

**Target**

- **Indicator**: Quantitative measure(s) used to assess performance against goal.

- **Desired level of performance**
Summary of public feedback on goals

- Equity and Fairness and Opportunity Infrastructure were identified as strong priorities by the majority of responders.
- Economic Diversification and Diverse Real Estate Options received mixed responses.
- Some pointed out that the City has a limited role in diversifying industry and were unsure of how the goal would be pursued.
- Other respondents wanted more specificity on the types of “diverse real estate options” and mechanisms through which this goal could be accomplished.

Cambridge benefits from clusters of economic activity in biotech/pharma and tech/software. While we encourage startups, we shouldn’t discourage existing successful industries.

By having a diversity of business and industry, this will allow more smaller businesses to thrive - we can’t put everything in one type because it limits who can participate.

I’d like to see something like an limited equity retail condo, where the business owner buys the space through a loan that does not increase, so that small businesses can stay.

Survey on draft goals: https://envisioncambridge.consider.it/
Session overview: Determining plan priorities

**Sorting:** Working with the City, the actions generated at the end of meeting #3 have been sorted into 4 categories based on expected impact and difficulty.

**Streamlining:** To bring the actions into a parallel style across all working groups, some of them have been rephrased or combined. We intended to make them more specific, and to sharpen them by replacing verbs such as “explore” or “encourage” with concrete actions that the City can pursue.
Actions
Action categorization (*Facilitated exercise*)

Do you agree with the current placement of each action along the four quadrants?

**Easy Wins**  
(high impact + low difficulty)  
Actions that are easier to accomplish and of a high impact. Should be a high priority for implementation.

**Major Projects**  
(high impact / high difficulty)  
Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. Worth doing, but may take more time to implement and should be prioritized carefully.

**Fill-Ins**  
(low impact + low difficulty)  
Actions that are easy to accomplish but of a low impact. Low priority but could be worthwhile.

**Lower impact/High difficulty actions**  
Actions that are hard to accomplish and of a low impact. Not worth the time nor effort and should not be considered.

**Major Projects**  
(High impact / High difficulty)

Actions that are difficult to accomplish but of a high impact. May be worth doing, but only considered after top recommendations are completed.

- Undertake alternative financing mechanisms, such as increment financing and community benefits districts, for infrastructure that supports targeted commercial development in transforming areas.

- Expand scholarships and number of slots in quality early education programs with a particular focus on low income families.

- Change zoning to increase commercial density and create jobs in transformative areas such as Alewife.
Indicators
Characteristics of a Good Indicator

An indicator is a quantitative measure used to assess performance against a goal. To guide the Working Group’s development of indicators, the following general characteristics of good indicators have been identified.

- **Simple to understand and communicate**
- **Historic data is available and readily accessible**
- **Indicator is a true reflection of desired performance**

**Indicators That Do Not Meet These Criteria**

- **Gini coefficient**
- **Data about income growth experienced by long-time Cambridge residents without a college degree**
- **Aggregate growth in median household income**
**Recommended economy indicators**

Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals?

Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal Addressed</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job growth rate by sector and wage</td>
<td>Aggregate economic growth; Quality jobs and inclusive growth; Economic diversity</td>
<td>Massachusetts Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparities in median income by race/ethnicity, gender, and disability status</td>
<td>Racial/ethnicity and gender economic equity</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of workforce-related program completions</td>
<td>Workforce development outcomes</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Department of Human Service Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of residents, households, and families living in poverty</td>
<td>Childhood outcomes</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minority- and women-owned businesses engaged by City through the procurement process</td>
<td>Racial/ethnicity and gender economic equity</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Purchasing Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative economy indicators

Which of these indicators seem most compelling in measuring progress against the goals?

Are there any other indicators that should be considered as a better way to measure progress against goal(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Goal Addressed</th>
<th>Potential Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total square footage of commercial space added</td>
<td>Production of commercial space</td>
<td>City of Cambridge Inspectional Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparities in unemployment rate by race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Racial/ethnicity and gender economic equity</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps
Upcoming citywide scenario analysis

- Envision Cambridge will be testing land use mixes and densities to determine the level of development under existing zoning compared to three alternative scenarios.

- The alternative scenarios will focus on the corridors and selected areas likely to have a higher propensity for change.

- The scenarios will be compared based on urban form outcomes and performance on citywide metrics such as:
  - Housing Units
  - Affordable Units
  - Jobs
  - Traffic impacts
  - GHG Emissions (MT CO2e)
  - Net Revenue ($)
Study areas for citywide scenarios

- Alewife Area Plan
- Star Market
- Cambridgeport Riverfront
- K2C2
- Mass Ave. Corridor
- Inman Square East
- Lechmere Square West
- Cambridgeport South
- North Point
- Cambridge St. Corridor
- Charles St.
- Prospect St.
- Lechmere Square West
- Recent planning areas
- Alewife study area
- Proposed areas for corridor analysis
- Potential areas of change
Next steps for Working Groups

- Envision Cambridge will be testing land use mixes and densities to determine the level of development under existing zoning compared to three alternative scenarios.

- The alternative scenarios will focus on the corridors and selected areas likely to have a higher propensity for change.

- The scenarios will be compared based on urban form outcomes and performance on citywide metrics such as:
  - Housing Units
  - Affordable Units
  - Jobs
  - Traffic impacts
  - GHG Emissions (MT CO2e)
  - Net Revenue ($)

Public meeting on scenarios, Winter ’18

Working Group meetings #5, Winter ‘18
  - Discuss overall actions within the context of the citywide plan and scenario analysis
  - Set targets based on the preferred scenario