Joint Working Group Meeting
March 22, 2018

Meeting Notes

Attendance

Envision Cambridge Advisory Committee (ECAC): Ruth Allen, Frank Gerratana, Zeynab Magavi, Alexandra Offiong, Ruth Ryals, Tom Stohlman, Robert Winters

Climate and Environment Working Group: Maxwell Cohen, Cynthia Hibbard, Emily Myron, Mike Nakagawa, Christopher Nielson, Julianne Sammut, Joanne Scheuble

Economy Working Group: Sarah Gallop, Gina Plata, Daniel Shenfeld

Housing Working Group: Lee Farris, Anthony Galluccio, Esther Hanig, Margaret Moran, Cheryl-Ann Pizza-Zeoli, Susan Schlesinger

Mobility Working Group: Dave Allen, Chris Featherman, Nate Fillmore, Greg Heidelberger, Mark Jensen, Rob Ricchi, Ruthann Rudel, Annie Tuan

Alewife Working Group: James Butler

Engagement Working Group: Debbie Bonilla, Justin Crane

City Council: Denise Simmons

City Staff: Iram Farooq, Sandra Clarke, Stuart Dash, Melissa Peters, Chris Cotter, Susanne Rasmussen, Lisa Hemmerle, Susan Mintz, Cliff Cook, Jeff Roberts, Christina DiLisio, Seth Federspiel, Stephanie Groll, Gary Chan, Wendell Joseph, Lanisha Blount

Consultant Team: Tim Love, Jessica Robertson, Kennan Lagreze, Nupoor Monani, John McCartin, Cory Berg

Meeting Objective

This meeting had two objectives:
1. Collect feedback across all working groups on how to prioritize high impact-high difficulty actions—i.e. actions that are impactful, but have a high degree of complexity
2. Collect input on options and priorities for community benefits, and mechanisms for attaining them through development, such as new requirements or density bonuses. Which community benefits should be prioritized? Should any be required? Should bonus capacity be treated differently in different locations (and where)?

Follow these links to view the [presentation](#) and [list of actions](#) on the Envision Cambridge website.

Meeting Overview

Participants from the four topic-focused working groups, the ECAC, the Alewife Working Group, and the Engagement Working Group were divided into small groups. To the extent possible, small groups were composed of members of different working groups. Melissa Peters, Tim Love, and John McCartin gave a short presentation describing the Working Group process thus far, the goals of this joint working group meeting, and the content of the two activities. Each small group then conducted the activities, described below. At the end of the meeting, each small group reported on its discussion to the wider group of participants.

What We Heard

Activity 1 – Priority Actions

In this activity, each group was asked to individually vote for their top 10 high-impact/high-difficulty actions. They then discussed these and selected their top 10 priorities collectively for the whole group. Based on a tally of collective group-wide votes, the following 12 actions emerged as priorities i.e. received a vote from 3 or more groups.

Note: A full tally of the number of individual votes each action received is included in Appendix A. Some working group members not in attendance submitted votes for their priority actions via email; these are tallied separately from votes received at the meeting and shown in Appendix A. *(Actions are listed in sequential order by topic area in Appendix A.)*

8   Develop disaster preparedness plans at the neighborhood level in conjunction with neighborhood organizations, service providers, public housing residents and other vulnerable populations

9   Develop a Green Infrastructure Action Plan

25   Undertake targeted business recruitment efforts to attract firms that offer low barrier-to-entry jobs with relatively high wages and job training opportunities, which could encompass many jobs in light industrial districts.

30   Change zoning to increase density and achieve a mix of uses in targeted areas along Mass Ave. and Cambridge St. that builds the customer base for retail.

34   Increase existing City funds dedicated to affordable housing through higher dedicated revenue from the general fund and exploring options for new resources.

40   Establish new City funding sources such as the regular issuance of bonds and using tax increment financing to support affordable housing at the project or district scale.

41   Establish or expand the use of taxes that provide dedicated revenue for affordable housing including a local real estate transfer tax (supplemental to state stamp tax), a speculative owner tax, and lodging tax on short-term rentals.

43   Change zoning to enable more housing, including affordable housing, to be built along major corridors and in other transforming areas that have the capacity to accommodate growth and are well-served by transit.

52   Develop an implementation plan and increase funding to complete gaps in the Bicycle Network Plan and pedestrian network to create a completely connected network of high-quality infrastructure citywide

53   Prepare transportation infrastructure to be more resilient to periodic flooding, possible salt water contamination, and high temperatures associated with climate change by relocating mechanical and electrical equipment and introducing more passive cooling features

55   Change zoning to allow low maximum parking requirements near transit nodes and in key squares and corridors, with lowered parking requirements citywide

63   Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)

Priority housing actions involved the creation of new sources of revenue to fund affordable housing and the overall creation of more housing in areas that can support more development. Priority mobility recommendations crossed all modes, from implementing bus priority treatments and developing an implementation plan to complete gaps in the Bicycle Network Plan and pedestrian network, to preparing transportation infrastructure to be more resilient and changing zoning to reduce parking requirements in key areas. The priority actions for Climate and Environment revolved around the need for a Green Infrastructure Action Plan and neighborhoods disaster preparedness plans. Within the Economy actions, allocating resources to assess training and education needs of low/moderate income residents to determine the readiness to access existing industry-focused training programs and changing the zoning to increase density along mixed-use along the corridors received the highest number of votes. The Urban Form action that emerged with the most votes was the connection of "Alewife Square" into the fabric of Cambridge.

Throughout this activity, members sought out ways to draw connections between the actions, often grouping actions from the same or different focus areas. Broader themes emerged from this effort, such as the desire to maintain a diverse community and support vibrant mixed-use commercial corridors.

Activity 2 – Development Requirements and Incentives

The second activity asked participants to weigh community benefits and development incentives to understand which should be pursued at a citywide scale. Much of these discussions revolved around which could be mandated versus incentivized and how some community benefits could be addressed through other policies. In general, the housing benefits garnered a lot of discussion, framed through the city's existing inclusionary zoning policy. Groups supported giving density bonuses in exchange for affordable housing beyond the 20% inclusionary requirement, and supported the development of more family-sized units, particularly affordable family-sized units. Increasing public gathering spaces was also a priority, but guidelines need to be set to ensure quality public space. Lowering parking requirements was supported near transit-oriented locations. Most felt additional trees and open space should be required. Net zero was a high priority but there was a mix of opinions as to whether they should be required under the current timeline of the Net Zero Action Plan or given incentives to happen sooner. District energy was deemed best to be incentivized as part of large-scale developments (i.e. PUDs).

Small Group Discussion

Members

Group 1:	Cheryl-Ann Pizza-Zeoli, Rob Ricchi, Daniel Shenfeld, Tom Stohlman, Greg Heidelberger, Emily Myron, Debbie Bonilla
Group 2:	Sarah Gallop, Joanne Scheuble, Lee Farris, Ruth Ryan Allen, Dave Allen
Group 3:	Mike Nakagawa, Gina Plata, Susan Schlesinger, Mark Jensen, Robert Winters
Group 4:	Ruthann Rudel, Esther Hanig, Chris Nielson, Zeyneb Magavi
Group 5:	Maxwell Cohen, Joanne Scheuble, Ruth Ryals, Chris Featherman, James Butler
Group 6:	Alexandra Offiong, Cynthia Hibbard, Annie Tuan
Group 7:	Frank Gerratana, Nate Fillmore, Julianne Sammut, Justin Crane, Anthony Gallucio

Activity 1: Priority Actions

Participants were given a list of 64 high impact-high priority actions. Individually, they chose the most important ten actions. Participants placed stickers next to each of their top ten actions. Then the group discussed why certain actions emerged as priorities, the criteria used to choose their top ten, and ultimately, which ten actions are priorities *for the group*. At points, some participants made edits to the list of actions (such as merging actions together).

Group 1

After each person identified their individual actions, the group discussed and determined their joint top ten actions. These include (not in ranked order):

8   Develop disaster preparedness plans at the neighborhood level in conjunction with neighborhood organizations, service providers, public housing residents and other vulnerable populations

16   Develop a stipend program for multilingual youth and adults to assist with city events and outreach activities to increase dialogue with members of the public with limited English proficiency.

23   Expand scholarships and number of slots in quality early education programs with a focus on low income families, which will facilitate workforce participation for adults and positive educational outcomes for children.

34   Increase existing City funds dedicated to affordable housing through higher dedicated revenue from the general fund and exploring options for new resources.

40   Establish new City funding sources such as the regular issuance of bonds and using tax increment financing to support affordable housing at the project or district scale.

41   Establish or expand the use of taxes that provide dedicated revenue for affordable housing including a local real estate transfer tax (supplemental to state stamp tax), a speculative owner tax, and lodging tax on short-term rentals.

42   Offer density bonuses and relief from other dimensional regulations for fully affordable housing developments through a citywide affordable housing overlay or other regulatory mechanism.

45   Evaluate gaps in supportive housing services provided by the City, increase capacity and funds to address identified gaps, and increase awareness of available services.

55   Change zoning to allow low maximum parking requirements near transit nodes and in key squares and corridors, with lowered parking requirements citywide

63   Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)

A brief discussion of each action is below, in the order in which they were discussed:

- #42: Offer density bonuses and relief from other dimensional regulations for fully affordable housing developments through a citywide affordable housing overlay or other regulatory mechanism
    - While this action received the most votes, some members weren't sure about the word "fully"; is fully affordable housing developments possible? There was some concern that there are few developments/developers that could make 100% affordable feasible.
    - Despite this concern, all agreed #42 is a worthy goal, and that reducing the 100% or combining similar actions regarding affordable housing (such as removing parking requirements or combining it with an overlay district), should be a priority action.
- #43: Change zoning to enable more housing, including affordable housing, to be built along major corridors and in other transforming areas that have the capacity to accommodate growth and are well-served by transit
    - Members agreed that this goal is important because it provides housing for other people, not only those that fit within the affordable housing requirements.

- Members acknowledged that this action is like 42, with lots of synergy between them. However, this action is slightly more geographic.
    - One member reminded everyone that parking requirements should be a part of the conversation.
- #63: Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)
    - Several members agreed that this is a complicated, long-term project that warrants significant effort.
    - One member noted that this rose to the top of the list, even though the Alewife Working Group is not represented here.
    - Members discussed the difficulties in getting around in Alewife; despite the many resources, poor transportation networks and infrastructure (traffic circles) make it difficult to access amenities, making the area feel less urban.
- #3: Procure 100% of municipal electricity from renewable resources
    - Members agreed that this is an important goal, but that something like this is already in the works. Members felt that the City already does a lot to ensure municipal electricity is coming from renewable resources. Therefore, this action was not believed to be a top priority since it feels like it's already being addressed.
- #23: Expand scholarships and slots in quality early education programs with a focus on low income families, which will facilitate workforce participation for adults and positive educational outcomes for children
    - Members felt that early education should be a priority. However, some members felt the action could be expanded to quality early education for all.
    - One member felt this action strayed from its initial intent, which was early education for all. Early education has long-term and far-reaching impacts, not only benefiting children but also allowing mothers to stay in the workforce
    - One member elaborated a bit more about the difficulties of the existing early childhood education scholarship program, and agreed it needs to be expanded.
    - One question came up regarding whether this should be guaranteed for everyone working in Cambridge, too.
    - All members agreed this should remain a priority action.
- #46: Implement bus priority treatments on key bus corridors at points of recurrent delay to increase transit speed and reduce traffic delays
    - This action was called out for its mobility benefits as well as its climate change benefits.
    - All members agreed to keep this as a priority action.
- #34: Increase existing City funds dedicated to affordable housing through higher dedicated revenue from the general fund, and exploring options for new resources
    - Some members felt that this is a vague action and needs more detail about how much the City will increase its funds.
    - A member pointed out that the City doesn't currently contribute dedicated funds, so this is a big step forward.
- #41: Establish or expand the use of taxes that provide dedicated revenue for affordable housing including a local real estate transfer tax (supplemental to state stamp tax), speculative owner tax, and lodging tax on short-term rentals
    - All members of the group thought that this action, along with the other affordable action items that were mentioned, are important. Members thought that every little bit helps.
- #55: Change zoning to allow low maximum parking requirements near transit nodes and in key squares and corridors, with lowered parking requirements citywide

- Many members expressed a desire to decrease parking requirements at several times in the discussion. One member compared Cambridge to Boston, noting the greater flexibility in Boston and how it's worked.
- All members agreed this is important and chose to keep it in the top 10.

Group members were then asked to make the case for other actions that weren't brought up.

- #8 Develop disaster preparedness plans at the neighborhood level
  - One member voiced this as an important action since she feels most people don't have a preparedness plan in place or are even thinking along these lines. This action could also have an impact on other plans (i.e. What buildings won't have AC, who won't have power, etc.).
  - Several members agreed.
- #52 Complete gaps in the Bicycle Network Plan and pedestrian network.
  - One member felt this action is important because it has more than mobility impacts, linking to the existing street network. Other members agreed that there are a lot of synergies between this action and others, while another disagreed, noting that housing should be the highest priority to retain lower income and a diverse population.
- #30: Change zoning to increase density and achieve a mix of uses in targeted areas along Mass Ave. and Cambridge St. that builds the customer base for retail mixed-use
  - One member introduced Action #30 as an important item. Others noted the synergy between this action and others, noting Action #42 as an example.
- #16: Increase staff capacity to conduct ongoing racial equity analyses of new and existing policies, programs, services, procurement practices, and community engagement
  - Members felt that actions 16, 17, and 18 were similar and extremely important. The perceived lack of diversity in the room was noted as a reason why this action is so important.
  - One member felt that conducting a study wasn't action-oriented enough. Another member pointed out that you need a study to know what to implement, making this action important.
  - In the end Action #16 replaced #52 as a top ten priority action.

Group 2

After each person identified their individual actions, the group discussed and determined their joint top ten actions. These include (not in ranked order):

3	Procure 100% of municipal electricity from renewable sources
15	Grow the number of beds and treatment opportunities for opioid users.
16	Increase staff capacity to conduct ongoing racial equity analyses of new and existing policies, programs, services, procurement practices, and community engagement to evaluate how the proposal advances racial equity, address gaps in services and disparities in access, and mitigates unintended consequences (i.e. Seattle Racial Equity Toolkit)
22	Pursue a standard list of desired economic development community benefits, including jobs and training opportunities for Cambridge residents to be pursued through development review.
25	Undertake targeted business recruitment efforts to attract firms that offer low barrier-to-entry jobs with relatively high wages and job training opportunities, which could encompass many jobs in light industrial districts.
34	Increase existing City funds dedicated to affordable housing through higher dedicated revenue from the general fund and exploring options for new resources.

40   Establish new City funding sources such as the regular issuance of bonds and using tax increment financing to support affordable housing at the project or district scale.

41   Establish or expand the use of taxes that provide dedicated revenue for affordable housing including a local real estate transfer tax (supplemental to state stamp tax), a speculative owner tax, and lodging tax on short-term rentals.

43   Change zoning to enable more housing, including affordable housing, to be built along major corridors and in other transforming areas that have the capacity to accommodate growth and are well-served by transit.

53   Prepare transportation infrastructure to be more resilient to periodic flooding, possible salt water contamination, and high temperatures associated with climate change by relocating mechanical and electrical equipment and introducing more passive cooling features

56   Better manage freight movement and delivery to improve safety and efficiency, including: (a) Increase enforcement of truck routes; (b); Create incentives & new loading zones that encourage large trucks to deliver off-peak; (c) Analyze consolidated neighborhood delivery pick-up spots which can minimize excessive door-to-door deliveries and offer reduced shipping costs; and (d) Initiate peak period pricing in loading zones to ensure trucks find curb space without double parking

- #2 Leverage new communication technologies to alert residents and workers, by geography, of risks in the event of an emergency.
    - o A member voted for #2 because it's not actually high difficulty and the technology exists. A member stated that the difficulty is not the technology but the decision making. If you look at the history of civic texting during events like the California mudslides there isn't a clear decision-making channel.
- #34 Increase existing City funds dedicated to affordable housing through higher dedicated revenue from the general fund, and exploring options for new resources.
    - o A member said adding new revenue sources is important.
    - o A member suggested property taxes should be raised and there should be a bigger homeowner exemption. The additional money could then be used for affordable housing. This distinction does not come across in the language of action 34.
    - o A member prioritizes actions that address issues where people's lives are at stake. She chose actions such as #34 that address the most serious problems along with several actions in the climate category.
    - o A member would rather see the City funds reallocated to housing rather than supporting a lot of other issues. She stated that housing is a life or death issue.
    - o A member believes housing and mobility issues are inextricably linked. If they are not resolved together you end up with a city like Atlanta.
    - o A member stated that you can't increase housing stock without thinking about impact on the climate.
    - o A member said that there is no housing available for working middle class families. When the City mentions affordable housing it's important for me to know if this is restricted to low-income families or includes middle-income families as well. It's hard for the middle-class families to stay in Cambridge because of affordability.
- A member sees himself as a permanent Cambridge resident and sees the corridors as the ideal development location. He stated that it is difficult to afford a house in Cambridge despite having a good income and stated that this is an untenable long-term situation. He believes that in an urban area where expansion is limited, increasing density is a good option.

- A member observed that one of the things that puts pressure on housing is all the commercial construction occurring in Kendall. Half of those people will want to live in Cambridge.
- A member said that the only way to get middle income below market housing is to cover all the things on the list for affordable housing. If the city only increases density, we will have 80% market rate and 20% low income and there will be no middle-income housing. If the City implements an affordable housing overlay (42) then they are incenting only affordable housing which can include middle-income housing over market-rate housing. More 2-3-unit developments in the less-dense areas of the city would result.
- A member believes density bonuses will result in a bad urban form and, thus, residents will not choose to stay because this housing type is transitional and does not build a community.
- #16 Increase staff capacity to conduct ongoing racial equity analyses
    - A member said that the Climate and Environment Working Group evaluates all issues based on racial justices because poor people live in the flood plains. That's an underlying tenet. Everything needs that as an underlying tenet.
    - One member agrees and stated that racial analysis is discussed within the Housing Working Group, but it'd be much better to have it within all the policies. The City lost a significant portion of the African American population when it lost the middle-income group.
- A member observed that the opioid crisis is getting worse and more beds are needed (#15), but the City has cut beds in the past. Cambridge needs more resources for young adults. The children coming through the public-school system don't have "starter job" opportunities.
- #56 Better manage freight movement and delivery
    - A member thinks managing freight trucks is important because they are one of the biggest polluters and generate safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians.
- #22 Develop a standard list of economic development community benefits
    - A member goes to a lot of development reviews. The neighborhood is always trying to come up with enforceable benefits. There should be a standard list from which developers can choose. This doesn't appear to be of high difficulty and other economic benefits could be rolled into the list.
- #25 Support low-barrier to entry jobs
    - A member said training programs need to include residents without a college degree. Employers should start buying into residents' educations starting in high school.
    - A member believes the City should attract firms and encourage them to recruit locally via incentives.

Group 3

After each person identified their individual actions, the group discussed and determined their joint top ten actions. These include (not in ranked order):

9   Develop a Green Infrastructure Action Plan
18   Increase funding to Community Engagement Team, a multi-agency collaborative that reaches out to underserved Cambridge families and connects them to community events and resources, develops community leaders, and supports agencies in working with a diverse community.
21   Allocate resources to assess the training and education needs of low/moderate income residents to determine readiness to access existing industry-focused training programs and to inform the design of new programs.

25   Undertake targeted business recruitment efforts to attract firms that offer low barrier-to-entry jobs with relatively high wages and job training opportunities, which could encompass many jobs in light industrial districts.

27   Support the industrial economy by providing low-cost capital to firms providing light industrial jobs, encouraging the development of a manufacturing incubator space, and studying the creation of a light industrial land trust and implementing study recommendations.

28   Expand capacity and funding to provide additional "earn and learn" opportunities with local employers for Cambridge residents, training to help current employees advance to the next level of employment, and partnerships for employers to hire graduates of City-supported workforce development programs.

33   Expand existing financial support to match rising costs associated with nonprofit efforts to develop affordable housing or purchase multifamily residential buildings where tenants are at risk of being displaced.

52   Develop an implementation plan and increase funding to complete gaps in the Bicycle Network Plan and pedestrian network to create a completely connected network of high-quality infrastructure citywide

63   Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)

The moderator asked the group, why did you put the stickers where you put them?

- One member voted for five housing actions out of ten, particularly changing zoning to make affordable housing easier, increasing overall production of affordable housing, and increasing funding for affordable housing. Other priorities included workforce development, diverse representation on boards and committees, and improving mobility access.
- One member focused on economy and housing, prioritizing actions where communities have a greater role in decision making.
- One member prioritized planting more trees in the city as a separate action. Wants to see this as its own action separate from native plantings ordinance. Voted for actions related to green space and infrastructure. Supports industrial economy jobs, related high-tech jobs to the affordability crisis. Supports intersection safety related actions, those that get people out of their cars, and ones that support the bicycle network. Supports building Alewife Square as a step towards having more trees and a better environment in that neighborhood.
- One member voted for 11 actions, including five workforce training related actions and two mobility: bus priority lanes and completing the bike and pedestrian plans. Noted that the Transit advisory committee is working on bus priority lane on Mt. Auburn Street, already movement on that front among community and MBTA. Easier to push forward as it has community support and existing infrastructure.
- One member supported access to grocery stores, access to quality jobs for low income residents, "earn and learn" opportunities, increasing overall housing production, increased funding to improve intersection safety, eliminating min parking requirement along corridors,

Synergies and conflicts between these actions were then discussed:

- One member advocated for affordable housing infrastructure, emphasized it is essential to support and maintain diversity in the city. Another member disagreed, commenting that recent development in Alewife has been 80% luxury housing. Supported restricting different levels of income. From experience, the first member mentioned that regulating for the moderate-income tier has not been effective in the past. Fine with regulating for middle and moderate-income through inclusionary zoning.

Group 4

After each person identified their individual actions, the group discussed and determined their joint top ten actions. These include (not in ranked order):

6 Offer a density bonus incentive through zoning for net zero projects

8 Develop disaster preparedness plans at the neighborhood level in conjunction with neighborhood organizations, service providers, public housing residents and other vulnerable populations

11 Increase number of community gardens

29 Expand existing industry-focused training programs to incorporate pre-vocational education that addresses barriers preventing residents from accessing training or "earn and learn" opportunities.

30 Change zoning to increase density and achieve a mix of uses in targeted areas along Mass Ave. and Cambridge St. that builds the customer base for retail.

41 Establish or expand the use of taxes that provide dedicated revenue for affordable housing including a local real estate transfer tax (supplemental to state stamp tax), a speculative owner tax, and lodging tax on short-term rentals.

43 Change zoning to enable more housing, including affordable housing, to be built along major corridors and in other transforming areas that have the capacity to accommodate growth and are well-served by transit.

52 Develop an implementation plan and increase funding to complete gaps in the Bicycle Network Plan and pedestrian network to create a completely connected network of high-quality infrastructure citywide

53 Prepare transportation infrastructure to be more resilient to periodic flooding, possible salt water contamination, and high temperatures associated with climate change by relocating mechanical and electrical equipment and introducing more passive cooling features

63 Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)

- One member said they tried to pick actions that had impact across strategies. Built environment is key issue. So, in favor of density bonuses for Net Zero. Bicycle infrastructure serves multiple purposes—environment, health. Ongoing concern about lack of diversity, so they chose (economy) action to enhance possibilities for diverse population.
- One member said they are concerned about diversity and would like to see more affordable housing and small business support. Feels Alewife needs improvement to be more communal—bridge. Density is a key solution to multiple issues—mobility, affordability.

Group 5

After each person identified their individual actions, the group discussed and determined their joint top ten actions. These include (not in ranked order):

8 Develop disaster preparedness plans at the neighborhood level in conjunction with neighborhood organizations, service providers, public housing residents and other vulnerable populations

9 & 53 Develop a Green Infrastructure Action Plan AND Prepare transportation infrastructure to be more resilient to periodic flooding, possible salt water contamination, and high temperatures associated with climate change by relocating mechanical and electrical equipment and introducing more passive cooling features

10 Modify zoning to allow for live-work space for artists.

24 Undertake alternative financing mechanisms, such as increment financing, to fund infrastructure or land assembly in support of targeted commercial development.

30   Change zoning to increase density and achieve a mix of uses in targeted areas along Mass Ave. and Cambridge St. that builds the customer base for retail.

34   Increase existing City funds dedicated to affordable housing through higher dedicated revenue from the general fund and exploring options for new resources.

40   Establish new City funding sources such as the regular issuance of bonds and using tax increment financing to support affordable housing at the project or district scale.

43 & 55 Change zoning to enable more housing, including affordable housing, to be built along major corridors and in other transforming areas that have the capacity to accommodate growth and are well-served by transit.

63   Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)

- One member tried to find commonality between the actions. They said their focus tends to be on underserved populations. Where are the connections between those categories? They noted #15.
- One member supported anything that focuses on density that can help bring down the demand and increase the supply for housing.
- One member noted two items in C&E leaned towards adaptation and mitigation. Also, a lot of things were tucked into #9.
- One member said that regarding urban form, they don't like isolated pockets of the same thing. They supported creating functioning, mixed areas and allowing for growth in those areas.
- One member noted that disaster preparedness was very important.
- One member supported #3 as a way for Cambridge to keep pace with what's currently trending.
- One member supported light industrial for local jobs over biotech.

Group 6
After each person identified their individual actions, the group discussed and determined their joint top ten actions. These include (not in ranked order):

8   Develop disaster preparedness plans at the neighborhood level in conjunction with neighborhood organizations, service providers, public housing residents and other vulnerable populations

15   Grow the number of beds and treatment opportunities for opioid users.

21   Allocate resources to assess the training and education needs of low/moderate income residents to determine readiness to access existing industry-focused training programs and to inform the design of new programs.

23   Expand scholarships and number of slots in quality early education programs with a focus on low income families, which will facilitate workforce participation for adults and positive educational outcomes for children.

30   Change zoning to increase density and achieve a mix of uses in targeted areas along Mass Ave. and Cambridge St. that builds the customer base for retail.

43   Change zoning to enable more housing, including affordable housing, to be built along major corridors and in other transforming areas that have the capacity to accommodate growth and are well-served by transit.

52   Develop an implementation plan and increase funding to complete gaps in the Bicycle Network Plan and pedestrian network to create a completely connected network of high-quality infrastructure citywide

53   Prepare transportation infrastructure to be more resilient to periodic flooding, possible salt water contamination, and high temperatures associated with climate change by relocating mechanical and electrical equipment and introducing more passive cooling features

63   Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)

- One member stated #43 and #30 very similar and could be combined. Another member said #43 is better because of the corridor aspect, though #30 was good though because it mentions both density and mix of uses. One member said they want to keep both though because each one has pieces of what is important.
- #41 expand the use of taxes for affordable housing: One member said the City should use available resources and tap into opportunities for housing.
- #8 disaster preparedness plans: One member felt very strongly about this action because recent storms. Focusing on neighborhood level will be an important way to address issues - working with landlords seems like low hanging fruit. Others in the group agreed and supported.
- #21 workforce training: One member said that there are so many huge industries that folks are being left out of and it would be so important an opportunity to bring folks into those areas.
- #23 expand scholarships and early education opportunities for underserved communities: Two members expressed support for this action as a low-cost way to make a meaningful impact in people's lives and remove disparities at an early stage.
- Regarding actions #60, #55, and 59, members liked #55 the best Change zoning to allow low maximum parking requirements near transit nodes and in key squares and corridors, with lowered parking requirements citywide.
- One member said they are on the fence about how to evaluate parking and is hoping that autonomous vehicles will make a big difference. One member sees parking as a very important issue to address but maybe doesn't need to be a central mission of Envision Cambridge.
- #56 freight movement and delivery: Several members (even those that did not vote for this action) noted their support, and that with Amazon Prime, Uber, and Lyft already on the streets, now is the time to act.
- #50 sustainable modes of transportation education: One member felt Cambridge is already walkable and this action is not a priority.
- #46 and #52 bus priority and bike plan: Modes of transportation that are space efficient were important to this member. The bike lane issue has been front and center for them. However, this person recognizes that #51 is very important.
- #15: Opioids use is a crisis and Cambridge has a large homeless population that is very vulnerable. Fed and State might already be providing some sources so maybe City doesn't need to address right now. Another member liked this one a lot but it didn't get their vote ultimately.
- #16 racial equity analyses: Given recent Boston spotlight reporting on race inequities this item was front and center. Members supported the Seattle Toolkit, but expressed skepticism around increasing staff capacity as a real path towards achieving that action.
- One member said Alewife needs attention like the other squares have gotten.

Group 7

After each person identified their individual actions, the group discussed and determined their joint top ten actions. These include (not in ranked order):

9   Develop a Green Infrastructure Action Plan

35+30 Change zoning to increase density and achieve a mix of uses in targeted areas along Mass Ave. and Cambridge St. that builds the customer base for retail. AND Require the creation of significant new housing in areas that are being rezoned.

38   Prioritize City and other public property that is available for disposition to develop affordable housing.

40+41   Establish new City funding sources such as the regular issuance of bonds and using tax increment financing to support affordable housing at the project or district scale. AND Establish or expand the use of taxes that provide dedicated revenue for affordable housing including a local real estate transfer tax (supplemental to state stamp tax), a speculative owner tax, and lodging tax on short-term rentals.

44   Change base zoning to require that developers of multi-family projects of at least 10 units provide a certain number of family-sized units (i.e. units with at least 3-bedrooms).

52   Develop an implementation plan and increase funding to complete gaps in the Bicycle Network Plan and pedestrian network to create a completely connected network of high-quality infrastructure citywide

8+53   Develop disaster preparedness plans at the neighborhood level in conjunction with neighborhood organizations, service providers, public housing residents and other vulnerable populations. AND Prepare transportation infrastructure to be more resilient to periodic flooding, possible salt water contamination, and high temperatures associated with climate change by relocating mechanical and electrical equipment and introducing more passive cooling features

55   Change zoning to allow low maximum parking requirements near transit nodes and in key squares and corridors, with lowered parking requirements citywide

25   Undertake targeted business recruitment efforts to attract firms that offer low barrier-to-entry jobs with relatively high wages and job training opportunities, which could encompass many jobs in light industrial districts.

63   Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)

The group discussed their top six choices (where there were multiple stickers):

- One member stated #9 (green infrastructure plan) could be low cost and replicable and done on different types of streets without impeding parking. Another member stated that among climate ones, #9 is more systematic and addresses issues that are highly relevant to the future.

- One member said they were thrilled to see #40 (new city funding sources for affordable housing) included, and that the City should trumpet it high bond rating. Another member noted the duplication in housing items, saying this was smart way to approach affordable housing. Another member stated she was fine choosing either #40 or #41

- One member stated #52 (implement Bike Plan) is one of the most urgent issue facing Cambridge right now. Critical issue for bicyclists. Crucial to have "sidewalks" for bicyclists. Another member agreed increased density must be paired with alternatives to automobile travel.

- One member stressed the importance of #53 (resilient transportation infrastructure), given forecasts of increased precipitation

- One member commended #55 (low parking maximums), saying "This is a solution dedicated to a problem. Too much infrastructure for cars." One member asked for a prediction of how much parking Cambridge will need in the future, another member said, "if you build it, they will come." Another member noted the trade-offs, with increased housing costs vs. pressure.

- One member noted it's a complex land use issue where you make trade-offs, often between housing costs and pressure on public parking. This has different effects in different parts of the city. Another member said the number of parking permits has declined over 20 years even as number of housing has increased.

- #63 (connections in Alewife): One member said the City should proactively plan to have Alewife be walkable, bikeable, transit accessible. Another member said the plan to develop the area

simple won't work without connections. A third member said there is a proposal for connection for residents around rotaries through Terminal Road. The group discussed general pedestrian inaccessibility in the area.

- Several members expressed support for bus priority
- One member expressed dismay over lack of disaster preparedness for new developments.
- #25 (low barrier to entry jobs): one member expressed regret that the city has not been able to figure out how to give companies a gold star for job training, making job connections with the community.
- #35, require the creation of significant new housing in areas that are being rezoned, received several votes from members. One member said to add the word affordable to this.
- There was wide support to change zoning to increase density along corridors (#30) to support retail.
- #44 (require more family sized units): One member did not think this action was effective, unless units are affordable. They said they would rather require people to build exactly what we need (affordable 3BRs) rather than requiring more. Another member agreed. A third member supported this action, though flawed, as a gesture.

Activity 2: Incentives and Community Benefits

Participants were given a list of desired public benefits and potential incentives. These came out of recommendations from several working groups suggesting the City require and incentivize additional community benefits. The activity was structured as a conversation about which should be requirements, which should be incentivized and prioritized for height/density bonuses, and if location, land use, or size of project is a consideration.

Group 1
- First reactions by the group were that there is no transit benefit in the list. Many members found this surprising.
- The first discussion was about the existing 20% inclusionary housing ordinance. One member noted that the verdict is still out about how effective it's been at producing more affordable units, and that time will tell.
- Affordable housing
    - Several people felt that this was not worded properly; it should instead say something about a range of housing opportunities.
    - Members debated the merits of this, arguing for a range of income levels, homeownership opportunities, etc.
    - The unit type was also brought up by a member of the group, saying that family units are most in need, along with middle-income homeownership opportunities.
- District energy plant
    - Due to size requirements, members felt a district energy plant should be required/incentive for large-scale developments only.
- Family-sized units
    - A need for family-sized units (3+ bedroom) was acknowledged by everyone in the group. However, others pointed out that there is a delicate balance offering larger units for families and having them occupied by students or young people.
    - One member felt that the new zoning ordinance which allows more flexibility in offering affordable housing is a good model.

- o Members generally agreed that all developments should have a mix of units.
- Net Zero
  - o Members of the group felt that this can be legislated other ways (though state building codes or other means), and therefore doesn't need to be included in the zoning.
- Green roofs
  - o Members felt that there could be some variation to this, requiring PV panels instead of green roofs.
- Increased trees
  - o One member felt that this, along with many action items, should simply be a requirement for developers. This member felt there is a fundamental problem with incentives vs. benefits, and that the public doesn't really understand that incentives will later come back to haunt them.

Group 2

- On/Off-Street Parking
  - o A member believed exemption from minimum parking requirements could be traded for transit funding. Another member agreed and stated that this is already being done on a project by project basis and should be standardized.
  - o The group agreed that they are trying to preserve the ability to drive for people that don't have other options.
  - o A member observed that reducing parking in this action list is presented as good in and of itself but believes that for every proportional increase in development value there should be a proportional reduction in parking. For example, the City could ask for an increase in middle-income housing in trade for a decrease in parking.
  - o A member said that sometimes developers want to build below the minimum parking requirements and don't want empty lots either. She stated that this is the case for MIT, but the institution could not decrease parking because of the city rules.
  - o A member observed that the utilization of the spots is the primary issue. MIT has too many spaces, but other neighborhoods don't have enough. The City needs a shared parking inventory and there needs to be enough parking supply for people with mobility challenges.
  - o A member stated that a lot of the private apartment complexes charge for parking. The City should either require that the private parking supply be free to residents or the city should charge more for resident parking passes.
  - o A member thought that the city needs to really examine all the nuances of the parking policy.
  - o A member said that road capacity must be addressed as well.
  - o A member observed that Cambridge's roads are getting smaller with the addition of bike lanes. She noted that the infrastructure was not designed for this purpose.
  - o A member said that every new large building should have to provide the names of all the resident names once per year, so the city can accurately understand our private parking ability. The City can then check it against parking permit list to find out if people are underutilizing off street parking and over-utilizing on-street parking.
  - o One member favored density particularly around transit. When there is high transit utilization there is less pressure on the roads for those who need to drive.
  - o Another member is in favor of reducing parking ratios. Commercial buildings could pay into a transportation mobility fund and residential buildings could trade for increased affordable housing or a publicly accessible open space, depending on the situation. The

density needs to be aimed at making economically diverse communities. The current policies are not producing an economically diverse community. The city is resistant to allocating resources. Low- and moderate-income people more urgently need it, which is true, but you're losing your community. The City needs to do some of each.

- Resiliency and Public Gathering Spaces
    - A member thought that areas of the City with the least trees need to reach a median level. The City needs to ensure other areas don't lose trees.
    - Another member observed that this point connects to action #22. Each development project can respond to a menu of ideas with an understanding of what developers are willing to spend.
    - A member suggested that every time there is a big proposal the City could address local problems such as increasing jobs or more trees per area.
    - A member stated that he appreciates the resiliency concerns but cares a lot more about services for the opioid epidemic, housing, and economy.
    - A member believes public gathering spaces should be a top priority within developments. The group talked about losing the community. Anybody can use a gathering space and it addresses socioeconomic issues.
    - Two members believe net zero should not be a priority in this plan because the Net Zero Action Plan is already effective.
    - Two members stated that the provision of family sized units is a non-negotiable priority.
    - A member noted that the City has 8,000 units being built but asked how many residents are going to stay if there is no provision for community amenities.
    - Another member pointed out that residents in below-market-rate housing will not move because of affordability. She thinks Cambridge needs more affordable housing beyond 20% and that this should include units for middle-income families. She supports a 100% affordable housing overlay with relaxed development requirements.
- The moderator asked if the size of the project a factor and if there is a size limit.
    - A member observed that one of the good parts about living in the city is walking. Sidewalks should be ample.
    - Another member said that if you look at the SoWa district in Boston, the buildings are nice, sidewalks are reasonably sized, buildings are stone and appropriately scaled in height. Regulation doesn't have to solely address building height.

Group 3
- One member strongly disagrees that >20% affordable housing can be achieved through zoning or incentivized.
- One member advocated for trees, mentioning that it is a trade-off between parking. A second member supported this notion reinforcing that open space is often compromised in favor of more parking. The moderator explained that it is a funding issue too. The first member supported the argument further citing Alewife examples where trees are provided but are too small to mitigate the effect of large buildings.
- One member highlighted the costs of new energy efficiency requirements as a burden to affordable housing. This individual proposed that the City have a fund to support these requirements to affordable housing developers.
- One member asked what benefits are best incentivized through a density or height bonus. Where is a higher density bonus most effective? This individual made the point that any community benefits that are incremental would be more effective and requirements that need more infrastructure or capital costs would be too prohibitive.

- One member pointed out that it Is difficult to calibrate how much City can ask from developers. This individual doesn't see anything in the list that is a "bang for the City's buck."
- Several members agreed that 100% affordable housing cannot be incentivized.
- One member suggested incentivizing third spaces instead of "public gathering spaces."
- Another member supported bonuses for higher percentage of inclusionary zoning.
- One member pointed out that many of these things are already negotiated by neighborhoods through development review.
- One member responded that green infrastructure and green open space is needed and should be prioritized in Alewife. Since it not yet built out, there is an opportunity to prioritize green infrastructure there.
- Another member pointed out that it is hard to confidently predict long-term impacts of green infrastructure requirements.

Group 4
- One member said that it seems like middle income housing is missing—we need to support middle income residents who aren't eligible for affordable housing.
- One member mentioned that constrained development sizes and requirements for affordable housing leads to more "luxury" units in buildings to make up costs.
  - Another member responded that building more housing helps, though it's unlikely to solve problem due to huge demand. Another member suggested that you give developers a menu of options to get density bonuses.
- One member brought up setbacks, reminding everyone that we can't forget to require setbacks to maintain streetscape. The moderator responded that the design review process can be used to create case-by-case flexibility. There is enough diversity in neighborhoods to lead to a variety of buildings. The group then agreed to consider all potential incentives with design review.
- The group would like to increase all housing types, but maybe with a preference to "dis-incentivize" luxury housing? Is this possible?
  - One member responded that there are issues with juxtaposition of luxury and affordable housing.
  - Another member disagreed and feels that this type of mixing is beneficial to society.
  - One member asserted that family size units is key. The future of a community is kids; the city needs to encourage families.
  - The question of how to define middle income unit arose from another member. The moderator responded that the more limits on unit type, the less incentive there is to do the development. More housing in general is good.
- Moving to the topic of district energy, one member found this exciting but asked would the investment pay for itself.
- One member posed the following question: can we group benefits by category and then allow for incentives for each category?
- The moderator then posed the question, which should be required?
  - One member felt district energy systems should be required. Increased trees should be paid for by City.
  - Another member disagreed since this refers to private property. This member suggested that green/cool roofs can be required citywide. Public gathering spaces are also valuable and appropriate for large developments.

- Net Zero is much broader but you could use district energy as a strategy to achieve net zero. Therefore, this should be the energy/environmental priority. The group agreed that energy/environmental benefit to be incentivized is Net Zero Buildings.
- Back on the topic of housing, one member felt that increasing affordable >20% is most likely to also increase family units, while increasing overall number of units.
  - A member posed the question, does this get offset by more luxury units?
  - The group agreed that the issue of middle income housing should be further explored. The moderator informed the group that increasing affordable housing likely creates a mix of all housing units. The group agreed that the housing benefit to be incentivized should be an increase affordable housing beyond 20%. But how can this disincentive luxury housing?
- One member felt that the City needs to emphasize incentives near transit.
  - The group agreed that exemption from minimum parking should be provided as an incentive when near transit.

Group 5

- One member offered the following comment: open space is a little different than development of community space. Many times, spaces get developed, then privatized. This individual felt it is important to make the distinction between the two.
  - Another member agreed and elaborated that there is an issue with quality of open space, as well. This individual believes high quality of open space is better than a lot of open spaces.
- Regarding the affordable housing requirement, on member was skeptical of 100% affordable housing and family sized units. This individual felt that you cannot force families into those spaces and feels the market will always outsmart the intention of this measure.
  - One member of the group did not support the 100% affordable housing, believing that it's results in few new units. This member felt that if Cambridge had the density for affordable housing, we could bring down the costs.
- Many asserted that green roofs and more trees should be required.
- One member felt that heading to net zero is a good thing, but the City should find ways to help developers get there. Yes, the State is doing things, but if the City could contribute to those incentives that would be very helpful.
- One member felt that the City desperately needs more open space and community meeting rooms. This individual felt that game rooms and places where teens can hang out are very necessary.
- Requirements – when given one vote for a requirement, the group voted for the following:
  - public gathering spaces (x2)
  - trees (x2)
  - green roofs
  - affordable housing beyond 20%
- When given two votes each for potential incentives, the group voted for the following:
  - net zero (x4)
  - green roofs (x3)
  - trees
  - 100% affordable housing
  - affordable housing beyond 20%
  - public gathering spaces
  - family sized units

- One member felt that the City could use more density along Concord Ave from Harvard Square to the Alewife Shopping Center. This individual felt that this is a missed opportunity and not as accessible as it ought to be.
- Another member felt that Porter Square is a key place to build up. This development should include height, mixed-uses, and parking.
- One member felt that the problem with affordable housing is that there's not enough housing to begin with. This individual felt that we need to meet the demand with supply to drive costs down, instead of trying to fight the market.
- Another member felt that additional height along the corridors should be used for additional housing.
- Furthermore, the group discussed that development should be incentivized around MBTA stops.
  - When it comes to affordable housing, one member expressed that you could only hold out for more than 20% of affordable housing if you're talking about very large developments.
  - Another member chimed in, saying that condoizing of Cambridge is not something we should be doing.

Group 6
Desired public benefits:
- The group discussed that there needs to be benefits that are meaningful to the community and developers – therefore 100% affordable housing would be tough. The amount of density needed would be nearly impossible. A member expressed that 100% affordable is great as a principle but unrealistic. Therefore, we need to strike a balance and that what you are giving and what you are getting is of equal value. To get 100% affordable housing, one member felt you had to give like a hundred floors in a height bonus which isn't realistic in Cambridge. Everyone in the group recognized that finding the financing to make 100% affordable possible would be very difficult.
- The group felt that the first bullet regarding increased affordable housing over 20% is very reasonable, striking a balance with what developers can get or make work.
- In general, the district energy systems seemed more attractive than green roofs. The group felt that it might only work with large developments so how often would it really get used? Schools might be good for this; North Point would have been a good candidate for a district energy system but that doesn't seem possible any more.
- Encouraging open space and public gathering spaces was endorsed by two members. There was a question about what constitutes open space, noting that open space doesn't necessarily mean public space like a park.
  - One concern in the group about the public gathering space was that if you just create a community space then you need to also think about who operates it, who is programming it, and where the money is coming from to make the programs work. The fear is that these could end up being dead spaces.
- Overall, there was the most consensus on increasing affordable housing above 20%, followed by family-sized units. However, there was recognition that with more affordable housing, there will be more affordable family units which was the real priority for the group.
- The group discussed that incentives should be for things that don't naturally occur in the market. One member said that many district energy projects are fossil fuel projects -- to be stand alone and reliable, it is rarely wind or solar. District energy is efficient and affordable but not often as sustainable.
- Green roofs, on the other hand, seem more manageable for developers.
- One member said more open space is important for stormwater management.

- One member felt that it's too bad that there isn't a menu of options for developers to choose from because some developments would really benefit, and nicely support, different things. For example, some places would nicely bolster more open space while others might bolster affordable housing.
- The group reached consensus about prioritizing Net Zero.

Potential Incentives:
- Members of the group felt that height and density tend to go hand in hand.
- From an open space perspective, the incentive of height would be good. Density bonuses, however, tend to be more useful.
  - The group pointed out that citywide there are already density bonuses for inclusionary housing.
- Geographically, transit nodes and commercial districts are where the City needs to focus its efforts.

Group 7
- One member stated that his biggest concern is that the city's infrastructure will be overburdened by development. However, he feels that it is not a problem if we continue to improve infrastructure.
- One member asked why transit isn't listed as public benefit.
- One member said that affordable housing is important. He felt district energy systems and net zero buildings are important for long-term financial gain. Green roofs, however, he feels are too specific. He asked what everyone else thought of the public gathering spaces in the city, noting the advantage to this that it can make new development feel more welcome.
- Another member agreed with the emphasis on affordable housing. She combined some of these (e.g. net zero and green roofs). She also like additional open space and increased trees and liked the addition of transit improvements/transit resiliency.
- One member stated that family size affordable units are important. He noted that community benefit conversations are only done in a strong economy. He fears displacement for those unable to afford rent and feels a conversation needs to be forced to connect the new economy with folks not participating in job market. He cited examples like the Roxbury Innovation Center and a New York initiative to train low-income youth to participate in the real estate market. He feels that we need to define what we want with jobs.
- One member felt we should dictate use/design on the ground floor, nothing that retail is good on the ground floor.
- A member felt that the conversation surrounding public gathering spaces/open space is misguided. He believes large spaces aren't usable, citing University Park as a waste of space. On the other hand, he feels Carl Barron plaza is small and used well by lots of different people. He believed transportation infrastructure should be on list, considering the City will grow and need more transit infrastructure. Furthermore, the increased inclusionary requirement should be based on location (more required near transit). He also feels developers should get a get density or height bonus if there are more 3 or 4 bedrooms.
- The moderator summarized the discussion, saying that this is a common theme: affordable housing including family sized units (3BR). This is the most immediate problem and one of most challenging. Increase affordable housing near transit is also important, along with energy and net zero or transit investment. He noted that green roofs are a component of sustainability/ net zero goal. While there is not as much support for the public gathering space, it is important for that space to be integrated in new development to make the character work.
- One member asked if there is there a way to do affordable commercial space?

- o Another member asked if the city can create a market place with stalls and booths that would make it affordable. Therefore, that breaks down the big space into something more affordable.
- A member brought up the environmental items, feeling it is appropriate to address in the base zoning. Density, on the other hand, is the piece we know the developer will reap new value. He believes we must figure out a job program that works and have developers contribute to it.

Appendix A: Tally of priority actions

Actions		Total collective votes[1]	Total individual votes[2]	Non-attendee votes
Climate and Environment				
1	Address regulatory and financial barriers to energy storage solutions to be implemented alongside solar implementation		3	1
2	Leverage new communication technologies to alert residents and workers, by geography, of risks in the event of an emergency (e.g. text message, smartphone app)		4	
3	Procure 100% of municipal electricity from renewable sources	1	8	2
4	Purchase additional land reserved to be used as open space		4	1
5	Increase enforcement of Commercial Recycling Rules & Regulations		2	
6	Offer a density bonus incentive through zoning for net zero projects	1	5	4
7	Institute commercial waste zones, with requirements for waste haulers to collect separated organics and report data		1	
8	Develop disaster preparedness plans at the neighborhood level in conjunction with neighborhood organizations, service providers, public housing residents and other vulnerable populations	3	12	3
9	Develop a Green Infrastructure Action Plan	3	12	4
Community Wellbeing				
10	Modify zoning to allow for live-work space for artists.	1	3	2
11	Increase number of community gardens	1	1	
12	Open community kitchens in existing public facilities, such as schools or libraries, that are open to the public, and/or have programming such as healthy cooking classes		3	
13	Improve transportation access to affordable grocery stores		2	1
14	Expand overdose education, naloxone use training, and naloxone distribution.		1	1
15	Grow the number of beds and treatment opportunities for opioid users.	2	8	4
16	Increase staff capacity to conduct ongoing racial equity analyses of new and existing policies, programs, services, procurement practices, and community engagement	2	8	4
17	Provide consistent, high-quality, culturally appropriate translation and interpretation services, particularly for key City events or meetings		2	1
18	Increase funding to Community Engagement Team, a multi-agency collaborative that reaches out to underserved Cambridge families and connects them to community events and resources, develops community leaders, and supports agencies in working with a diverse community.	1	7	2
19	Develop a stipend program for multilingual youth and adults to assist with city events and outreach activities to increase dialogue with members of the public with limited English proficiency.		2	1

[1] Actions receiving > 3 group votes are highlighted as priorities
[2] Actions receiving > 10 individual votes are highlighted as priorities

Economy

20	Increase funding for lab-based internship opportunities for Cambridge students, and work in collaboration with local academic institutions to development strategy for implementation.		4	1
21	Allocate resources to assess the training and education needs of low/moderate income residents to determine readiness to access existing industry-focused training programs and to inform the design of new programs.	2	11	3
22	Pursue a standard list of desired economic development community benefits, including jobs and training opportunities for Cambridge residents to be pursued through development review.	1	2	
23	Expand scholarships and number of slots in quality early education programs with a focus on low income families, which will facilitate workforce participation for adults and positive educational outcomes for children.	2	6	3
24	Undertake alternative financing mechanisms, such as increment financing, to fund infrastructure or land assembly in support of targeted commercial development.	1	6	1
25	Undertake targeted business recruitment efforts to attract firms that offer low barrier-to-entry jobs with relatively high wages and job training opportunities	3	8	1
26	Facilitate site assemblage as necessary to support targeted commercial development in transforming areas.			
27	Support the industrial economy by providing low-cost capital to firms providing light industrial jobs, encouraging the development of a manufacturing incubator space, and studying the creation of a light industrial land trust and implementing study recommendations.	1	4	1
28	Expand capacity and funding to provide additional "earn and learn" opportunities with local employers for Cambridge residents, training to help current employees advance to the next level of employment, and partnerships for employers to hire graduates of City-supported workforce development programs.	1	8	
29	Expand existing industry-focused training programs to incorporate pre-vocational education that addresses barriers preventing residents from accessing training or "earn and learn" opportunities.	1	5	2
30	Change zoning to increase density and achieve a mix of uses in targeted areas along Mass Ave. and Cambridge St. that builds the customer base for retail.	4	11	3
31	Change zoning to increase commercial density and create jobs in transformative areas such as Alewife.		1	3
32	Change zoning to require light industrial uses in certain areas of the city.			1

Housing

33	Expand existing financial support to match rising costs associated with nonprofit efforts to develop affordable housing or purchase multifamily residential buildings where tenants are at risk of being displaced.	1	4	2

34	Increase existing City funds dedicated to affordable housing through higher dedicated revenue from the general fund and exploring options for new resources.	3	13	3
35	Require the creation of significant new housing in areas that are being rezoned.	2	7	2
36	Modify the development approval process for fully affordable housing projects to provide a design advisory review instead of a discretionary approval.		4	2
37	Engage housing and service providers to prioritize the production of quality permanent supportive housing		1	
38	Prioritize City and other public property that is available for disposition to develop affordable housing.	1	4	2
39	Institute a production-focused incentive for owners of multifamily buildings who construct more affordable units than required by the Inclusionary Housing Program.		1	1
40	Establish new City funding sources such as the regular issuance of bonds and using tax increment financing to support affordable housing at the project or district scale.	4	5	
41	Establish or expand the use of taxes that provide dedicated revenue for affordable housing including a local real estate transfer tax (supplemental to state stamp tax), a speculative owner tax, and lodging tax on short-term rentals.	5	13	3
42	Offer density bonuses and relief from other dimensional regulations for fully affordable housing developments through a citywide affordable housing overlay or other regulatory mechanism.	1	12	2
43	Change zoning to enable more housing, including affordable housing, to be built along major corridors and in other transforming areas that have the capacity to accommodate growth and are well-served by transit.	4	15	7
44	Change base zoning to require that developers of multi-family projects of at least 10 units provide a certain number of family-sized units (i.e. units with at least 3-bedrooms).	1	4	3
45	Evaluate gaps in supportive housing services provided by the City, increase capacity and funds to address identified gaps, and increase awareness of available services.	1	3	1
Mobility				
46	Implement bus priority treatments on key bus corridors at points of recurrent delay to increase transit speed and reduce traffic delays		10	4
47	Install co-located carshare, bikeshare, and transit nodes in areas that are currently underserved to help reduce automobile traffic		5	4
48	Implement demand-based pricing for all parking meters owned by the City of Cambridge to improve parking availability for those driving while incentivizing the use of other modes		1	2
49	Increase funding to improve multimodal access to key public facilities such as schools, parks, community centers, recreation centers, and libraries by adding crosswalks, bus shelters, bike lanes, and bike parking, etc.		3	3
50	Develop and offer pedestrian, transit, and bicycle education into the CPSD, private, and charter school curriculum for all grades		1	

#				
51	Increase funding to improve intersection safety in locations with high rates of crashes		4	1
52	Develop an implementation plan and increase funding to complete gaps in the Bicycle Network Plan and pedestrian network to create a completely connected network of high-quality infrastructure citywide	4	14	6
53	Prepare transportation infrastructure to be more resilient to periodic flooding, possible salt water contamination, and high temperatures associated with climate change by relocating mechanical and electrical equipment and introducing more passive cooling features	5	11	
54	Restructure resident parking permit program to reflect a balance between people who use parking and people who use other modes, including: (a) Increasing the resident parking permit fee (can be combined with a discount for low-income residents and grandfathering of existing recipients); and (b) Introducing an escalating fee scale, so that each additional permit at a given address is more expensive		1	2
55	Change zoning to allow low maximum parking requirements near transit nodes and in key squares and corridors, with lowered parking requirements citywide	3	12	4
56	Better manage freight movement and delivery to improve safety and efficiency, including: (a) Increase enforcement of truck routes; (b); Create incentives & new loading zones that encourage large trucks to deliver off-peak; (c) Analyze consolidated neighborhood delivery pick-up spots which can minimize excessive door-to-door deliveries and offer reduced shipping costs; and (d) Initiate peak period pricing in loading zones to ensure trucks find curb space without double parking	1	7	3
57	Work to expand PTDM programs and incentives citywide to all existing commercial and existing and new residential development		2	1
Urban Form				
58	Require a minimum building height of 37 ft. and a minimum ground floor height of 14' for all new buildings.		4	1
59	Eliminate minimum parking requirements for development along the corridors.		5	3
60	Develop design guidelines for all commercial corridors that include a requirement for activating design elements along the street wall, including frequency of entrances, signage, awnings, and breaks in the building facade.		1	2
61	Require developers to install a minimum number of street trees, as determined by the corridor character zones and the length of the parcel frontage.		2	3
62	Design and implement clear wayfinding for biking and walking routes to the City's open spaces and other destinations.		4	1
63	Build the connections to integrate "Alewife Square" into the fabric of the City (as recommended in the Alewife District Plan)	6	20	2
64	Develop design guidelines for as-of-right affordable housing development		2	1

Appendix B: Development Requirements and Incentives

Desired public benefits

- Increased affordable housing beyond 20% Inclusionary Zoning requirement
- 100% affordable housing
- Family-sized units
- District energy systems
- Net zero buildings ahead of Net Zero Action Plan schedule
- Green roofs
- Increased trees
- Additional open space beyond required minimum
- Public gathering spaces (community rooms, childcare facilities, library)

Potential incentives

- Increase height
- Increase density
- Exempt from minimum parking requirements
- Relax dimensional requirements