

Cambridge University and College Property Statistics

	Harvard	MIT	Lesley	Cambridge College
Area of non-taxable Property (acres)	186.16	170.1	7.41	0.34
% of Total Property in Cambridge	4.08%	3.73%	0.16%	0.01%
Note- Cambridge is 4,563.5 acres				
Commercial Property				
Land	\$39,564,400	\$173,563,100	\$ 9,404,100	\$2,963,300
Building	\$102,145,200	\$447,524,100	\$ 13,045,700	\$9,326,300
Total	\$141,709,600	\$621,087,200	\$ 22,449,800	\$12,289,600
Total Tax	\$2,665,558	\$11,682,650	\$422,281	\$231,167
Residential Property				
Land	\$36,924,100	\$32,339,600	\$ 2,614,100	\$840,400
Building	\$98,094,047	\$68,884,800	\$ 4,056,200	\$609,600
Total	\$135,018,147	\$101,224,400	\$ 6,670,300	\$1,450,000
Total Tax	\$984,282	\$737,926	\$48,626	\$10,571
Mixed-Use				
Land	\$14,021,100.00	\$3,797,100.00		
Building	\$16,418,100.00	\$6,383,000.00		
Total	\$30,439,200.00	\$10,180,100.00		
Total Tax	\$456,588.00	\$152,701.50		

B

City Expectations of a Good University Neighbor

City Council/Administration Priorities

1. Financial responsibility: long term protection of tax base, fair financial contribution to support city services, and appropriate philanthropic participation
2. (12) Manage growth in a way that is consistent with city's goals: "City of 13 neighborhoods"; voluntary compliance with the city policies relating to quality of life
3. (8) Communication and dialogue: advanced knowledge of development and expansion
4. (8) Common approach to housing problems
5. (7) Sensitivity to campus edge issues (i.e., not turning backside to community; sensitive placing of loading docks, public access to green space, etc.)
6. (3) Coordinated efforts to support public education in Cambridge
7. (3) Hiring Cambridge residents
8. (2) Sharing expertise
9. (1) Design that is sensitive to abutters (related to item 5)

There was unanimous agreement on the first priority and the numbers in parenthesis indicate the number of priority votes for the remaining items.

Variety of Tools for Managing/Clarifying/Improving Relations

- Master planning process
 - Project review
 - Hybrid of master planning and project review
- Unified Planning Process; Institutionalized Forum for shaping the city
 - Every two years:
 - Topics could include:
 - Council's goals and objectives
 - Projects
 - Impacts
 - Boundaries
- Line Agreements which define campuses
- Legislative Options

Cambridge, MIT owns 170.1 acres, Lesley owns 7.41 acres and Cambridge College owns 0.34 acres.

Councillor Galluccio noted the City's need for information as to properties for which the universities hold options or rights of first refusal. While the universities may have an argument for not wanting to disclose plans to purchase property because of the effect such disclosure could have on the sale price of the property, that argument does not hold in the case of properties for which options are already held.

Mr. Maloney said that the single biggest threat to the future health of the city is MIT's acquisition of such a significant amount of the total taxable property of the city with the very real possibility of removing it from the tax rolls. In an atmosphere of insecurity, mistrust and rumors abound. For example, there is currently a rumor that MIT may take 400,000 sq. ft. of Tech Square property for exempt use in conjunction with a huge grant from the Defense Department.

Councillor Murphy said that he would be very interested in information about the legal basis of the exemption of universities, and whether changing facts and circumstances could affect the principles on which the legal analysis is based. He stated that he would also be interested in looking at a more serious attempt to effect legislative change.

Councillor Simmons noted the need for the City to take more central control of the conversation that various segments of the city government have with the universities to ensure that the contributions that the universities do make, for example in the schools, are aligned with the overall goals of the City.

Councillor Reeves observed that Cambridge's elected officials are caught in an old paradigm in their relationship to the universities, the manner of relating best exemplified by former Mayor Vellucci – a great deal of loud and very public growling. However, that model involves very little knowledge of or connection with the governance – the trustees, etc., to whom the City Council could be writing and addressing their persuasive energies. Councillor Reeves added that he would like to see honest and open exchanges of information, land use plans and concerns at annual or biannual discussions with the universities. Such meetings must be with persons who run these universities and actually make the decisions. Other institutions in Cambridge must be involved in such exchanges as well as the major universities.

Councillor Galluccio said that the greatest source of strength that the City Council could bring to city/university relations would be agreement on a bottom line of what makes a Cambridge university a good neighbor. He is not talking about issues like Harvard's request for a tunnel, which is the kind of issue that all members of the Council will never agree upon, but rather the basics. He added that the universities make a lot of extraordinary requests to the Council, such as purchasing roads, easements, adding and changing curb cuts. In deciding whether the public good is served by approving these extraordinary requests, the Council should be entitled to consider whether the universities

are meeting the Council's standards of furthering the public good as responsible good neighbors. Councillor Galluccio said that he also agrees with the idea of pursuing legislative changes to provide legal limits or changes to the current property tax exemptions.

Mayor Sullivan stated that he is interested in the idea of approaching the trustees, overseers and fellows of the universities directly.

Councillor Maher noted that the Yale trustees devote one of their annual meetings to the town/gown relationship.

After a short break, Ms. Miller directed the discussion to the question of the City's expectations of the universities. She noted that one way of thinking about these expectations is to divide them into three major categories: legal, good neighbor and philanthropic. She requested that the participants think about their expectations in terms of the questions/explorations that have been suggested: looking at the legislative and legal options, getting on the agenda of the governing bodies of Harvard and MIT, looking at the Yale model, taking a unified approach to the City's authority on development issues, and other kinds of taxes that could more fairly distribute the economic burden, such as payroll taxes. Ms Miller also requested that participants keep in mind the agreements among the Councillors that seem to be emerging from the discussion to date: the need for a written agreement that provides long-term economic protection to a city that is experiencing escalating threats to its tax base; the importance of keeping taxable property taxable; the need for a renewed "red-line" agreement with Harvard and a new "blue-line" agreement with MIT, both for the purpose of agreeing upon physical boundaries to campus growth; the need for honest information about plans for growth in students, programs and physical plant.

The participants then embarked upon a process of listing all of their individual expectations of the universities as good neighbors and prioritizing these expectations as a group. Before moving to the prioritization exercise, the entire group agreed that the highest priority expectation of everyone present is a written agreement that guarantees the long-term stability of the property tax base regardless of the future use of property now on the tax rolls. The group then proceeded to prioritize the remaining items on the list. The resulting priorities appear in the attached table (Attachment B).

The following next steps were agreed upon:

- A facilitated meeting with representatives of the universities to discuss their visions of being a good neighbor and their expectations.
- Thereafter, another working meeting of the committee focusing on strategies.

Councillor Maher thanked those present for their participation. The meeting was adjourned at 1:23 P.M.

For the Committee,

David P. Maher DMP

Councillor David P. Maher, Chair

City of Cambridge

UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Councillor David P. Maher, Chair
Vice Mayor Henrietta Davis, Vice Chair
Councillor Brian Murphy
Councillor E. Denise Simmons
Councillor Timothy J. Toomey

In City Council April 22, 2002

The University Relations Committee held a public meeting on April 5, 2002, beginning at 9:28 a.m. in the first floor conference room of the Water Treatment Facility, 250 Fresh Pond Parkway. The meeting was held for the purpose of continuing a facilitated discussion on the relationships between the City of Cambridge and the universities located within Cambridge.

Present at the meeting were Councillor David P. Maher, Chair of the Committee, Mayor Michael A. Sullivan, Vice Mayor Henrietta Davis, Councillor Marjorie C. Decker, Councillor Anthony G. Galluccio, Councillor David P. Maher, Councillor Brian Murphy, Councillor Kenneth E. Reeves, Councillor E. Denise Simmons, City Clerk D. Margaret Drury, Deputy City Clerk Donna P. Lopez and City Council Assistant Sandra Albano. City administrative staff present were Robert W. Healy, City Manager, Richard Rossi, Deputy City Manager, Beth Rubenstein, Assistant City Manager for Community Development, James Maloney, Assistant City Manager for Fiscal Affairs, Ellen Semonoff, Deputy Director of the Department of Human Services and Julia Bowdoin, Assistant to the City Manager. Roberta Miller, trainer and facilitator, facilitated the meeting.

Councillor Maher convened the hearing and explained the purpose. He noted that this is the third meeting of the new committee. Councillor Maher then introduced Roberta Miller, and invited her to begin the discussion.

Ms. Miller outlined the agenda for the meeting, and provided a brief review of the previous meeting. She then introduced James Maloney to discuss the map that he had distributed, which showed the taxable and tax exempt property owned by Harvard University, MIT, Lesley University and Cambridge College. Mr. Maloney also distributed a table of statistics relative to university-held property in Cambridge (**Attachment A**). Mr. Maloney observed that Harvard property as shown on the map looks quite similar to what it would have looked like twenty years ago. However, MIT property does not look similar. MIT has experienced phenomenal growth, especially in taxable property holdings. Harvard owns 2% of the total property taxed by the city; MIT owns 8% of the total property taxed and 9 ½ % of the total commercial property taxed. When the MIT commercial property is completely built-out, they will own 12% of the total commercial property in Cambridge. This figure does not include the commercial property in University Park. Harvard owns 186.16 acres of non-taxable property in

S-119

Committee Report #2

Committee Report from Councillor
David P. Maher, Chair of the
University Relations Committee,
for a meeting held on April 5, 2002
for the purpose of continuing a
facilitated discussion on the
relationships between the City of
Cambridge and the universities
located within Cambridge.

In City Council April 22, 2002

**REPORT ACCEPTED.
PLACED ON FILE.**