PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

7:00 p.m. in Second Floor Meeting Room 344 Broadway Cambridge, Massachusetts

Hugh Russell, Chair
H. Theodore Cohen, Vice Chair
Pamela Winters, Member
Steven Winter, Member
Tom Sieniewicz, Member
Steven Cohen, Member
Ahmed Nur, Associate Member
Catherine Preston Connolly, Associate Member

Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for Community Development

Community Development Staff:

Liza Paden Jeff Roberts Stuart Dash Suzannah Bigolin

REPORTERS, INC.
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD

617.786.7783/617.639.0396 www.reportersinc.com

INDEX

PAGE GENERAL BUSINESS Update, Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for Community Development Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s) Board of Zoning Appeal Cases 8 640 Memorial Drive 13 12 1430 Massachusetts Avenue 1100 Massachusetts Avenue 10 300 Mount Auburn Street 9

PUBLIC HEARING

7:00 p.m. PB#286 - 75 New Street (continued), Special Permits to construct 93 residential units at 75 New Street, pursuant to the Project Review Special Permit (Section 19.23); Multifamily housing in the Industry A-1 District (Section 4.26.3), Reduction of the Side and Rear Yard Setbacks (Section 5.34.2(b)), Setback Reduction of On-Grade Parking and for On-Grade Parking within 10 feet of the building (Sections 6.44.1(a), (b), and (g) and 10.45) and Waiver of Parking Screening Requirements (Section 6.47.8). Applicant is Abodez Acorn 75 New Street, LLC 35

(Index Continued on the Following Page)

INDEX

PAGE

8:00 p.m. City Council Petition to amend the Zoning Map of the City of Cambridge by creating the Cambridge Highlands Overlay District to be coterminous with the district currently zoned Residence B located in the Cambridge Highlands neighborhood and to amend the text of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Cambridge by creating Section 20.800 - Cambridge Highlands Overlay District, which would modify the requirements of the base zoning district.

8:30 p.m. PB#175, 1-5 East Street, Major Amendment to PUD Special Permit and Project Review Special Permit (PB#175) by Archstone North Point II LLC, for the property located at 1-5, 7-13 and 23 East Street to permit a reduction of the height of the final residential building to 70 feet and a reduction of the number of dwelling units to 300. The Major Amendment to PUD Special Permit and Project Review Special Permit (PB#175) is required pursuant to Section 12.37 and Section 19.25 of the ordinance. This will be the first of two public hearings required pursuant to Article 12.000 of the Ordinance. 216

GENERAL BUSINESS

PB#289 -- 57 JFK Crimson Galleria LP to construct 25, 860 square feet of additional floor area on the existing retail building. Request to withdraw. 327

KeyWord Index

PROCEEDINGS

* * * * *

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is the meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. I would ask that we come to order.

LIZA PADEN: Excuse me, please, the meeting is about to start.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Can people now hear me?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: So the first item on our agenda is an update from Brian Murphy.

BRIAN MURPHY: Thanks, Hugh. I will be brief.

Tonight we've got a hearing, it's on 75

New Street, a continuation. We've got the

Cambridge Highlands Overlay District Zoning,

and then the first hearing for 1-5 East

Street, Major Amendment to reduce the size of the building.

Under General Business we've got
Planning Board item No. 289, 57 J.F.K. Street
as that expires September 30th. For the
September 30th hearing we will be going to
the Kennedy Longfellow School, and the one
item on the agenda for that evening will be
Planning Board No. 288, 40 Thorndike Street,
again a continuation -- a continued hearing.

October 7th we'll be back here. We've got 75 J.F.K. Street, the Kennedy School of Government coming before the Board for the first time, as well as Planning Board No. 2892, 88 Cambridge Park Drive, which is a continued hearing.

On October 21st, we've got 88 Ames

Street, the Boston Property Housing Planning
Board No. 294 at eight o'clock. As well as

North Point retail parking revision Zoning

Amendment at nine. There may be some

additional items, but what we're trying to do

going forward is not to schedule things until

we have all the materials. Because what we

found is though we schedule things and

haven't had the material and gone back and

forth. So we're trying to institute a policy

to have all the material in before we

solidify dates. That seems to give us a

better chance to have the hearings move along

more smoothly.

HUGH RUSSELL: It also gives you the opportunity to review the material and have discussions with proponents --

BRIAN MURPHY: Exactly.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- before it comes to the Board.

BRIAN MURPHY: And try to give the

Board a more useful memo.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: One question, Brian, one question I had is I think we, there's a commitment that the Planning Board will start discussing some of the processing questions.

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes, I'm sorry, that is actually on October 7th.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

BRIAN MURPHY: So we do have that scheduled.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thanks.

Are there any meeting transcripts?

LIZA PADEN: No, you have all of the ones already. So there are no new ones.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

So then it's Board of Zoning Appeal cases and we have four telecom antenna cases.

And I'd like to try something different

tonight because I don't want to spend an hour and a half on telecom antennas given the other agenda. And we also have sent to us a memo by the staff reviewing in great detail all of the antennas. And I would like to actually -- is Suzannah here? There she is. I wonder if she could walk us through and then if there are questions, I would -- I mean, I would hope that we could, over time, have the Board role in these cases be reduced, have the staff's role be increased.

And now I think we all were sent the electronic version of the presentation and how much everybody has reviewed that or not, but, Suzannah, do you want to come up?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: So, thank you, Hugh. I've reviewed the four applications and provided some suggestions in the memo that was circulated.

With 300 Mount Auburn street which is the Mount Auburn Hospital, an additional antenna on either face of the north stairwell is proposed and there are empty mounts that will be removed as well. It seems generally a good approach, but they're using with the paint finish and the blending in with the background. And I've just suggested that the antenna could sit slightly further down the wall so it doesn't interrupt the cornus line from the views from the street.

And with the south elevation the same applies. And from the photo simulations it does look it will sit below the cornus line to it, so it is a good outcome.

HUGH RUSSELL: Any more discussion of that?

STEVEN WINTER: No.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: With 1100 Mass.

Ave., the east elevation, the rooftop mechanical penthouse is set well back from the street, so you can't see any of the antenna or the remote radio head from that viewpoint. And the supporting equipment that they're installing isn't visible either. With the north elevation, this is adding some clutter and it is a bit more of a prominent view when you're travelling from the street, and so in this instance I've suggested looking at some options to sort of work with cabling to straighten that out. It's kind of clumsy and awkward and also looking at arranging the antenna in a more symmetrical fashion, that would be on the north elevation.

With the south elevation it's also quite prominent. It's not that visible from the street. But if the antenna could be

moved down a little bit again, it wouldn't break the cornus line from the street.

Any questions?

HUGH RUSSELL: Questions on this one?

STEVEN WINTER: No.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have a comment that I would ask Suzannah and staff to consider. I went and looked at all of these again today. I know they've been painted to match the building color, but they don't match. And I'm just wondering if at some point or on some buildings it would be better to have them simply not even attempt to match the building and just be a different color from the building, just be a different I don't know what the answer is, element. and I'm just hoping that other people can look at it and think about it because at this point the building's grey and some of these are sort of yellowish now.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Yes. Maintaining that paint finish I think is really important. But you're right, they could be -- but they are design elements in certain situations.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

Moving on to 1430.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: With 1430 that's in the Harvard Square Conservation District, and the staff at the Cambridge Historical Commission have already approved that application. There is already quite a lot of wireless equipment on this penthouse rooftop, so I thought in my review that we could encourage the applicant to sort of organize cabling a bit better and to ensure that the equipment is in a symmetrical sort of

alignment and layout. The color choice did seem to be an improvement on the existing situation here as well.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, now we get to the hard one.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Yes.

So 640 Memorial Drive. With the north elevation the -- an improvement in this instance would be to ensure the antennas don't interrupt the crane brick cornus line when viewed from the street. So they need to sort of drop them down a little bit on the facade. And then also the remote radio remote head unit and junction box are adding some clutter as well on top of the roof, top there. So if their positioning could possibly be reviewed in looking at perhaps a further setback, that would help in this instance.

The east elevation, the existing antennas are quite clumsy looking in their appearance and it's because of this striped color treatment which does sort of protrude above the parapet line as well. So the proposal to match the paint finish with the white towel I think is a good outcome, and also the positioning as flush as possible as well seems to be an improvement in this situation.

And the southwest elevation is the most prominent view of the antennas at this installation, and they're quite untidy at the moment, and they will protrude above the parapet line as well, which is the existing case. Depending on how far the antennas can be moved, it would be preferable that they do sit below the parapet line, but this may not be possible with the existing cornus and the

building details or alternatively looking at other locations such as the mechanical penthouse which is set further back in the background. But if there's -- we're just sort of confined to looking at the existing installation. Then in this instance the striped paint finish I think is an okay outcome. It does -- a number of views it does make the antennas recede into the background, and the RRH units won't be visible in this situation either, so it is just the antenna and the striped finish.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ted, you looked at them?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I agree with you that if -- they're all clumsy and they look unattractive on what is such a beautiful building that clearly they spent a

small fortune renovating. I agree that the best from what I can see, the best concept is moving it up into the penthouse and then painting them grey, and there's already live equipment there. I mean, my concern about this building obviously is appearance, but I'm assuming that the building is still owned by MIT. And just as we've been talking about Lesley trying to do something better with the array of antennas on University Hall, I think, you know, it would be good if MIT could come up to the bat -- come up to the plate, too, and try to do something better with this building. I mean, it's a beautiful building. It's a very visible. You're coming across the BU Bridge when you're driving on Memorial Drive, and you see the building and you're like wow, it's beautiful and then you see these things sticking out

all over the place.

I mean, I agree with all of your comments, but I really would hope that, you know, some pressure could be brought to bear on MIT to really rethink what they're doing here or what they've allowed to happen here and try to do something better.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: Any other comments?

PAMELA WINTERS: I'd like to say I agree with Ted. If anybody can do it, MIT should be able to do it.

HUGH RUSSELL: So then, what I would suggest is that we forward Suzannah's comments to the Board of Zoning Appeal. And it appears to me that the first three cases:

Mount Auburn Street, Mass. Avenue, and 1430

Mass. Avenue cases, where there are minor suggestions, questions, and we would like the

Board of Zoning Appeal to put to the proponents in the course of those hearings, but there are adjustments that would slightly improve things.

With 640 Memorial Drive, are we saying that we don't want them to act on this until MIT really steps back and looks at the whole building and figures out what they're doing? Is that a recommendation?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I think that's our recommendation. So, the Zoning Board would have it within its powered to make it a continued case and delve deeper into a redesign and rethinking in way in which that building supports the antenna.

I mean I don't want to get into their business, but they do have a mechanism for allowing such a deeper conversation to take place.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

And they can also decide that this isn't the time to do that and act -- we're giving them advice to make their decision.

So if that's agreeable, we could send the recommendation.

PAMELA WINTERS: Sounds good.

HUGH RUSSELL: And we think this is a reasonable -- it's a good process.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I like it.

STEVEN WINTER: I like the process very much, and I'd also like to thank
Suzannah coming forward and helping us to get this far this quickly. We really appreciate that.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: All right, thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

LIZA PADEN: There are two other

Board of Zoning Appeal cases; one for signs at 355 Fresh Pond Parkway, which was a Planning Board Special Permit which was also known as Fresh Pond Retail that has a Bank of America Board of Zoning Appeal case. And Bank of America's asking for additional signage beyond what their sign allocation is for the bank, and I believe also for a sign that exceeds the 30-inch dimension for internal illumination. And I didn't know whether or not the Planning Board wanted to send a comment on that application or not.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there any justification of this?

LIZA PADEN: Is there a justification? Well, it's --

HUGH RUSSELL: In the application?

LIZA PADEN: In the application, I think that they just want more signage.

Their attorney is sitting behind me mumbling.

HUGH RUSSELL: James Rafferty I think.

PAMELA WINTERS: Who's he?

LIZA PADEN: One of the things about this building, if you remember this, it has a rounded edge, and so the sign allocation starts where the section of the building is parallel and abuts the public street.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Thank you.

LIZA PADEN: And so, the amount of signage doesn't -- the allocation is not around the entire ground floor where the bank occupies. It's only on the part that is abutting Fresh Pond Parkway.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the bank wraps around that corner?

LIZA PADEN: The bank takes up the entire point.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, is this reminiscent at all of the fact that we sometimes see excessive signage and advertising on large strips of bank property that really is like a billboard or an ad? I'm not sure that it is, I'm just positing the question.

HUGH RUSSELL: This would not be the -- it would not be at the top of the list of tasteless bank signs.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay. I have not seen that book by the way.

HUGH RUSSELL: Nevertheless, this is a parkway district. It seems to me that, you know, maybe some sign can tell several people zipping by at 35 miles an hour if they listen to some of the people in the room, that never happens, but -- and I must say that when I was out there doing a study of all the retail

premises, I had difficulty determining the Bank of America. So I think the Board ought to be very, very careful in granting a Variance in a case like this.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, this is also, the building that -- the proponent closer to the road at the Board's request, correct? Instead of putting the building back and the parking in front of it, right?

HUGH RUSSELL: That's part of the standards of the district.

LIZA PADEN: The standard is the parking has to be behind the building.

STEVEN WINTER: All of the preconditions are there. I wonder why we should grant that Variance?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, so do I.

LIZA PADEN: Okay, thank you.

The other case that's on the Board of

Zoning Appeal agenda for the 18th is the Glassworks Avenue, which is the Maple Leaf Building.

And so in 2012, in January, the Planning Board reviewed the proposal for a projecting sign on the residential building which is actually two projecting signs. You're allowed one projecting sign for ground floor use and they're proposing to have two; one of which is above the street line on the Gilmore Bridge. So if you can think about North Point, you're on the Gilmore Bridge coming in from Charlestown, you will see the Maple Leaf Building, which has been converted The Planning Board did to residential use. send a recommendation saying that this was residential development and the comments that I had sent earlier. So my question is did you want to reaffirm those comments or did

you want to change the recommendation from 2012? The only thing that's different about the sign from 2012 to today is the name.

PAMELA WINTERS: That's it?

LIZA PADEN: Yes. It's the same size, same features.

PAMELA WINTERS: What is the name now?

LIZA PADEN: It's in the picture. I'm sorry.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Avalon Lofts.

LIZA PADEN: Sorry, it went out of my brain for a second. Avalon Lofts.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, actually I would recommend that we change our recommendation.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

 $\mbox{H. THEODORE COHEN:} \ \ \mbox{I -- clearly I}$ $\mbox{voted in favor of it two years ago.} \ \ \mbox{I}$

thought it was an interesting element of the design -- well, when we voted on the design, we said that we weren't passing on the sign, but that would come back at some point in And when it did, I think we were all impressed with how it fit in with the building, and the idea that even though it was a residential building and you had the Gilmore Bridge and you needed to be above the bridge, I would say two things have happened; one is that I think the name Maple Leaf was -- it had a historicism that implied something about the building and it was more an identification of the historic building than saying this is Avalon Lofts, this is a residential building with this name. We have been opposing other residential buildings having their names put up prominently in violation of the Zoning Ordinance.

Further, over the years, my attitude towards branding of buildings with, you know, commercial names has evolved in large measure because of some of the buildings that have been built in Boston with some of the signs that have been put up on them and the Converse building and also I think Vertex buildings in the South Street Seaport, I'm less commemorative branding than I made them a couple years ago.

So taken together, you know, while it's still an interesting design element and a nice piece of artwork might be nice going from Maple Leaf which had an historic element to it to simply Avalon Lofts is not something I think is a great idea.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, just throwing my two cents briefly. I wasn't around as the sign policy evolved over the

I for one don't have a strong years. objection to signage on buildings, including residential buildings. However, I would have a very high standard for the quality of those signs. I think quality of signs on these buildings can enhance them, and for those who are driving passed a building and may be interested in what that building actually is, because it isn't evident, that even a residential building, I think it can add into the color and interest, not to mention branding and identification. So I simply don't feel as strongly as you do on this as Ted. And, again, I don't know the history and the evolution of this policy, but it seems like imposing some sort of absolute, for me anyway, it doesn't seem warranted.

PAMELA WINTERS: Liza, is the Avalon Lofts, is that a definite name now that

they've established or can they go back to the Maple Leaf?

LIZA PADEN: I don't know. I don't know if they can go back to the Maple Leaf.

The Board of Zoning Appeal is very specific that if you get a Variance, it has to be exactly what is shown in the plans. And I wonder if they changed the name of it, they would have to go back to the Board of Zoning Appeal to change it to something else.

PAMELA WINTERS: I sort of liked

Ted's thought about the historical nature of
the Maple Leaf, and I guess that's all I have
to say is that I kind of agree with Ted on
that one issue. So, you know, if we're just
talking about the name, if there's a
particular reason why it has to be that name
or they didn't like the name Maple Leaf or,
you know, whatever, you know, I kind of agree

with Ted on that issue. It does have a historical aspect to it that I like.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I wasn't that wild about this sign the first time around, but I deferred to the judgment of my colleagues, and to me the idea that it picked up a historic element was a very important thing. I think that some relief is reasonable here. I think it's not unreasonable to have the sign of permitted dimensions visible from the Gilmore Bridge. If it's limited to 20 feet above the ground, it will be 14 feet below the deck of the bridge. It won't really function as a sign, but I think it should be that, you know, should be no more than 20 feet above the bridge deck. I mean, integrated into the design of the building

and be of the size that is appropriate.

Because I don't believe Maple Leaf actually had this particular sign on it. I think there was maybe a painted sign there.

PAMELA WINTERS: It was painted.

HUGH RUSSELL: Painted.

And was it in -- it was a vertical painted sign that was near this location.

But because of the renovation, they can no longer accomplish that. So I would encourage the Zoning Board to ask for a different proposal that comes as close to meeting the spirit on the Ordinance. And I should speak a moment to my colleague about what is the spirit of the Ordinance.

The Sign Ordinance is actually an old part of the Ordinance. I think it was redone maybe in the 1980s. It's been around with relatively few changes for sort of a whole

I think it was developed by the Planning
Board and the Department with the idea that
signs should serve the people who are on the
streets trying to find the buildings, not
people in airplanes. And that they should be
scaled to the experience of, you know,
pedestrian and the motorist who is going by
at a certain speed.

I do remember that at one point the question came up as to how big a projecting sign could be. And I remember getting involved in that discussion because it was thought that I think the old standard was four feet square and those signs were a little gross. Particularly if they said Pepsi Cola or Coca-Cola or something like that. And so we came up with a notion of 13 square feet, which is a four-foot circle or a

three-and-a-half-foot square. I mean, that's -- and that's what you see a lot of around the city. And I think it keeps things -- keeps signs in their right place which is an informative rather than decorative, and we liked it because it was decorative before. But I think when it now shouts out the name of one of, you know, 50 people renting apartments in the city, it's unfair somehow.

Yes, Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: I apologize I was late for the signage, but if it's the same signage that we had the ten points from Carol O'Hare, I agree with all ten points. There's no need for that sign there.

HUGH RUSSELL: Any other comments?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Well, I liked the way you framed it as far as the dimensional

from the bridge. It is a peculiar particular function of the site because of that adjacency. I'm wrestling here because the notion it's connected to our history and say Maple Leaf is appealing to me, and I also am aware that I don't want to get into the business of telling people what they should write on their signs, because there's a free speech element there that I hold sacred and most people do here. But, however, if they're asking for relief, maybe if under those circumstances, some suggestion about if you're going to need additional height and area, that maybe the content is our business and that we can begin to express an opinion. So I have sympathy for the two fellow board members here that are -- or three board members that are talking potentially of going back to that original idea.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do you have enough to make a recommendation?

LIZA PADEN: Sure.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

LIZA PADEN: And just to let you know there will be a sign on for the October 7th agenda, which will be the Ipsen Company which is that Cambridge Research Park.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's the Carol O'Hare memo.

Okay, the next item on our agenda is 75

New Street. We have -- we had several

meetings discussing this project. At the

last meeting we asked that, made kind of a

list of things that we wanted to see. I have

not seen most of those things. Maybe the

proponent is planning to present them

verbally which is not great procedure, but I

think -- so what is the -- what does the

proponent want to do at this time?

PHIL TERZIS: We're prepared to present.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

PHIL TERZIS: We had two

submittals -- Phil Terzis with Acorn Holders and Abodez Development.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Could we ask that everyone use the mics including the Chair? We can't hear you back here.

PHIL TERZIS: We had two submittals which I will go through.

One was the original package which had a list of changes, that hopefully you've seen this list in your package. And then we had a supplemental submittal which was largely more detailed communications which was suggested by Community Development that was submitted last week.

HUGH RUSSELL: So one of the -- the one last week. What's the date on the other one?

PHIL TERZIS: It would say Special Permit hearing September 16, 2014.

AHMED NUR: That's the one we just got.

PAMELA WINTERS: They both say that.

PHIL TERZIS: And the second one says supplemental information package.

AHMED NUR: So we're going by the supplemental?

PHIL TERZIS: I was going to go through our first submittal, which this one on the second page which has a list of revisions that we've made.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, I'm trying to find that.

PAMELA WINTERS: Is that on the

supplemental?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No.

PAMELA WINTERS: The first, the

original?

HUGH RUSSELL: This one? It's dated May 20th.

PHIL TERZIS: Let's make sure you have the right document.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: This was submitted two weeks ago.

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, it was --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It was developed in response to questions from that hearing.

PHIL TERZIS: That's correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: I do have that. Now there's something else?

PHIL TERZIS: That was our first submittal. And then at the request of

Community Development we submitted more detailed elevations of the whole building last week, and that says supplemental information package. And I think that's the correct one that Mr. Winter has.

HUGH RUSSELL: I've seen that, but I don't think I have it in front of me.

STEVEN WINTER: Do we have any more of these?

AHMED NUR: What are you looking for?

STEVEN WINTER: A copy of the supplemental.

PHIL TERZIS: I have a copy here.

AHMED NUR: They're looking for the supplemental.

LIZA PADEN: I know. I don't have any extra copies. I'll go upstairs and get them.

STEVEN WINTER: We just need the one, Liza.

LIZA PADEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: So -- so I think I got confused by two things that looked like they are the same but aren't.

PHIL TERZIS: Sorry.

HUGH RUSSELL: And this is what I was looking for so that's good news.

PHIL TERZIS: You've seen that already, though?

HUGH RUSSELL: No, I have not.

PHIL TERZIS: Okay. What I could do is go through that on the screen if you like point by point.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure, yes. And I think there are probably plenty of people out here who also haven't seen it.

PHIL TERZIS: This is the first

package that we submitted about two weeks ago which is the bulk of the submittal. What we tried to do in this package was address all of the questions and concerns that were brought up at the last hearing.

The second page has a list of those concerns and our responses and I can go through them. I can go through them one by one.

The first question was how would visitor parking be handled? And our answer was that there will be four unassigned parking spaces in front of the building at the drop off area that would be for short-term parking during the day, and then there would be assigned overnight parking using a parking pass at night for overnight visitors. In our discussions with the Traffic Department, we've agreed that if

those four spaces prove to be inadequate for all of the parking needs on the site, that we would have other spaces left unassigned in the parking area behind the building in the open parking behind the building to accommodate if there were, say, more overnight guests at any particular time. So that would be something that we would monitor over time.

The second question was how would delivery trucks be handled? We have two ways to handle deliveries. One is a short-term parking area in the front of the building at the drop off, which I'll show you in the next slide. And then we will have a place for the moving trucks to park between the existing building at 87 New Street and 75 New Street. I'll just quick flip to that slide. As you can see here, this area here which is, which

would serve both 87 and 75 New Street. of the concerns brought up in our meetings with the neighbors in the past week was whether that would be adequate if there were, say, two more events happening at the building at one time. And we would propose if that were happening, this would be used at any move-ins at 87 New Street, and that we'd also have space here for move-ins at the front door of 75 New Street. Typically move-ins take -- to load a truck, usually takes less than three hours. To unload usually takes an hour and a half or so. So there probably won't be a whole lot of overlap, but we'll monitor that as we go forward.

HUGH RUSSELL: The existing building is a condominium; is that correct?

PHIL TERZIS: It's an apartment

building.

HUGH RUSSELL: And a rental building.

PHIL TERZIS: Rental.

HUGH RUSSELL: Apartment building?

PHIL TERZIS: Yes. The existing

building is 54 units. The new building will be 93 units.

Third question was: Will sidewalks be ADA compliant? And they will all be designed to be ADA compliant, both the public sidewalks and the compliant entrances at the front of the building.

There was a question as to whether they would be tree wells on both sides of New Street? We have been in negotiations with the DPW over time to discuss the future of New Street, and we have agreed that we will replace the sidewalks, curbs, and add street

trees to both of our properties at 87 New Street and 75 New Street. The design has not been developed yet because I believe the DPW is going to hold meetings with neighborhood groups to finalize the design, and we've had meetings with the neighbors in the past couple of weeks, specifically the Fresh Pond Neighborhood Alliance, and they are -they're concerned about the planning in that area and that it be as global as possible and not just focusing on the sidewalk with New Street but what are the impacts of development on the infrastructure up and down the street. When we would be happy to meet with the DPW and the neighbors as this develops in the future.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think we see the city engineer here. So perhaps she'll speak later about what's going on.

PHIL TERZIS: Okay.

Another question is will there be a roof deck in the final plan? We are planning for a roof deck. We are hoping that ISD will interpret that our elevator penthouse could be above the height limit in order to service the roof deck. If they determine that, they will not approve that, then we would try to go for a Variance to have the elevator go above the allowable height so that we can provide handicap access to a roof deck.

Another question was will there be enough room for shrubs along the rear of the property where the parking area abuts the railroad? And we spoke with our landscape architect and she has said that she thinks that may be a valid concern, and that rather than putting a chain link fence with shrubs here, she is suggesting that we do a cedar

fence and then grow vines or something on the fence so that it's a little bit more attractive and a little less -- it doesn't take up as much space.

Next question was can we designate a path from New Street to the future bike path without any stairs? And one of the comments is that it may connect to the adjacent auto body land at the proposed side. What we have proposed here is along our property line, which is in the center of this green swath along the site, we would provide a five-foot right-of-way along that property line that would be future access to the bike path if the bike path is ever built. And that this All these landscaped areas along here next to the parking will also be available to augment the path with either foot lighting or bollards or trees or shrubs just to landscape the path.

The other side of the -- on the other side of the property line we are proposing that the other property owner or developer of that property could also provide a five-foot wide right-of-way as well. And whether that's something that is done through the Planning Board sort of requiring it of the developer or there is some kind of incentive? The neighbors have suggested that maybe there be some kind of incentive for that developer to provide that path.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It might be helpful to describe the land ownership at the end of the path.

PHIL TERZIS: At the end of the path this piece of land here is owned by the auto body shop. So if this path were to end here, I mean if there were a bike path here, and

this path would need to be considered -continued across this land to the right of
way that's to the railroad right of way.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: And how it's being used now?

PHIL TERZIS: Right now it's used to store cars that they're in the process of being worked on or there are some abandoned parts and cars back there that we hope some day will be cleaned up.

Next question was could you add more bike parking in the future? What we've done is add more bike parking in this area. We started with 10 spaces, we now have 14 spaces. We probably could add -- if there was more of a future need for bike parking, we would probably add more bike parking in this area, but right now we are way exceeding the Zoning requirement for both resident and

guest bike parking.

It was suggested that we hire an acoustical consultant to review the impact of Whole Foods' loading dock on the building. We've hired a firm Acentech which is a Cambridge firm, and they have placed sound monitors on the roof of the existing JC Adams building and they've been collecting data, basically ambient noise data, that catches both the parking lot and also the street in front of our building, basically all the noise in the area. And preliminary data shows that there are spikes at times when there is loading activities happening at Whole Foods, but we don't have a final definitive report. But once we have that report, we'll share it with the neighbors and the Planning Board.

The neighbors have also expressed

concern about us building a building next to an auto body shop and the fumes that might come from the auto body shop, and also the issue of exhaust from Whole Foods. We can't really speak to that because we haven't done any kind of sampling or testing of the air there, but it's our feeling that really it's the auto body shop's responsibility to provide a safe, you know, safe emissions for the neighborhood and that it's really not our job to monitor the auto body shop's emissions. But, you know, we would hope that if there is an issue, we could bring it up with the Cambridge Health Department and maybe get some satisfaction that way.

STEVEN WINTER: Sir. Mr. Chair, may

I? Is there a timeline on the acoustic

monitoring?

PHIL TERZIS: The company we're

working with suggested a one week timeline so that we would get a full week of deliveries and -- because he said that supermarkets work in sort of weekly cycles when they have a heavy delivery date before the weekend.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes. In fact Whole Foods is a chain that utilizes the -- I think it's midnight to four a.m. They utilize deliveries in a way that is pretty standard in the industry.

PHIL TERZIS: Yeah, okay.

The next question was about the building design and renderings, and we'll go into that more in detail. Jim Pyatt is here and he will describe some of the elevations.

One of the complaints was our elevations were too sort of fuzzy and evocative but not providing enough detail. And you'll see in the rest of this presentation we've hit some

very hardline elevations that explain the building more carefully. And we also have here a mockup against the wall which is, which was built just to kind of give an idea of the depth of the facade, some of the relief that's going to be present in the facade and final product.

It was also requested that we show rooftop mechanical equipment and elevator penthouses in more detail. We've provided that in the elevations as well. The final size of the mechanical equipment are not quite known, but we're trying to work with sizes that we've used on other projects at this point.

There was a question about adequate planting along New Street. There's sort of two answers to that. One is that we've beefed up the planting in front of the

entryway. As you can see, this green area here originally was much smaller planting We made that much bigger in front of area. the public terrace. And we're also looking at the potential impact of the redesign of New Street. And in our early discussions with DPW there was an idea of moving the curb out some distance and then providing street And this is just, this is not a trees. design, it's more of an idea about how that can happen pending DPW -- the final DPW plans, but it would be our intent to have fairly large caliber street trees that are close enough spacing so that they would have some immediate presence on the street after planting.

And the last question from the Planning Board was whether our traffic study included all of the known and upcoming projects in the

area. It basically -- we followed the guidelines of the Traffic Department and their scoping session and our traffic engineer has also taken into account a few upcoming projects; one on CambridgePark Drive and then another one that we're actually planning on Concord Road Phase II, and has studied those and found no, no exceedances with those two projects added in. And their full report has been submitted to the Traffic Department for their review.

STEVEN WINTER: May I ask, sir, may I ask a clarifying question?

The TIS scope that's performed in the letter dated July 9, '13, that includes 160 CambridgePark, 130 CambridgePark, etcetera, etcetera; is that correct?

PHIL TERZIS: That's correct.

STEVEN WINTER: Yeah, okay. And it

goes 70 Fawcett, Tyler Green, and Concord Ave. And the additional information that Mr. Black provides us relates to 88 CambridgePark and Concord Avenue.

PHIL TERZIS: That's correct.

STEVEN WINTER: Thank you.

PHIL TERZIS: So a few more items on our site plan that we've changed.

One is this, we are adding two ZipCar spaces. We've had discussions with ZipCar and they're very interested in being in this project. So we're thinking of leasing a couple spaces to them.

Another change which will show up in later drawings, this is our old site plan. We have relocated the main entry to the building from this little arrow here and we moved it over here. And the stairs that are associated with it are moved over as well.

And we'll show you those changes in upcoming sheets.

This is a civil engineering plan which I won't belabor on. It's a little difficult to read here. But this drawing is just trying to show the DPW, the potential for street trees when DPW redesigns New Street.

This drawing is showing of rooftop units where we have condensers which typically we have one condenser per dwelling unit to run the air conditioning, and then there are rooftop units here and here which serve the corridors of the building, and then there are these small head houses which are about three feet high, serving the -- which basically take refrigerant from the rooftop here and down to the apartments. These units, the condensers are about two and a half feet high. The head houses are three

feet high. The corridor HVAC unit is about five feet high, and we're centering that in the roof sort of the value of the roof as hidden as possible from view.

This is the elevator penthouse here and stair. And then there's this vestibule which would access the roof deck if we're allowed to build the roof deck either by ISD blessing, the height change, or by obtaining a Variance.

Now we're going to get into the actual building design unless there are questions about site planning or anything like that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I just have a quick one. Do we have a map or a view anywhere that shows the building and its relationship to the shopping center and specifically Whole Foods?

PHIL TERZIS: Is that adequate?

That's a little better.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. So you're saying what's in the yellow-green?

PHIL TERZIS: What's in yellow, correct.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And where is the Whole Foods loading dock?

PHIL TERZIS: Whole Foods is right here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So it is right behind the building?

PHIL TERZIS: It is.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And the building below you with the dark roof, that's the auto body shop?

PHIL TERZIS: That's the auto body shop.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

STEVEN COHEN: I had one question

before you got to the building design. I'm not sure whether this is the right juncture to raise it, but on New Street I've read the DPW memo where they describe the design process that they want to initiate this fall, but I'm not sure I understand what they're saying and what's being proposed, or if anything specific is being proposed other than the beginning of a non-specific process.

PHIL TERZIS: I think --

HUGH RUSSELL: You want to jump in, Kathy?

KATHY WATKINS: Hi. Kathy Watkins from Public Works. I can talk a little bit about that. And what was outlined and there are some images in there, in the report that we did to City Council a couple months ago outlining what we thought was one option for improving New Street, and that is basically

to provide two travel lanes, two bike lanes, and then two, eight-foot wide sidewalks. And what that would allow us to do is, as some of the images spoke to, to really provide a nicer pedestrian environment with street trees as well as bike facilities.

Do you have your pointer?

PHIL TERZIS: Yes.

KATHY WATKINS: So to look at the image just in terms of what we outlined. I know some of it is a little complicated to follow in terms of implementation. That's one of the big questions people have, is you know, how does this all sort of fit in?

As he was talking about the developer has committed to redoing the sidewalk adjacent to these two parcels. So that's the current parcel. And then also the newly constructed parcel here.

And what Public Works is committed to doing is really beginning a process and we would start holding a community meeting in early October and we would anticipate three to four community meetings to really come up with what makes sense for New Street, given all the different changes and sort of the opportunities to really make New Street work for all the different uses there now. And so what we would do is do a design for all of The developer would be New Street. responsible for building these two parcels. We would obviously look at the section along Danehy Park. And one of the things along Danehy Park is that this is the methane trench here from the site and this is sort of a landscape, you know, a grass area that's outside of the park. And so in this area you have an opportunity to provide, you know, a

nice walking facility that's sort of along the back of the those existing trees along the Danehy Park side. And then we would do a full design for the entirety of New Street. And what we've committed to doing is constructing at least one side of that. Which likely would be this side on this whole parcel. So that, you know, in approximately one year's time we would have a sidewalk, a wider sidewalk along this entire length of New Street as well as a sidewalk along the city parcel here, and then we've outlined is as these parcels up here develop, we would anticipate that they would need to do the sidewalk construction along their parcels. So that's sort of the outline of the process.

STEVEN COHEN: Again, assuming it gets built as you've now --

KATHY WATKINS: Your mic's not on.

STEVEN COHEN: Sorry.

KATHY WATKINS: That's okay.

passage lanes and the bike lanes, you're obviously not showing any accommodation for parking. Is that what you contemplate that parking on New Street would be eliminated? We've heard from the neighbors that even now, before all of the residential development, that parked cars present an impediment and a problem.

KATHY WATKINS: We had outlined, and again, it's really just to get the conversation started and that there are opportunities to make New Street work better. What we had outlined included much better pedestrian facilities, the two bike facilities, and no parking. So that's what has been outlined, but no street parking

along New Street.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you.

KATHY WATKINS: You're welcome.

HUGH RUSSELL: Didn't somebody move

the yellow line?

KATHY WATKINS: Yeah.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Me.

KATHY WATKINS: Yeah. There was a small section of parking that was added, and the yellow line hadn't been moved over. So then and traffic and Parking recently moved the double yellow line over so it functions much more appropriately.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The property, I don't know the direction, from the --

KATHY WATKINS: This way?

H. THEODORE COHEN: From the proposed building down to Concord Ave. and the circle. Does the city own that?

No, we do not own KATHY WATKINS: So what we're talking about is on this side, that the widened sidewalk would be into the existing right of way. The only thing that would happen on private property is located on this side of the street. And really the focus for that reason, sort of, you know, why are you looking to put the sidewalk on private property on this side and not on this side, is that the parcels on this side are much deeper, and it's much -- it's more of an appropriate impact. Which these are much more narrow properties. So we would do this within the public right of way on this side is what we'd anticipate.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I was walking it yesterday --

KATHY WATKINS: Sure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and you cross

a lot of curb cuts. So is that in the public right of way or --

KATHY WATKINS: Yep, yes. That existing sort of sidewalk --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

KATHY WATKINS: -- is in the public right away.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So the city can develop that, and including down by the fireplace shop down the circle which is just dirt now.

KATHY WATKINS: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, thank you.

STEVEN WINTER: Just a comment,

Mr. Chair. I wanted to tell you that I appreciated the depth, the content depth of your memo about the methane, as I like to say, the methane issues and the vestibule issues from the dump. I really understand it

now and it's very clear. I'm grateful for that.

KATHY WATKINS: I'm glad it was useful.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: Yeah, this is a relevant I guess a relevant concern, but I appreciate the Public Works' presence as well as the Cambridge traffic, but going forward it would be really nice to hear from someone who has environmental sustainability officer from the city because I have questions with regard to the environment there, such as -- excuse me. Such as recently I haven't been playing soccer, but I went and played soccer about a month ago. It looks like there's acres of synthetic carpet instead of grass that sizzle in heat. And now we're looking at -- from what I'm hearing from the proponent is that

there's going to be 94 units of condensers on the roof. So on a hot summer day, I just am a bit concerned about the environment and I would like to talk to someone from the city as to what they're doing going forward especially in that area.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the concern is?

AHMED NUR: Air quality.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have one more question on that, actually, I'm not sure if you're the right person or if this is the right time.

KATHY WATKINS: Take a crack.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But the other issue is getting across the Fresh Pond
Shopping Center, getting to the subway. And
I know there was a comment in one letter about right now getting from the, from the parking lot up to the bridge. There's a dirt

path that people use rather than walk all the way down and back. Are there any plans that the city has or is this outside the city's jurisdiction to actually construct something there?

KATHY WATKINS: I'll turn it over to Sue who is working on that.

STEVEN COHEN: I'm going to have a follow-up question for you.

KATHY WATKINS: I won't go far.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sue.

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: Sorry.

So there's been concern raised in this, the conversations about this project as well as in the Council hearings, and so we're in the process of trying to work with the mall and with fellow city staff to look at safety improvements which would benefit people who are using the mall as well as connections

through. So both between Alewife Brook Parkway and the crosswalk at the signal at Alewife Brook Parkway. Is it Alewife? Directly to the front of the mall. And then looking also at pedestrian paths between the corner of the mall where the sidewalk ends to New Street. They're all within the mall owner's property. It's really his jurisdiction and decision on what he wants to do, but I think with all of the new activity that's coming to the area, it's good opportunity to push that forward. The issue of scaling the bank there is much more complicated because the majority of that is DCR property and there's also the issues of what's the accessible path of travel for people who obviously aren't going to be able to scale the bank. So I think the first focus that we're taking is can you get

safely, much more safely than today from the mall to the Alewife Brook Parkway where the existing crosswalk and traffic light is.

So -- I need the pointer back.

So right here, approximately, there's a traffic light and a crosswalk, and the goal is to come to create a path straight through that people can safely walk through this parking lot. And then to look at where this sidewalk ends are there opportunities to get -- I'm losing New Street on this picture. Right here to the corner of New Street.

And, you know, it's a conversation because we're asking a private property owner to make improvements on his own property for which we have no jurisdiction.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Sue, I have a question. Sorry. You may need a pointer on this. Just a question, because it did come

up in the letter and I was anxious to get your view on this. The question was whether this was a transient-oriented development. How would you trace the pedestrian path from this site to the T? What's the route that you would recommend? Even with potentially the new design change through the private property?

SUSAN CLIPPINGER: If I'm just walking myself, not worrying about my official capacity working for the city, I'm going to go up New Street and go through the parking lot and go over to the crosswalk and go up along the bridge on one side or the other.

BRIAN MURPHY: The other issue, Sue, I suppose is the use of the busses which is another piece. I think, when folks looked at it a lot more, people would take the bus into

Harvard Square as another alternative because you could get that right there.

another piece that we had looked at, which is, there's a fair amount of bus service on Concord Ave., and are you going to Alewife in order to go in to Harvard where it would be -- it could be faster to take the bus straight into Harvard. So in that case you're just walking down New Street and getting on the bus to go in. So there's a variety of options there depending on which transit services you're using.

STEVEN COHEN: I had that one follow-up question on New Street. The process you've outlined sounds good. I like the design proposal that you have in your memo. I think eliminating parking would be a great idea. Let's say you complete this

community-based design charrette and you come up with a great design, is funding in place?

Is funding going to be an issue once the design is established?

identified funding through general city funds for this construction. That would be for the sidewalk piece on one side, you know, not excluding the private developer piece, but the remaining section as well as the piece along Danehy and then the paving. And we would anticipate the construction could begin as early as next summer just depending on how the process works.

STEVEN COHEN: It's fair to say, details aside, this isn't a speculative matter? New Street will be improved next year?

KATHY WATKINS: Yeah.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you very much.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thanks four your patience, Phil.

PHIL TERZIS: No, thank you. Shall we go back to the New Street petition?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

PHIL TERZIS: So we were just about ready to start talking about the building itself and some of the refinements to the elevations that we've made, and also some changes around the entryway and this common deck area.

Before I go into that, just one quick thing. One of the questions that's come up again and again with the neighbors is why isn't there retail in the base of this building? And one of the -- there are a couple of reasons:

One, is that we feel that it's probably

very difficult to lease retail in this location. We're already challenged by leasing retail at 603 Concord Ave. which is kind of retail center Main Street retail area. And that's one reason.

And another reason is that retail would, by nature, probably need more parking and would probably generate more traffic on New Street which might be counter to some of the goals for people on New Street. With that said, I think we can go into the elevations and Jim Pyatt our architect will take up on the elevations.

We also have Kevin Trainer our environmental engineer here. There have been questions posed by neighbors about environmental issues so that he's prepared to answer questions if anyone has questions.

And our traffic consultant David Black is

here if there are any other questions about traffic. And I'll give it to Jim.

JAMES PYATT: Good evening. I'm Jim Pyatt of Pyatt Associates, we're the architect for the project. And I'm here tonight to respond to -- there were comments from the Board the last time about providing a little bit more detail on the project. There's been comment that the elevations that we've had were a little too, I guess, evocative or soft. They're actually based on drawings. The water color may have been soft but the drawing itself was pretty hard. But as a result of the questions, and as a result of the request for information, we have done a little bit more thinking. We have colored the buildings now in a cad program so that it's crisper. And we've made a handful of small changes, which I will go over -- not

that things were necessarily requested but development that just shows the project developing in our minds.

So this elevation, which we also developed in a request from the Community Development office, we have elevations of all sides of the building, all lengths, but this is a close up that people can perhaps see things a little bit more clearly.

One of the first things we did --

HUGH RUSSELL: So I think one thing for my colleagues, the green form on the left is actually projected 20 or 30 feet beyond the stuff on the right.

JAMES PYATT: Right. You can sort of see a deep shadow here that's suggesting that that's way in front.

We picked an area of the building that we thought had the most complexity around the

entrance to do this enlarged elevation. And, again, later on you'll see we have all sides of the building.

The first thing that we've done is focussed on the windows. The last time the windows basically stopped right at the door height. We've added approximately one foot of window area which includes the frames above the windows that we had before and developed a transom window. Now we have more glass. In addition, we think with this sort of T framework in the middle, have developed a little bit more articulation in the windows in addition to the glass area.

The parapets in the building were raised approximately one foot over what we had them before in the original submission.

You can see mechanical equipment peaking over the roof right now. I will show you a place

when we get to the larger elevations that we might have -- the person drawing may have underestimated exactly what the two corridor pieces of equipment were. I didn't catch it and I'll point it out to you.

Let's see, I need to go to.... Okay, we also provided a set of details, approximately six or eight details to the Board that show typical trim details, typical There was a comment early, early on, reveal. nine months ago, ten months ago from Mr. Dash in Community Development that if we're going to be changing materials from the fiber cement lap siding to the metal shingling, that he wanted to see more than just a flat change. We'd like to get some relief on the building, so this detail and some of the other ones show that we're aiming for approximately six inches of depth where we do make those changes. As Phil pointed out, we have a sample over in the corner here that is just sort of a typical place with most of the material. The fact that there would be clapboard of different exposures, where we have the shingle, it would be set back approximately six inches. And this is just -- obviously our windows are bigger than this one, but it's one that would fit into the sample we could bring into the room.

But anyway, people could look at these details, ask more questions, but the model pretty much tells the story.

And we also have some detail of the red cedar up at the top of the building that again has been on the design from the beginning, but this shows a little bit how we intend to do it.

This is alternating vertical boards

with like an inch and a half vertical with a recessed piece, one inch thick. So you're going to get sort of a little bit of in and out for the board forming that you saw on the elevations.

Oh, maybe I'm just going into the next.

Oh, this is the supplemental. Okay.

I'm trying to think. Oh, the other -one other detail that we did change
originally on the design, every place that
there's sort of a vertical line alongside
windows, the original submission from last
December, I guess, we were talking about
doing a vertical fin similar to the one that
we did over at the Concord Street, 603
Concord. We've changed or thinking on this
one, mostly just for we think just a little
variety, we just thought it might make a nice
detail for this particular project, and so

we're using vertical. Probably will be PVC or a fiber cement trim so basically it will look like a square chunk of wood and be painted the color of the clapboard to either side. So it will still provide the same shadow relief that we had before, but it will be a little thicker and a little bit more substantial and sealing it along the sides will be a little bit easier for the painters and coffers to be correct.

This from up above, as Phil mentioned, another one of the things that we mentioned again, not from the comment from the committee but just looking at the project we thought maybe this would be an improvement. We used to have the entrance where you see all of this -- this is a close up first of all. Right around the front terrace in the center of the building. Here's New Street

and here's the driveway, circular driveway And we've always had a little terrace out in front. But we used to have the entrance area and the stair right in this zone right here. And we thought it's sort of coming right into the side of the elevator, so we thought we would move it over, and in addition by having a planning area here, a couple of rooms that were going to be dark parts of apartments now can actually be rooms that have windows in them. And this area of planting, it's over a parking area and over structure, so it will probably be at the part back in here fairly shallow planting, we'll have a low curb. The succulents and things that don't need a whole lot of soil, but right out in the front we do have enough to have soil for a tree, I think. The landscape architect said a red bud and small evergreens and some other shrubs and grasses and similar to what we have in this area.

Coming out of the side of the building we've always had a stretch of bluestone that goes up about five feet above the terrace level. It comes out in front of the building to create a low stone seat wall about two and a half to three feet -- it will be about three feet high but they want it just slightly higher than the terrace which is about two and a half feet high. So this will be a seat wall that, you know, people coming along obviously could sit on along the sidewalk. And then that same bluestone continues as we've had before around this area to the right of the stair and over here. So the stair has moved over approximately 12 feet, and the vestibule similarly is moved over about 12 feet. So now people coming up

the stair can sort of get a view through the building because this opens up to the terrace that we've always had in the back. And the paving on the terrace right now we're assuming would be a concrete block. We would like it to be a color that would be a concrete paving -- stone rather, that would be varied colors. We haven't picked the color of that yet. And along that terrace there will actually be a wood seat for anybody from the building who are, you know, hanging out on the terrace. We have a common room right behind it which is sort of the living room for the building.

And I think that covers most of the changes.

PHIL TERZIS: Can you go over the elevations?

JAMES PYATT: And so this is just

the black and white detail of the planning -here are the full elevations. This is the piece we were just looking at was just in the middle in here. Here's the new stair, the new vestibule, the common -- windows to the Balconies above for the units common room. that are over that. Those have always been the design. The trellis area that does -screens the roof deck. And the thing I mentioned about the mechanical units, you'll see like a little bump there and if this drawing was a little bigger, you'd see a couple more little bumps. You probably should see about a foot and a half of a unit right in here and right -- excuse me, right in here which are the corridor units. They're set back in the middle of the building as Phil mentioned, so you'll probably never see them. But in a straight

elevation they'll project in this area about one and a half feet above the parapets. This is the area for move-in on the north side of the building which is just a blowup of this area of the north elevation.

Here's the south elevation of the building. Again, this part right in here is set well back, halfway into the building. This is the only part that really would register from the street if you're driving by. And this is the rear elevation. Again, we're breaking it up; similar materials, similar level of articulation, and variety, we think, as defined on the front of the building.

I guess that's it.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chairman.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, you have a

question?

AHMED NUR: Yes, please.

The slide that you've mentioned of the projected area, I believe columns -- between 9 and 11 on the front facade elevation view that the Chairman said projected out some maybe 30 feet? Where is that again?

JAMES PYATT: About 30 feet. So this chunk.

AHMED NUR: Looking at the plain view I'm measuring about 10 feet. I don't understand how that -- page 7. Go to page 7.

PHIL TERZIS: This is where we revised. The sheet on the supplement that shows --

JAMES PYATT: That's the back.

AHMED NUR: That's the back right

there. That's 30 feet?

JAMES PYATT: Yes.

AHMED NUR: You know what's

confusing, it would be nice to have column lines in all of your drawings so we know what's what.

And then the second thing is on your civil drawing you show a water retention.

Was that part of that?

PHIL TERZIS: We don't have any water retention. We have water retention on the roof but there are no tanks.

AHMED NUR: No tanks on the ground? PHIL TERZIS: No.

AHMED NUR: And the reason being? You're right on the elevation.

PHIL TERZIS: We've increased the permeable area of the site, and our civil engineer who is not here unfortunately has worked through the storm water control aspects of the project with DPW, but there is no underground storage tank in this project.

AHMED NUR: Okay.

If that's all right later on I would like to talk to Public Works in regards to that. That's fine.

KATHY WATKINS: I'm sorry?

HUGH RUSSELL: I don't know if you have the answer but you could at least hear the question.

AHMED NUR: I just --

PHIL TERZIS: Storm water.

KATHY WATKINS: As with the other development projects, they are required to store between the 25 year and the two year so the post-25 year storm runoff has to be stored between the 25 and 2. And so there's a variety of ways that they can do that. We will work through the details of that with the storm water control permit. That would definitely be one of the requirements.

AHMED NUR: Okay. I just --

KATHY WATKINS: Yes.

AHMED NUR: Looking at the civil site drawings, I didn't see anything.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, does that complete your presentation?

PHIL TERZIS: I think so. Unless there are any other questions for traffic or environmental.

AHMED NUR: I would love to ask questions for the environmental person if you don't mind.

PHIL TERZIS: Sure. This is Kevin Trainer our environmental engineer.

KEVIN TRAINER: I'm Kevin Trainer with GeoInsight.

AHMED NUR: Just a quick question that I had. As I mentioned earlier, I was really surprised how much heat was being

generated on the synthetic carpet very close to your site and I wanted to know how you considered or have plans on measuring the air quality in that area.

KEVIN TRAINER: That's actually a question that's beyond my area of expertise. I'm more of the assessment and remediation. And so the issue that you're bringing up, someone else has to address.

PHIL TERZIS: The building is being designed, as Cambridge requires, for larger projects, it's being designed to be LEED certifiable standards and we're trying to achieve LEED Silver standards for this building. And heat island effect is one of the things that's addressed in LEED. We will have all high albedo roofs and/or green roofs as you see here on the project. So that's how we're qualifying for the heat island

effects.

STEVEN COHEN: Since you've introduced Kevin, quick question for you, Kevin. Some concerns you raised about hazardous waste and so forth here. Did I hear you correctly that you're an LSB?

KEVIN TRAINER: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: The project construction will be performed under the supervision of you as the LSP, and if there are any hazardous waste or anything else, you'll assure that it's dealt with appropriately under the Mass. Contingency Plan.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: For the public, what is an LSD?

HUGH RUSSELL: So maybe, Kevin, you can answer that question by explaining what your role is and how the process works.

KEVIN TRAINER: Sure.

Summary is that Massachusetts has a privatized environmental assessment and clean-up program for oil and hazardous Basically the DEP has an materials. oversight role and they've sort of quote/unquote deputized licensed site professionals to make the environmental decisions for assessment and clean-up. So we are gonna be doing that work under the provisions of the Massachusetts Contingency Plan, which is the regulations that govern the work for this type of project in Massachusetts. And all the documentation that we're going to be putting out is gonna be public record, both on the Mass. DEP website and also we're setting up our own website, which you've already set up on Yahoo Groups, and we're going to be posting our

environmental reports on there for folks to review. So it will be a transparent process.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so based on what you know of the site so far, is it possible to safely build a building in this location?

KEVIN TRAINER: Oh, absolutely. The impacts that we're seeing at this site are fairly consistent over a fairly wide area in Cambridge. Not only Cambridge but Boston and Worcester. It's basically urban fill material that we see in a lot of projects.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it's just what anybody happened to dump there 50 years ago?

KEVIN TRAINER: That's right.

HUGH RUSSELL: By foot.

STEVEN WINTER: That's actually a good point, Mr. Chair, because it's -- it includes ash, coal dust, all kinds of things, and that's what you search for the parts that

are so toxic that they need to be remediated?

KEVIN TRAINER: That's right.

That's part of the process.

STEVEN WINTER: Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do you know now is the plan to remove the materials or to just encapsulate it and perhaps have a vapor barrier on top?

KEVIN TRAINER: That's probably premature to put it together. We haven't really put our plans out. I know that we'll have everything out for public review, though, when we put it together.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And maybe it's the same answer, but do you know when it's all done, do you envision that there will be an activity in use limitation on the property or it will be cleaned up enough that you

won't need to do that?

KEVIN TRAINER: It's hard to say right now at this stage in the process.

We're very early into the process. You know, we just reported a few months ago. We're still early in the MCP process right now.

AHMED NUR: And in terms of the rooftop, I'm used to having such a large building, a rooftop unit that would supply air to all the units as opposed to -- is it my understanding that each dwelling unit, all 94 of them, will have a condenser on the roof?

KEVIN TRAINER: Phil?

PHIL TERZIS: That's correct. Every unit will have its own condenser. And that way if people are away for the winter or for the summer or they're away from their unit, that condenser is not running. But every

unit has its own controls and pays its own utilities, and to the idea that people will self-conserve.

AHMED NUR: And that will be a split unit for heating and cooling?

PHIL TERZIS: We actually have -- we use gas hot water for heating and condensers on the roof for cooling.

AHMED NUR: Okay.

PHIL TERZIS: And just as aside from the environmental, we have little handouts here for anyone who is interested which is the website for our environmental information. So if anyone in the audience wants to -- we could pass these around.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm not sure who this is addressed to, perhaps Mr. Trainer.

If we assume that the auto body shop

next-door is emitting some fumes and perhaps some chemicals, and I'm assuming that they are within their rights doing what they're doing, I don't think it's sufficient to simply say that's not our issue. We have in other projects looked at what neighbors were doing and fumes and other wastes that they were generating and requiring that new construction next to it had to take that into account, perhaps with fixed windows or other elements that would make sure that this material could not get into the residential So have you considered this at all? unit.

PHIL TERZIS: We haven't asked Kevin specifically to consider that because we've been focusing on the soil, the site clean-up in the soil. This issue just came up. It was brought up by one of the neighbors. We would be happy to look at that and report

back to Community Development any findings that we have.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, may I suggest that the proponent could talk to staff about the -- particularly the Cambridgeport piece where we did work with the proponent who was a bioscience? Yeah, so there is some precedent you could look at and see how we dealt with that.

PHIL TERZIS: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I guess I would comment that, in that case, there were legal emissions from the adjacent building, and part of this equation is if the auto body shop is making emissions, are they legal or are they illegal?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. I'm assuming that they're legal for purposes of our discussion.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

AHMED NUR: And that's to my point, is that I've taken my car there, there used to be a Euro-tech, I think they left there. Euro-tech has, you know, like everybody else they're in business held to certain standards in terms of air quality. They actually had an imported room from Italy that they brought my little car in, closed doors, and then has a proper ventilation and they have to wait a certain hours of drying. And when they come out, they have the respiratories and stuff like that. I personally think that it's safe.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

Tom?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I guess I have some questions for the architect. If you could go back to the detail elevation that you were

sharing.

There. This shows the details of the roof deck in this elevation, does it?

JAMES PYATT: Yes, what you should see in elevation, correct.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay. I guess my question would be, so I was having a hard time understanding that. If I compare the railing, for instance, the height of the railing on the balcony to what's pictured on the roof, I was -- and also putting that together with the density of the details that you very kindly shared, I didn't understand why the railing appeared to be so short.

JAMES PYATT: It's because it's sitting on top of a parapet that is intended to be above the level of the roof. So the parapet provides some of the safety for the railing and the railing takes it up to the

full three feet. We raised the solid part of the parapet in order to make sure that you would never be aware of the equipment on the roof.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay. Okay. And so the deck details, so the railing is obscured by the parapet you're saying?

JAMES PYATT: The parapet itself provides some of the railing. This railing would actually could be attached directly to the back of the parapet just sort of extending a little bit.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay. So the parapet's a couple of feet?

JAMES PYATT: It varies from -- I think one and a half to two feet at the shortest, like, let's say one and a half, two. And in an area like this is more like four feet.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So have you asked ISD whether they would allow the penthouse overrun?

JAMES PYATT: We have some experience with another project, not by this same developer, where they initially said that they would not allow it. And according to that client, there have been more conversations recently that suggest they may be developing a different interpretation. If I have a building permit a week from now, I'll say that they've changed their mind on it and then this will go through. But until we get that ruling we won't know.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I see. And you can't just --

JAMES PYATT: Conversations have been sympathetic, and they seem to say it will, but I don't know if you've ever dealt

with the ISD. We won't get the answer.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I see. I found
Ranjit to be an infinitely reasonable man.
You can ask him a pretty direct question and get a question answered.

JAMES PYATT: Actually this question was from Sean and he said we could not do it. And in subsequent conversations it's been explained a little bit more fully exactly the logic behind why we should be able to do it. And he's at least suggested that he would go along with it. Again, until we have the permit in hand I can't say that it will happen.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So, okay, it's ambiguous, but we'll have to figure out how we deal with that as a Board, whether we're feeling we could pump that --

JAMES PYATT: We would certainly

love to -- we want --

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay, and maybe we can get into this later in terms of what our view is on it. And I had another question actually which was to the handicap ramp.

Everything, of course, will be ADA compliant. We appreciate the statement on the record saying that the length of the ramp -- I believe if I read the plans correctly, there is a 1.6 difference between the plaza entry and the driveway. So how long is the ramp?

JAMES PYATT: I think it's 45 or 50 feet. We're basically doing a one and 20 so it doesn't require railings.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: That's the nature of my question.

STEVEN COHEN: Jim, a couple of questions. I have a few concerns about the elevation, but I'm just going to limit myself

to questions right now. When I look at the original rendered perspective and then I compare it to the elevation, in the rendering -- this seems to be greater variation in the heights amongst the sections of the building. And then just a general but a couple of specific questions, first of all. First of all, as we talk about this question of the roof deck up there or not, does that question also impinge on the -- this, I assume this is a trellis, a wood trellis, that we're seeing up by the elevator head house as well? Yes.

And then related to that in the rendering we see a similar trellis at the two ends of the building, and, again, providing some relief in the height, but I don't see those trellises in the elevation. So if you could address both the general question and

the specifics, that would be great.

JAMES PYATT: Could we build this trellis if we couldn't get the roof deck? It's possible. There are some allowance in our understanding of the Zoning Ordinance for decorative elements, clock towers, things like that, is how it sort of addresses them. Would we want to go up as high as we're doing here if we didn't have it? I mean, just as a cost issue, probably not. The elements -there's a couple of things going on in this drawing relative to the building -- I'll get to the question about the ends. The building elevation that looks like it's been flattened out a little bit in certain areas, it's something we should have picked up when we sent this through. In the Revit model that we're using, there are some areas that actually it does drop down if you look very

closely to the drawings, it's grey. That's actually looking at the parapet on the far side of the building. So places that there shouldn't be, if you're standing on the sidewalk, like right in here some up and down, that little strip right there is actually 60 feet away making it look like it's flattened out but it's not.

Regarding the end, once again, the green part here on both ends of the building is taller by about a foot and a half, two feet than the actual solid part of the roof at this end. The parapet, the wood trellis-y kind of a trim goes up above, so you will see some daylight in between. It is not as high as it was last December. It was mostly because the ownership felt that it was suggesting -- pardon me?

PHIL TERZIS: We actually were

suggesting that because there were no roof decks at that end of the building that maybe it was -- it seemed a little false to have these big trellises that weren't really doing anything. Suzannah Bigolin had much the same comments that you had about, gee, the roof seems to have flattened out and we would definitely be willing to work with CDD to maybe bring back some of that lively relief that was showing in the previous submissions.

JAMES PYATT: I mean we didn't -- we actually raised the parapets, I think the previous submissions, the end did change but I think it's this filling in of the grey from the parapet on the far side of the building that is most of what is causing me some concern.

STEVEN COHEN: Both elevations and perspectives have their limitations.

JAMES PYATT: And computers.

H. THEODORE COHEN: There have been questions raised by a number of people about the size of the building and that it's very long and monolithic and desires to have it broken up into perhaps two buildings with some space in between. Is this something that's been considered? And if so, the reasons why that might have been rejected, and if it hasn't been considered, is that something that you're willing to consider?

PHIL TERZIS: We had considered it early on. We've had hundreds of schemes for this building over time, but from a functional standpoint, we feel the building will be better for us to manage by having one secured entrance and one kind of main desk, one set of elevators, that's one reason. And also we would probably lose unit count if we

were to break the building into two and this is -- this is a way for us to achieve the FAR of the building. And we felt that by breaking it sort of front to back and making it sort of set back, that was providing quite a bit of relief on the facade. Perhaps, you know, some of the neighbors have felt that was not enough, but we felt it was an adequate move.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's very hard for us to tell what all of the -- the different moves you're making or proposing in the elevation would really look like if you're walking down the sidewalk. On this side of the street, on your side, and also the sidewalk on the other. And this rendering I can see from the soccer ball in the corner seems to be taken from the higher level of the Danehy Park and I would submit that's

less important than what it looks like from So I would want to see several the street. street level perspectives that would be done in harder, you know, hard line perspectives rather than the -- and I simply can't tell whether -- what this building looks like. Does it look like a series of buildings with a lot of modulation and interest? Does it look like an endless facade? I suspect it's closer to the former than the latter, but I'd like to see the proof in terms of drawings that would allow us to see that. And of course my former employer Mr. Serwick (phonetic) built a quarter scale model of the entire building which would have filled up If you want to do that, that's this room. okay, too.

PHIL TERZIS: I am bringing up this, it may or may not help you, but --

HUGH RUSSELL: It's the point of view that doesn't help me. It's like that and, you know, it's evocative. It's a watercolor rendering. That's what worries me, is that it's more like that. But I think your architectural thinking has progressed beyond the watercolors now, so you're in a better position to tell us more.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, I'm not sure what the procedure here tonight is. Is there a public comment tonight?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: Are we going to have discussion now or are we reserving discussion for after public comment?

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, we've been --

STEVEN COHEN: We've been sort of on

the line.

HUGH RUSSELL: We've been trying to

understand what's going on here. I think what I would propose is that we hear from the members of the public who wish to speak, and there seem to be only about half a dozen. Many people seem to have or who are present or listening, they're giving us a break by having the spokespeople speak for them I think, so that -- I think after that we need to really say what are the -- what are the steps that need to take place before we can decide this case. And I don't -- I'm convinced we can't decide it tonight.

PAMELA WINTERS: No.

STEVEN COHEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: But I think if we can hone in on exactly what we need, and I know the staff has some ideas of what they want to see, and I'm not sure whether I've got a memo that says that clearly or not; because one of

the things that's happened when a case spends most of the year in front of us, there gets to be a great deal of paper and comment and so -- anyway. If it's agreeable to the Board, I would go to the public testimony.

Again, I'll remind you that we ask you to limit your remarks to three minutes. You should come to the podium, you give your name, spell your name, give your address, and that's it.

So first person who says she wants to speak is Jan Devereux.

And after Jan, the next person I believe is Lee Farris; is that right?

JAN DEVEREUX: Hi. Hello, everyone.

Jan Devereux, D-e-v-e-r-e-u-x, 55 Lakeview

Avenue. Thanks, everyone.

Quickly, because we did submit a long memo and I don't want to repeat all of that,

just having listened to tonight's discussion. Actually, I'd love it if you could bring up the elevation that shows the entire length of the front of the building. Because one of the things -- as that Mr. Russell says as he has trouble visualizing the building, I think we all do. And I think one of the things that they've brought this section of the building, which is somewhat helpful, but I really have to say that I think that we would all greatly benefit from an actual model not a quarter scale model. I'm not an architect. I don't want to fill up the entire room. a model similar to what Mr. McKinnon brought.

The questions from you all about how close it is to the loading docks, to the auto body shop, all of those things would be much easier to see if we had a model.

The other thing that I would really

like to see is how the two buildings, okay, this is -- so how long is that full facade? Is it 450-odd feet?

PHIL TERZIS: I don't know the exact length.

JAN DEVEREUX: 300 feet? One the things that the model would do is show the two buildings together. Phase I since these are being called Phase I and Phase II and being developed by the same folks, I don't think they're going to look very nice together quite honestly. I mean I realize that Phase I was built during the recession and nobody's not going to win any architectural prizes. But Phase II has a completely different color pallet and a different style and I -- and they're very close together. They're separated by what is essentially a shared driveway. I'm not an

architect, but I have some reservations about how they're going to look. And it's a very long street front.

Furthermore, we talked about how they're going to look from a sidewalk which is obviously important. I was at a soccer game for my school up on the field there, and the other building is actually most visible from that soccer field, that front soccer field, including I was actually really surprised by all the roof equipment. And I was like, wow, there's a whole lot of stuff up on that roof while this building is almost twice as big, there's going to be a whole lot of stuff on that roof. And by the way, I could see across both shopping centers and see the top of the Concord/Wheeler Street building, the bright blue and is very visible from the far site. I do feel it's, you know,

it's important to think about how they're going to look from the park because that's where they're most visible.

You know, I guess we've been talking about this, as you said, a better part of the year and it does seem like there's a great deal of stuff up on the air including what's going on with the context. I'm very glad to hear Kathy Watkins talk -- give a commitment that there will be a sidewalk for the entire length of one side of New Street. But, you know, the business with the parking lot is still a huge issue in our mind. And I know you can't control that owner. There was some I don't know if that talk of eminent domain. was just posturing. But that parking lot does not conform to any modern safety standards and that is the clear desired line not only for getting to transit to the T, I

mean, yeah, you can take a bus on Concord

Avenue, but it's the desire line to go
shopping. You know, if you're leaving from

New Street to go to Whole Foods, you're not
gonna walk all the way around by the hotel

Tria and Starbucks to get back into Whole

Foods. You're going to go through the
parking lot.

In relation to the environmental issues which our group brought up, you know, I am reassured that there's going to be a public involvement process that we're gonna help initiate, and that there's a website and all of that. Some of the information that was presented, no one has mentioned Kukui (phonetic) Oil Company which did own the land where these buildings are for a time. So I don't know that it's just urban fill. That will be to determined. And in terms of these

auto fumes from the auto body shop, I happen to live directly across the street from the Honda dealership on Lakeview Avenue. Yes, and, you know, that's a lot further away from my front porch than this building is from the windows that are facing that southwest exposure, and I -- we, you know, there are all kinds of things that they're supposed to be doing to minimize the fumes. They're supposed to be keeping their garage bays closed etcetera, etcetera. We still smell the fumes. So, you know, I don't think I'm gonna die because of it, but if I were -- my windows were a lot closer, I would be a lot more annoyed. And I think -- oh, I just like to make one comment on the overall process. Your confusion this morning with the supplemental plans and so forth, I really feel like in this area of technology we could do a whole lot better job with the posting on the website and the labelling. Because I did look at the website and I tried to see after we met with the folks from Abodez at the end of last week, I tried to see if those plans were on-line and I did not see them over the I completely missed the September weekend. I don't know whether it -- I 10th CDD memo. did not see it. And if -- when things are posted, if they could be labelled with a date that they're posted and kept in some sort of order so that you weren't constantly saying, you know, this is plan 2, have I already seen that one? That would be very helpful if there was some sort of notification process. Because honestly our group has been the most involved in this process, and the fact that CDD staff published a memo and didn't notify us or didn't even tell us after we submitted

our own memo yesterday, "Hey, did you see ours?" That would have been a courtesy.

a few questions about your comments. And thank you for organizing the comments the way you did. It gives me a lot to think about when we have these conversations. I would like to ask that for three times running this -- your memos have come in on Monday at noon, and I know you have a lot of people look at them, but it doesn't, it's -- it works much better if you can get them in earlier.

JAN DEVEREUX: I understand.

Although on the same time frame we were, you know, invited to meet with Mr. Terzis and his associates on -- that was Thursday afternoon was it I believe? Late afternoon on Thursday, which was the first time we had

seen these supplemental plans. Obviously all of this process could be improved. You know.

STEVEN WINTER: Sure.

JAN DEVEREUX: And I would add, you know, as Ted knows, I have a full-time job, so I probably spent, you know, 12 hours this weekend. People ask me what I do on the weekends. Not much anymore. It's actually gotten kind of sad.

STEVEN WINTER: I hear you.

JAN DEVEREUX: So I would love it if I had a staff who could do these things.

STEVEN WINTER: As would I.

And also you mentioned that the Fresh
Pond Shopping Center will likely remain an
intractable obstacle to safe pedestrian
passage through its wild west and
non-conforming parking until there's a change
in ownership. So I guess my question is do

you recommend, then, waiting until there's a change in ownership before we do anything?

JAN DEVEREUX: No, I recommend that this owner is derelict, I'm sorry, in allowing his parking lot to be a safety hazard. I mean there's just no other way to put it. And, you know, modern parking lots have medians with plantings and trees and, you know, clearly marked aisles and all that kind of stuff. People keep saying we don't have any control over him. Is he waiting for someone to be killed in his parking lot so he can be sued?

STEVEN WINTER: It is a mystery to even who it is.

And also you mentioned the tax increment financing should be considered to help fund street improvements. Tell me how that would work.

JAN DEVEREUX: I would defer to Bob Simha who suggested that who I don't believe he's here tonight. I'm not an expert on that.

STEVEN WINTER: Also on the five-foot easement along the property line shared along the body shop, it seems that, quote, weak tea without the assurance of the neighboring property.

JAN DEVEREUX: Yeah.

STEVEN WINTER: See, I have to say I think that the glass is half full, and I think we should be happy that the proponent has come forward to place that there rather than critical of the process. So I -- it's step by step or inch by inch or row by row if you know that song.

JAN DEVEREUX: No, I do know that song. Yeah, I see that, however, you know,

as it was made clear with that little

L-shaped bit at the back where they store the

cars, the five-foot path is a path to nowhere

unless you can get that owner to cooperate.

And the owners on New Street don't appear

very cooperative.

STEVEN WINTER: I hear you. And I think it's, I think it's a daunting process --

JAN DEVEREUX: It is.

STEVEN WINTER: -- but I still think that we need to be as positive as we can, as we approach it.

JAN DEVEREUX: Okay.

STEVEN WINTER: And let's see, and that's, that's really it.

And oh, you also mentioned that the current and future residents of New Street will benefit from access to the Alewife TMA

shuttle service. How would that -- how would that happen? How would we structure that?

JAN DEVEREUX: Again, I think you have Karen Dumaine here from TMA Associates who is trying very hard to put together a TMA with all of the Alewife and the thing --

STEVEN WINTER: That's terrific.

JAN DEVEREUX: -- so you know, I don't know how that works if they invite them to participate. It's obviously the money that changes hands, but it's certainly something worth considering if they're going to be running a shuttle bus over from CambridgePark Drive from the shopping center. Can they make a stop on New Street? You know.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay, terrific. And in fact Karen Dumaine is a very high profile transportation expert and I'm glad she's on

the case.

JAN DEVEREUX: Yeah. Well, I mean I didn't put her on the case. I hope she's on the case. She's been coming to these meetings diligently, so I'm assuming it's just because she has nothing else better to do on a Tuesday night.

Thank you, all.

PAMELA WINTERS: Can I ask another question?

JAN DEVEREUX: Is somebody going to start paying me to testify? I think these guys get paid and I'm not getting paid.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: We can pay you to stay home.

JAN DEVEREUX: That sounds good.

PAMELA WINTERS: Jan, I was wondering would you be satisfied if the drawings were a little bit more detailed in

terms of like the car place next-door and just a lot more detailed rather than having a model built? Would you be -- do you think that the neighbors would be more -- would be okay with that? Because it seems as though that would be take a little less time than actually building model.

JAN DEVEREUX: Well, I mean I don't know. Mr. McKinnon was here a few minutes ago. Maybe he can say how long it took to build the model. I think with 3-D printers models aren't as labor intensive. Again, I'm not in the model building business either. I happen to think the three-dimensional element is essential. The drawings -- I mean, we've been doing drawings now, you know, as long as this project has been presented and none of them have really been satisfactory.

PAMELA WINTERS: No.

JAN DEVEREUX: And it seems to me we should try a different technique.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, thank you.

JAN DEVEREUX: Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I don't have a question for Jan, but when you were talking about TMA, it struck me that the city of Cambridge should be part of the TMA because getting safe access from the Alewife T Station to Danehy Park I would think would be a high priority.

STEVEN WINTER: Well, in fact if I may, and I don't know if Karen Dumaine is still here, the TMA business model has previously been focussed exclusively on private sector partnerships and they're now seeing that public sector partnerships may be just as important because it is a fee for service and it should be paid by someone.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, but particularly given all the traffic in the area, the poor state of New Street even though there will be a new sidewalk on one side, we can't necessarily convince a 14-year-old that's the way he wants to go. So....

STEVEN WINTER: Yes, but,

Mr. Chair --

HUGH RUSSELL: -- having more options --

STEVEN WINTER: -- I don't want to seem lukewarm about the TMAs. I think they're wonderful ideas, and I think it's an investment that we can certainly afford to make.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I probably shouldn't have spoken.

Lee Farris is next. And after Lee,

Peggy Barnes Lenart.

LEE FARRIS: Hi, Lee Farris, 269 Norfolk Street. I just have a couple of quick comments. In a way it's been fortunate that the planning of this building has gone on for a while because I feel like the city is, according to what we heard tonight, starting to catch up on planning the street. However, I have to say that -- perhaps I'm naive, but I would like a situation when we're converting a street from these kinds of industrial/commercial uses to residential uses, that the city plan first and build the new street and then the developers come along and change or create the building that will fit the new street. And so I continue to have the feeling that we're doing this process kind of backwards from how it seems to me like it should be done. I would like

not to have to shoehorn sidewalks in on the park side so that the developer has more space on their side. That doesn't seem appropriate to me in terms of the use of my public land as a tax payer. So I can't imagine such an accommodation being made for a private homeowner when I consider the grief that I had to, you know, do a little dormer on my house. So you've heard that comment from folks before. But then lastly, two main points:

One, I really feel like it should be two buildings. And the fact that the developer would have to have two elevators, I think is a good thing because they're gonna have to maintain the elevators sometimes and if the elevator goes out, then all these people are gonna be out of luck. And what if there's a wheelchair person on the fourth

floor or something? And so I think the elevator is a good thing. And if they lose a few units because it's two buildings, again, that's not my primary concern. I'm concerned with getting something good built.

Lastly, I want to emphasize the 3-D model question and if nothing else, it could be virtual 3-D. My husband used to be an architect. He was doing things that looked like movies touring through spaces in the late nineties. We're not even seeing that here. Let's do better on that. At least get a -- something that takes you through as if you're walking along the street, something that shows you at, like, what would happen if you climbed up to the soccer field and what that would look like and the vista beyond. That's very doable.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Peggy Barnes Lenart. And after Peggy,
Allison Field-Juma.

PEGGY BARNES LENART: Hi. I live at 115 Fayerweather Street and I'll try and keep my comments short. Thank you.

Two basic themes: One is just speaking to this process, we're kind of planning ad hoc on the fly a very important area of Cambridge, it feels like to me. We've agreed that New Street has been outside the Concord/Alewife study area, and yet we're trying to move those guidelines from the Concord/Alewife study area to the street to see can we make it fit? And so the guidelines from that, the first one does say break up large blocks into smaller blocks of sizes similar to those in the surrounding Cambridge neighborhood to improve circulation neighborhoods. And I guess what we're saying here is we're creating, we're trying to create a neighborhood and it's a challenge because the shopping center ownership. I gather they own that part of the Alewife as well as across the street, I believe. I do remember they did a presentation in early --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: No.

PEGGY BARNES LENART: Is that not right? They don't own that part anymore?

Okay. I remember they had quite a big presentation.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Yes, at one point they did.

PEGGY BARNES LENART: Yes.

We have built, I gather, 2.1 million square feet of residential out in this area, and the goals are to involve a public process

in this. We have a study plan for a master plan in the future. There's a lot being built here on a future. There would be a future bike path, there will be a future bridge going on, street's going to be improved. And who's bearing those costs? And who is making the decisions that what's integrated in the greatest number of people? And so I'm just putting that out to you as a resident that this is an important piece of property, a lot of expense is being talked about to improve it, and who's bearing that cost? And do we have a process here, really that involves the stakeholders? And I do appreciate, I have to say I do appreciate that the Abodez invited us in last week to talk about it.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you.

STEVEN WINTER: Thank you, Peggy.

Can I also indicate that Peggy Barnes Lenart as opposed to Leonard?

PEGGY BARNES LENART: I'll answer to whatever. Thank you.

STEVEN WINTER: We like to get the names right.

HUGH RUSSELL: Next is Allison Field-Juma. And then after her, Andrea Wilder.

ALLISON FIELD-JUMA: Thank you.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment. My name is Allison Field-Juma

F-i-e-l-d-J-u-m-a. And I live at 363 Concord Ave., Cambridge. A couple of comments:

One is, I support certainly the letter by the Fresh Pond Residents Association.

They're very good points. I would just mention that I think looking forward, we

really need to think about access under the railroad tracks. It seems to make a lot of sense to have an underpass there behind the Apple but in front of Apple Cinema wherever It could be through the bike path, but that would create a tremendous connection between all the resources at Danehy Park, New Street, the people who are stranded on the other side in Rindge Towers and all the developments there and the T. So it's not part of this project. I would really like to see developers engaged in contributing, if it's through funds, they may contribute some kind of a mechanism to start to enable that sort of thing to happen. We've been talking about this for a very long time, and this one seems to keep falling off the map. So I like to mention that one.

And then something that I feel a little

stupid about, because I think I'm missing something, but maybe other people are also confused, about the vehicular capacity analysis that's on page 2 of the August 29th memo. It says that the Sozio Rotary operates at a level of service F. Then it says that there will continue to be no change in the level of service grades at the Sozio Rotary because it's an F and there's no letter after F? Is that my understanding?

HUGH RUSSELL: That's it, you got it.

ALISON FIELD-JUMA: And so it says here, concludes that 75 New Street TIS is not impacted by the addition of 88 CambridgePark Drive and Concord Ave. and Wheeler Street. The number of exceedances therefore remains at zero. Is that because you can't get worse than F? So maybe we should not stick with

this, if we're in high school with A through F and we could add G, H, I, something because it just seems that -- the assumption is that you can't make a bad situation worse. And I think that, I just don't understand how the traffic analysis can be done if it can't reflect a bad situation getting worse. So, that's -- thank you very much for listening to that one.

HUGH RUSSELL: I have Andrea Wilder.

And after Andrea, James Williamson.

ANDREA WILDER: I'm Andrea Wilder, W-i-l-d-e-r, 12 Arlington Street in Cambridge.

I wasn't planning to speak until I saw
the concept map and I'm not sure what page it
is shows New Street and the trees on each
side and bike path and so forth, but then I
read a narrative and tried to think about how

the concept and the narrative went together and they don't really. The concept, I believe, is put there to show dimensions rather than where say a bike path would be literally put. Because it says in the narrative, the section of sidewalk adjacent to Danehy Park would be constructed between the existing trees and the methane trench in the open space outside the fence. So this -that doesn't, is not reflected here in this concept map. And I was also curious, and maybe the slide could go up, the last one that I saw where people were talking about how it looked like a water color maybe, which shows the trees that are now on the Danehy side have been moved to come to the base of that kind of wall of -- well, it used to be trash, but now it's grass. And so that's a real confusion, too. So those are three

confusions as to those trees.

Now, I've walked by those trees, they are lush. They are lovely. The reason they're lush and lovely is because they are surrounded by a lot of grass. They're not surrounded by hardscape, it's softscape. need in Cambridge for our trees, I don't think anybody's going to like me to say this, but we need as much water as we can get because we're talking about clay soil which is almost impervious to water when it comes straight down, that's why we have brickworks -- we used to have brickworks in North Cambridge is clay soil. So those trees that look so lush are lush because there is enough open space around them to get the water in and hopefully not runoff. They're really lovely, and I really want to pay attention to how are they continued to be

placed. That picture really did show them as though they've been moved. If there's a bike path on the other side, I want it to be between the trees and Danehy Park. I want to be clear that there's really enough space for those trees to continue to thrive. The trees on the other side, I have to say that I fear for their life knowing what, knowing the size of the holes that the trees are planted in. I've said it before, I think here and that my friend who is the arborist in Concord calls those spaces tree coffins. Now, this is kind of accurate if you -- if anybody looks at the trees that are -- go down Mass. Ave., you can see the ones that thrive and the ones that are dead or they're cut off. And so, I think there needs to be something in the maintenance contract that says that these trees should be watered.

PAMELA WINTERS: Excuse me, Ma'am?

ANDREA WILDER: Yes.

PAMELA WINTERS: Your time is up.

If you could just --

ANDREA WILDER: Okay. I'll just take my last point then.

I certainly agree with having a model. I grew up with my mother landscape architect that knew blueprints, and I married an architect and I knew the models. Models are really essential for a project like this I believe.

Thank you very much.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

James. And after James, Micha Schattner.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you. James Williamson 1000 Jackson Place. I join others in being concerned about the seeming sort of

long wall and there's the colloguy back and forth about what it's actually going to look like, and obviously that seems to me it would be very important. It looks like one giant long warehouse building or not even as nice as a warehouse building, some kind of office It seems to me that a lot of, a building. lot more variety in the height and maybe even some sense of separation of pieces of building, including the possibility, and it was mentioned made of walking through the building and coming out through the other And it seems to me that maybe there's side. an opportunity to think about maybe three or four semblances of buildings with where you can actually walk through, the public could actually walk through, like you can do it in some buildings like the Burnes or the Manning in Central Square. Okay, the Burnes is a

better example because there's building on both sides of where the public can actually walk through.

As far as the cost that was mentioned and alluded to in the letter from Jan

Devereux. I really get tired of hearing about the allegations about how much something is supposedly going to cost, but we never get to see the numbers. I think if you're gonna talk about cost, you have to show those numbers to the public and to the Planning Board and then we can have an honest, transparent discussion of what people claim. Otherwise, it should be ignored. I don't think it's fair.

The question about retail, I think
there's an opportunity because there's a lot
of recreation going on at Danehy Park. There
could actually could be retail that's

catering to the people engaged in recreation.

I like the idea about improving the opportunities for different kinds of recreation, which would improve that as a more diverse space. I was part of a whole group of people who were invited to try to stop them from putting plastic all over there, but the City Council, in their wisdom, I think approved that.

I was really impressed to see that
there's a capital management company with the
name Vast Capital Management. The Jefferson
Park piece to this is important to me because
I live there. I didn't know until the
Planning Board walk around, the walking tour,
that apparently the woman who was killed was
killed right in this area that's being
discussed about this dirt, kind of -- the
truth is people are going to continue to try

to go down the edge of that, the side there. They're not gonna walk over to where the traffic light is. So really something ought to be done there. But also something ought to be done to make it possible for people to get over without having to walk all the way over to Alewife Brook Parkway and over that bridge, which would help solve that problem because people could cross the Fitchburg Railroad line without having to do that.

And finally, the Pan Am, for those in the transportation field, Pan Am had a pretty bad reputation for track safety in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. And insofar as Pan Am are a factor in your deliberations, I would urge you to investigate and take that into consideration.

Thank you.

MICHA SCHATTNER: Micha Schattner,

Lexington Avenue.

Okay, my problem is -- starts with and ends with the property behind the building. The southern part of it is abutting the back parking lot, the northern parking lot of the garage, which is a pity. Because otherwise we could have moved the whole building about 10, 15 feet back on top of the, hopefully to be purchased railroad track. The reasons are then we could move the bike path to a much wider New Street. The railroad track route is really ugly to say the least. On one side you have the loading docks and parking -back parking lot of the shopping mall. The other side is the back side of some other utilities with their parking lot, and now the back side of those buildings with a loading So I prefer to see a bike path dock. developed along New Street which will also

add another dimension to its life rather than separated.

The problem is to come to terms with a garage, and as far as I know, they still want that, that property as is.

Part No. 2 is -- point No. 2 is the water table. It means that we have polluted soil, we can dig, we can do whatever we want. Water table there in this area averages three and a half feet. When you get close to the railroad tracks, it's even one foot below, and people from Jefferson Park can attest to this. Last month they had a nice flooding there.

The problem is, of course, you can try to clean the soil but there will be migration both lateral and vertical percolation of chemicals from underground with the water into the surface or close to the surface.

Point No. 3 is we have almost half an acre of free rooftop besides the cooling units and rooftop garden. Why not put solar panels there? At least it will supply the day and night, the 24 hours' day ventilation for the corridors and lighting that the corridors demand. Down below there's no lighting. There's 150 foot corridors. So why not use the rooftop for panels for solar panels?

And, well, obviously for DPW to talk. That's it. Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

Councillor.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: Thank you.

The question earlier was tax increment financing which has been a tool used for over

40 years throughout the country. And Massachusetts finally allowed it some years ago after many years not allowing it, and what it basically is, is any area that's subject to improvement, Alewife, Fresh Pond, one can focus all the increased taxes for public improvements in that area. So, one, if that -- in fact, I went to a conference on this and have proposed this to the manager for Alewife, what would happen is one could take out a bond based -- and that would be paid off by the increased taxes on this site or other sites under construction and it -the public improvement, the public infrastructure could be put into place. it would be phased because you don't -- you have to plan it out, but New Street could be done, parts of the Alewife quadrangle could be done. This is used very extensively out

west and is beginning to become more popular here. It's an amazing tool. The danger is that from a citywide planning point of view, you're already committing money in one district that if there's an emergency, you can't use that short term. But it's a wonderful tool.

In the old days if there was a danger and one needed a pedestrian way through a parking lot, you take an easement for the public benefit. In fact, the law allows us to do that now. And the danger is we did it in East Cambridge. I know I say a lot about East Cambridge riverfront, but that's how the whole park system was taken, that's how the roads were taken, and the danger is you get sued. And that is the fear at the shopping center. But there's no doubt in my mind that the public benefits are there.

The -- if you walk by the DCR bridge over the railroad tracks, you will notice by the Rindge Towers there is a ramp for pedestrians coming from that building. There are steps going up. All we're saying is the same thing should be on the other side. Now it's steeper, but DC -- the state built it as part of the bridge because it was requested. It didn't, it was not requested on the other side as best I can tell.

The public way presented tonight, I concur with the notion of making the sidewalks a little wider, I believe they were nine feet, Phil, on one of your drawings proposed with -- but we also in our discussion with the neighbors and the developer talked about lighting. That in fact the only new development on this stretch is the developers, and that the street lamps

could be the parkway street lamps so that it becomes more of a parkway connection between Fresh Pond Parkway and our park. And then as it continues with other development that could be added, too. At least in a PUD you can make that requirement. On the first building by Abodez, there are no utilities above grade. I believe I heard that they weren't there in the beginning, but half of the site that we're discussing tonight does have utilities above grade, and it would be a real shame to keep those lovely timbers and wires on half the site, and at least on this site it go below grade. Because the usual reason it doesn't happen or so you hear is well, yeah, but the connection to the individual buildings is so expensive it doesn't make sense. It's one building.

And then as succeeding people do it,

develop their sites, then the poles come down, further down.

The park, it just seems to me and, again, we talked with the developers about this, that the edge of the park, that no man's land that isn't used very much, maybe it's used as a mini dog park. I've heard rumors of that. That is critical to making this street feel like a neighborhood and that there should be in the planning a pre-primary playground there or some communal meeting place there and not just grass. And there is room -- it's thin but there is room to do that. And, again, who's going to benefit from that but the 30 percent families that are in the buildings that the developer is proposing.

It was mentioned on the silhouette, to me the bigger the building, the more

important the silhouette is because it isn't just individual objects that have some up and down, but in this building, and there is a playfulness as we understand from the architect that one and a half feet or so -but there's no question that the end pavilions made a great deal of sense. It took the sausage and added ketchup or mustard, at least in some places that added some joy to it. And it's expensive. no question. But one of the beauties of historic architecture was they did that automatically. We don't do that. It's the modernist movement. There's no reason for it, don't do it. The reason is joy. reason is it's a Special Permit.

Models were talked about and others, neighbors and the Board talked about context and character, and I agree with Lee Farris,

if a real good walkthrough software is wonderful because you can get views from different points, but there's still nothing like a model that you can decide what view you want, and we're talking about a 95 or so unit building here. This isn't small change. This is big business.

And finally, the notion of the guidelines in breaking up the massing, I would love it, believe it or not, we need to hear from you to say this should be in Zoning. I wish I could tell you that the Council will tell you it should be in Zoning, but I know you got a letter recently. And you are the experts, according to the Council, so it has to come from you. There's no doubt in my mind that what makes -- if you look at our neighborhoods, even where there are -- this is my last comment, even where

there are big brick buildings, the brick buildings are 100 feet by 100 feet. I'm thinking of Garfield Street. Beautiful street and yet there's a brick building, not the Arlington pillbox at the end, but the older one, 1920, there isn't much going on, but there's enough going on. And the size makes a difference.

Now, this, the developer made a case with us that this is the Zoning, this is what they're submitting and actually I think they're right, sadly. But the next project isn't far away. So I hope recommendations will come out of this, and thank you for your time.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?
Charles.

CHARLES TEAGUE: Thank you. Charles

Teague, 23 Edmunds Street. I wanted to say how much I agree with the gentleman from Lexington Ave. talking about waiting to acquire the land that was proposed for bike path and putting the bike path on New Street. I tried to express that a long time ago. did a much better job than me. But it really goes back to the fact that we don't have anything in plan view of New Street. We have these cross-sections from DPW. And after all these months we don't have a plan view. And so I would actually like everybody to look at the back page of the CDD handout and which I was really -- the reason why I'm talking is because I looked, I read the, I read the memo here, and they're discussing all the methane and we're discussing methane down here and down the lower right at Briston Arms. We're discussing methane underneath the existing

building at 87 New Street where they had to take special action. And then we have these stars here along New Street and that's all methane. And then -- we can see, now look at the two soccer fields to the left, and of the two soccer fields, you can see the fence line. And if you go there, you'd see that the methane trench is protected because the soccer fields are up on the berm and then they put the fence. And the lawn outside, that's not, quote, park land. Is -- it's outside the fence because the fence is keeping you out from the methane trench. And I hadn't appreciated that after all these There's a lot of gas coming out of years. this. And I don't know what else. So, that is, that's -- the concept of moving the sidewalk and the people and frolicking at the methane trench seems a poor idea. And so

really, I would like some second thoughts on that. But, but to move on it's like, just to -- this is just a really -- this building is just so expensive for lots of people, and it's to transform what Phil Terzis said, an unbuildable lot into a really big building. And so let's just quickly review this, is we're going to take taxpayer money, build a street. We're going to -- down at New Street for this first phase at the corner of Alewife Parkway, there's some sort of mechanical object there where the sidewalk should be, that's got to move at our expense. We're going to take public parking. We're going to take some parkland. That's what the people are putting in. And then we're going to -then for this sort of the glass half full, I would say the glass is like one quarter full from getting out to the proposed bike path

because you're gonna have to take land from the body shop. But the body shop has to cleanup its act.

Now the shopping center has to, like, give up land for sidewalks. And there was a proposal on one of the Council proposed in order to pay for the stairs. And, you know, it's just a -- it's everybody's contributing, and then there's no screening. At the end of the day what this is all about is the rear setback. And that's the key special permit and that's what Phil said a long time ago. Because this is industrial, you get to build up to the lot line in the front. But the back it's, it's a massive setback because of the height of the building and each (inaudible). Right?

PAMELA WINTERS: If you could wind up your comments, sir.

CHARLES TEAGUE: Yep.

So everything could be fixed if this is a smaller building. You make the building single loaded corridor, a lot thinner, it will fit in. And so a smaller building solves it.

And then the last thing on the building on Concord and wheeler, I don't know whether you've seen it, but there's a lot of warts on that building because they didn't pipe all the duct, all the exhaust from the individual units. They put them individually out the sides of the building. I'd like that not to happen here.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Yes, sir.

GREGORY ROCKLAND: I'm Gregory
Rockland, 22 Hutchinson Street. I'd like to

talk a little bit about right -- this piece of a building that was brought in. we need to think a little bit about history And most of the residential residences in North Cambridge are over 100 years old and they're wood frame and when they were built, no one ever thought that these things would still be there, but they are and they're -having to be constantly maintained. About the same time that kind of development's going on and there was some substantial apartment buildings being built in Cambridge with substantial materials, masonry, stone, and that sort of tradition was continued in Cambridge up until about ten years ago. then with changes in wood technology and changes in the Building Code and changes requiring sprinklers, now we're looking at a massive wood frame building built with wood

frame technology and wood frame finishes.

And obviously there's a big issue about first cost and certainly architects are sensitive to that as a developer. But what you see there today will not be there 30 years from now. That's gonna have to be all redone.

Now, I have an architectural practice where it's fine, because a great deal of what we do is repairing this stuff. And we work with buildings that are 25 to 30 years old, and a lot of the work we do is basically "I don't believe they did that." And "How are we gonna fix this?" We have to totally rebuild it. And this is something that we're seeing with these developments, these massive wood frame buildings, which we don't have a lot of experience with. This is new. is a technology that we haven't seen before, and I think it's something we really want to

think about, whether this is really what we want to add to our historic housing inventory.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair. I'd like to if I could, I'd like to simply note that City Councillor Marc McGovern sent us -- forwarded a letter and it was a very good letter and a very -- it had terrific points. He agrees that the size of the building is an issue.

He agrees that New Street is -- needs a hard look.

He agrees that the building materials need to be of the highest quality and most aesthetically pleasing.

And he also brings up that the soil and

the clean-up is an important part of what we're doing here. And -- but I also want to note that this was a very interesting and well received letter on my part because Councillor McGovern is bringing his perspective in. He's asking us to be thoughtful in applying Special Permit criteria.

He's asking us to have stewardship for the city as he does. And this to me is a good model of how to hold the dialogue with the municipal board, is he's very respectful, he's very firm, he makes good points, and I think we're taking a hard look at it. It's a much more effective approach to opening a dialogue than I have seen recently from some who have appeared here using tactical maneuvers that involved aggression and inflammatory language as a longer term

strategy. This is very important to me, and I think, I hope, it's posted and that everyone can take a look at it.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: I know there may well be copies back on the shelf.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I see no one.

So, Colleagues, what more do we need to be done before we can -- so we have what we need to deliberate this? I think, as I understand, the staff has communication with proponent about more information they want.

Is that generally around the physical appearance of the building?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Yes, and more detailed elevations and floor plans to be consistent with what we've seen with the new

changes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I think a critical moment in the hearing tonight was the back and forth and, you know, I really appreciated the professionalism on the architect's part to say, you know, what, my revit model is not serving me well right now because this elevation doesn't look the way it appears. And I appreciate the predicament he's in, but at the same time there's some ambiguity about what it is that we're looking at. And given how carefully we've worked on this, it gives me some pause about my ability to kind of, to submit the final decision given that I'm not -- I'm a trained architect, not exactly clear about how this building meets the sky and that's a really, really, really important element here. So that's what's going on in

my head right now.

A lot of other questions have been put to rest; environmental questions, etcetera, but that one's still hanging in the air. And so I think it's consistent with what city staff is looking for, is some more careful representations.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to first ask I guess the Board Members if should we continue with our comments or do you want to take a break or --

HUGH RUSSELL: I would like to -- we want more and then we'll take a break and then we'll go on to the eight o'clock hearing.

AHMED NUR: Well, with that, can we start from this end of the table and maybe go that way?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I'm calling on

you.

AHMED NUR: Thank you.

I do want to overshadow what's been said that I share the same view with the massing of the building.

Thomas had asked the proponent what would be the impediment of dividing the building and the elevator, the cost of the elevator, rather, or the security, the access control of the building seem to be the top, so.... And also the FAR. And I'm -- like to ask the staff, you know, I'd be more than happy to negotiate an FAR increase on the division of the building. I think that it is huge, it's massive. And also along those same lines I share that the quality of the building, wood buildings, wooden houses have been built across from me ten years ago and they had to replace almost 50 percent of the

exterior already. It was rotted by water.

And I don't think it's gonna last. And so,
that's got to be in the Zoning. It's not
here.

I also wanted to touch on the retail.

And I do think that there are certain retail that that space can use such as during the long winters all the people that normally use, you know, soccer or not, there could be a gym, they could be a place where they repair bicycles if there's a bike route there. And there could be a coffee shop other than -- I think there's Panera on the other side. But I think there's an option for retail that's not in that mall.

I do share Councillor Carlone's view of the in-ground cables. I think that as we go forward and the environment gets worse, that we should bury all the cables in ground as opposed to leaving these dangerous overhead powers hanging on the top of poles.

And the last is the access over the railroads by the cinema. You know, that came over several times and I don't know whether the city can take a lead in this or the developers, but I think that that would -- that's been asked. And those are all of my points.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do you have more you want to say, Tom?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes, just quickly.

And so I did appreciate the correspondence of just taking the points in the letter from the local community group. I've spoken already about the variations in the facade that we'd like to get into potentially with more detail. I do believe it is a transit-oriented site. The earlier package

said that it was less than a mile and a half.

I appreciate all the details and the

difficulty of how one traverses from this

site to the T.

Unfortunately most of those solutions are not on this proponent's property, and so we have to figure out how we stay on top of that. But I do believe it firmly to be a transit-oriented site.

I'm reassured on point 3, which is about New Street, great progress that's been made, that street is going to get reconstructed. It's in the budget and it's going to support some form of the element here we hope.

I think we -- and on point 4 we would make it a condition and we actually heard testimony about the LSP which is reassuring.

We'll make it a condition should we grant the

Special Permit with that follow through.

And I think also 0.5 could be dealt with with a condition which is the acoustics at the site. It looks like there's great progress there.

The shortcut, that's a difficult one.

And I think I agree with my fellow Board

Member, it's a glass half full. Let's get

started there and I appreciate that, let's

memorialize that with a condition.

The Pan American Railway issue, I think that's not -- that's a City Council issue to deal with -- they're talking about a negotiation across another property at North Point, but that doesn't get dealt with here. Although we can suggest that it may be something that should be explored.

The loading dock, it's not required under the Zoning Ordinance to have a loading

dock in a multi-family house, a multi-family building, and I believe that they have dealt with this responsibly and there's testimony on the record. So I really appreciate the letter and it's going to be very, very helpful in framing our condition.

The view Jan's points of view about the mechanicals from the park, that's resonated with me, too. That is a perspective with -- of my fellow citizens will see often. So I'd like to have that addressed.

A model? Yes, that would be huge. A quarter-inch would be good but.... a full model, something, some kind of model would be good.

STEVEN WINTER: Thank you,

Mr. Chair. I concur with the comments of my

colleagues, and I would only wish to add that

I think that linking the TMA activity that's

happening in Alewife linking New Street on this part of the town is critical, critically important. And I think the sooner we start doing that, the better we are. And I would hope that CDD staff would facilitate the conditions with the proper transportation planners and also with the policy makers for the city to see if we, in fact, can find money for this which I think is imperative. I, you know, I think that if, if breaking up the building cannot really be done, and I'm not sure that that's true, but if breaking it up cannot really be done, then I think we need to design, we need to design with excellence to make it look like it's broken And I don't think that we're there yet. up. I -- the memo from staff was an outstanding memo and has a lot of information for the Board and the proponent and the citizens and

I think we need to pay close attention to that.

And the comment breaking up large buildings in small pieces for pedestrian circulation is a very important point. We're talking about what is the pedestrian experience? Where do we feel as humans what this environment, and I think that's, I think that's a very important piece.

And this was a confusing presentation for me and I -- I'm still confused and I'd like to think of myself as reasonably bright, but I can't get my head around a lot of this, this building right now.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Just a query, and it's around the appearance and the design?

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Or does it go beyond

that?

STEVEN WINTER: It's appearance and the design. What is the pedestrian feel?

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I concur with a lot of everything my colleagues have Although I have -- I bemoan the loss of wood buildings in Harvard Square and other places in Cambridge, and since I replaced the aluminum siding on my house with wood, I'm not opposed to wood and wood technology and I don't know that bricking up everything or using masonry everywhere is the best thing. I would like to know, you know, from my colleagues or perhaps from staff what they think of this proposed technology and, you know, how long it might last?

I'm also not convinced that breaking up the building is the best way to go, but I'm

certainly willing to consider it and would like to know from staff and from the proponent what improvement might come from breaking it up, what the pros and cons of it are.

At the moment having walkthroughs in this building is going to put you at an auto body shop property and a chain link fence and the railroad, so, you know, if some time point in the future it is a bike path, maybe it would be a good thing, but right now I don't know what benefit it would have, although to pedestrians, it may have a benefit to people on the street looking at the building and experiencing the building. I agree that the -- how the building looks from Danehy Park is very significant because I think that's where most people are going to experience the building. I don't think

they're going to be a lot of pedestrians on I walked it all yesterday. the street. was the only pedestrian, but there are cars zooming back and forth. The only pedestrians I saw were kids going up the side of the bank to get to the T station, and that's indeed a path I've used in the past because people aren't going to walk all the way down to the entrance to the shopping center and then walk all the way back. So I think that really has to be determined, you know, what the city can do, what we ought to ask the state to do and what we ask DCR to do. And in that context maybe, you know, can we consider seeking some payment from the developer in order to use to deal with the private property owner who owns the parking lot or maybe with the state to get some of the things we want done.

I do think it's a transit-oriented

project. I'm, you know, not particularly concerned about the added traffic issues. You know, I've read the traffic reports and yes, F is as bad as you can go. It's not going to get, you know, you can't consider it worse because you can't go any worse. But I think based on the traffic report and the concept that you're going to add maybe one car every two minutes at peak hour is not something that I'm particularly concerned I am more concerned about, you know, about. the bikes and the cars and the pedestrians on New Street and what we can do to improve that.

Definitely I want more detail about what this building is going to look like and its context in this neighborhood, and whether that's through a model or through a video presentation or through a lot more

elevations, we just do need that because I agree with everyone else, I'm not an architect and it's difficult for me to visualize what this is actually going to look like.

And the last thing is I am concerned about the issue of people who are living on I guess the north side of the building who are abutting the auto body shop, and I think it is necessary for the proponent to look into that to see, you know, what type of fumes and materials are coming from the auto body shop and whether that is something that needs to be addressed. As I said, we addressed it previously with windows that were fixed and that's not necessarily the solution here, but I want to know is there a problem? And if so, what is the solution to it?

HUGH RUSSELL: You guys don't leave

a lot to be talked about so, just some idol thoughts here.

Look at the parapet heights vis-a-vis concealing the forest of condensers from Danehy Park. There's some -- you can figure out the site lines. That's the only place they'll be visible from except from the new buildings and that will get built eventually across the street.

I prefer -- in all perspectives, I prefer making a computer model and pulling out perspectives from realistic points of view. I, you know, got my way through the school of design building beautiful models but you can't -- you know, you can't really get your eye down in the model. Models are great things. I wouldn't object if a model was built, but I still want to see those perspectives from the street level.

I think we need to have a recommendation of what you're going to do about what you learned about the acoustic report before we sign off on this project.

I was faced 13 years ago when I was designing a big building, it was about the length of this building, although we folded it in part to make it seem less, and it was sticking up above the strip mall parking lot it was being built in, was built in. And I realized that the skyline was the critical element of this building because, you know, it was what you were going to see. And it was a modular building. It was made out of block and plank. It's just as these buildings are made out of wood modules, you start building module and building, and you have to break the module and you have to be very smart about how you do it.

So what we did was we knocked the living room off on each corner of the very top floor and those became different kinds of apartments. They also became terraces which were way oversized, but it was a big building and we needed to make that big a gesture. Next to it we pushed back the facade about six feet again to get some level. Because when you look, when you push a piece of the facade back that much and you're looking at it from below, it looks like it's doing this. Where, in fact, it's doing that. But it's the appearance that you want. We did it by converting one-bedroom apartments to studio apartments. And, you know, so they were six feet shallower. There are the things you can do, and I think not enough of them have been done here. I don't believe you have the right to max out on every single limit in the Zoning Ordinance. If you can't make -- if you can't meet all of the standards, then you may have to give up some units, do something else. You know, it's not -- you're not entitled first to the size of the number of units and then try to accomplish everything else. You have to do it all. And if you have to lose units to do that, you don't have to lose very many to make some pretty big moves. So I think that's all I'm going to say.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

I just have a few comments.

Ted, you sort of described the traffic situation pretty well, but I still would like to hear a little bit more about the, you know, level F and so forth and how that gets, you know, what happens there. I'm just a little bit confused about that.

I like --

HUGH RUSSELL: That's something we might want to ask the Traffic Department to follow up on a memo on.

PAMELA WINTERS: Yes.

I liked Councillor Carlone's suggestions about the lamps along the street making sort of a boulevard there. I thought that was a good suggestion. And I liked the idea of the poles, you know, taking the wires down and taking away the poles. I live in Orchard Street, North Cambridge, we have a beautiful street and the poles are so disgusting and so ugly with the wires sort of draping down and it's just, it takes away from the ambience of the street which is sort of an historic street. Our front neighbor applied for a permit, they had to redo their front porch, and the electric company's wires were so close to the house that they couldn't get their permit. So now they have to do all of this stuff to get the permit and it's just -- it's just incredibly ugly to see these wires going across the street. And so I appreciate your considering that.

The -- in terms of the model versus the computer video, perhaps we could even do both. I agree, Hugh, you took the words right out of my mouth, you don't -- the model is great but the -- some sort of a video would give you a real feeling of what this building is going to be like, you know, walking along it from the street, what the pedestrian is going to feel as they walk along the street. I think I'm sort of taking that idea from my former colleague Bill Tibbs, he used to always mention that.

And in terms of wood, our house was

built in 1846 out of wood, it's still there.

A lot of the houses, in fact, the three
oldest houses on our street were built in
1846 and they're still there. I kind of like
wood.

And in terms of the building itself, I'm not an architect but just looking at it aesthetically, to me, it seems a little bit too long. I just would like to see it broken up in some way or something done to it. And, again, I'm not an architect, but just aesthetically, I mean, I'm a painter so I know when something doesn't look great, but I can't offer any suggestions as to how that can be done. I'm looking to my other architect, the other architects on the Board to help me with that. So those are my only comments.

STEVEN COHEN: I started with a

couple of fundamental concerns with the project. One of them was New Street. The condition of New Street. It sounds like that's going to be addressed this year or next year, and I really want to point out that it was as a result of the Planning Board process and the public input that this process elicited, I think, that prompted the city and the DPW to address New Street. So I think that's something really good that's come out of this process.

Everybody has expressed the desire for models. Yeah, I do think we should have a model here, and it should show the surrounding buildings as well. And, yeah, I think software could be good, too, with sketch up on one of the modules. The sketch up and you can actually create a walk-by and you can look at it from different

perspectives. Both great tools. However, it is a shame, and I think it's wrong for this to arise so late in the process. And for this I have to address the staff. Please, for buildings of this scale, you know, it should be one of the requirements for an application, you know, that we have a model right from Day 1. This is the fourth building that comes to mind just in the last year that's been a fairly large building where people didn't fully understand what it would look like or they felt that it might be too long, maybe it should be broken up. And every time we have the same discussion and every time we say maybe we should have a model and sometimes we get it. It should be a fundamental element of the application on Day 1 to see a model and/or perhaps a really good video through sketch-up or something,

you know.

And, Hugh, I'm not suggesting that there shouldn't be perspective drawing as well. Of course the same software can generate the perspectives, but, you know, movies in addition to the still lifes I think would help a whole lot.

This is the fourth project that I can think of this year where there's been some concern that the building was too long, should we break it up. And I'm really interested in Dennis Carlone's notion that maybe this is something that should be addressed in the Zoning, but maybe not in the Zoning. Maybe it's simply a matter of this Board in connection with Community Development, you know, to establish some policies and some preferences and concerns so that applicants are at least on notice right

from Day 1, you know, that this is a concern that we may well bring up. And if we do have that concern, I think it should be brought up real early in the process and not late in the process that perhaps this building is too long.

And, Steve, when you say that breaking up this building maybe cannot be done. Well, of course it can be done. Of course it can be done. And of course I believe that we have the right to require that it be done. You know, whether that's the appropriate step and a reasonable step for us to take or for us to require, that's a separate question and that's a difficult question because we do want to be reasonable. And I think it's especially difficult in a location like this where there really isn't an existing pattern of development. But even here I think it's a difficult question. But do we have the power? Can it be done? Absolutely. Would it mean increased construction costs? Additional units? Lost units? Probably. And as a developer, I'm pretty sensitive to those things. As a member of the Planning Board, I'm not so sensitive to those things. You know, that's, that's not our concern really. Our concern is to facilitate either construction with the best possible, you know, project on the site. I agree entirely with the Chair on that point. The fact that there may be a permissible FAR or a permissible number of units, it doesn't mean that every applicant is entitled to that FAR and to those number of units on every site. So I wish that in fact whether it be a Zoning proposal or some sort of serious dialogue with our staff and us, that we would somehow

generate a policy, an approach to this problem of these long buildings.

Next thing, on this particular building, you know, when I look at it, yes, do I wish it were broken up? Yes, sure. You know, if I had my druthers, if we were on Day 1 of this conversation, I'd say yeah, I prefer that. Is it appropriate at this late date? You know, I'm not sure. But I sure wish, and the way that you sort of phrased it, Hugh, earlier, you know, could it be designed so that it looked like multiple buildings? Well, you know, that's second best, and maybe in some instances it's even better. But it's certainly better than the long, you know, your building that is unbroken up. Not articulated well. So is this building well articulated? Well, you know, we saw a detail of the elevation in the middle part, and there it was really well articulated, and it was a 30-foot set back and so forth. I mean, that was nice. But that was about 20 percent of the building. On either side of it was a fairly long, you know, relentless section of building. was a small setback in either side. But I mean if I read it correctly and understand it correctly, that little break in the facade was only six inches. I don't think that's enough to do what you want to do to sort of break up the massing of that building. And then when you point out the importance of the skyline, boy absolutely. I mentioned that earlier. I think it's absolutely essential in this building that we create some variation in the heights, or at least a variation in the perception, you know, of the heights. And, gosh, there's lots of tools

that you can do.

You mentioned a really interesting one that I haven't thought of, but there's a lot of different ways that can, that can be achieved, and certainly one of them using those trellises that I certainly miss at the two ends, and then in the middle, even if you don't get the deck, you know, I'd like to see the trellis there. But I think actual variation in height in addition to tricks to effect our perception would be welcome there as well.

I think that's really it for me. You know, there are a lot of small subsidiary issues and I consider them to be peripheral issues for me. The biggest issue with the building is the facade, the length of it which I think is kind of overpowering. I think the model will reveal it. But unless

my eye is really deceiving me, I think this length is pretty intense and well as I say it would be nice to break up the building. You know, I don't know where the rest of my colleagues feel about that, but in the absence of breaking up the building, I really like to see some work in further articulating the facade and further creating interest and diversity in the parapet.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. That's our charge.

LIZA PADEN: There's one other issue that this permit has been extended to September 30th. And so if you're not making a decision tonight, then we need to ask for an extension.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Sure.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. And --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Do you

want to suggest a date?

LIZA PADEN: Do I want to suggest a date?

HUGH RUSSELL: 60 days.

LIZA PADEN: 60 days?

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Sure, whatever.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I would not hope that -- I wouldn't hope that we don't wait 60 days for the next discussion.

LIZA PADEN: No.

JEFF ROBERTS: I think that what we would, as Brian was mentioning at the beginning, is a 60-day extension probably makes sense at this stage and we would continue to work with the proponent to make sure that all the materials are provided.

And when we feel confident that those

materials are in good shape, we would schedule the continued hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So we need to take a vote on it. We have a written request.

LIZA PADEN: Yes, sir.

HUGH RUSSELL: So all those in favor of a 60-day extension.

(Raising hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in favor for the extension.

And, Mr. Rafferty, I have a question:

Is this the longest deliberation that we ever spent on a case and we got canceled once because of snow here. We got canceled once because of snow in Chicago.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: I was thinking with the 60-day extension we'll celebrate a one year anniversary of the

filing which I have never experienced. But I got another one that's driving this so I wouldn't want to --

HUGH RUSSELL: We need to take the time to get it right.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: Agreed.

PHIL TERZIS: Hopefully we can do it next hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Thank you very much. We're going to take a break.

(A short recess was taken.)

agenda the City Council petition to amend the Zoning Map of the City of Cambridge by creating the Cambridge Highlands Overlay area of the city. I don't have to remind my colleagues that this is an area that we've reviewed and the petition has been gradually has become modified. Our recommendations

have been accepted and there's an additional little piece that the Council and the neighborhood feel are important. So it's mostly familiar. So is somebody going to present it?

JEFF ROBERTS: I can do that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Please.

JEFF ROBERTS: Jeff Roberts,

Community Development.

Just to bring the Board Members back up to speed quickly on this:

There was a petition filed back early in the year called the -- it was called the Chun Petition at the time. It was signed on by a group of neighbors in the Cambridge Highlands neighborhood and the proposal was, there was concern about townhouse development, on developments that occurred in the past, and sites that might be redeveloped

for townhouses in the future. The neighbors filed a petition to rezone the area from Residence B which it currently is to Residence A-2 that had hearings at the Planning Board and the Council and was re-filed a couple of times.

The general sense was that the change to Residence A-2, while it would prohibit townhouse development, it would be a relatively drastic change because it would make several lots non-conforming. It would make many lots non-conforming in the area. The A-2 is only allowed a single-family development. So some alternative recommendations were put forward, discussed at the Planning Board. One was to require Special Permits for projects that are more than two units that where there would be more than two units on a lot.

Another suggestion was to change the lot area per dwelling unit so that on lots that are larger than 5,000 square feet, the overall, the total number of units would be reduced in some cases. And ultimately it was that the Planning Board recommended moving forward with the Special Permit requirement. The Planning Board didn't necessarily recommend reducing a lot area per dwelling unit, but the Council chose to adopt that into its re-filed petition. So this is a new version of the petition. It is -- it creates a Cambridge Highlands Overlay District which you should have a map of, as well as it's coterminous to what is now the Residence B It will be defined on the Zoning District. Map and it would be, there would be text included which says that the overlay requirement -- the overlay requirements

modify the Residence B requirements except in places where it's specifically modified the Residence B Zoning would continue to apply. So all the FAR and other requirements would continue to apply. And the changes are the lot area per dwelling unit, which for lots -it continues to be two units for the first 5,000 square feet of lot area. Now under the proposal to get a third unit, you would need 5,000 square feet of lot area. In other current Residence B Zoning you only need 4,000 square feet of lot area. And in the background materials in your package is a little chart that says, you know, how many square feet you need to get to each new dwelling unit.

And then the second piece of the proposed text says that a Special Permit would be required by the Planning Board for

projects resulting in a total of three or more units on a lot that is wholly or partially within the Cambridge Highlands

Overlay District. That is important because there are some lots that are split between the Overlay District and others.

And the Planning Board would use the procedure for townhouse and multi-family review, which has a set of criteria mostly dealing with the site plan and landscaping how and just how the site design fits within the overall surrounding area. So I am happy to answer any questions, and the Planning Board can consider taking the recommendations they made before which is essentially on this proposal or to -- or to reconsider any part of that.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair? I'd like to say that I think that the petition as it

is now represents the best thinking of the Council and the Planning Board and the community, and I just wanted to say that I think it's where it ought to be. I like where it is now.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. Should we hold the public hearing portion of this meeting?

STEVEN WINTER: Sure.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes.

speak?

LIZA PADEN: Nobody signed up.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does anyone wish to

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm sorry?

HUGH RUSSELL: Please come forward and give your name and address. Please spell your name for the recorder, and our timekeeper will let you know when your time expires.

PATRICIA AMOROSO: Good evening. My name is Patricia Amoroso and I reside at 40 Loomis Street, and I agree, thank you for all the considerations. It's been a process learning. And I think that this is the best scenario for the neighborhood in preserving its integrity and moving forward with developers and readdressing things as things come up. But I think that -- I speak, you know, for myself and John Chun that we were happy with this proposal.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: I see no one.

Steve, would you like to make a motion?

STEVEN WINTER: I move that the
Planning Board approve the petition as it's
come back to us in this version and I think

that's all I need to say.

HUGH RUSSELL: I recommend to the

Council that they adopt it as submitted.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes, indeed.

STEVEN COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Any discussion on the

motion?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in favor.

Speaking of records, well, it's how many years has this been in discussion?

Since nobody is here for East Street, we can go home.

The Board is going to try to discuss

1-5 East Street, the Major Amendment PUD

Special Permit No. 175 and also consider a

project Special Permit.

I just have a comment that the Major Amendment is a two step process. What we do tonight is we identify, first, we generally approve the concept and then additional work that has to be made based on what's been submitted. I don't think it's ready for a full project review Special Permit. And I think we would basically, you know, we could make comments about any aspect of the design that we want people to work on, but I think until that's done, it's gone through the next player of the design and gone through the department that so we would probably discuss that at the second hearing.

Are you ready to go?

RICHARD McKINNON: We can do it very quickly. I know the hour is late.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. McKinnon, we

want to move just as how we need to move in order to make a good decision. So don't worry about that.

RICHARD McKINNON: We've got a good presentation.

STEVEN GORNING: Well, good evening.

Good late evening to everyone. I know it's been a long night so far. Just to reintroduce myself since it's been almost two months now. Steve Gorning, development manager with Avalon Bay.

We've got the whole team here: Michael Roberts, VP vice president of development for Avalon Bay, Kevin Renna from Goulston and Storrs. And of course our development consultant Rich McKinnon. And our design team from CUBE 3 Studio headed up by Brian O'Connor.

We're here tonight to discuss our Major

Amendment request for North Point II parcel which was driven by the reduction of height and the reduction in total unit count in parking as we presented a couple months ago.

Over the past couple of months we've spent several meetings, meeting with the CDD staff and well as the East Cambridge Planning Team to present our proposal and get feedback from them. I think it's been, you know, a truly collaborative process. We've gotten some great feedback, and we've incorporated it already. And I think we've got a good working relationship with the city and the staff so far.

And, you know, this is just site location. And I think everybody probably knows where the North Point area is now. And just as a brief refresher, we've got the existing North Point Tower that we picked up

from Archstone, the Maple Leaf building we just completed. And then the red outline there is the Phase II site that we're talking about tonight.

This is just, you know, an overview of the entire North Point District. Just a, you know, to highlight the fact that we, you know, this is just the beginning of the entire build out.

And then, you know, the feedback that we've gotten and what we've kind of worked on, we really wanted to maintain a lot of the public realm that were already in the project and I think we really worked over the past, you know, couple months to enhance the stuff that's already there. Primarily the Glassworks Avenue frontage really making a greater residential feel along the street and then just more gracious connections; the

green area, the parks, and the public spaces.

And one thing that Brian will point out in a minute is just the, you know, the main archway pass through.

So with that I'm going to go ahead and hand it over to Brian and he can go over more of the details on the details.

BRIAN O'CONNOR: Mr. Chairman,
Members of the Board, I'm Brian O'Connor from
CUBE3 Studio. What I'd like to do is just
take you fairly quickly through a little bit
of our design thought process. And I'm going
to start with the building form and shape as
it is, and then we'll get to design. I think
as Steve said, maintaining the, you know, the
really four or five key elements of the prior
design and the prior set of approvals that
were really important to us. So we did spend
a lot of time thinking about Amelia Earhart

Park and how to make that connection up to the front space, how to create, you know, a building that feels of this place, and we'll kind of dive in a little bit here. I'm going to explain how the building lays out. There are a lot -- there's a lot going on here so I'll just walk you through it a piece at a Our main building entry is over on the time. right-hand side, right here, off of Leighton Street, fairly directly opposite the entrance to the existing North Point building that's The prime clubhouse space located there. sort of amenity space for the residents is here, and bleeding over and occupying that corner so we can keep a real active frontage at Glassworks and One Leighton. Really. building on, you know, the great, you know, there's a playground here and sort of some nice frontage over on Two Earhart, you know,

the new entry over on that side and really thinking about how to make that corner work.

One of the most important pieces of this building and the overall plan is really thinking about how this connection works. mean, we've talked about the arch extensively internally with Community Development, with yourselves a little bit the last time we were here, and I think we've really refined what we're trying to do with that arch. But the most important piece is allowing this connection to really serve as a front door to the rest of the future development over on the North Point area creating a strong connection to the multi-use pathway, allowing direct residential access on to that pathway, so that the building has a continuation at the ground floor focusing on, you know, we have about 2500 square feet of retail on

those west sides of the plan abutting the head house for the new train station. really thinking about how this building looks from here, how public access is achieved here, primary residential entry to the building here adjacent to the station, and working with GLX and the station design that's ongoing to make sure that this whole landscape and sort of public realm experience, you know, works seamlessly here, connects strongly to the multi-use path, and allows a front door connection through that archway and back into the rest of North Point.

A few other quick highlights: There is another entry to the club and the amenity space for residence here. Entry to parking, which is all below grade happens from Glassworks Ave. over on the other side and

then we do have service and loading also in this area.

In addition to sort of thinking about the importance of these spaces as public spaces, we really wanted to treat the North Point Plaza over here and really find a way to compliment and reinforce what's happening there so that Leighton Street really becomes a very active street front, and it has a plaza on either side that really feels like it starts to engage from across the street. In addition to that, you know, one of the real key things for us as the building started to evolve is to think about how residents both access and use this path, access and use Glassworks Ave. and have some sort of a connection here. So we're working The landscaping is fairly early right hard. now. So we don't have a lot of detailed

landscape plans. The goal is to develop and really define very clearly the public and private spaces and think about how they really work together so that we can get direct access resident stoops on Monsignor O'Brien Highway in addition to the stoops that we're proposing sort of all along the back edge of the project on Glassworks Ave. We think there's a great opportunity to really take what's happening at One Earhart, you know, where we have these direct front doors, stairs up, you know, the landscaping's is a little overgrown in these images, but the idea is to take what's there, build on it, reinforce it, and if anything make this whole street edge better.

So here's just a very quick working perspective, but, you know, you could see the passthrough coming through here which we'll

talk about in a little bit more detail, dumping onto Glassworks. And then, you know, we're really working hard on what that experience is on the stoop on Glassworks, you know, stairs as well as seating areas, integrated planters, and, you know, railings that are in small sections that are digestible and visible. Direct access, front doors. Overhangs that really come down and address the street at a more pedestrian scale to really just thinking about how the sidewalk on the south side of Glassworks really, you know, becomes even more exciting and more interesting than what we already have over at One Earhart, and I think we have a great opportunity to reinforce that.

Typical, this is the ground floor building. Again, you can see the 2,000 to 2,500 square foot retail space over here.

We're currently at 266 units. There's a fairly, you know, healthy mix of a significant number of one beds, two beds, and then 41 studios along with the 12, The goal here is to three-bedroom units. really make sure that, you know, we're providing a variety of unit types at these active stoop faces. At the ground floor, we're creating rich, you know, landscape spaces at those stoops, reinforcing the key paths, this network. And then really anything about, you know, how this functions, how it addresses the street edge, how it addresses the park.

A typical floor on the building stacks fairly cleanly as it goes up through here, again, you can see here the mix of one, two, three, and studio units.

On the sixth floor we're proposing a

reduction over at the end of the building here to allow the mass and the volume of the building to step down as it gets towards East Street and Glassworks Ave. We'd like to do a green roof over on that edge to really sort of reinforce the scale and the mass of the building rising up to the east from the west and really think about how we can create an interesting space there that will reinforce both the connection to the rail and the retail and really just try to figure out how to make it a nice space. So we're going to definitely to commit to that, and we think it's from a massing standpoint it's great for the building.

And this is a quick executive summary.

We heard a lot of great comments from you
guys last time. We heard a lot of great
comments from Cambridge Community Development

as well, and in no way do these represent all I just tried to distill it of the comments. into a few key points. We talked about an important transition and height across the site creating some vertical rhythm, creating a building that has steps to it. Advancing the vertical articulation, the break down, the horizontality that this building has the potential to have. And look at carrying some of these vertical bays up in a more meaningful way across the building. Careful consideration of the archway, and the integration of the archway into the design of the building and into the landscaping to reinforce that path. And then we have changed the arch so that we now have a continuous two floor opening through that So what used to be a two-story space. opening at Glassworks and on Monsignor, but

had a hallway across the middle of it, sort of pinching that space down has now been expanded to a full two stories all the way through which we actually love now and we think it really supports what the arch wants to do.

We're also working hard to make sure that there is a grade change through that pass way. So we want to make sure that the pedestrian flow is ADA accessible and smooth from Monsignor O'Brien Highway, through the arch into Amelia Earhart Park and really function as well.

So I'm going to take a step back. We heard some great comments from you guys last time, and what we wanted to do is actually just clean slate, start over, and readdress the massing. So I'm going to walk you through a very quick white model studies that

will hopefully give you guys a sense of where we're coming from on the mapping and what we're thinking in response to the comments.

So here you can see that floor missing over on this edge. And we're really thinking about how, as this building goes from East Street towards One Leighton we can create, you know, some fairly strong rhythm of massing that's defined and elevating as it moves towards One Leighton. And we really wanted to think about those masses as we were modelling the building.

We wanted to take the Glassworks Ave.

edge, which is really from here over to here.

And we have an arch that's missing right here
in the middle. We'll get to that in a

minute. On either side of the arch we really
wanted to think about the building as cousins
and not twins. We don't want one sort of

singular architectural language all the way down Glassworks. But we also don't want two completely separate buildings. So we did think about how to articulate what's going on in that building forum and then really use the archway as a break in the building. We have a two-story height down below and we want to use that to separate these pieces.

We also thought about the vertical elements. You guys had some fantastic comments as well. You know, thinking about how in order to reinforce the vertical here and sort of take some of the curse off the horizontal, to think about how these bays break the roof line in key areas here and in here at different heights and think about how they connect to the ground plain or don't connect to the ground plain in the way that strengthens the vertical read on the

building. And then the last key point here was to really look at this building mass over against North Point One on Leighton and think about it a little bit differently. It has a scale proportion and a mission that really is fundamentally different than what's going on on Glassworks. So we wanted to think about how that was articulated quite a bit differently. And, again, here you can see, you know, we were taking some of the very simple but clean cues that were coming from One Leighton here and thinking about how to integrate those and how to make these buildings have a little bit of relationship to one another, both from a scale and a mass standpoint, but also from a finer grain detail and articulation standpoint.

So we dive right into the arch. What we did is we took a step back and we said,

let's took a bunch of different very high level conceptual ways to look at the arch and try to land on something that's sympathetic to the building and sympathetic to the site that really supports what we're trying to do.

We looked at very traditional arch forms here. We looked at a lot of precedent images. And there's some real strengths to this. You know, there's a relationship to scale to the building. It's consistent to what was approved before. And the public element is really identified by the significant massing. Ultimately, you know, we started moving in a direction that was a little cleaner and a little more contemporary. Again, here you can see that hallway passing through, but we did spend a lot of time on the very traditional sort of arch form. This is similar to what you saw

last time, and this was the very non-traditional form where the arch is almost an independent architectural element. And I think we agree with all of the comments that this is just absolutely the wrong direction for this arch. We don't want something that you pass through by accident. We want it to announce itself as an arch. We want it to be recognizable as an arch, not as part of the building.

And then here's just another view and some precedent images of that. And then we started ending up more towards a -- more of a contemporary design to the arch where the form and the mass of the arch itself has a strong connection and a strong relationship to the building architecture. And one of the things that we liked about moving in this direction is it allowed the arch itself to be

visible and project beyond the site. We didn't want an arch that was down low, hidden behind, you know, the edge of the tracks and didn't have any opportunity to announce itself more as sort of an iconic element that not only works for this building but helps serve as a gateway into North Point. We thought that was a really good starting point.

Again, this one was an early version.

It does show that corridor connecting through. But, you know, we spent a lot of time thinking about how this form would work. And here's where we are right now in the current arch design. So not only did we really think about how this mass and form connects strongly to the building around it and the ground plain, but we really thought about how we could do something that's a

little bit more sculptural, has more of a connection to the site, and really talks to this as a place. And so what we really did is we're looking at taking this glass element, and it actually comes down the building and flows right through as the roof plain to the arch projecting out on to Glassworks Avenue. And we really wanted this to be a more sculptural thing that's really sort of rooted into the idea of flow and the idea of sort of transporting people from one side to the other. So it's a very sort of sculptural interpretation what the arch could And you could see here with the corridor be. removed it actually ends up becoming a really grand place. We think the language of what's going on here with the, you know, sort of these vertical elements can come out and really become benches and planters and

patterns and paving and the landscape to really allow that language to carry itself into the ground plain from Monsignor O'Brien straight through to Amelia Earhart Park. It really creates something here that we think is -- we think and we hope is pretty wonderful.

In this image you can also start to see some of these front patios that we're talking about here, and you can start to see a little bit of the difference in the building architecture from the west side to the east side. On the west side, you know, these building volumes here, which are, again, very clean and very simple, come down and engage the grounds, sort of breaking the horizontal plain there. The top floor varies in color and is actually set back so the building reads guite differently.

Over here the roof is broken by these similar but not identical bays that, you know, come off the ground here. And as the building moves towards what's a much more public space where the primary entry to the amenities in that inside corner, the ground plain becomes a little bit more important. We end up with more storefront glass and so that those bays come up off the grounds.

Jumping over to the intersection of Glassworks Ave. and East Street, what we did here is -- I'll just kind of orient you for a minute. Glassworks goes down here. At the end of this street or towards the end of this street is the intersection with Leighton Street. This is One Leighton sort of poking out in the back. And then on this side of the street you can see, you can see Sierra and Tango the left side of this image.

On the right side of this image you're looking at the current design proposal for the new train station on the right-hand side, the rail line coming through, and then you can see our proposed retail and outdoor cafe space over there. What's important about this image is to really think about how to create an engaging environment along the edge of Glassworks that comes down in scale and really has a relationship to Sierra and Tango on the other side of the street, that's quite different than how the building wants to project itself from Monsignor O'Brien. you can see similar elements that you saw on the front of the building. These are brought down lower on this side. They engage the stoops. And here, although it's a little harder to see, I have another view that hopefully it's clearer. Again, it's sort of

that rhythm of stoops, that rhythm of direct connection, and that flow of public pedestrian accessible space from the train station, around this retail space, and then flowing down glassworks Ave. And we hope doing a really strong job of complementing of what's already started on the other side of the street.

This is a view, again, from the East
Street side looking, looking east. This is
the edge of the station here. You can see
our retail band continues down along this
edge bike parking. This is the multi-use
path. That's a really critical part of this
project. And I think you can tell in this
image, we still have quite a bit of work to
do on the landscape side to work that
coordination with GLX and the other design to
get this area to really be as rich as we can

make it. We want, you know, paving patterns or colors or textures or things to happen there so that we can do what we want to do over here, which is create the most active and vibrant edge that we can that abuts that train station.

You can see sort of the other buildings on the other side of glassworks in the background there.

This is an image you're looking in the other direction. So now you're looking westbound here. The primary entry to our residential building for residents happens just off the screen down here. This is all sort of retail storefront edge here, very active public space that, you know, we're working on strategies right now for defining the boundary a little bit between that, you know, cafe spill out space and the true

multi-use path. We have a lot of strong ideas there and we're starting to really explore those. But you can see a canopy, signage, you know, umbrellas, outdoor active, very pedestrian-scaled space that I think, again, we feel sort of complements the activity level that's going to be coming out of that train station.

This is a view looking westbound down Monsignor. One Leighton is right here. Here you can start to see, you know, some of the echos, what I was talking about here. We don't want to copy anything. We don't want it to be a direct relationship, but we do want there to be some sort of, you know, you want to look at these buildings and think, you know, I understand what's going on in the corners here, but there's something different here but there's a connection, there's

something there where this building and this edge of the building is responding much more strongly to One Leighton than a lot of the architecture that we were talking about down in the -- further down towards Glassworks and East Street.

This is a view down One Leighton looking roughly north, the main entry of our building is in this inside corner here and you can see the plaza on the right-hand side for One Leighton and the beginnings of the development of our plaza on the other side. Again, I think for us it was about treating the mass and the scale of this building in a much more slick, much more smooth way so that it had a stronger relationship to the building across the street. So it has, you know, fewer of these very detailed pedestrian elements and it's more about, you know, the

pedestrian scaled down at the ground plain.

This is a view from Amelia Earhart Park looking back towards Monsignor. You can see the rail line through here. And it's really just another view from the arch. I think the important thing here is that you can see the glass coming through on the ceiling plain and then wrapping up on the back side. You can see the pathway right here as it comes through and transitions downgrade. this side of the building we've incorporated more balconies and more pedestrian elements both at the ground plain and up through the building. And so really again, I hate to beat on the point, but, you know, all of these direct pedestrian entries down here, you can see the resident entries to the building on either side within the archway, and then again just thinking about how to

take the scale of the architecture and sort of bring it down to address glassworks in a meaningful way.

The landscape plan at this point is really still at the sort of big idea stage. The key for us is thinking about how to develop this plaza in a complementary way. How to sort of reinforce the green space that we have to make it both public and feel like it's accessing a private building. We've got a lot of work to do here, and we're excited about the potential for connecting this passthrough from the park over to the multi-use path in a really meaningful way. And, again, over here on the retail edge, we think this is one of the, you know, one of the real challenging areas of the site where we have, you know, the retail edge that we're trying to reinforce here. You know, this is

the train station down at the ground plain, the integration of bike racks. I mean, the multi-use path cuts right through this area So there's a tremendous amount going on at a fairly small area. And you can see one the columns right here from the rail line above. So there's a lot going on here. think it really deserves a very intense level of scrutiny and I think we're really excited about the potential not only to make this train station sane but really make the multi-use path flow through and create an identity that we think at the end of the Glassworks Ave. can really identify all the exciting stuff that's going on in the North Point area. So we're really looking at, you know, this corner also as a gateway into this area.

That's it. That's where we are right

now. Hope that was helpful. Just kind of wanted to bring you up to speed on the evolution and design from the last time we are here.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you. Is there more that you want to present to us?

RICHARD McKINNON: That's it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

So, we've got three elements, one is -this is a public hearing so we have to seek
testimony from the public.

There's a memo. I'd like to have that presented to us. And then we have to try to make some sense of this and go forward.

Shall we start with the public testimony?

STEVEN WINTER: Indeed.

HUGH RUSSELL: Liza's going to see

if there's a sign-in sheet.

LIZA PADEN: No.

HUGH RUSSELL: Nobody signed up?

LIZA PADEN: No.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. So,

Councillor.

COUNCILOR DENNIS CARLONE: This is the first time I've seen the you. project and I want to congratulate the team on trying to make a very difficult site work geometrically, location wise. And this view in particular I think is quite successful. But I feel I have to say that the notion of having a building that changes materials every large bay strikes me as being too fragmented. And I want to say this view is by far the best view, and it might be because we see -- I'm not even sure what material it is, but it looks like stone. I know it's not

at the corner. And then there's sort of a brick color, and I know it's not brick. And so the masonry feel in color and tone hangs together and where the so-called arch is, I think is the least successful. I think the notion of the glass going under and up, that's fine. But you have this lip, this canopy at the upper floors that probably should be a canopy at the arch as well to even accentuate that it's something unique. But on the other side it seems even more fragmented facing the mass transit. almost looks like a series of blocks were used with different colors. And at least in my mind, buildings have to hang together. There still can be great variety, but they hang together. It's not clear to me what the dominant material is. It seems to be as many nice elements, but it seems to be almost

chaotic in places. And I think there can be richness and texture and change of material, but there sort of should be an overall theme that ties it together. And if you look at the other buildings, and I know some of you might remember, they're not my favorite buildings, but at least they hang together. And this tries maybe to try to do too much. And believe me I applaud the notion of trying to make it human scale as you can and trying to make it breathe like large townhouses, but it's into the quite large townhouses.

And those are my comments. I think there's a lot of logic in the layout and the organization.

Oh, the other thing is the connection from the main park through Amelia Earhart Park through the arch kind of ends in this, non-event. And perhaps where the main

passageway, which seems very wide under the arch connecting to the -- I forgot the name of the path that you called it, maybe there's something that happens at that intersection that kind of gives the path a little more meaning. It's kind of like, wow, this is a grand entry and where are we going? And then oh, sort of nowhere. Those are just comments. I mean them in a positive way, but that's what struck me and I think it needed to be said.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

SARAH KIM: Hi. My name is Sarah
Kim. I'm a resident of the city of Boston.
And I'm here on behalf of my parents who own
a unit in the One Earhart. I noticed in the
design and the archway the floors aren't
flush. It looks like it's a ramp of sorts.
And I wondered if you would -- what was the

consideration behind that? Because I have a concern with respect to folks, and I'm thinking of my parents who are going to be older in age, walking over and down that arch especially in the wintertime. And I'm not -- I assume that the folks are gonna take care to clean the ice as much as possible, but I just -- I have a concern about that. And so if you could think about a way to alleviate that issue, that would -- I would appreciate it.

Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

John.

JOHN HAWKINSON: John Hawkinson.

Without the benefit of advanced review just off the cuff, I'm a little concerned about the potential for bicycle/pedestrian conflicts at the interface between the

multi-use path and your property as it -because you're trying really hard to get
close to it and that might be dangerous.
That's all.

Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, it's our turn.

I think a lot of progress has been made. A lot of additional thinking has been made. I'm -- I think the three speakers actually hit upon the three of the more important questions.

It seems like the multi-use path entrance to the T retail thing is, is a problem. Although I'm not quite sure what's happening to the multi-use path as it goes west because it's not the main multi-use path

that's coming down from Somerville going under the Gilmore Bridge to North Point. This is a different branch. It's not -- so I don't think we're expecting a lot of commuters to be racing through on bicycles. They're also going to have to adjust across East Street. And so -- and the other thing I saw about that was the way -- as it was making it's way around the columns. When we were 20 years ago studying the park plan, there was a very seductive presentation about the viaduct that goes from the Gilmore Bridge over on your way to Boston. And saying wouldn't it be really cool to have the pedestrians move through, directly into the trains in the viaduct. And people talked about getting off the trains and there were lots of problems, but the notion that that was a very strong space and why shouldn't it

be given to important people? And I'm wondering if the two sets of columns also form an important space and if that is part of the solution to this path.

I would agree with the urban design Dennis Carlone has spoken to us. We have a man of many talents here. I thought the massing, the way you were thinking about the massing was very interesting and it seemed to be really, really good. And I think Dennis's comment that as this goes forward, you have to start thinking about what things that maybe pull it together in materials not so much changing the forms but changing the language, you know. And I don't know what that material is, but I'm guessing it is the last half-inch of it at least is masonry. And that his suggestion that you play up the masonry character and whatever surfaces are

on top of the wood framing and, you know, poured on the outside of the metal studs that -- you know, it used to be when you built brick buildings, there was a brick wall and, you know -- I'm working in Lowell and, you know, the brick wall was 24 inches thick on the ground floor and it finally got down to 12 inches. And then after World War II those walls became four inches of masonry. And now we figured out ways to make them at very little masonry, but the surface is still masonry. And so I like the idea of the masonry surface and as a way of helping to pull things together.

The -- I only saw one thing that I wanted -- hasn't been mentioned that I wanted you to work on. And your view down Leighton Street, the plaza in front of your building appears to be raised up a couple of feet

above the street level. And there was a -right now there's a like five-foot tall or
six-foot tall brick wall there. Masonry
wall. And I think that's pretty forbidding.
I wasn't able to convince Renzo Piano that
his wall in the new Fogg Museum was a bad
thing. Now if you walk over there I think
you'll agree with me.

And here, as I think about that, I think about the experience of the pedestrian.

BRIAN O'CONNOR: I totally agree with you 100 percent. On the wall -- actually in the original model wrapped around and we tore the wall down on the entire left side and created a series of steps that come down and engage -- we literally just didn't get to that, but that wall is actually doing the exact opposite of what we want it to do. So I totally agree with you 100 percent.

the other thing I don't like is the illegal sign on the other side of the street. But I would warn you that this Board is not very interested in having signs that exceed the requirements of the Ordinance.

So anyway, other people have comments they wish to make?

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair?

at some point I think Suzannah has made a list of a lot of things she wants, requests for the final development plan. It's a detailed list and I think it's a great framework to work off of. And so I think we need to think about what we want to add to that list if anything. And so, okay.

STEVEN WINTER: I want to tell the proponent that I under -- I get the arch. I

understand it. And it really speaks to me. So I really appreciate what that arch is; the glass, the lines, the glass on the bottom. I think it's artistic without saying Boy, am I art. And it's very functional. The only place that I get a little concerned over there is on the flooring, the actual walkway itself. It just looks wrong. I don't know what it is.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's unfinished.

STEVEN WINTER: Yeah, yeah.

HUGH RUSSELL: At this point.

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: And some of the feelings that you had as well.

And I, I want to bring up that I go through the Alewife T Station with some frequency on my way to a ZipCar. The bikes

are locked on every single piece of metal that you can see. So even though we've got cages for the bikes, we've got places for where you can put the bikes under -- that are regular formal bike parking, there just are so many. So I think we need to start planning for whatever we're doing for many more bikes to be there. And I just want to put that on the table.

I think that the corner with the retail and the T stop and the column that's nearby, I think that's -- that has real potential. That has real interesting potential. It's not there yet. It's so evocative to me that I thought we've got to name that something. We've got to give it a name. There's something really great that could happen there.

And I'm a little concerned about the

have doors going outside? I'm a little concerned about that. And I wonder, I just wonder if we could think about is that an experience that someone in a studio apartment wants. Basically you're opening the door into the single room where they live. So I just don't know. And I just want you as designers to take a look at that and see if that's really what you want.

And I also think that this memo from staff was very, very good and contains a lot of good stuff and I feel like we're heading in the right direction.

Tom.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Just quickly going around the building. So my first thought is that this space between the viaduct and the face of the building actually has a scale

which is really kind of magnificent, can be really wonderful. Right? And that side of the building -- so you could take something that's an industrial artifact that's been an eyesore and certainly in the 40 years that I've lived in this community and you can turn it into an amenity. Right? It's the edge of the a space that you can really make a marvelous garden for you. And I contrast to the Glassworks site, because I think that's a very different thing. Amelia Earhart Park that's going to connect over to the other open space systems in North Point and that street, it's a very different side. And so, I was interested to see that the buildings actually treated exactly the same as one side as the other side. That the arch actually, I don't think, necessarily needs to be of the scale that it's drawn on the viaduct side,

because it's actually addressing a space that's a scale that's sort of like two large backyards. And so the grand civic gesture I think does absolutely, appropriately belong on the Earhart side. It matches the addresses there. It matches the scale of the development on that side. But on -something tells me that if you look at it more closely and begin to think about that space, that maybe it would be different. And so I was beginning to look around the building and say, okay, let's look at all the It's our business to comment more edaes. about the public space maybe not the actual architecture so much, but the architecture relates to that public space in this case. So I wonder whether there's a symmetry about the way the stoop should work on the two sides. I actually think the stoops are

great. I worry a little bit about the loading dock and parking entry being across from a playground. I know that there's probably -- that's a tough decision to make. Okay, where do we site that thing so that it has the least impact on the urban environment. But thinking of the kids, I'm not sure what I would have chosen, but I don't understand the planning modules so readily. Maybe that is the rational place for that.

I think the Leighton Street building on the entrance to the opposite building I think it's a good civic gesture. I think that's right.

And so I come to the cafe, which is a shortcut into the development, I could see that. And there was a lot of foot traffic there. And I'm just wondering, you know,

you've got that area shaded which then becomes the seating area, and I know you talked about the paving detail and we're going to do something really great there. And this perspective gave me this idea that like once again, that viaduct, which is a functional piece of infrastructure, people on the Green Line actually could be a roof of something. Is there a way, I don't know if it's possible on the T. But I'm thinking on the other side maybe. Where the, where the train station comes down. I'm looking at the plan here. Can we occupy that? Is that a place that maybe you'd want to be? Is that a -- I don't know, these are perspectives are beginning to suggest that could be really cool under there, but maybe not just a shelter for bikes but maybe there's umbrellas there or maybe not. Maybe there's a plaza.

I don't know. There's a way I was looking at the data. It's a space which is not a passthrough but it's more of a -- this is a promising cafe and why not -- could actually occupy the spaces of that industrial -- it's got a funk to it that actually I think could be pretty cool. Maybe there's a way you could take advantage of that.

So those are some preliminary thoughts as I looked around the building. I do agree with Dennis Carlone's perspective that it is a bit of a patchwork in terms of the materiality and just the range of masonry. I agree was the most successful -- it did hang together much more coherently and much more elegantly. And so....

to pick up on Tom's point about the viaduct,
I actually, I think viaducts by definition

are a place that people pass through and along and that I would prefer to see that as space for movement rather than space for That said, I think you have the sitting. potential for some great confluence of activities here. And the more successful you are, the more activity there will be. And I do think it probably makes sense to think about how those are going to work together. And I do think that there are a lot of things that signal that this isn't a high speed bike route at this point, but just figuring out what kind of paving is not just aesthetically pleasing, but with further signal, how the various activities here might interact together might be something to think about.

I personally am not convinced yet on the arch. The longer views of it that are supposed to show the part, you know, from Monsignor O'Brien Highway through to the parks behind, I don't feel like they signal that to me yet. I frequently get, you know, get lost in it and wonder where the arch is. And I, I don't know, maybe that's just a personal thing, but I don't find that the arch signals any great opening to things beyond yet. So from my perspective that doesn't add much to the design except to break up an extremely long building up close and that is of value. So I'm not saying get rid of the arch by any means, but I don't know, I don't think if you're looking for a statement that says, you know, come through to the great green space beyond here, to me at least in the drawings it isn't there yet.

I think folks have already spoken to materials and that's not my area of expertise. But I do agree that less

patchwork, more coherent design is better.

And I think that's all I've got for now.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, just following up with the viaduct, do you have any control over where the pillars in the viaduct are going to be?

STEVEN GORNING: No, we've been through that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So it looks great now, you know, with the big opening between the pillars and the arch, but if the pillar ends up smack dab in front of the arch or slightly off center or something, it's going to be pretty unappealing.

STEVEN GORNING: One thing so you guys know, this is actually the GLX design that's integrated into our renderings and these are 90 percent CD's. So that's -- at this point it's probably highly unlikely that

they would move unless there was some big error. But the location is where they're going to go. The sizes, the materials.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, if you could go to the front elevation. There's one that shows the pillars and the archway.

BRIAN O'CONNOR: This is the view from Amelia Earhart. You can see it in the background.

H. THEODORE COHEN: No, there was one you showed us earlier.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I wonder if it was one of the models.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Maybe it was in your massing.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: White models.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, there.

If the pillars end up like that and you get a clear shot of the archway, then it

makes some sense if you end up with a pillar right in the middle of the arch or it makes no sense. And so I mean, you know, I guess you have no control over it, but, you know, I mean, that's something to be considered.

I definitely agree with Councillor Carlone about the patchwork and Hugh's comment I think the last time that there are seven changes that you can do. It seems there's much too much going on in terms of materials. I would really like the Main Street end of it. And, you know, maybe I'm one of the few who misses the fact that it's going to be a taller building, but I think that the station end -- I heard your rationale for why it goes lower. It just, to me, it looks like the building's just petering out and somehow there should have been some top to it, but it didn't happen.

You know, it just feels like it's going downhill, and I don't really care for that.

I like the concept of the arch but I understand the comments, you know, it's not the Boston Harbor building where you go through the arch and you've got the harbor right there. And to me right now since you've said you don't want the buildings, the two halves to match, that they're cousins, to me it looks like you've got two buildings that happen to have been there and you cleverly put in an arch to connect the two buildings and I'm not sold that that's the best thing to do. You know, maybe no arch and you just break it down to two buildings or maybe the two halves are twins and somehow the arch connects the two. I just, I just don't think you're there yet.

Those are my comments.

HUGH RUSSELL: You guys were outside when we were discussing the New Street case, but a lot of our discussion was how do you handle a long building? This building is longer than the New Street building, which -and so that's, you know, that's -- you know that. You've been really trying to address that, but I think we're seeing this as a more generic problem where you're essentially building a long building that from a sort of functional point of view just wants to be a long slab at one height. And how you address that.

So I'm just putting that into context of what else we're thinking about on the Board. And it's maybe why we're focusing on element somewhat because it's teed up for us for a few hours before.

Pam.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, so you didn't want to hire Dale Chihuly to do the glasswork for you? Do you know who he is?

RICHARD McKINNON: Yes, I do.

PAMELA WINTERS: That would have been pricey.

The only comment that I have is I'm wondering if I like the colors of the -- that mustardy color with the brick, you know?

That's just my only comment. Did you -- how did you go about coming about those colors or is it the materials that were thought about first?

BRIAN O'CONNOR: I think we're still talking about color and material. I think all the comments are great. And I think as we go back and try to clean and simplify and sort of unify the building, I think the material choices will sort themselves out and

simplify the pallet, and I think the colors will, you know, will most likely change. I think it's really a function of what the materials end up being and how they come together. I do hear your comment and I think the next round we'll be more prepared to really talk materials and talk more definitively about color.

PAMELA WINTERS: And we'll have a chance to throw in our --

BRIAN O'CONNOR: Yeah, absolutely.

PAMELA WINTERS: Thank you.

STEVEN COHEN: I feel a little bit out of step with some of my colleagues. As far as the patchwork goes, I kind of like the so-called patchwork and I think it adds visual interest and texture here which it's good in any building, but is really good in a big long building like this. And I'm a

little bit nervous that if you respond to some of the critiques that you heard today as you would simplify and unify the design as you put it, we're simply going to end up with a more boring, more mundane, more conservative building. And I sure as hell don't want to see it go in that direction.

And, you know, I like this direction.

And the arch, I think the arch is great. I don't know where it's going, and I don't know what it's for, but I think it looks great.

But apropos for previous discussions, it's a really long building and that's still a concern for me. And I kind of wish, again, that, you know, we as a Board and with input from staff could kind of try to clarify our own thoughts about such buildings. But it's a really long building. And picking up on

Ted's point, you know, probably the relentless length of the building would be less objectionable to me if there were greater diversity of height. I kind of miss some of that height as does Ted. Unfortunately this building, for the most part, is a very consistent height from one end to the other and I think that's unfortunate. Should it be broken up into other buildings? You know, I really don't But this seems to be a repetitive know. issue that we need to grapple with, and I wish we could develop the principles to apply to such buildings.

But other than that length, I like what I'm seeing. So I encourage you in the direction that you're going.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I'm sorry, maybe I missed something because there is an

allocation for reduction in height. Why are we -- why is that happening here? Are they transferring FAR to another site within the development?

HUGH RUSSELL: No. It's a, it's a building construction issue. This is going to be a Type 3 building sitting on a podium wood frame up above.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Type 5 on the podium?

STEVEN GORNING: Type 3.

HUGH RUSSELL: Type 3. It's all wood, wood exterior wall. And so that's -- that's the why.

STEVEN COHEN: You know it's an interesting question, though. I mean I certainly understand the applicant's motivation to do that and to resort to a construction method that, you know, saves

money in both materials and code requirements and so forth. And if it works for the Board, then great. But if it's not working for the Board, then not so great. You know, I don't know that we need to feel constrained by those internal economic issues.

Mr. Chair, I'd like STEVEN WINTER: to comment that I want the Board to be really careful how we're instructing the proponent so that we don't at the next time see a building that we're going to say well, my goodness, that's a big, long block with -it's not broken up. I want to be careful that we're giving the right message to the proponent. And I think there's a -- there's a sweet spot in there that's understood by architects and designers, and I think that's the sweet spot that you got to find so that it does have some elements that break it up.

But I, you know, we just put New Street out saying it's too long and too boring, and I feel like we're asking the proponent to go that way here.

And also I wanted to say, Steve, that I think that this building being long as it is, in North Point it's in a different urban fabric than the New Street building.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right, that's right.

STEVEN WINTER: There could be different things going on. But I think there's a lot of good advice coming out of the Board tonight for this proponent.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I would take a little different take on it. Our job is to react to what we've seen and express the things that we're not comfortable with. And I -- we have -- there's a range of things

we're not comfortable with. I think it's the job of the staff to try to take those comments, work with the architects and the owners to try to, say, well, okay, what are the ways in which you try to address things so that it's not uncomfortable. And so in that sense I don't think we're giving vast -we're not instructing them not to do. We have done that in the past, but I don't think we're doing that here. I think we're just saying, well, we've -- you know, we've looked at this for four days and this is what we see or this is how we see it. And some of those perceptions may actually be the function of the graphics.

PAMELA WINTERS: That's true.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so I think we're actually giving very good comments here, and I don't think we need to emphasize the fact

that, you know -- we can recognize they understand the issues. They're addressing the issues. Some of the consequences of this way give us a little pause, you know, but throw it back and say come -- you know, you're obviously created. You're obviously talented and see what you can do. And then Suzannah has to write in on that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can somebody put this into perspective to me? The length of this building, how does it compare to Thomas Graves' Landing?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's slightly shorter, but it's similar.

of -- the aerial picture will show.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thomas Grave's is an enormously tall building which is more evident because it's set back behind the

parking lot.

RICHARD McKINNON: There it is right above the Lechmere Canal.

HUGH RUSSELL: There's a little bend and it helps enormously. And I'd also comment on the magic number seven and a half plus two. Because in the one sense there are five things happening along Glassworks

Avenue:

There's the two ends and then the two different things somewhat that are happening in the middle. And each of those gets broken down into the next level of hierarchy. And so that's how you have to play the seven plus or minus two game, is that, you know, get the very big gestures and then you break it down in scale. And I think it's not clear from every point of view, and it can't be clear from every point of view what's going on.

I was thinking about the John F. Kennedy Memorial Park in the Harvard Square and there's a very long pedestrian walkway that leads down to the park, and the park is this flat piece of ground that isn't enormous, isn't wide. I mean, it's much bigger than this, but -- and there's a very low feature there. It's like a little -it's a wall and there's a little depression, and something -- when you're walking, even things that aren't very tall assume great importance. So that you can do something at the end that may only be this high, but it -if it's a place, to create a place that just, you know, think about that. Go over and take a look at that, because it's done very skillfully and it was a huge compromise between trying to have, you know, a grand memorial to our slain president after having

sort of a park that fit in with the waterfront, and it somehow achieves both those goals in a sort of understated way.

And admittedly they've got second (inaudible) and you've got a viaduct behind you.

RICHARD McKINNON: We have nothing to worry about.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It only goes in one direction. The other direction there's nothing.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Right. The other direction is faces the new park. And thank you, Ted, for asking, you know, how does that compare to the building. That's a wonderful thing to understand how it enormously attenuated how long the building is.

I want to go back to something that we skipped over very, very quickly and then also relate it back to the earlier conversation.

which is the building height. My question about the building height and yes, it relates to construction time again. I understand it's economics, but what about that? Do we have to accept that as a matter of fact? mean, certainly it's what's constraining Mr. McKinnon and Avalon. They have certain metrics that they're trying to hit. We're going to live with this thing a lot longer than these guys. I think we should re-examine that. You know, because that's something that we're going to accept as a given here. Is the building better for the city for performing to that, you know, economic constraint, and I'm not so sure it And, yes, it may mean that the construction type changes, and that may mean that the whole shape of this thing changes. But I think it's worth looking at. This is a very prominent site and, you know, a really important new neighborhood in our city and it's right at a T stop. It's a coveted piece of property, and why would we say well, okay, we have to accept these, you know, fairly strict development performance as the basis of departure? I -- there's other ways to look at this.

So relating it to the questions that were raised at the last hearing -- and I agree, that conversation, we're giving good advice here. We're not the designers.

We're not going to give specific and precise advice here. We have a skilled team here that's done amazing things and can figure this out. So a range of comments is acceptable, and we will react to the next iteration of this, and that's the process that we're in as laborious as it sounds it

usually comes out with something more interesting and richer than we started with.

But the thing that Steve was suggesting at the New Street deliberations self-consciously admitting, you know, why are we here now? Why aren't we asking for these things earlier? Here we are a little earlier in this one.

So a model? You know, something this big. I don't think that that's the word to say, that would be really, I think, informative both for our process and both for the development team. I'm sure they're using models already for us to look at this. How does it fit into the context? How does it look relative to fairly complicated set of site conditions?

STEVEN WINTER: Yes.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes. And so, it

doesn't have to be a rendered model. You know, it could be foam. It could be 40 scale so you see it. You see the buildings coming together. I think that would be really, really helpful.

You know, one of my STEVEN COHEN: concerns as a developer myself as we finish up one of these hearings, I ask myself, okay, what have we said? What has the applicant heard? You know, what is he going to do next? And, you know, I hate when a Board asks me to do something that I don't want to do, but I like that better than walking out of a hearing and not knowing what the hell the Board wants me to do. And, you know, I think sometimes we can be a little clearer. For instance, on this height thing we're talking about, what are they going to do with that? You know, I don't -- I guess we can

ask them, you know, to do some studies. know, just for the sake of argument if you weren't constrained by the economic issues, show us some options. And, you know, it doesn't have to be options, you know, developed to a great extent but just give us a sense of what's possible here. What some alternative approaches might be. I don't know whether we would all agree with that request, but at least that would be a specific request and they would know what to do. You know, if I were in their shoes right now I don't know what I would be doing about height and I don't know what I would be doing about the length of this building. And I'll tell you one thing, unless you specifically ask them to break down the length of the building, the building is not going to be broken down.

New Street has been before us for a year. They've been hearing from Day 1 that we have concerns about the length of the building, but we've never pressed them on it. We just have some concerns. And, you know, the building never changed. And maybe they heard something a little stronger today. But for them to hear that for the first time a year later, it's, it's unfortunate. I feel it's unfair to the applicant.

And so I -- in all due respect, Hugh, I do wish sometimes we could be more specific about what we'd like to see. Not necessarily, but ultimately what to do. But at least, you know, do a study. Give us some options. Help us better understand what's possible.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I respond?

I don't disagree with what you said, I think

though, you know, a couple of weeks ago it was a proposal that this be a Minor Amendment, and at least two of us were opposed to that on the theory that, you know, the public ought to have an opportunity to talk about what they thought the height should be because it was changing the original plan. So the only real comment we got was from ECaPs which said they like the lower height and that's their perspective. I don't think the developer, the proponent made a cogent argument presentation tonight as to why the building should be lower. And, you know, so we're looking at a plan, you know, with a lower height and we're making comments about what we like or what we don't like about it. But I think the initial issue of whether we should lower the -- have them approve a Major Amendment that's going to

lower the height of the building, has really been addressed. And I think, you know, I was willing to go along with, Well, if everybody else is comfortable with it. But I think there are at least three of us who are saying, Gee, maybe it ought into be lowered. And so I think, you know, that's the direction to the proponent that to come back next time and say, you know, this is what it would look like tall, this is what it would look like small, and maybe it saves me money to do it lower, but here are the reasons why it should be lower. And, you know, maybe they say well, it fits in better with the It fits in better with, you know, cityscape. with the T station. It fits in better with the viaduct. I haven't heard any of those comments yet.

PAMELA WINTERS: Well, you know,

though, but what's their motivation, though, to do that when the majority of the people of the ECaPs people liked the way it was. I mean, why would they have done that? What would be their motivation to do that?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I mean ECaPS it's not the final word --

PAMELA WINTERS: Nobody else?

H. THEODORE COHEN: No, I agree.

And it's midnight now.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right, but I mean nobody else, nobody else came last time objecting to the height.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, that's....

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Then it shouldn't be too hard to make the case that it's -- but that case hasn't been made yet.

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

RICHARD McKINNON: On the ECaPs

question, we had a very large crowd there.

And we understand, Ted, we'll come back and make a cogent argument to you. But the presentation to ECaPs was one of the very few unanimous votes that they had. And I think that's why you don't have anyone up here from East Cambridge making public comments. And it was not just the old timers. It was a very diverse group. The old timers like myself. Excuse me.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm going to put myself on the side of six stories is a better scale Glassworks Avenue and stepping up.

Because Glassworks Avenue is to the north of the building and so the lower the building is the more sun that gets into the streets. I look at that diagram and I think well, now the scale of the rest of North Point is -- blocks that are 250 feet long. That was

essentially the Ken Greenberg version and the vision of this place. And so you see instead of a single, long building across the street, you see two separate buildings and open space in between them. And so maybe the problem -and I think we're voicing in different ways, is how do you deal with a long building? They've made, they've done a lot of stuff to make that roof line be a lot more interesting, but it still comes across as one building. And I think maybe what people are saying is, you know, it needs more vertical articulation if it's going to read as one, you know, four or five hundred foot long building. So maybe I would say look at the passthrough differently as, you know, rather than a connector between two buildings as a void between two buildings, does that make any difference? I'm not sure it makes much

difference, but I'm just saying looking at the plan here.

The other comment I'd make is that you can fairly easily put firewalls across a building, particularly in a podium building where the firewalls could just start at the podium and go up. So you could actually switch construction types, you know. You could have one section that was two stories taller. You might have to be built out of light gauge metal instead of wood, but you don't have to. You can leave parts of the building in more economical construction, not in high rise.

The other piece of this is when it goes over six stories tall, it becomes a high rise and then you've got a few hundred thousand dollars of bells and whistles. But how many units? 350 units.

STEVEN GORNING: This is about 265 right now.

HUGH RUSSELL: 265 units. You know?

And so that's -- more than \$50 million

construction costs for making decisions

because you want to save several hundred

thousand dollars in bells and whistles.

STEVEN COHEN: Makes a difference.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

So I think they're -- if you say we're not comfortable, all of us are uncomfortable for different reasons. Some of us are uncomfortable because the case hasn't been made and maybe the case can be made. Some we liked the skyline before. You know, others are thinking that what troubles them can maybe be handled through the materiality and doing some gestures in a bowl here. And so it's -- we have our own ideas what the

solutions are. So I --

STEVEN COHEN: Is the great length of it more or less at the center of our concerns?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And I think it ought to be at the end. You know, I think it's right to fill up the blocks, but does it read as two blocks of buildings or one block of buildings?

You know.

STEVEN COHEN: Because, you know, again, maybe if we can say -- if we all agree that it is that perceived great length which is our greatest concern and for the moment address our concerns. You know, there are a lot of other details and maybe put them aside for the moment, you know, address that troubling perception and we're not going to tell you how to address it, but address it

and try to persuade it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And I mean just a simple move where you take 50 feet of the building in the middle and you just go -- push it back. And, you know?

And so on one side it's a void, and on the other side it's a projection. And obviously the place you do it is best. now, yeah, it gets a little messy when you're trying to have a corridor that sort of wants to go straight and it's got the -- but, you know, it's just the units. And it can be done and while these guys are very tough on unit layouts because they have corporate staff down in Virginia saying this is the product we want. We want to more than half because we think we know a lot about this business and we want to satisfy the people who are coming to rent.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Right, but we cannot lose sight that the citizens of the Commonwealth and Cambridge are invested in a significant amount of dollars in public transportation infrastructure which makes this site and this neighborhood unique. And there's -- we have to demand, I think, because of that relatively, relative proximity to this amazing now extended Green Line that something extraordinary happens here and not the cheapest/finest. finest. And so, I'm less sympathetic at this site to the economic arguments. I want to do what's right. And we all want to do what's right, and the developer wants to do what's right. And the potential here and the upscale potential is at stake here. And they know that. Mr. McKinnon knows that.

And I would also say given the message

that we're giving the proponent, Mr. McKinnon is very in tune at understanding and reading what both the public understands and needs and what this Board understands and needs.

He's very, very skilled. So, you know, the developer should know that they've got a guy here that really can figure things out. Even though our message at midnight may be a little foggier than it normally is.

HUGH RUSSELL: He has a great history of thinking outside the box.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Right, right. Yes.

RICHARD McKINNON: Can I point out one of the ironies of institutional memory, the long building broken up by an arch has always been a part of the project and it was part of the original master plan as you know. And the arch had two functions, one was to break up an admittedly long building, but the

other was to connect the grain spaces, you know, and we had Ken Greenberg, the master planner for North Point had a series of finger parks, and our big open space connects through the arch to the finger park and beyond. But the interesting thing,

Mr. Chairman, is that the design consultant to the Planning Board who actually approved that concept spoke to you earlier tonight.

So there we are.

This is not a new idea to break the building up by an arch. It's really been an essential feature of this, and the arch really was also a way of highlighting the connections between the green spaces.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I would -CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And so
I think procedurally, then, if what we're
saying is we're not comfortable, I don't know

that we're ready to move this on to the second hearing. Because typically when we move a Major Amendment on to the second hearing we're saying we are comfortable and that you are going in the right direction and, you know, please continue in that direction. What I'm hearing is that we have a lot of different ideas about what might be done, but no one seems to be terribly pleased with what we have before us now and ready to say, yes, we're likely to approve the requested change.

PAMELA WINTERS: What is the ruling with that? I don't know what the ruling with that is actually.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I feel comfortable answering this if this were a brand new project before us because we would be -- people would want to say oh, we don't want

that building too high. We want that moved over. We want you to create this open space and all the rest. Big changes can happen in a context of saying, so I think, you know, we're not questioning kind of the open space strategy. We're not questioning the use.

And those things aren't actually changing.

So we're -- now we're dealing with an amendment that changes the massing of the project.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: And as you said, we're not ready to do that. And so we're also required under the Ordinance to make a determination within about two weeks of this hearing. So we have to get a reaction back.

JEFF ROBERTS: 21 days.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so I'd have to look a little more carefully, and that's the

way it's essentially written because there's a --

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair.

HUGH RUSSELL: A 90-day process for the whole thing.

JEFF ROBERTS: Maybe I could jump in and clarify some of the procedural questions. So this is -- since the Board determined this would be a Major Amendment, it's a two step The first step is reviewing the process. development proposal, and the Board has to make a preliminary determination within 21 days of the hearing. If the Board -- so that the choices that the Board has is to approve the development proposal and that can include -- it doesn't necessarily have to be saying everything is great. It can enumerate the issues that the Board has with the proposal that need to be addressed in the

final development plan. It's almost like taking a first shot at it to say that here's what we think needs to be revised or modified or reviewing the development plan. If the Board fails to -- if the Board could also reject the development proposal, in which case the application essentially disappears, doesn't come forward again, so that the choice of not approving the final -- not approving the development proposal, but then taking another shot at it later isn't really an option.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jeff, why can't we simply continue the hearing and continue it at a later date? And it seems to me the 21 days don't start running until we've adjourned the hearing. That's how I've always --

JEFF ROBERTS: I don't believe

that's -- it's not typically the -- the 21 days is generally the timing from the public hearing is only the matter of the opening of the public hearing. It doesn't say specifically one way or another in the Zoning text.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's not how most communities do it. They consider it that the timing for filing a decision runs from the termination of the hearing. You do have an end deadline. For a Special Permit you always have the 90-day staring you in the face. But generally you can --

JEFF ROBERTS: That's not the way we've operated procedurally in the passed.

Generally we've, for instance, for the 90-day period that is generally counted from the opening of the first public hearing.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I agree the

90-day is an absolute, but I don't agree that there are other deadlines which are measured from the termination of the hearing. I think they are measured from the termination of the hearing you always have to be within the 90 days unless you get a continuation agreed to.

JEFF ROBERTS: So I think if that's --

H. THEODORE COHEN: If we simply had a room full of people that we couldn't finish at by midnight and we said we're continuing until two weeks from now, I mean you can't really be saying that we couldn't continue the hearing and have the opportunity to hear the public because we were constrained to make a decision within that two-week period.

JEFF ROBERTS: No. I don't know. I think what I'm saying is I'm trying to figure out what -- if you're suggesting that the

Planning Board proceeds by continuing the hearing and agreeing on some extension of the 21-daytime period for making the preliminary determination and that's something that would need to be discussed I think with the applicant and their attorney. And then we would need to act -- and then we would need to file that accordingly.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I don't know the Ordinance, but it would take my a while to find it.

JEFF ROBERTS: Do you want me to hand it over?

H. THEODORE COHEN: What section is it?

JEFF ROBERTS: Section 12.35.2.

Why don't I read it aloud for people who don't have it in front of them.

(Reading) Within 21 days after the

public hearing the Planning Board shall make a determination concerning the development If the Planning Board approves the proposal. development proposal or conditionally approves the development proposal with recommendations for modification, than the developer must submit a final development plan as specified in Section 12.36. If the Planning Board disapproves the development proposal on the application for a Special Permit to construct a PUD shall be denied. If the Planning Board makes no decision within the specified time limit, then the development proposal shall be considered approved and the developer shall prepare a final development plan.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm sorry, it was Section 12-point....

JEFF ROBERTS: Point-35.2.

H. THEODORE COHEN: My issue is after the public hearing does not commence to run until we have concluded the public hearing, and should we continue the public hearing now to a later date, at that later date when we end the hearing then the 21 days run.

JEFF ROBERTS: I don't feel like I could make necessarily a ruling on this. It appears to be for -- I would say procedurally when we consider the time period for making a decision, and this is slightly different because it is a, it's a written determination rather than a decision, then we count it starting from when the public hearing is open. It could be -- if the public hearing was never opened and it was continued because the Board didn't have time to pursue the matter, then we would count it from that

future date, but tonight the hearing was open and public comment was taken.

STUART DASH: A suggestion would be, Hugh, you may recall it more than I do, is it seems like we've passed things from a public -- the first hearing in this kind of situation and given instructions to it, the proponent, to say and here -- when you come back for the second hearing, here are the things we want to say. And you might say we want to see two approaches: One approach takes this one on and one approach takes this And one approach takes the height on and on. show us both approaches and talk us -- you know, when you come back. I'm trying to think if we, you know, there are some basics to this that we've seen. I'm not sure if that's too far from approve the basic concept.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY, so

Stuart, in that case, what is the development plan we're approving? I mean, if we say there are two different approaches, what are we approving?

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'd like to weigh in on this, because I think -- if we forget about what the words say, and we say what do we want to have happen? And so if we, if we follow, if we make a determination and then say come back with the final development proposal, that's not what we want to have happen. When we see next we want you to have thought some more about the issues about long buildings and stepping-in heights. without going through enormously, we want you to spend three months doing that. And once we then get through that stage, then we want you to go and perfect the proposal. So how

do we accomplish that? And I think the way to accomplish it is to take Ted's advice and not close the hearing and try to get you back before us sooner rather than later to discuss this question that we're having trouble with here. Show us options whether there are options and, you know, in a model, in perspectives and you know.

PAMELA WINTERS: Are we going to be able to do that within 21 days?

HUGH RUSSELL: No, no, but I think
Ted's interpretation is a perfectly viable
interpretation of the argument. It may not
be the one that we normally do, but in fact I
think it's probably a better interpretation.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I think it is correct, but I would suggest that we, you know, if we can continue, we then ask the City Solicitor, because 12.35.2 does provide

(Reading) That if the Planning Board makes no decision in the specified time limit, then the development proposed shall be considered approved. And the developer shall prepare a final development plan.

HUGH RUSSELL: Which we'll then shoot down. It doesn't sound productive.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's true.

But I think we should continue it, but, you know, staff should communicate to the City

Solicitor just to con -- you know, to confirm or overrule my feel of it.

BRIAN MURPHY: Mr. Chair?

STEVEN COHEN: Can the applicants agree to waive --

RICHARD McKINNON: We can agree to an extension which is the cleanest way to do it. It takes the ambiguity out of the question I think Ted is rightly raising. And

so which we will do, Ted, and, Mr. Chairman, excuse me.

STEVEN COHEN: That's --

PAMELA WINTERS: That's good.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so I think we need a motion to approve an extension.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, we're just continuing the hearing. We're continuing the hearing.

STUART DASH: We're doing belts and suspenders.

STEVEN COHEN: Right, belts and suspenders.

HUGH RUSSELL: So is there a motion to --

STEVEN COHEN: To what?

BRIAN MURPHY: Mr. Chair, the other question would be that we do have a hearing on the 30th which is primarily focussed on

the courthouse. This is at least an East Cambridge project. If the Board wanted to, you could, depending if that's too tight of a time table, to continue the discussion. In the meantime that would allow us to find out from the Solicitor what her thoughts are and it would be within the two weeks. We wouldn't be bumping up against the time limit.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think we could address procedural matter at which time we could not address the substantive matter. I believe that we will not be a long discussion or a long night just dealing with courthouse.

STEVEN COHEN: Is there still a procedural matter if the applicant is agreeing to an extension of this time limit?

HUGH RUSSELL: Only if somebody says that our motion is improper and it needs to

be fixed.

STEVEN COHEN: I think if the applicant is agreeing with the matter --

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: -- rather than sitting there and he's not objecting.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I'm not anticipating -- I think we're doing the right thing, which is -- and so I think we ought to formally allow an extension and --

STEVEN COHEN: What do we do? We're extending the 21-day --

H. THEODORE COHEN: I suggest we're continuing the hearing to a date certain that Liza may be able to give me and that we accept the extension of the 21-day period until 21 days after the conclusion of the continued hearing.

STEVEN COHEN: Is that a motion?

H. THEODORE COHEN: So moved.

STEVEN COHEN: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the only difficulty with that is Liza is unable to give us a date certain for the next hearing.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, then I move that we move to continue the hearing by staff and that we extend --

ATTORNEY KEVIN RENNA: You can't obviously we want to work with you guys.

We're happy to do the extension normally just for the public notice and everything, we need to have it be to a date and the time in the future.

The other option, I know it's not where you're going, Hugh, if we have to re-notice that guys could approve it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's what they generally do.

ATTORNEY KEVIN RENNA: And then we're back to the same -- we're gonna do a whole other paper notice and stuff. We could go procedurally where you don't want to go. Get out of the first hearing, let us do the notice for the second hearing, and then continue that if you're more comfortable. mean, we're talking about semantics here, right? We know we're going to be hear again and probably not the last time based on what you're saying. You could technically approve the development plan with conditions, we'll come back next time --

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's not going to happen now.

ATTORNEY KEVIN RENNA: Okay. Unless you have a date then we'll have to re-notice it and everything. And so it's --

LIZA PADEN: The way the schedule

looks now is October 7th two public hearings, one of which you have not heard at all and the other is 88 CambridgePark Drive. And you've also asked for a discussion of the Planning Board procedures.

PAMELA WINTERS: So we don't have time on that one.

LIZA PADEN: Correct.

The options are to move to October 21st which has two public hearings, neither of which you've heard, and the possible continuation of the Discovery Park. Or, I can check the quorum and schedule a fourth meeting for October.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Fourth?

LIZA PADEN: The schedule for October is October 2nd and 28th at the moment.

H. THEODORE COHEN: What's on the

28th?

LIZA PADEN: A deliberation meeting that was discussed earlier that no new hearings would be opened but it would be used to continue discussion to clear up the --

HUGH RUSSELL: Why isn't that the logical date for this?

LIZA PADEN: That's what I'm asking you.

PAMELA WINTERS: Sounds fine.

JEFF ROBERTS: And just to ask a clarifying question, the purpose of that continuation isn't simply for the Board to continue discussion. It's to, it's to hear new arguments or presentations made by the applicant as requested?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So I would move

that we move the hearing to October 28th and that we accept the -- agree to extend the 21-day period in Section 12.35 until 21 days after October 28th.

RICHARD McKINNON: Oh, no, Ted.

October 28th that's all you get. Only kidding you. No, that's fine obviously.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is there a second?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Second.

HUGH RUSSELL: Second.

Discussion on the motion?

(No Response.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

HUGH RUSSELL: All members voting in

favor.

I think we're done for this morning.

BRIAN MURPHY: There's General

Business.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have two items of General Business.

And first item of General Business is to allow -- leave to withdraw a case which Liza is going to tell us about.

In a nutshell, this is LIZA PADEN: Planning Board case No. 293 which is 57 J.F.K. Street. If you remember, this was a proposal you have not actually seen in the public hearing process, and this is for the Crimson Galleria in Harvard Square. original proposal was for residential addition on top of the existing restaurant retail space. They, the proponent went to the Historical Commission, the Historical Commission's asked for substantial revisions to this case which changes the use, changes the size, and they still have not been approved by the Historical Commission. So my suggestion is that they withdraw the residential proposal. They're not going to do a residential proposal. That they will come back with a whole new application that the Planning Board will look at when they're ready to present it.

So the motion is that on behalf of the applicant, they request to withdraw a Special Permit application and it won't be the same when it comes back in any case. So it will be brand new.

HUGH RUSSELL: Someone like to make that motion?

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.

HUGH RUSSELL: Second?

H. THEODORE COHEN: (Raises hand.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Ted.

On the motion?

(Raising hands.)

LIZA PADEN: Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: The second item of General Business is not listed.

RICHARD McKINNON: Thank you, all, for all your time.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

I've been advised by the City Solicitor that I should put into the record that the Board has become aware that we engaged in improper chain of e-mails on the 1st and on -- through the 3rd of March discussing the -which I initiated. And so since I'm to blame. And the discussion was on the legal status of courthouse project. And we had not reached a conclusion in the e-mails, but we actually discussed it and we asked that the City Solicitor give us an opinion. We've received that opinion. And we've not made a decision on the case yet. And so I'm making

that disclosure. I believe the e-mails have been placed into the record.

Has that been done?

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do you know when that was done?

BRIAN MURPHY: On or about March 1st through 3rd it was placed in the file.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

And so that's a statement that should go into our record. We also --

STEVEN COHEN: Do we have to do a certain amount of Hail Mary's?

BRIAN MURPHY: It's a reminder that in the future that such communication should take place only in the public hearing if they involve a quorum or more of the Planning Board members.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so....

PAMELA WINTERS: Are we all fired?

STEVEN COHEN: You should be so lucky.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think several of us have safe seats but most of us are up for reappointment.

So I think if there's nothing else before, we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 a.m., the Planning Board Adjourned.)

ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS

The original of the Errata Sheet has been delivered to Community Development Department.

When the Errata Sheet has been completed and signed, a copy thereof should be delivered to each party of record and the ORIGINAL delivered to Community Development Department to whom the original transcript was delivered.

INSTRUCTIONS

After reading this volume of Planning Board, indicate any corrections or changes to testimony and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. **DO NOT** make marks or notations on the transcript volume itself.

REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE COMPLETED AND SIGNED ERRATA SHEET WHEN RECEIVED.

ATTACH TO PLANNING BOARD

DATE: 09/16/14

REP: CAZ

ERRATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: After reading the transcript of Planning Board, note any change or correction to testimony and the reason therefor on this sheet. DO NOT make any marks or notations on the transcript volume itself. Sign and date this errata sheet (before a Notary Public, if required). Refer to Page 332 of the transcript for Errata Sheet distribution instructions.

PAGE	LINE		
		_ CHANGE:	
		REASON:	
		_ CHANGE:	
		REASON:	
		CHANGE:	
		REASON:	
		CHANGE:	
		REASON:	
		CHANGE:	
		REASON:	
		CHANGE:	
		REASON:	

I have read the foregoing transcript of Planning Board, and except for any corrections or changes noted above, I hereby subscribe to the transcript as an accurate record of the statements made.

CERTIFICATE

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS BRISTOL, SS.

I, Catherine Lawson Zelinski, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, the undersigned Notary Public, certify that:

I am not related to any of the parties in this matter by blood or marriage and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

I further certify that the testimony hereinbefore set forth is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 1st day of December, 2014.

Catherine L. Zelinski Notary Public Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 147703

My Commission Expires: April 23, 2015

THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS
TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION
OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE
DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE
CERTIFYING REPORTER.

\$	196:4	3-D [3] - 133:11,	7	46:14, 243:5
Y	18th [1] - 24:1	138:6, 138:8	•	abutting [4] - 21:15,
A=A 000 4	19.23 [1] - 2:11	30 [7] - 79:13, 90:6,	- 04.0044	154:4, 189:9, 224:1
\$50 [1] - 300:4	19.25 [1] - 3:13	90:7, 90:17, 161:15,	7 [3] - 2:4, 90:11	accentuate [1] -
•	1920 [1] - 164:6	171:5, 171:10	7-13 [1] - 3:10 70 [2] - 3:11, 56:1	251:10
	1980s [1] - 31:18	30-foot [1] - 203:2	75 [11] - 2:9, 2:10,	accept [5] - 288:5,
	1st [2] - 329:10, 330:7	30-inch [1] - 20:9	2:15, 4:16, 5:12,	288:12, 289:5,
'13 [1] - 55:15	•	300 [4] - 2:7, 3:12, 9:1, 120:6	35:11, 42:17, 43:1,	321:16, 326:2 acceptable [1] -
_	2	30th [4] - 5:5, 5:6,	43:10, 45:2, 144:14	289:17
0		205:15, 319:19	7:00 [2] - 1:5, 2:9	accepted [1] - 209:1
	2 [5] - 92:15, 125:13,	327 [1] - 3:18	7th [4] - 5:11, 7:8,	access [14] - 46:11,
0.5 [1] - 181:2	144:4, 155:6	332 [1] - 333:7	35:7, 324:1	47:14, 58:7, 130:19,
09/16/14 [1] - 333:1	2,000 [1] - 227:18	344 [1] - 1:6		134:9, 143:1, 177:9,
	2,500 [1] - 227:19	35 [2] - 2:15, 22:16	8	179:3, 223:16,
1	2.1 [1] - 140:17	350 [1] - 299:19		224:4, 225:15,
	20 [6] - 30:13, 30:17,	355 [1] - 20:2	8 [1] - 2:5	225:16, 226:5,
1 [5] - 198:8, 198:18,	79:13, 108:13, 203:4, 256:10	363 [1] - 142:14	860 [1] - 3:17	227:8
200:1, 202:7, 293:2	20.800 [1] - 3:5	3rd [2] - 329:11, 330:8	87 [5] - 42:17, 43:1,	accessible [3] -
1-5 [4] - 3:8, 3:10,	2012 [3] - 24:4, 25:2,	_	43:8, 45:1, 166:1	71:16, 231:10, 242:3
4:19, 216:18	25:3	4	88 [5] - 5:15, 5:17,	accessing [1] -
1.6 [1] - 108:10	2014 [2] - 1:4, 37:5		56:3, 144:15, 324:3	247:10
10 [5] - 2:7, 2:13,	208 [1] - 3:7	4 [2] - 2:3, 180:16	8:00 [1] - 3:2	accident [1] - 236:7
49:14, 90:10, 154:8	20th [1] - 38:6	4,000 [1] - 212:12	8:30 [1] - 3:8	accommodate [1] -
10.45 [1] - 2:14	21 [9] - 307:17,	4.26.3 [1] - 2:11		42:6
100 [5] - 164:2, 170:5,	308:12, 309:16,	40 [5] - 5:9, 157:1,	9	accommodation [2] -
259:12, 259:19	310:1, 312:19,	215:2, 264:5, 291:2		64:5, 137:6
1000 [1] - 149:18	314:6, 317:10,	41 [1] - 228:4	9 [3] - 2:7, 55:15, 90:4	accomplish [4] -
10th [1] - 125:8	321:17, 326:3	45 [1] - 108:12	90 [2] - 271:18, 311:5	31:10, 193:6, 317:1,
11 [1] - 90:4	21-day [3] - 321:12,	450-odd [1] - 120:3	90-day [4] - 308:4,	317:2
11-foot [1] - 64:3 1100 [2] - 2:7, 9:19	321:16, 326:3 21-daytime [1] - 312:3		310:12, 310:16,	according [3] - 106:7,
115 [1] - 139:5	216 [1] - 3:15	5	311:1	136:7, 163:15 accordingly [1] -
12 [7] - 2:6, 86:17,	21st [2] - 5:17, 324:9		93 [2] - 2:9, 44:8	312:8
86:19, 127:6,	22 [1] - 169:19	5 [1] - 280:9	94 [2] - 69:1, 99:12	account [2] - 55:4,
145:13, 228:4,	23 [2] - 3:10, 165:1	5,000 [3] - 211:3,	95 [1] - 163:5	101:10
258:8	24 [2] - 156:5, 258:6	212:8, 212:10	Α	accurate [2] - 148:13,
12-point [1] -	25 [4] - 3:17, 92:13,	5.34.2(b [1] - 2:12	Α	333:17
313:18	92:15, 171:10	50 [5] - 33:8, 97:13,		Acentech [1] - 50:5
12.000 [1] - 3:14	250 [1] - 297:19	108:12, 177:19, 302:3	A-1 [1] - 2:11	achieve [2] - 94:14,
12.35 [1] - 326:3	2500 [1] - 223:19	54 [1] - 44:7	A-2 [3] - 210:4, 210:8,	114:2
12.35.2 [2] - 312:16,	265 [2] - 300:1, 300:3	55 [1] - 118:16	210:13	achieved [2] - 204:5,
317:19 12.36 [1] - 313:8	266 [1] - 228:1	57 [3] - 3:17, 5:4,	a.m [2] - 52:8, 331:9 abandoned [1] - 49:8	224:4
12.37 [1] - 3:13	269 [1] - 136:2 288 [1] - 5:9	327:7	ability [1] - 175:14	achieves [1] - 287:2
12:20 [1] - 331:9	289 [1] - 5:4		able [6] - 17:12,	Acorn [2] - 2:15, 36:6 acoustic [2] - 51:17,
13 [3] - 2:6, 32:18,	2892 [1] - 5:15	6	71:17, 107:10,	191:3
191:5	28th [5] - 324:17,		259:5, 317:10,	acoustical [1] - 50:3
130 [1] - 55:16	325:1, 326:1, 326:4,	6.44.1(a [1] - 2:13	321:15	acoustics [1] - 181:3
14 [2] - 30:14, 49:14	326:6	6.47.8) [1] - 2:14	Abodez [5] - 2:15,	acquire [1] - 165:4
14-year-old [1] -	293 [1] - 327:7	60 [4] - 111:7, 206:5,	36:7, 125:4, 141:16,	acre [1] - 156:2
135:6	294 [1] - 5:19	206:6, 206:11	160:7	acres [1] - 68:16
1430 [4] - 2:6, 12:9,	29th [1] - 144:4	60-day [3] - 206:15,	absence [1] - 205:6	act [4] - 18:6, 19:3,
12:10, 17:17	2nd [1] - 324:17	207:8, 207:18	absolute [2] - 28:16,	168:3, 312:7
15 [1] - 154:8		— 603 [2] - 77:3, 83:15	311:1	action [1] - 166:2
150 [1] - 156:8	3	617.786.7783/617.	absolutely [7] - 97:6,	active [6] - 222:15,
16 [2] - 1:4, 37:5		639.0396 [1] - 1:19	201:2, 203:14, 203:15, 236:5,	225:9, 228:8, 243:4,
160 [1] - 55:15 175 [1] - 216:19	3 [6] - 156:1, 180:10,	640 [3] - 2:6, 13:7,	265:4, 277:11	243:16, 244:4
1846 [2] - 196:1,	218:17, 280:7,	18:5	abuts [3] - 21:9,	activities [3] - 50:14, 269:6, 269:15
10 70 [2] 100.1,	280:11, 280:12			200.0, 200.10

activity [5] - 71:10, 98:18, 182:19, 244:7, 269:7 actual [6] - 58:11, 111:12, 119:11, 204:9, 261:7, 265:14 ad [2] - 22:5, 139:8 ADA [4] - 44:10, 44:11, 108:6, 231:10 Adams [1] - 50:7 add [14] - 28:10, 44:19, 49:11, 49:13, 49:15, 49:17, 127:4, 145:2, 155:1, 172:2, 182:18, 188:8, 260:16, 270:9 added [7] - 55:9, 65:9, 80:7, 160:5, 162:8, 162:9, 188:2 adding [3] - 10:7, 13:14, 56:9 addition [10] - 80:11, 80:14, 85:8, 144:15, 199:6, 204:10, 225:3, 225:12, 226:6, 327:13 additional [10] - 3:17, 6:3, 9:2, 20:6, 34:13, 56:2, 201:4, 209:1, 217:5, 255:11 address [18] - 41:3, 94:9, 109:19, 118:9, 197:9, 198:4, 214:16, 227:10, 247:2, 275:7, 275:12, 283:5, 301:15, 301:17, 301:19, 320:11, 320:12 addressed [9] -94:16, 100:18, 182:11, 189:14, 197:4, 199:14, 295:2, 308:19 addresses [4] - 110:7, 228:13, 228:14, 265:6 addressing [2] -265:1, 284:2 adds [1] - 277:16 adequate [4] - 43:4, 53:16, 58:19, 114:9 adjacency [1] - 34:3 adjacent [5] - 47:8, 61:17, 102:13, 146:6, 224:6 Adjourned [1] -331:10 44:18, 139:10,

adjourned [2] -309:17, 331:8 adjust [1] - 256:6 adjustments [1] -18:3 admittedly [2] -287:4, 304:19 admitting [1] - 290:5 adopt [2] - 211:10, 216:3 Adoption [1] - 2:4 advanced [1] - 254:16 advancing [1] - 230:6 advantage [1] - 268:8 advertising [1] - 22:4 advice [5] - 19:4, 282:13, 289:12, 289:14, 317:2 advised [1] - 329:7 aerial [1] - 284:16 aesthetically [4] -172:18, 196:8, 196:12, 269:13 afford [1] - 135:15 afternoon [2] -126:17, 126:18 age [1] - 254:4 agenda [7] - 4:13, 5:8, 8:3, 24:1, 35:7, 35:11, 208:13 aggression [1] -173:18 ago [20] - 25:19, 27:10, 38:10, 41:1, 60:17, 68:16, 81:11, 97:13, 99:5, 133:10, 157:3, 165:6, 168:12, 170:15, 177:18, 191:5, 219:4, 256:10, 294:1 agree [34] - 15:16, 16:1, 17:2, 17:11, 29:14, 29:19, 33:15, 149:7, 162:19, 165:2, 181:7, 186:16, 189:2, 195:9. 201:11. 215:3, 236:4, 257:5, 259:8. 259:11. 259:19, 268:10, 268:14, 270:19, 273:6, 289:11, 292:9, 296:9, 301:12, 310:19, 311:1, 318:15, 318:16, 326:2 agreeable [2] - 19:5, 118:4 agreed [5] - 41:19,

208:6, 311:6 agreeing [3] - 312:2, 320:17, 321:3 agrees [3] - 172:12, 172:14, 172:16 ahead [1] - 221:5 Ahmed [2] - 1:11, 33:11 ahmed [1] - 68:5 **AHMED** [27] - 33:12, 37:6, 37:11, 39:10, 39:15, 68:6, 69:8, 89:17, 90:1, 90:9, 90:16, 90:19, 91:10, 91:12, 92:1, 92:9, 93:1, 93:3, 93:10, 93:17, 99:7, 100:4, 100:9, 103:2, 176:8, 176:16, 177:2 aiming [1] - 81:18 air [8] - 51:6, 57:11, 69:8, 94:3, 99:10, 103:7, 122:7, 176:4 airplanes [1] - 32:6 aisles [1] - 128:9 albedo [1] - 94:17 Alewife [16] - 71:1, 71:3, 72:2, 74:6, 130:19, 131:6, 134:9, 140:6, 153:7, 157:5, 157:10, 157:18, 167:10, 183:1, 261:18 alignment [1] - 13:1 **ALISON** [1] - 144:13 allegations [1] - 151:7 alleviate [1] - 254:9 Alliance [1] - 45:8 Allison [3] - 139:3, 142:8, 142:13 ALLISON [1] - 142:11 allocation [4] - 20:7, 21:7, 21:12, 280:1 allow [9] - 61:3, 106:2, 106:7, 115:12, 229:2, 239:2, 320:5, 321:10, 327:4 allowable [1] - 46:10 allowance [1] - 110:4 allowed [6] - 17:6, 24:8, 58:7, 157:2, 210:13, 236:19 allowing [5] - 18:18, 128:5, 157:3, 223:11, 223:15 allows [2] - 158:11, 224:12 alluded [1] - 151:5 almost [9] - 121:13,

147:11, 156:1,

237.4

177:19, 218:9, 236:2, 251:13, 251:19, 309:1 alongside [1] - 83:11 aloud [1] - 312:17 alternating [1] - 82:19 alternative [3] - 74:1, 210:14, 292:8 alternatively [1] - 15:1 aluminum [1] -185:10 amazing [3] - 158:2, 289:15, 303:9 ambience [1] - 194:16 ambient [1] - 50:9 ambiguity [2] -175:11, 318:18 ambiguous [1] -107:16 amelia [1] - 264:11 Amelia [6] - 221:19, 231:12, 239:4, 246:2, 252:17, 272:8 amend [3] - 3:2, 3:4, 208:13 amendment [1] -307:9 Amendment [11] -3:8. 3:12. 5:1. 6:2. 216:18, 217:3, 219:1, 294:3, 294:19, 306:3, 308:9 amenities [1] - 240:6 amenity [3] - 222:13, 224:16, 264:7 America [2] - 20:5, 23:2 America's [1] - 20:6 American [1] - 181:11 Ames [1] - 5:17 AMOROSO [1] -215:1 Amoroso [1] - 215:2 amount [5] - 21:11, 74:5, 248:4, 303:4, 330.13 analysis [2] - 144:4, 145:6 AND [2] - 332:1, 332:18 Andrea [4] - 142:9, 145:10, 145:11, 145:12 **ANDREA** [3] - 145:12, 149:2. 149:5 anniversary [1] -207:19 announce [2] - 236:8,

annoyed [1] - 124:15 answer [9] - 11:17, 41:11, 77:18, 92:7, 95:18, 98:16, 107:1, 142:4, 213:13 answered [1] - 107:5 answering [1] -306:17 answers [1] - 53:18 antenna [8] - 7:18, 9:3, 9:9, 10:4, 10:14, 10:19, 15:12, 18:15 antennas [8] - 8:2, 8:5, 13:9, 14:2, 14:12, 14:16, 15:9, 16:10 anticipate [4] - 62:4, 63:14, 66:15, 75:12 anticipating [1] -321:8 anxious [1] - 73:1 anyway [4] - 28:17, 82:11, 118:4, 260:7 apartment [4] - 43:19, 44:5, 170:12, 263:5 apartments [7] - 33:9, 57:17, 85:10, 192:4, 192:14, 192:15, 263:1 apologize [1] - 33:12 Appeal 191 - 2:5, 7:17. 17:15. 18:1. 20:1. 20:5, 24:1, 29:5, 29:10 appealing [1] - 34:5 appear [1] - 130:5 appearance [6] -14:3, 16:6, 174:16, 184:17, 185:2, 192:13 appeared [2] -104:14, 173:17 applaud [1] - 252:9 Apple [2] - 143:4 applicant [9] - 12:17, 201:15, 291:9. 293:10. 312:6. 320:16. 321:3. 325:16. 328:8 Applicant [1] - 2:15 applicant's [1] -280:17 applicants [2] -199:19, 318:14 application [10] -12:14, 20:12, 20:17, 20:18, 198:7, 198:17, 309:7, 313:10, 328:4,

328:9

applications [1] -8:17 applied [1] - 194:18 applies [1] - 9:13 apply [3] - 212:3, 212:5, 279:13 applying [1] - 173:7 appreciate [13] -19:14, 68:7, 108:7, 141:15, 175:10, 179:13, 180:2, 181:9, 182:4, 195:6, 254:10, 261:2 appreciated [3] -67:16, 166:14, 175:5 approach [7] - 9:6, 130:13, 173:15, 202:1, 315:11, 315:12, 315:13 approaches [4] -292:8, 315:11, 315:14, 316:4 appropriate [5] - 31:1, 66:12, 137:4, 200:12, 202:8 appropriately [3] -65:13, 95:13, 265:4 approvals [1] -221:17 approve [10] - 46:8, 215:18, 217:5, 294:19, 306:11, 308:14, 315:18, 319:6, 322:17, 323:11 approved [7] - 12:13, 152:9, 235:11, 305:8, 313:15, 318:4, 327:19 approves [2] - 313:3, 313.5 approving [4] - 309:9, 309:10, 316:3, 316.5 apropos [1] - 278:13 arborist [1] - 148:11 arch [50] - 223:6, 223:10, 230:16, 231:5, 231:12, 232:15, 232:17, 234:18, 235:2, 235:6, 235:19, 236:2, 236:6, 236:8, 236:9, 236:14, 236:15, 236:19, 237:2, 237:15, 238:7, 238:13, 246:5, 251:4, 251:9, 252:18, 253:2, 254:4, 260:19,

261:2, 264:17, 269:18, 270:4, 270:7, 270:12, 271:11, 271:12, 273:2, 274:3, 274:6, 274:12, 274:14, 274:17, 278:9, 304:15. 304:18. 305:5, 305:12, 305:13 architect [16] - 46:16, 77:12, 78:5, 85:19, 103:18, 119:12, 121:1, 138:9, 149:8, 149:10, 162:5, 175:16, 189:3, 196:7, 196:11, 196:16 architect's [1] - 175:6 architects [4] - 171:3, 196:16, 281:17, 283:3 architectural [5] -116:6, 120:15, 171:7, 233:1, 236:3 architecture [7] -162:12, 236:17, 239:12, 245:4, 247:1, 265:15 Archstone [2] - 3:9, archway [9] - 221:4, 224:13, 230:12, 230:13, 233:6, 246:18, 253:17, 272:6, 272:19 area [73] - 3:18, 34:14, 41:14, 42:4, 42:13, 42:19, 45:10, 46:14, 47:16, 49:13, 49:18, 50:12, 54:1, 54:3, 55:1, 62:17, 62:18, 69:6, 71:11, 76:12, 77:5, 79:18, 80:8, 80:14, 85:4, 85:8, 85:11, 85:12, 86:2, 86:16, 88:8, 89:1, 89:3, 89:5, 90:3, 91:15, 94:4, 94:6, 97:8, 105:18, 124:19, 135:3, 139:9, 139:12, 139:14, 140:18, 152:17, 155:9, 157:4, 157:7, 208:15, 208:17, 210:2, 210:12, 211:2, 211:9, 212:6, 212:8, 212:10, 212:12, 213:12, 219:17, 221:1,

223:14, 225:2,

242:19, 248:3, 248:5, 248:16, 248:18, 267:1, 267:2, 270:18 areas [6] - 47:16, 110:15. 110:18. 227:5. 233:15. 247:17 argument [4] - 292:2, 294:12. 297:3. 317:13 arguments [2] -303:13, 325:15 arise [1] - 198:3 Arlington [2] -145:13, 164:5 Arms [1] - 165:18 arranging [1] - 10:14 array [1] - 16:10 arrow [1] - 56:17 art [1] - 261:5 Article [1] - 3:14 articulate [1] - 233:4 articulated [4] -202:17, 202:18, 203:2, 234:8 articulating [1] -205:7 articulation [5] -80:13, 89:13, 230:7, 234:17. 298:13 artifact [1] - 264:4 artistic [1] - 261:4 artwork [1] - 27:13 ash [1] - 97:18 aside [3] - 75:16, 100:10, 301:16 aspect [2] - 30:2, 217:10 aspects [1] - 91:18 assessment [3] -94:7, 96:3, 96:9 assigned [1] - 41:16 Assistant [2] - 1:12, 2:2 Associate [2] - 1:11, associated [1] - 56:19 associates [1] -126:17 Associates [2] - 78:4, 131.4 Association [1] -142:17 assume [4] - 100:19, 109:11, 254:6, 286:11 assuming [6] - 16:7, 63:17, 87:5, 101:2, 102:18, 132:5

assumption [1] -

assure [1] - 95:12 ATTACH [1] - 333:1 attached [1] - 105:10 attempt [1] - 11:14 attention [2] - 147:19, 184.1 attenuated [1] -287:16 attest [1] - 155:12 attitude [1] - 27:1 ATTORNEY [18] -4:11, 21:10, 38:2, 38:9, 38:12, 48:13, 49:4. 132:14. 140:9. 140:14, 205:18, 206:1, 206:7, 207:17, 208:6, 322:9, 323:1, 323:16 attorney [2] - 21:1, 312:6 attractive [1] - 47:3 Auburn [4] - 2:7, 9:1, 9:2, 17:17 audience [1] - 100:14 **AUDIENCE** [2] - 36:8, 214:13 augment [1] - 47:18 August [1] - 144:4 auto [16] - 47:8, 48:17, 51:2, 51:3, 51:8, 51:11, 59:14, 59:16, 100:19, 102:14, 119:16, 124:1, 186:7, 189:9, 189:12 automatically [1] -162:13 available [1] - 47:17 Avalon [8] - 25:11, 25:13, 26:15, 27:15, 28:18, 218:11, 218:14, 288:7 Ave [17] - 10:1, 56:2, 65:18, 74:6, 77:3, 142:15, 144:16, 148:14. 165:3. 224:19, 225:16, 226:8, 229:4. 232:13, 240:11, 242:5, 248:14 Avenue [15] - 2:6, 2:7, 17:17, 17:18, 24:2, 56:4, 118:17, 123:2, 124:3, 154:1, 220:17, 238:8, 285:9, 297:13, 297:14 averages [1] - 155:9

145:3

assurance [1] - 129:8

aware [3] - 34:6, 105:3, 329:9 awkward [1] - 10:13

В

background [6] - 9:8, 15:4, 15:10, 212:13, 243:9, 272:9 backwards [1] -136:18 backyards [1] - 265:3 bad [5] - 145:4, 145:7, 153:13, 188:4, 259:6 balconies [2] - 88:6, 246:12 **balcony** [1] - 104:10 **ball** [1] - 114:17 band [1] - 242:12 Bank [3] - 20:4, 20:6, 23:2 bank [9] - 20:8, 21:13, 21:16, 21:18, 22:4, 22:10, 71:13, 71:18, 187:5 **BARNES** [4] - 139:4, 140:10, 140:16, 142:4 Barnes [3] - 136:1, 139:2, 142:2 barrier [1] - 98:9 base [3] - 3:6, 76:16, 146:16 based [7] - 75:1, 78:11. 97:3. 157:11. 188:7. 217:6. 323:10 basic [2] - 139:7, 315:18 basics [1] - 315:16 basis [1] - 289:6 bat [1] - 16:12 bay [1] - 250:15 Bay [2] - 218:11, 218:14 bays [5] - 124:10, 230:10, 233:14, 240:2, 240:9 bear [1] - 17:4 bearing [2] - 141:6, 141:12 beat [1] - 246:15 beauties [1] - 162:11 beautiful [6] - 15:19, 16:14, 16:18, 164:3, 190:14, 194:13

became [3] - 192:3,

become [4] - 158:1,

192:4, 258:9

208:19, 238:19, 329.9 becomes [6] - 160:2, 225:8, 227:13, 240:7, 267:2, 299:16 becoming [1] -238:15 bedroom [2] - 192:14, 228.5 beds [2] - 228:3 beefed [1] - 53:19 begin [3] - 34:15, 75:12, 265:9 beginning [9] - 60:9, 62:2, 82:17, 158:1, 160:9, 206:15, 220:8, 265:11, 267:16 beginnings [1] -245:11 behalf [2] - 253:15, 328:7 behind [14] - 21:1, 23:13, 42:4, 42:5, 59:11, 87:13, 107:10, 143:3, 154:3, 237:3, 254:1, 270:2, 284:19, 287:5 **belabor** [1] - 57:4 bells [2] - 299:18, 300:7 belong [1] - 265:4 below [10] - 9:14, 14:18, 30:14, 59:14, 155:11, 156:7, 160:14, 192:11, 224:18, 233:7 belts [2] - 319:10, 319.12 bemoan [1] - 185:7 benches [1] - 238:19 bend [1] - 285:4 benefit [8] - 70:18, 119:11, 130:19, 158:11, 161:14, 186:12, 186:14, 254:16 benefits [1] - 158:19 berm [1] - 166:9 best [12] - 16:2, 159:10, 185:13, 185:19, 201:10, 202:14, 214:1, 215:5, 250:17, 274:14, 302:8 better [31] - 6:11, 11:14, 12:18, 16:9, 16:13, 17:7, 59:1, 64:15, 64:16,

113:16, 116:8, 122:5, 125:1, 126:12, 132:6, 138:12, 151:1, 165:7, 183:4, 202:15, 226:16, 271:1, 288:13, 291:13. 293:16. 295:14, 295:15, 295:16, 297:12, 317:15 between [23] - 42:16, 71:1, 71:5, 90:3, 92:13, 92:15. 108:10, 111:15, 113:7, 143:7, 146:7, 148:4, 160:2, 213:5, 243:18, 254:19, 263:18, 271:11, 286:18, 298:5, 298:17, 298:18, 305:15 beyond [10] - 20:7, 79:13, 94:6, 116:7, 138:17, 184:19, 237:1, 270:8, 270:15, 305:6 bicycle/pedestrian [1] - 254:18 bicycles [2] - 178:11, 256:5 big [22] - 32:11, 61:13, 112:4, 121:14, 140:12, 163:7, 164:1, 167:6, 171:2, 191:6, 192:5, 192:6, 193:9, 247:5, 271:10, 272:1, 277:19. 281:12. 285:16. 290:10. 305:4, 307:3 bigger [5] - 54:3, 82:8, 88:12, 161:19, 286.7 biggest [1] - 204:16 **Bigolin** [2] - 1:16, 112:5 **BIGOLIN** [8] - 8:16, 9:19, 12:3, 12:10, 13:6, 17:8, 19:16, 174:17 bike [29] - 47:6, 47:14, 47:15, 48:19, 49:12, 49:13, 49:16, 49:17, 50:1, 61:1, 61:6, 64:4, 64:17, 141:4, 143:5, 145:18, 146:4, 148:2, 154:10, 154:18, 165:4, 165:5,

167:19, 178:11,

186:10, 242:13,

248:2, 262:5, 269:11 bikes [6] - 188:12, 261:19, 262:3, 262:4, 262:8, 267:18 Bill [1] - 195:17 billboard [1] - 22:5 bioscience [1] - 102:7 **bit** [42] - 10:8, 11:1, 12:18, 13:12, 47:2, 60:14, 69:3, 78:8, 78:16, 79:9, 80:13, 82:17, 83:3, 84:7, 84:9, 105:12, 107:9, 110:15, 114:6, 130:2, 132:19, 170:1, 170:3, 193:16, 193:19, 196:8, 221:11, 222:4, 223:8, 227:1, 234:4, 234:8, 234:14, 238:1, 239:11, 240:7, 242:16, 243:18, 266:1, 268:12, 277:13, 278:1 Black [1] - 77:19 black [2] - 56:3, 88:1 blame [1] - 329:13 bleeding [1] - 222:14 **blending** [1] - 9:7 blessing [1] - 58:9 block [4] - 87:5, 191:15, 281:12, 301:8 blocks [6] - 139:17, 251:13, 297:19, 301:7, 301:8 blowup [1] - 89:4 blue [1] - 121:18 blueprints [1] - 149:9 bluestone [2] - 86:4, 86:14 board [4] - 34:16, 34:17, 83:4, 173:12 **BOARD** [2] - 1:2, 333:1 **Board** [92] - 2:5, 4:5, 5:4, 5:9, 5:13, 5:14, 5:19, 6:18, 7:1, 7:5, 7:17, 8:10, 17:15, 18:1, 18:11, 20:1, 20:3, 20:5, 20:11, 23:2, 23:19, 24:5, 24:15, 29:5, 29:9, 31:11, 32:3, 48:8, 50:18, 54:18, 78:7, 81:9, 107:17, 118:5, 151:12, 152:15, 162:18, 176:9,

181:7, 183:19, 196:16, 197:6, 199:16, 201:7, 209:10, 210:5, 210:16, 211:6, 211:8, 212:19, 213:7, 213:14, 214:2. 215:18. 216:17, 221:9, 260:4, 275:16, 278:16, 281:2, 281:4, 281:8, 282:14, 291:11, 291:15, 304:4, 305:8. 308:8. 308:11. 308:13. 308:14. 308:18. 309:5, 312:1, 313:1, 313:3, 313:9, 313:12, 314:18, 318:1, 320:2, 324:5, 325:13, 327:7, 328:5, 329:9, 330:18, 331:10, 332:13, 333:4, 333:16 Board's [1] - 23:7 boards [1] - 82:19 Bob [1] - 129:1 body [18] - 47:9, 48:18, 51:2, 51:3, 51:8, 51:11, 59:15, 59:16, 100:19, 102:14, 119:17, 124:1, 129:7, 168:2, 186:8, 189:9, 189:12 **bollards** [1] - 47:19 bond [1] - 157:11 book [1] - 22:12 boring [2] - 278:5, 282:2 **Boston** [6] - 5:18, 27:5, 97:9, 253:14, 256:13, 274:5 **bottom** [1] - 261:3 boulevard [1] - 194:8 boundary [1] - 243:18 bowl [1] - 300:18 **box** [2] - 13:14, 304.11 Boy [1] - 261:4 boy [1] - 203:14 brain [1] - 25:13 branch [1] - 256:3 brand [2] - 306:17, 328:11 branding [3] - 27:2, 27:9, 28:12 break [22] - 11:2, 114:1, 117:6,

139:17, 176:11, 176:13, 191:18, 199:11, 203:9, 203:12, 205:3, 208:10, 230:7, 233:6, 233:15, 270:10, 274:15, 281:19. 285:16. 292:17, 304:19, 305:11 breaking [11] - 89:12, 114:4, 163:9, 183:10, 183:12, 184:3, 185:18, 186:4, 200:7, 205:6, 239:16 breathe [1] - 252:11 Brian [9] - 1:12, 2:2, 4:13, 7:3, 206:14, 218:17, 221:2, 221:6, 221:9 **BRIAN** [17] - 4:14, 6:16, 6:19, 7:7, 7:10, 73:16, 221:8, 259:11, 272:7, 276:14, 277:11, 318:13, 319:17, 326:18, 330:4, 330:7, 330:14 brick [11] - 13:10, 164:1, 164:4, 251:2, 258:4, 258:6, 259:3, 276.9 bricking [1] - 185:12 brickworks [2] -147:13 Bridge [7] - 16:16, 24:11, 24:12, 26:9, 30:13. 256:2. 256:12 bridge [10] - 26:10, 30:15, 30:18, 34:1, 69:19, 73:14, 141:5, 153:8, 159:1, 159:8 brief [2] - 4:15, 219:18 briefly [1] - 27:18 bright [2] - 121:18, 184:12 bring [9] - 51:13, 82:10, 112:9, 119:2, 200:2, 209:10, 247:2, 249:2, 261:17 **bringing** [3] - 94:8, 115:18, 173:5 **brings** [1] - 172:19 **Briston** [1] - 165:18 **Broadway** [1] - 1:6 broken [11] - 113:6,

183:15, 196:9,

198:13, 202:5,

102:6

Canal [1] - 285:3

240:1, 279:9, 281:13, 285:12, 292:19, 304:15 Brook [4] - 71:1, 71:3, 72:2, 153:7 brought [11] - 17:4, 41:5, 43:2, 101:18, 103:8, 119:8, 119:14, 123:10, 170:2. 200:3. 241:15 BU [1] - 16:16 bud [1] - 85:19 budget [1] - 180:13 **build** [9] - 58:8, 97:5, 110:2, 133:11, 136:13, 167:8, 168:13, 220:9, 226:14 building [295] - 2:13, 3:11, 3:18, 5:2, 11:11, 11:15, 11:16, 15:1, 15:19, 16:6, 16:7, 16:14, 16:15, 16:18. 18:8. 18:15. 21:6, 21:8, 23:6, 23:8, 23:13, 24:6, 26:7, 26:8, 26:13, 26:14, 26:16, 27:7, 28:7, 28:8, 28:10, 30:19, 39:2, 41:13, 42:4, 42:5, 42:13, 42:17, 43:6, 43:17, 44:1, 44:3, 44:5, 44:7, 44:13, 50:4, 50:8, 50:11, 51:1, 52:13, 53:2, 56:17, 57:13, 58:12, 58:16, 59:11, 59:13, 60:1, 62:12, 65:18, 76:8, 76:17, 79:7, 79:18, 80:3, 80:15, 81:17, 82:15, 84:19, 86:3, 86:6, 87:2, 87:11, 87:14, 88:18, 89:4, 89:7, 89:8, 89:15, 94:10, 94:15, 97:5, 99:9, 102:13, 106:11, 109:6, 109:16, 110:12, 110:13, 111:3, 111:10, 112:2, 112:15, 113:4, 113:14, 113:15, 114:1, 114:3, 115:6, 115:15, 119:4, 119:6, 119:9, 121:8, 121:13, 121:18, 124:5, 133:7, 133:13, 136:5, 136:15, 150:5, 150:6, 150:7,

150:10, 150:12, 151:1, 154:3, 154:7, 159:4, 160:7, 160:18, 161:19, 162:3, 163:6, 164:4, 166:1, 167:3, 167:6, 168:16, 169:3, 169:5. 169:7. 169:10, 169:13, 170:2, 170:19, 172:12, 172:16, 174:16, 175:17, 177:5, 177:8, 177:10. 177:14. 177:17, 182:2, 183:11, 184:14, 185:19, 186:7, 186:15, 186:16, 186:19, 188:16, 189:8, 190:14, 191:6, 191:7, 191:12. 191:14. 191:17, 192:5, 195:13, 196:6, 198:9, 198:10, 199:10, 200:5, 200:8, 202:4, 202:16, 202:18, 203:4, 203:6, 203:12, 203:16, 204:17, 205:3, 205:6, 220:1, 221:13, 222:3, 222:5, 222:8, 222:11, 222:17, 223:4, 223:17, 224:3, 224:6, 225:13, 227:18, 228:15, 229:1, 229:3, 229:7, 229:15, 230:6, 230:8, 230:11, 230:14, 232:6, 232:12, 232:18, 233:5, 233:6, 234:1, 234:2, 235:4, 235:10, 236:10, 236:17, 237:6, 237:17, 238:6, 239:11, 239:14, 239:18, 240:4, 241:12, 241:15, 243:13, 245:1, 245:2, 245:9, 245:14, 245:17, 246:11, 246:14, 246:18, 247:10, 250:14, 258:18, 263:17, 263:19, 264:3, 265:12, 266:12, 266:13,

268:10, 270:10,

277:18, 277:19, 278:6. 278:14. 278:19. 279:2. 279:6. 280:6. 280:7. 281:11. 282:6. 282:8, 284:11, 284:18, 287:14, 287:16, 288:1, 288:2, 288:13, 292:15, 292:18, 293:4, 293:6, 294:13, 295:1, 297:15, 298:3, 298:7, 298:11, 298:15, 299:5, 299:13, 302:4, 304:15, 304:19, 305:12, 307:1 **Building**[3] - 24:3, 24:14, 170:17 building's [2] - 12:1, 273:17 **buildings** [59] - 11:13, 26:17, 27:2, 27:4, 27:8, 28:2, 28:3, 28:6, 32:5, 78:17, 113:6, 115:7, 120:1, 120:8, 123:17, 137:13, 138:3, 150:15, 150:18, 154:17, 160:17, 161:16, 164:1, 164:2, 170:12, 171:10, 171:16, 177:17, 184:4, 185:8, 190:8, 191:16, 197:15, 198:5, 202:2, 202:13, 233:3, 234:14, 243:7, 244:16, 251:15, 252:5, 252:7, 258:4, 264:15, 274:8, 274:10, 274:13, 274:15, 278:18, 279:10, 279:14, 291:3, 298:4, 298:17, 298:18, 301:8. 301:9. 316:15 built [23] - 27:5, 47:15, 53:4, 63:18, 115:14, 120:13, 133:3, 138:5, 140:17, 141:3, 159:7, 170:6, 170:12, 170:19, 177:18, 190:8,

190:18, 191:10,

273:14, 274:5,

275:10, 276:18,

275:4, 275:5,

196:1, 196:3, 258:4, 299:10 **bulk** [1] - 41:2 bump [1] - 88:11 **bumping** [1] - 320:8 **bumps** [1] - 88:13 bunch [1] - 235:1 Burnes [2] - 150:18, 150:19 bury [1] - 178:19 **bus** [6] - 73:19, 74:5, 74:8, 74:11, 123:1, 131:13 BUSINESS [2] - 2:2. 3:16 business [10] - 18:17, 34:7, 34:14, 103:6, 122:12, 133:13, 134:14, 163:7, 265:13, 302:18 Business [5] - 5:3, 326:19, 327:2, 327:3, 329:3 busses [1] - 73:17 **but...** [1] - 182:13

C

cables [2] - 178:17, 178:19 cabling [2] - 10:12, 12:18 cad [1] - 78:17 cafe [4] - 241:5, 243:19, 266:16, 268:4 cages [1] - 262:3 caliber [1] - 54:13 **CAMBRIDGE** [1] - 1:2 Cambridge [41] - 1:7, 3:2, 3:3, 3:4, 3:5, 3:6, 4:4, 4:18, 5:15, 12:12, 35:8, 50:6, 51:14, 68:9, 94:11, 97:9, 134:8, 139:10, 139:19, 142:15, 145:14, 147:7, 147:14, 158:13, 158:14, 170:5, 170:12, 170:15, 185:9, 194:12, 208:14, 208:15, 209:15, 211:13, 213:3, 219:7, 229:19, 297:7, 303:3, 320:2 CambridgePark [7] -55:5, 55:16, 56:4,

131:14, 144:15,

Cambridgeport [1] -

324:3

canceled [2] - 207:14, 207:15 cannot [4] - 183:11, 183:13, 200:8, 303:2 canopy [3] - 244:3, 251:8, 251:9 capacity [2] - 73:11, 144:3 capital [1] - 152:11 Capital [1] - 152:12 CAPTURING [1] car [4] - 103:3, 103:9, 133:1, 188:9 care [2] - 254:6, 274:2 careful [5] - 23:3, 176:6, 230:11, 281:9, 281:13 carefully [3] - 53:2, 175:13, 307:19 CARLONE [3] -156:16, 250:7, 284:15 Carlone [2] - 257:6, 273.7 Carlone's [4] -178:16, 194:6, 199:12. 268:11 Carol [2] - 33:14, 35:9 carpet [2] - 68:17, 94:1 carry [1] - 239:2 carrying [1] - 230:9 cars [6] - 49:7, 49:9, 64:10, 130:3, 187:3, 188:12 case [27] - 14:16, 18:13, 20:5, 23:4, 23:19, 74:9, 102:12, 117:11, 118:1, 132:1, 132:3, 132:4, 164:9, 207:14, 265:16, 275:2, 296:16, 296:17, 300:13, 300:14, 309:7, 316:2, 327:4, 327:7. 327:17. 328:10. 329:19 cases [7] - 7:18, 8:10, 17:16, 17:18, 20:1, 211:5 Cases [1] - 2:5 catch [2] - 81:4, 136:8 catches [1] - 50:9 catering [1] - 152:1 CATHERINE [6] -

268:17, 296:15,

305:17, 307:11,

316:1, 326:9 Catherine [1] - 1:11 causing [1] - 112:16 CAZ [1] - 333:2 CD's [1] - 271:18 CDD [6] - 112:8, 125:8, 125:18, 165:13, 183:5, 219.6 cedar [2] - 46:19, 82:15 ceiling [1] - 246:7 celebrate [1] - 207:19 cement [2] - 81:14, 84.2 center [11] - 47:11, 58:17, 77:4, 84:19, 131:14, 140:5, 158:18, 168:4, 187:9, 271:13, 301:3 Center [2] - 69:16, 127:15 centering [1] - 58:2 centers [1] - 121:16 Central [1] - 150:19 cents [1] - 27:18 certain [10] - 12:6, 32:9. 103:6. 103:11. 110:15, 178:6, 288:7, 321:14, 322:5, 330:13 certainly [13] -107:19, 131:11, 135:15, 142:16, 149:7, 171:3, 186:1, 202:15, 204:5, 204:6, 264:5, 280:17, 288:6 certifiable [1] - 94:13 chain [4] - 46:18, 52:7, 186:8, 329:10 chair [17] - 22:1, 23:5, 27:17, 51:16, 67:15, 97:17, 102:3, 116:9, 135:9, 172:7, 182:17, 213:18, 260:9, 281:7, 308:3, 318:13, 319:17 Chair [4] - 1:8, 1:8, 36:10. 201:12 Chairman [7] - 89:17, 90:5, 126:3, 176:8, 221:8, 305:7, 319:1 challenge [1] - 140:4 challenged [1] - 77:2 challenging [1] -247:17 chance [2] - 6:11, 277:10

change [22] - 25:1,

25:15, 29:10, 56:14, 58:9, 73:7, 81:16, 83:9, 112:13, 127:18, 128:2, 136:15, 144:7, 163:6, 210:7, 210:10, 211:1, 231:8. 252:2. 277:2. 306:12, 333:4 CHANGE [6] - 333:9, 333:10, 333:11, 333:12, 333:13, 333.14 changed [6] - 29:8, 56:8, 83:16, 106:12, 230:16, 293:6 changes [24] - 31:19, 36:14, 57:1, 62:7, 76:11, 78:19, 82:1, 87:16, 131:11, 170:16, 170:17, 175:1, 212:5, 250:14, 273:9, 288:17, 288:18, 307:3, 307:9, 327:17, 332:13, 333:17 changing [5] - 81:13, 257:14, 294:7, 307:7 chaotic [1] - 252:1 character [2] -162:19, 257:19 charge [1] - 205:12 Charles [2] - 164:18, 164:19 CHARLES [2] -164:19, 169:1 Charlestown [1] -24:13 charrette [1] - 75:1 chart [1] - 212:14 cheapest/finest[1] -303:11 check [1] - 324:13 chemicals [2] - 101:2, 155:18 Chicago [1] - 207:16 **Chihuly** [1] - 276:2 choice [2] - 13:1, 309:9 choices [2] - 276:19, 308:14 chose [1] - 211:10 chosen [1] - 266:8 Chun [2] - 209:14, 215:10 chunk [2] - 84:3, 90:8 Cinema [1] - 143:4

cinema [1] - 179:4

circle [3] - 32:19,

65:19, 67:10 circular [1] - 85:1 circulated [1] - 8:19 circulation [2] -139:19, 184:5 circumstances [1] -34.12 citizens [3] - 182:10, 183:19, 303:2 CITY [1] - 1:2 city [27] - 32:1, 33:3, 33:9, 45:18, 63:12, 65:19, 67:8, 68:12, 69:4, 70:3, 70:17, 73:11, 75:6, 134:7, 136:6, 136:13, 173:10, 176:5, 179:6, 183:8, 187:11, 197:9, 208:16, 219:13, 253:14, 288:14, 289:2 City [15] - 1:12, 2:2, 3:2, 3:2, 3:5, 60:17, 152:8, 172:9, 181:12, 208:13, 208:14, 317:19, 318:10, 329:7, 329.17 city's [1] - 70:3 cityscape [1] - 295:15 citywide [1] - 158:3 civic [2] - 265:3, 266:14 civil [4] - 57:3, 91:5, 91:15, 93:3 claim [1] - 151:14 clapboard [2] - 82:5, 84:4 clarify [2] - 278:17, 308:7 clarifying [2] - 55:13, 325:12 clay [2] - 147:10, 147:14 clean [10] - 96:4, 96:9, 101:16, 155:16, 173:1, 231:17, 234:11, 239:15, 254:7, 276:17 clean-up [4] - 96:4, 96:9, 101:16, 173:1 cleaned [2] - 49:10, 98:19 cleaner [1] - 235:15 cleanest [1] - 318:17 cleanly [1] - 228:16 cleanup [1] - 168:3 clear [10] - 68:1,

122:18, 130:1,

148:5, 175:17,

251:17, 272:19, 285:17, 285:18, 325.5 clearer [2] - 241:19, 291:16 clearly [6] - 15:19, 25:18, 79:9, 117:19, 128:9, 226:2 cleverly [1] - 274:12 **client** [1] - 106:8 **climbed** [1] - 138:16 CLIPPINGER [4] -65:7, 70:12, 73:9, 74:3 clock [1] - 110:6 close [14] - 31:12, 54:14, 79:8, 84:17, 94:1. 119:16. 120:18, 155:10, 155:19, 184:1, 195:1, 255:3, 270:10, 317:3 closed [2] - 103:9, 124:11 closely [2] - 111:1, 265:9 closer [3] - 23:7, 115:10, 124:14 club [1] - 224:16 clubhouse [1] -222:12 clumsy [3] - 10:13, 14:2, 15:17 clutter [2] - 10:8, 13:15 coal [1] - 97:18 Coca [1] - 32:17 Coca-Cola [1] - 32:17 code [1] - 281:1 Code [1] - 170:17 coffee [1] - 178:12 coffers [1] - 84:10 coffins [1] - 148:12 cogent [2] - 294:12, 297:3 **COHEN** [99] - 11:7, 15:16, 25:11, 25:14, 25:18, 27:17, 58:14, 59:2, 59:6, 59:10, 59:13, 59:18, 59:19, 63:17, 64:1, 64:3, 65:2, 65:14, 65:17, 66:16, 66:19, 67:5, 67:8, 67:13, 69:9, 69:14, 70:8, 74:14, 75:15, 76:1, 95:2, 95:8, 98:6, 98:15, 100:17, 102:17, 108:17, 112:18, 113:2, 116:9, 116:13, 116:17,

117:14, 185:5, 196:19, 214:9, 216:5, 271:3, 271:9, 272:4, 272:10, 272:14, 272:17, 277:13, 280:15, 284:9, 287:8, 291:6, 293:18. 296:6. 296:9, 296:14, 300:8, 301:2, 301:11, 309:13, 310:7, 310:19, 311:9, 312:9, 312:14, 313:17, 314:1, 317:16, 318:8. 318:14. 319:3. 319:7. 319:12. 319:16. 320:15. 321:2. 321:5, 321:11, 321:13, 321:19, 322:1, 322:2, 322:6, 322:18, 323:14, 324:15, 324:19, 325:17, 325:19, 328:14, 328:16, 330:12, 331:2 Cohen [2] - 1:8, 1:10 coherent [1] - 271:1 coherently [1] -268:15 Cola [2] - 32:17 collaborative [1] -219:10 colleague [2] - 31:14, 195:17 colleagues [8] - 30:7, 79:12, 182:18, 185:6, 185:15, 205:5, 208:17. 277:14 Colleagues [1] -174:10 **collecting** [1] - 50:8 colloquy [1] - 150:1 color [17] - 11:11, 11:16, 13:1, 14:4, 28:11, 78:12, 84:4, 87:6, 87:9, 120:16, 146:14, 239:17, 251:2, 251:3, 276:9, 276:15, 277:8 colored [1] - 78:16 colors [6] - 87:8, 243:2, 251:14, 276:8, 276:11, 277:1 column [2] - 91:1, 262:11 columns [4] - 90:3, 248:6, 256:9, 257:2 comfortable [8] -

282:18, 283:1, 158:4 61:11, 71:14, 57:10, 99:12, 99:16, 295:4, 300:11, 290:16 99:19 common [4] - 76:11, 305:19, 306:4, 87:12, 88:5, 88:6 compliment [1] condensers [5] -306:16, 323:7 Commonwealth [2] -225:7 57:9, 57:18, 69:1, coming [25] - 5:13, 153:14, 303:3 compromise [1] -100:7, 190:4 condition [6] -16:16. 19:13. 24:13. communal [1] -286:17 71:11. 85:6. 86:3. 180:17, 180:19, 161:11 computer [2] -86:12. 86:19. 132:4. communicate [1] -181:3, 181:10, 190:11, 195:8 150:12, 159:4, 182:6, 197:3 318:10 computers [1] - 113:1 166:15, 189:12, conditionally [1] communication [2] con [1] - 318:11 226:19, 232:2, 174:13, 330:15 concealing [1] - 190:4 313:4 234:11, 241:4, conditioning [1] communications [1] concept [11] - 16:2, 244:7, 246:7, 256:1, 36:17 57:11 145:16, 146:1, 276:11, 282:13, communities [1] -146:2, 146:11, conditions [3] -291:3, 302:19 183:6, 290:17, 310:8 166:17, 188:8, commemorative [1] -323:12 community [6] - 62:3, 217:5, 274:3, 305:9, 27.9 condominium [1] -62:5, 75:1, 179:15, 315:19 commence [1] - 314:2 43:18 214:3, 264:6 conceptual [1] comment [28] - 11:8, Community [14] -235:2 conference [1] -20:12, 67:14, 69:17, 1:13, 1:14, 2:3, concern [18] - 16:5, 157:8 78:9, 81:10, 84:13, 36:18, 39:1, 79:5, 46:17, 51:1, 68:7, confident [1] - 206:19 102:12, 116:11, confined [1] - 15:5 69:7, 70:13, 112:17, 81:12, 102:1, 116:15, 118:3, confirm [1] - 318:11 199:16, 209:9, 138:4, 199:10, 124:16, 137:9, 223:7, 229:19, 200:1, 200:3, 201:8, conflicts [1] - 254:19 142:13, 163:19, 332:4, 332:9 201:9, 209:17, confluence [1] -184:3, 217:2, community-based [1] 254:2, 254:8, 269.5 257:11, 265:13, - 75:1 278:15, 301:14 conform [1] - 122:17 273:8, 276:7, concerned [12] - 45:9, commuters [1] conforming [3] -276:10, 277:5, 69:3, 138:4, 149:19, 256:5 127:18, 210:11, 281:8, 285:6, 294:8, 188:2, 188:10, company [2] - 51:19, 210:12 299:3, 315:2 188:11, 189:6, 152:11 confused [4] - 40:5, comments [39] - 17:3, 254:17, 261:6, Company [2] - 35:7, 144:3. 184:11. 17:9, 17:15, 24:17, 123:16 262:19, 263:3 193:19 24:19, 33:17, 47:7, company's [1] concerning [1] confusing [2] - 91:1, 78:6, 112:6, 126:4, 313:2 194:19 184:10 126:5, 136:4, 139:6, concerns [12] - 41:4, compare [4] - 104:8, confusion [2] -142:15, 168:19, 109:3, 284:11, 41:7, 43:2, 95:4, 124:17, 146:19 176:10, 182:17, 108:18, 197:1, 287:14 confusions [1] -193:13. 196:18. 199:18, 291:7, compatible [1] -147:1 217:10, 229:17, 293:3, 293:5, 301:4, 140:1 congratulate [1] -229:19, 230:2, 301:15 complaints [1] -250:9 231:15, 232:3, concluded [1] - 314:3 52:16 connect [6] - 47:8, 233:11, 236:4, concludes [1] complementary [1] -233:17, 233:18, 252:13, 253:9, 144:14 247:7 264:12, 274:12, 260:7, 274:4, conclusion [2] complementing [1] -305:1 274:19, 276:16, 321:17, 329:15 connected [1] - 34:4 242:6 283:3, 283:18, Concord [13] - 55:7, complements [1] connecting [3] -289:16, 294:15, 56:1, 56:4, 65:18, 244.6 237:11. 247:12. 295:18, 297:7 74:6, 77:3, 83:15, complete [2] - 74:19, 253:2 commercial [1] - 27:3 83:16, 123:1, 93:6 connection [16] -Commission [3] -142:14, 144:16, completed [2] -143:6, 160:2, 12:13, 327:15, 148:11, 169:8 220:2, 332:7 160:16, 199:16, 327:19 Concord/Alewife [2] -COMPLETED [1] -222:1. 223:5. Commission's [1] -139:12, 139:14 223:12, 223:15, 332:18 327:16 Concord/Wheeler [1] completely [3] -224:12, 225:17, commit [1] - 229:13 - 121:17 229:10, 236:16, 120:16, 125:7, commitment [2] - 7:5, concrete [2] - 87:5, 233:3 238:2, 242:2, 122:9 87.7 244:19, 252:16 complexity [1] - 79:19 committed [3] concur[3] - 159:12, compliant [4] - 44:10, connections [3] -61:16, 62:1, 63:5 182:17, 185:5 44:11, 44:12, 108:6 70:19, 220:19, committee [1] - 84:14 condenser [4] -305:15

complicated [3] -

committing [1] -

connector [1] -298:17 connects [4] - 224:11, 237:17, 274:17, 305:4 CONNOLLY [6] -268:17, 296:15, 305:17, 307:11, 316:1, 326:9 Connolly [1] - 1:11 cons [1] - 186:4 consciously [1] -290:5 consequences [1] -284:3 Conservation [1] -12:11 conservative [1] -278:6 conserve [1] - 100:3 consider [12] - 11:9, 101:15, 113:11, 137:7, 186:1, 187:14, 188:5, 204:15, 213:14, 216:19, 310:8, 314:11 consideration [3] -153:17, 230:12, 254:1 considerations [1] -215:4 considered [10] -49:1, 94:3, 101:13, 113:8, 113:10, 113:12, 128:17, 273:5, 313:14, 318:3 considering [2] -131:12, 195:6 consistent [5] - 97:8, 174:19, 176:5, 235:10, 279:7 constantly [2] -125:12, 170:9 constrained [3] -281:5, 292:3, 311:15 constraining [1] -288:6 constraint [1] -288:15 construct [4] - 2:9, 3:17, 70:4, 313:11 constructed [2] -61:19, 146:7 constructing [1] -63:6 construction [15] -

63:15, 75:7, 75:12,

95:9, 101:9, 157:13,

201:3, 201:10, 280:6, 280:19, 288:3, 288:17, 299:8, 299:13, 300:5 consultant [4] - 50:3, 77:19. 218:16. 305.7 contains [1] - 263:12 contemplate [1] -64:6 contemporary [2] -235:16, 236:14 content [2] - 34:14, 67:16 context [7] - 122:8, 162:18, 187:13, 188:17, 275:14, 290:15, 307:4 contingency [1] -95:13 Contingency [1] -96:11 continuation [6] -4:17, 5:10, 223:17, 311:6, 324:12, 325:13 continue [20] -136:16, 144:7, 148:6, 152:19, 176:10, 206:17, 212:3, 212:5, 306:6, 309:14, 311:13, 314:4, 317:18, 318:9, 320:4, 322:7, 323:7, 325:5, 325:14 Continued [1] - 2:18 continued [10] - 2:9, 5:10, 5:16, 18:13, 49:2, 147:19, 170:14, 207:2, 314:17, 321:18 continues [4] - 86:15, 160:4. 212:7. 242:12 continuing [5] -311:11, 312:1, 319:8, 321:14 continuous [1] -230:17 contract [1] - 148:18 contrast [1] - 264:9 contribute [1] -143:13 contributing [2] -143:12, 168:8 control [7] - 91:17, 92:18, 122:14, 128:11, 177:10, 271:5, 273:4

controls [1] - 100:1 conversation [6] -18:18, 64:14, 72:13, 202:7. 287:19. 289:11 conversations [5] -70:14, 106:9, 106:17, 107:8, 126:7 Converse [1] - 27:7 converted [1] - 24:14 converting [2] -136:11, 192:14 convince [2] - 135:5, 259:5 convinced [3] -117:12, 185:18, 269:17 cool [3] - 256:14, 267:17, 268:7 cooling [3] - 100:5, 100:8, 156:2 cooperate [1] - 130:4 cooperative [1] -130:6 coordination [1] -242:18 copies [2] - 39:18, 174.6 copy [4] - 39:12, 39:14. 244:13. 332:7 corner [14] - 21:17, 71:6, 72:12, 82:2, 114:17, 167:10, 192:2, 222:15, 223:2, 240:6, 245:9, 248:17, 251:1, 262:10 corners [1] - 244:18 cornus [5] - 9:10, 9:14, 11:2, 13:10, 14:19 corporate [1] - 302:14 correct [13] - 23:8, 38:15, 39:5, 43:18, 55:17, 55:18, 56:5, 59:5, 84:10, 99:15, 104:5, 317:17, 324:8 correction [1] - 333:5 corrections [2] -332:13, 333:17 correctly [4] - 95:6, 108:9, 203:8, 203:9 correspondence [1] -179:13 corridor [7] - 58:1, 81:3, 88:16, 169:4, 237:11, 238:14,

302:10

141:13, 151:4. 151:8, 151:10, 171:3, 177:8 costs [3] - 141:6, 201:3, 300:5 coterminous [2] - 3:3, 211:15 Council [14] - 3:2, 60:17, 70:15, 152:8, 163:13, 163:16, 168:6, 181:12, 208:13, 209:2, 210:5, 211:10, 214:2, 216:3 Councillor [6] - 172:9, 173:5, 178:16, 194:6, 250:6, 273:6 councillor [1] -156:15 COUNCILLOR [2] -156:16, 284:15 COUNCILOR [1] -250:7 count [4] - 113:19, 219:3, 314:14, 314:19 counted [1] - 310:17 counter [1] - 77:9 country [1] - 157:1 couple [20] - 27:10, 45:7, 56:13, 60:17, 76:18, 85:9, 88:13, 105:14, 108:17, 109:7, 110:11, 136:3, 142:15, 197:1, 210:6, 219:4, 219:5, 220:15, 258:19, 294:1 course [9] - 18:2, 108:6, 115:13, 155:15, 199:4, 200:9, 200:10, 218:15 courtesy [1] - 126:2 courthouse [3] -320:1, 320:14, 329:14 cousins [2] - 232:18, 274:9 covers [1] - 87:15 coveted [1] - 289:3 crack [1] - 69:13 crane [1] - 13:10 create [15] - 72:7, 86:7, 136:15, 140:4, 143:6, 197:18, 203:16, 222:2,

229:8, 232:7, 241:8,

corridors [4] - 57:13,

cost [7] - 110:10,

156:6, 156:7, 156:8

243:4, 248:12, 286:14, 307:2 created [2] - 259:15, 284:6 creates [2] - 211:12, 239.5 creating [9] - 3:3, 3:5, 140:3. 205:8. 208:15, 223:14, 228:9, 230:5 Crimson [2] - 3:17, 327:11 crisper [1] - 78:18 criteria [2] - 173:8, 213:9 critical [6] - 129:15, 161:8, 175:3, 183:2, 191:11, 242:14 critically [1] - 183:2 critiques [1] - 278:2 cross [3] - 66:19, 153:9, 165:10 cross-sections [1] -165:10 crosswalk [4] - 71:2, 72:3, 72:6, 73:13 crowd [1] - 297:1 **CUBE** [1] - 218:17 CUBE3 [1] - 221:10 cues [1] - 234:11 cuff [1] - 254:17 curb [3] - 54:7, 67:1, 85.15 **curbs** [1] - 44:19 curious [1] - 146:11 current [5] - 61:18, 130:18, 212:11, 237:15, 241:2 curse [1] - 233:13 cut [1] - 148:16 cuts [2] - 67:1, 248:3 cycles [1] - 52:4

D

dab [1] - 271:12 Dale [1] - 276:2 Danehy [13] - 62:14, 62:15, 63:3, 75:11, 114:19, 134:10, 143:7, 146:7, 146:15, 148:4, 151:18, 186:17, 190:5 danger [4] - 158:2, 158:8, 158:12, 158:16 dangerous [2] -179:1, 255:3 dark [2] - 59:14, 85:9 Dash [1] - 1:16 **DASH** [2] - 315:3, 319:10 dash [1] - 81:11 data [4] - 50:8, 50:9, 50:12, 268:2 date [16] - 37:2, 52:5, 125:10, 202:9, 206:2, 206:4, 309:15, 314:5, 314:6, 315:1, 321:14, 322:5, 322:13, 323:17, 325:7, 333:6 **DATE** [1] - 333:1 dated [2] - 38:5, 55:15 dates [1] - 6:10 daunting [1] - 130:8 **David** [1] - 77:19 daylight [1] - 111:15 days [15] - 158:8, 206:5, 206:6, 206:11, 283:12, 307:17, 308:13, 309:16, 310:2, 311:6, 312:19, 314:6, 317:10, 321:17, 326:3 **DC** [1] - 159:7 DCR [3] - 71:15, 159:1, 187:13 dead [1] - 148:16 deadline [1] - 310:11 deadlines [1] - 311:2 deal [8] - 107:17, 118:3, 122:7, 162:7, 171:8, 181:13, 187:16, 298:7 dealership [1] - 124:3 dealing [3] - 213:10, 307:8, 320:14 dealt [6] - 95:12, 102:9, 106:19, 181:2, 181:15, 182.2 deceiving [1] - 205:1 **December** [2] - 83:13, 111:16 decide [4] - 19:2, 117:11, 117:12, 163:4 decision [13] - 19:4, 71:9, 175:15, 205:16, 218:2, 266:4, 310:9, 311:16, 313:12, 314:12, 314:14,

318:2, 329:19

141:7, 300:5

deck [15] - 30:15,

decisions [3] - 96:9,

30:18, 46:3, 46:4, 46:7, 46:11, 58:7, 58:8, 76:12, 88:9, 104:3, 105:6, 109:9, 110:3, 204:8 decks [1] - 112:2 decorative [3] - 33:6, 33:7, 110:6 deep [1] - 79:16 deeper [3] - 18:13, 18:18, 66:11 defer [1] - 129:1 deferred [1] - 30:7 define [1] - 226:2 defined [3] - 89:14, 211:16, 232:9 defining [1] - 243:17 definite [1] - 28:19 definitely [5] - 92:19, 112:8, 188:15, 229:13, 273:6 definition [1] - 268:19 definitive [1] - 50:16 definitively [1] - 277:8 deliberate [1] -174.12 deliberation [2] -207:13. 325:2 deliberations [2] -153:15, 290:4 delivered [4] - 332:4, 332:8, 332:9, 332:11 deliveries [3] - 42:12, 52:2, 52:9 delivery [2] - 42:11, 52:5 delve [1] - 18:13 demand [2] - 156:7, 303.7 denied [1] - 313:11 **DENNIS** [3] - 156:16, 250:7, 284:15 **Dennis** [3] - 199:12, 257:6, 268:11 Dennis's [1] - 257:10 density [1] - 104:12 **DEP** [2] - 96:5, 96:16 Department [8] -32:3, 41:19, 51:14, 55:2, 55:11, 194:3, 332:5, 332:10 department [1] -217:14 departure [1] - 289:7 depression [1] -286:9 depth [4] - 53:5, 67:16, 81:19 deputized [1] - 96:7

derelict [1] - 128:4

describe [3] - 48:14, 52:15, 60:4 described [1] -193:14 deserves [1] - 248:8 design [48] - 12:6, 26:2, 27:12, 30:19, 45:2, 45:5, 52:13, 54:10, 58:12, 60:1, 60:4, 62:10, 63:4, 73:7, 74:17, 75:1, 75:2, 75:4, 82:16, 83:10, 88:8, 183:14, 184:17, 185:3, 190:14, 213:11, 217:10, 217:13, 218:16, 221:12, 221:14, 221:17, 224:7, 230:13, 236:14, 237:15, 241:2, 242:18, 249:3, 253:17, 257:5, 270:9, 271:1, 271:16, 278:3, 305:7 designate [1] - 47:5 designed [4] - 44:10, 94:11, 94:12, 202:12 designers [3] - 263:9, 281:17, 289:12 designing [1] - 191:6 desire [2] - 123:2, 197.12 desired [1] - 122:18 desires [1] - 113:5 desk [1] - 113:17 detail [17] - 8:4, 52:14, 52:18, 53:10, 78:8, 81:17, 82:14, 83:9, 83:19, 88:1, 103:19, 179:18, 188:15, 202:19, 227:1, 234:17, 267:3 detailed [8] - 36:17, 39:2, 132:19, 133:2, 174:18, 225:19, 245:18, 260:14 details [14] - 15:1, 75:16, 81:7, 81:8, 81:9, 82:12, 92:17, 104:2, 104:12, 105:6, 180:2, 221:7, 301:16 determination [6] -307:15, 308:12, 312:4, 313:2, 314:13, 316:10 determine [1] - 46:7

determined [3] -

123:19, 187:11, 308.8 determining [1] - 23:1 develop [6] - 63:13, 67:9, 161:1, 226:1, 247:7, 279:13 developed [9] - 32:2, 38:13, 45:3, 79:5, 80:10, 80:12, 120:10, 154:19, 292:6 developer [22] - 48:4, 48:9, 48:11, 61:15, 62:11, 75:9, 106:6, 137:2, 137:14, 159:17, 161:16, 164:9, 171:4, 187:15, 201:5, 291:7, 294:11, 303:15, 304:6, 313:7, 313:15, 318.4 developers [6] -136:14, 143:12, 159:19, 161:4, 179:7, 215:8 developing [2] - 79:3, 106:10 Development [15] -1:13, 1:14, 2:3, 36:7, 36:18, 39:1, 79:6, 81:12, 102:1, 199:17, 209:9, 223:7, 229:19, 332:4, 332:9 development [42] -24:17, 32:1, 45:13, 64:9, 73:3, 79:2, 92:12, 159:18, 160:4, 200:19, 209:18, 210:9, 210:14, 218:10, 218:13, 218:15, 223:13, 245:12, 260:13, 265:7, 266:17, 280:4, 289:6, 290:13, 308:11, 308:15, 309:1, 309:4, 309:6, 309:10, 313:2, 313:4, 313:5, 313:7, 313:9, 313:14, 313:16, 316:2, 316:11, 318:3, 318:5, 323:12 development's [1] -170:10 developments [3] -143:10, 171:15, 209:18 develops [1] - 45:16

Devereux [3] -

118:12, 118:16, 151:6 DEVEREUX [20] -118:15, 118:16, 120:6, 126:14, 127:4. 127:11. 128:3. 129:1. 129:10. 129:18. 130:10, 130:14, 131:3, 131:8, 132:2, 132:11, 132:16, 133:8, 134:1, 134:4 diagram [1] - 297:17 dialogue [3] - 173:11, 173:16, 201:18 die [1] - 124:13 difference [6] -108:10, 164:8, 239:11, 298:19, 299:1, 300:8 different [37] - 7:19, 11:15, 11:16, 25:2, 31:11, 62:7, 62:9, 82:5, 106:10, 114:11, 120:16, 120:17, 134:2, 152:3, 163:3, 192:3, 197:19, 204:4, 233:16, 234:6, 235:1, 241:12, 244:18, 251:14, 256:3, 264:11, 264:14, 265:10, 282:7, 282:12, 282:16, 285:11, 298:6, 300:12, 306:8, 314:12, 316.4 differently [4] - 234:4, 234:9. 239:19. 298:16 difficult [8] - 57:4, 77:1, 181:6, 189:3, 200:15, 200:17, 201:1, 250:10 difficulty [3] - 23:1, 180:3, 322:4 dig [1] - 155:8 digestible [1] - 227:8 diligently [1] - 132:5 dimension [2] - 20:9, 155:1 dimensional [2] -33:19, 133:14 dimensions [2] -30:12, 146:3 direct [8] - 107:4, 223:16, 226:5, 226:11, 227:8, 242:1, 244:14, 246:16 direction [15] - 65:15,

235:14, 236:5, 236:19, 243:11, 263:14, 278:7, 278:8, 279:17, 287:9, 287:12, 295:8, 306:5, 306:7 directly [5] - 71:4. 105:10. 124:2. 222:10, 256:15 dirt [3] - 67:11, 69:19, 152:18 disagree [1] - 293:19 disappears [1] -309:7 disapproves [1] -313:9 disclosure [1] - 330:1 Discovery [1] -324:12 discuss [5] - 44:17, 216:17, 217:14, 218:19, 317:4 discussed [5] -152:18, 210:15, 312:5, 325:3, 329:16 **discussing** [8] - 7:6, 35:13, 160:10, 165:16, 165:17, 165:19, 275:2, 329:11 discussion [20] -9:16, 32:13, 102:19, 116:14, 119:1, 151:13, 159:16, 198:14, 206:11, 216:6, 216:14, 275:3, 320:4, 320:13, 324:4, 325:5, 325:14, 326:11, 329:13 discussions [5] -6:15, 41:18, 54:6, 56:10, 278:13 disgusting [1] -194:14 distance [1] - 54:8 distill [1] - 230:2 distribution [1] -333:8 **district** [5] - 3:3, 3:7, 22:14, 23:11, 158:5 District [10] - 2:11, 3:3, 3:6, 4:18, 12:11, 211:13, 211:16, 213:4, 213:6, 220:6 dive [2] - 222:4, 234:18 diverse [2] - 152:5,

297:9

diversity [2] - 205:9, 279:4 dividing [1] - 177:7 division [1] - 177:14 DO [1] - 333:5 doable [1] - 138:18 dock [6] - 50:4, 59:7, 154:18, 181:18, 182:1, 266:2 docks [2] - 119:16, 154.13 document [1] - 38:8 documentation [1] -96:14 dog [1] - 161:7 dollars [3] - 299:18, 300:7, 303:4 domain [1] - 122:15 dominant [1] - 251:18 done [36] - 48:7, 49:12, 51:5, 78:15, 80:4, 98:17, 115:3, 136:19, 145:6, 153:4, 153:5, 157:18, 157:19, 174:11, 183:11, 183:13, 187:18, 192:18, 196:10, 196:15, 200:8, 200:9, 200:10, 200:11, 201:2, 217:12, 283:9, 286:16, 289:15, 296:4, 298:8, 302:13, 306:9, 326:17, 330:3, 330.6 door [7] - 43:10, 80:6, 101:1. 133:1. 223:12, 224:12, 263.6 doors [4] - 103:9, 226:12, 227:9, 263.2 dormer [1] - 137:8 double [1] - 65:12 doubt [2] - 158:18, 163:17 down [65] - 9:9, 11:1, 13:12, 45:13, 57:17, 65:18, 67:9, 67:10, 70:2, 74:10, 110:19, 111:6, 114:14, 147:12, 148:14, 153:1, 156:7, 161:2, 162:3, 165:17, 165:18, 167:9, 187:8, 190:16, 194:11, 194:15, 227:9, 229:3, 230:7, 231:2, 233:2, 233:7,

237:2, 238:5, 239:15, 240:13, 241:9, 241:16, 242:5, 242:12, 243:14, 244:9, 245:4, 245:5, 245:7, 246:1, 246:16, 247:2. 248:1. 254:4. 256:1, 258:7, 258:17, 259:14, 259:16, 267:12, 274:15, 285:13, 285:16, 286:4, 292:17, 292:19, 302:15, 318:7 downgrade [1] -246:10 downhill [1] - 274:2 dozen [1] - 117:4 **DPW** [13] - 44:17, 45:3, 45:15, 54:7, 54:11, 57:6, 57:7, 60:4, 91:18, 156:11, 165:10, 197:9 draping [1] - 194:15 drastic [1] - 210:10 drawing 181 - 57:5. 57:8, 78:13, 81:2, 88:12, 91:5, 110:12, 199:3 drawings [11] - 56:15, 78:12, 91:2, 93:4, 111:1, 115:11, 132:19, 133:15, 133:16, 159:14, 270:16 drawn [1] - 264:19 Drive [9] - 2:6, 5:15, 13:7, 16:17, 18:5, 55:5, 131:14, 144:16, 324:3 driven [1] - 219:2 driveway [4] - 85:1, 108:11, 120:19 drivina [4] - 16:17. 28:7, 89:10, 208:2 drop [4] - 13:12, 41:14, 42:14, 110.19 druthers [1] - 202:6 drying [1] - 103:11 duct [1] - 169:11 due [1] - 293:11 Dumaine [3] - 131:4, 131:18, 134:13 dump [2] - 67:19, 97:13 dumping [1] - 227:2 during [3] - 41:15, 120:13, 178:7

dust [1] - 97:18

dwelling [7] - 3:11, 57:10, 99:11, 211:2, 211:9, 212:6, 212:16

Ε e-mails [3] - 329:10, 329:15, 330:1 Earhart [12] - 221:19, 222:19. 226:10. 227:15. 231:12. 239:4. 246:2. 252:17. 253:16. 264:11, 265:5, 272:8 early [13] - 54:6, 62:4, 75:13, 81:10, 99:4, 99:6, 113:13, 140:8, 200:4, 209:12, 225:18, 237:10 easement [2] - 129:6, 158:10 easier [2] - 84:9, 119:18 easily [1] - 299:4 east [5] - 10:1, 14:1, 229:7, 239:12, 242:10 East [16] - 3:8, 3:10, 4:19. 158:13. 158:14. 216:15. 216:18, 219:7, 229:3, 232:6, 240:11, 242:9, 245:6, 256:7, 297:7, 320:1 ECaPs [5] - 294:9, 296:3, 296:7, 296:19, 297:4 echos [1] - 244:12 economic [4] - 281:6, 288:15, 292:3, 303:13 economical [1] -299:13 economics [1] - 288:4 edge [19] - 21:7, 153:1, 161:5, 226:8, 226:16. 228:13. 229:5. 232:5. 232:14, 237:3, 241:8, 242:11, 242:13, 243:5, 243:15, 245:2, 247:15, 247:18, 264.7 edges [1] - 265:13

Edmunds [1] - 165:1

effect [2] - 94:15,

204:11

effective [1] - 173:15 eminent [1] - 122:15 effects [1] - 95:1 emissions [4] - 51:9, eight [4] - 5:19, 61:2, 51:12. 102:13. 102:15 81:8, 176:14 emitting [1] - 101:1 eight-foot [1] - 61:2 emphasize [2] either [13] - 9:3, 10:6, 15:11, 47:18, 58:8, 138:6, 283:19 84:4, 133:13, 201:9, **employer** [1] - 115:13 203:5, 203:7, empty [1] - 9:4 225:10, 232:17, enable [1] - 143:14 246:18 encapsulate [1] - 98:8 electric [1] - 194:19 encourage [3] electronic [1] - 8:13 12:17. 31:10. elegantly [1] - 268:16 279:16 element [16] - 11:17, end [28] - 48:15, 26:1, 27:12, 27:14, 48:16. 48:18. 111:9. 30:9, 34:9, 133:14, 111:13, 112:2, 175:19, 180:14, 112:13, 125:4, 162:6, 164:5, 168:9, 191:12, 198:17, 235:12, 236:3, 176:17, 229:1, 237:5, 238:5, 240:8, 240:14, 275:17 248:13, 272:18, elements [13] - 12:6, 273:1, 273:12, 101:11, 110:6, 273:15, 277:4, 110:10, 221:16, 278:4, 279:8, 233:10, 238:18, 286:13, 301:6, 241:14, 245:19, 310:11, 314:6 246:12, 249:10, ending [1] - 236:13 251:19, 281:19 endless [1] - 115:9 elevating [1] - 232:9 ends [11] - 71:6, elevation [28] - 9:12, 72:10, 109:16, 10:1. 10:7. 10:16. 110:13, 111:10, 10:17, 13:8, 14:1, 154:3, 204:7, 14:11, 79:4, 80:1, 238:15, 252:18, 89:1, 89:5, 89:6, 271:12, 285:10 89:11, 90:4, 91:13, engage [4] - 225:11, 103:19, 104:3, 239:15, 241:16, 104:5, 108:19, 259:16 109:3, 109:18, engaged [3] - 143:12, 110:14, 114:13, 152:1, 329:9 119:3, 175:9, engaging [1] - 241:8 202:19, 272:5 engineer [5] - 45:18, **elevations** [17] - 39:2, 55:4, 77:15, 91:16, 52:15, 52:16, 53:1, 93:14 53:11. 76:10. 77:12. engineering [1] - 57:3 77:13, 78:9, 79:6, enhance [2] - 28:6, 81:1, 83:5, 87:18, 220:15 88:2, 112:18, enlarged [1] - 80:1 174:18, 189:1 enormous [1] - 286:6 elevator [10] - 46:5, enormously [4] -46:9, 53:9, 58:5, 284:18, 285:5. 85:6, 109:12, 287:15, 316:16 137:17, 138:2, ensure [2] - 12:18, 177:8, 177:9 13:9 elevators [3] - 113:18, entire [10] - 21:13, 137:14, 137:16 21:19, 63:10, elicited [1] - 197:8 115:15, 119:3, eliminated [1] - 64:7 119:13, 122:10, eliminating [1] -220:6, 220:9, 74:18 259:14 **emergency** [1] - 158:5 entirely [1] - 201:11

entirety [1] - 63:4 entitled [2] - 193:5, 201:15 entrance [8] - 80:1, 84:16, 85:4, 113:17, 187:9, 222:10, 255:16, 266:13 entrances [1] - 44:12 entries [2] - 246:16, 246:17 entry [12] - 56:16, 108:10, 222:8, 223:1, 224:5, 224:16, 224:17, 240:5, 243:12, 245:8, 253:7, 266:2 entryway [2] - 54:1, 76:11 enumerate [1] -308:17 environment [7] -61:5, 68:13, 69:3, 178:18, 184:8, 241:8, 266:7 environmental [13] -68:11, 77:15, 77:17, 93:9, 93:11, 93:14, 96:3, 96:8, 97:1, 100:11, 100:13, 123:9, 176:3 envision [1] - 98:17 equation [1] - 102:14 equipment [10] - 10:5, 12:15, 12:19, 16:5, 53:9, 53:12, 80:18, 81:4, 105:3, 121:11 era [1] - 32:1 ERRATA [3] - 332:1, 332:18, 333:3 Errata [4] - 332:3, 332:6, 332:14, 333.7 errata [1] - 333:6 error[1] - 272:2 especially [3] - 69:6, 200:17, 254:5 essential [4] - 133:15, 149:11, 203:15, 305:13 essentially [6] -120:19. 213:15. 275:9, 298:1, 308:1, 309.7 establish [1] - 199:17 established [2] - 29:1, 75:4 etcetera [5] - 55:16, 55:17, 124:11, 176:3 Euro [2] - 103:4,

103:5

Euro-tech [2] - 103:4, 103:5 evening [6] - 4:3, 5:8, 78:3, 215:1, 218:6, 218:7 event [1] - 252:19 events [1] - 43:5 eventually [1] - 190:8 evergreens [1] -85:19 everywhere [1] -185.13 evident [2] - 28:9, 284:19 evocative [4] - 52:17. 78:11, 116:3, 262:14 evolution [2] - 28:15, 249:3 evolve [1] - 225:14 evolved [2] - 27:3, 27:19 exact [2] - 120:4, 259:18 exactly [7] - 6:16, 29:7, 81:3, 107:9, 117:16, 175:16, 264:16 examine [1] - 288:11 example [1] - 151:1 exceed [1] - 260:5 exceedances [2] -55:8, 144:17 **exceeding** [1] - 49:18 exceeds [1] - 20:9 excellence [1] -183:15 except [4] - 190:7, 212:1, 270:9, 333:16 excessive [1] - 22:3 excited [2] - 247:11, 248.9 exciting [2] - 227:13, 248:15 **excluding** [1] - 75:9 exclusively [1] -134:15 excuse [6] - 4:6, 68:13, 88:15, 149:1, 297:10, 319:2 executive [1] - 229:16 exhaust [2] - 51:4, 169:11 existing [20] - 3:18, 13:2, 14:1, 14:15, 14:19, 15:5, 42:16, 43:17, 44:6, 50:7, 63:2, 66:4, 67:4,

72:3, 146:8, 165:19,

200:18, 219:19,

222:11, 327:13 expanded [1] - 231:3 expecting [1] - 256:4 expense [2] - 141:11, 167:13 expensive [3] -160:17, 162:10, 167.4 **experience** [9] - 32:7, 106:5, 171:17, 184:7, 186:19, 224:10, 227:4, 259:10, 263:5 experienced [1] -208:1 experiencing [1] -186:15 expert [2] - 129:3, 131:19 expertise [2] - 94:6, 270:19 experts [1] - 163:15 expires [2] - 5:5, 214:19 explain [2] - 53:1, 222:5 explained [1] - 107:9 explaining [1] - 95:18 explore [1] - 244:3 explored [1] - 181:17 exposure [1] - 124:7 exposures [1] - 82:5 express [3] - 34:15, 165:6, 282:17 expressed [2] - 50:19, 197:12 extend [2] - 322:8, 326:2 extended [2] - 205:14, 303:9 extending [2] -105:12, 321:12 extension [12] -205:17, 206:15, 207:8, 207:11, 207:18, 312:2, 318:17, 319:6, 320:17, 321:10, 321:16, 322:11 extensively [2] -157:19, 223:6 extent [1] - 292:6 exterior [2] - 178:1, 280:13 extra [1] - 39:18 extraordinary [1] -303:10 **extremely** [1] - 270:10 eye [2] - 190:16, 205:1 eyesore [1] - 264:5

F F-i-e-l-d-J-u-m-a [1] -142:14 fabric [1] - 282:8 facade [13] - 13:13, 53:5, 53:7, 90:4, 114:6, 115:9, 120:2, 179:16, 192:7, 192:10, 203:9, 204:17, 205:8 face [3] - 9:3, 263:19, 310:13 faced [1] - 191:5 faces [2] - 228:8, 287:12 facilitate [2] - 183:5, 201.9 facilities [3] - 61:6, 64:17, 64:18 facility [1] - 63:1 facing [2] - 124:6, 251:12 fact [21] - 22:2, 52:6, 82:4, 125:17, 131:18, 134:12, 137:13, 157:8, 158:11, 159:18, 165:8, 183:8, 192:12, 196:2, 201:12, 201:17, 220:7, 273:13, 283:19, 288:5, 317:14 factor [1] - 153:15 **fails** [1] - 309:5 fair [3] - 74:5, 75:15, 151.15 fairly [16] - 54:13, 85:14, 97:8, 198:10, 203:5, 221:11, 222:10, 225:18, 228:2, 228:16, 232:8, 248:5, 289:5, 290:16, 299:4 fall [1] - 60:5 falling [1] - 143:17 false [1] - 112:3 familiar [1] - 209:4 families [1] - 161:15 family [4] - 182:1, 210:13, 213:8 fantastic [1] - 233:10 far [16] - 14:16, 19:14, 33:19, 70:10, 97:4, 111:2, 112:15, 121:19, 151:4, 155:4, 164:13,

218:8, 219:14,

250:17, 277:15,

315:18 FAR [7] - 114:2, 177:11, 177:13, 201:13, 201:15, 212:4, 280:3 **FARRIS** [1] - 136:2 Farris [4] - 118:14, 135:19, 136:2, 162:19 fashion [1] - 10:15 faster [1] - 74:8 favor [7] - 25:19, 207:7. 207:11. 216:9, 216:12, 326:13, 326:16 favorite [1] - 252:6 Fawcett [1] - 56:1 Fayerweather [1] -139.5 fear [2] - 148:7, 158:17 feature [2] - 286:8, 305:13 features [1] - 25:6

fee [1] - 134:18 feedback [3] - 219:8, 219:11, 220:10 feelings [1] - 261:16 feet [51] - 2:13, 3:11, 3:17, 30:13, 30:14, 30:18, 32:15, 32:19, 57:15, 57:19, 58:1, 58:2, 79:13, 86:5, 86:8, 86:9, 86:11, 86:18, 86:19, 89:2, 90:6, 90:7, 90:10, 90:17, 105:1, 105:14, 105:16, 105:19, 108:13, 111:7, 111:12, 120:3, 120:6, 140:18, 154:8, 155:10, 159:14, 162:5, 164:2, 192:8, 192:16, 211:3, 212:8, 212:10, 212:12, 212:15, 223:19, 258:19, 297:19, 302:3 fellow [4] - 34:16, 70:17, 181:7, 182:10

felt [5] - 111:17,

fence [9] - 46:18,

166:6, 166:10,

166:12, 186:8

47:1, 47:2, 146:9,

few [15] - 31:19, 55:4,

56:7, 99:5, 108:18,

198:12

114:3, 114:7, 114:8,

126:4, 133:9, 138:3, 291:7, 311:10 193:13, 224:15, finishes [1] - 171:1 230:3, 273:13, fired [1] - 331:1 275:18, 297:4, fireplace [1] - 67:10 299:17 firewalls [2] - 299:4, fewer [1] - 245:18 299:6 fiber [2] - 81:13, 84:2 firm [3] - 50:5, 50:6, FIELD [2] - 142:11, 173:13 144.13 firmly [1] - 180:8 field [5] - 121:7, first [39] - 3:14, 4:12, 121:9, 121:10, 4:19, 5:14, 17:16, 138:16, 153:12 30:6, 37:14, 38:3, Field [3] - 139:3, 142:9, 142:13 71:18, 79:10, 80:4, FIELD-JUMA[2] -142:11, 144:13 118:11, 126:19, Field-Juma [3] -136:13, 139:16, 139:3, 142:9, 160:6, 167:10, 142:13 fields [3] - 166:5, 166:6, 166:9 263:1, 263:17, figure [7] - 107:16, 276:13, 293:8, 308:10, 309:2, 180:7, 190:5, 229:11, 289:15, 310:18, 315:6, 323:5. 327:3 304:7, 311:18 figured [1] - 258:10 fit [8] - 26:6, 61:14, 82:9, 136:16, figures [1] - 18:8 139:15, 169:5, **figuring** [1] - 269:12 287:1, 290:15 file [2] - 312:8, 330:8 Fitchburg [1] - 153:9 filed [4] - 209:12, fits [4] - 213:11, 210:2, 210:6, 295:14, 295:15, 211:11 295:16 filing [2] - 208:1, 310:9 five [10] - 47:12, 48:5, 58:2, 86:5, 129:6, fill [4] - 97:10, 119:13, 130:3, 221:16, 123:18, 301:7 259:2, 285:8, filled [1] - 115:15 298:14 filling [1] - 112:14 five-foot [5] - 47:12, fin [1] - 83:14 48:5, 129:6, 130:3, final [15] - 3:10, 46:3, 259.2 50:15, 53:7, 53:11, fix [1] - 171:13 54:11, 175:15, fixed [4] - 101:10. 260:13, 296:7, 169:2. 189:15. 309:1, 309:9, 313:7, 321:1 313:16, 316:11, flat [2] - 81:15, 286:5 318.5 flattened [3] - 110:14, finalize [1] - 45:5 111:8, 112:7 finally [4] - 153:11, flip [1] - 42:18 157:2, 163:8, 258:7 flooding [1] - 155:13 financing [2] -Floor [1] - 1:6 128:17, 156:19 floor [16] - 3:18, findings [1] - 102:1 21:13, 24:9, 138:1, fine [5] - 92:4, 171:8, 174:18, 192:3, 251:7, 325:10, 223:18, 227:17, 326.7 228:8, 228:15, finer [1] - 234:16 228:19, 230:17, finest [1] - 303:12 232:4, 239:17, finger [2] - 305:4, 258:7, 263:1 305:5 flooring [1] - 261:7 finish [7] - 9:7, 12:4,

14:6, 15:7, 15:12,

253:17 flow [4] - 231:10, 238:10, 242:2, 248:12 flowing [1] - 242:5 flows [1] - 238:6 flush [2] - 14:8, 253:18 fly [1] - 139:9 foam [1] - 291:2 focus [3] - 66:7, 71:19, 157:6 38:18, 40:19, 41:10, focusing [4] - 45:11, 101:16. 223:18. 84:17, 109:7, 109:8, 275:16 focussed [3] - 80:5, 134:15, 319:19 Fogg [1] - 259:6 171:2, 176:9, 193:5, foggier [1] - 304:9 212:7, 217:4, 250:8, folded [1] - 191:7 folks [8] - 73:18, 97:1, 120:10, 125:4, 137:10, 254:2, 254:6, 270:17 follow [6] - 61:12, 70:9, 74:15, 181:1, 194:4, 316:10 follow-up [2] - 70:9, 74:15 followed [1] - 55:1 following [1] - 271:4 Following [1] - 2:18 Foods [8] - 50:15, 51:4, 52:7, 58:18, 59:7, 59:8, 123:4, 123:7 Foods' [1] - 50:4 foot [20] - 32:19, 33:1, 47:12, 47:18, 48:5, 61:2, 80:7, 80:16, 88:14, 97:15, 111:11, 129:6, 130:3, 155:11, 156:8, 227:19, 259:2, 259:3, 266:18, 298:14 FOR [1] - 1:2 forbidding [1] - 259:4 foregoing [1] - 333:16 forest [1] - 190:4 forget [1] - 316:7 forgot [1] - 253:2 form [9] - 79:12, 180:14, 221:13, 235:19, 236:2, 236:15, 237:13, 237:16, 257:3 formal [1] - 262:5 formally [1] - 321:10 former [3] - 115:10, floors [2] - 251:8, 115:13, 195:17

forming [1] - 83:4 forms [2] - 235:7, 257:14 forth [10] - 6:8, 95:5, 124:18, 145:18, 150:2, 175:5, 187:4, 193:17, 203:3, 281:2 fortunate [1] - 136:4 fortune [1] - 16:1 forum [1] - 233:5 forward [17] - 6:4, 17:14, 19:13, 43:16, 68:9, 69:5, 71:12, 129:14, 142:19, 178:18, 210:15, 211:7, 214:15, 215:7, 249:15, 257:11, 309:8 forwarded [1] -172:10 four [15] - 7:18, 8:17, 32:15, 32:19, 41:12, 42:1, 52:8, 62:5, 76:2, 105:19, 150:15, 221:16, 258:9. 283:12. 298:14 four-foot [1] - 32:19 fourth [5] - 137:19, 198:8, 199:8, 324:13, 324:15 fragmented [2] -250:16, 251:12 frame [7] - 126:15, 170:6, 170:19, 171:1, 171:16, 280:8 framed [1] - 33:19 frames [1] - 80:8 framework [2] -80:12, 260:15 framing [2] - 182:6, 258:1 free [2] - 34:8, 156:2 frequency [1] -261:19 frequently [1] - 270:3 Fresh [9] - 20:2, 20:4, 21:15, 45:7, 69:15, 127:14, 142:17. 157:5, 160:3 friend [1] - 148:11 frolicking [1] - 166:18 FROM [1] - 36:8 front [39] - 23:9, 39:7, 41:13, 42:13, 43:10, 44:13, 50:11, 53:19, 54:3, 71:4, 79:17, 84:18, 85:3, 85:17,

86:6, 89:14, 90:4,

114:4, 118:2, 119:4, 121:3, 121:9, 124:5, 143:4, 168:14, 194:17, 194:19, 222:2, 223:12, 224:12, 225:9, 226:11, 227:8, 239:9. 241:15. 258:18, 271:12, 272:5, 312:18 frontage [3] - 220:17, 222:15, 222:19 full [15] - 52:2, 55:10, 63:4, 88:2, 105:1, 120:2, 127:5, 129:12, 167:17, 167:18, 181:8, 182:13, 217:8, 231:3, 311:10 full-time [1] - 127:5 fully [2] - 107:9, 198:11 fumes [7] - 51:2, 101:1, 101:7, 124:1, 124:9, 124:12, 189:11 function [5] - 30:16, 34:2, 231:13, 277:3, 283:14 functional [4] -113:15, 261:5, 267:7, 275:11 functions [3] - 65:12, 228:12, 304:18 fund [1] - 128:18 fundamental [2] -197:1, 198:17 fundamentally [1] -234:6 funding [3] - 75:2, 75:3, 75:6 funds [2] - 75:6, 143:13 funk [1] - 268:6 furthermore [1] -121.4 future [17] - 44:17, 45:16, 47:6, 47:14, 49:12, 49:16, 130:18, 141:2, 141:3, 141:4, 186:10, 210:1, 223:13, 315:1, 322:14, 330:15

G

Galleria [2] - 3:17, 327:11 **game** [2] - 121:7,

fuzzy [1] - 52:17

207:9, 216:10,

285.15 garage [3] - 124:10, 154:6, 155:4 garden [2] - 156:3, 264:9 Garfield [1] - 164:3 gas [2] - 100:7, 166:15 gateway [2] - 237:7, 248:17 gather [2] - 140:6, 140:17 gauge [1] - 299:11 gee [1] - 112:6 Gee [1] - 295:6 GENERAL [3] - 1:3, 2:2, 3:16 general [4] - 75:6, 109:6, 109:19, 210:7 General [5] - 5:3, 326:18, 327:2, 327:3, 329:3 generally [8] - 9:5, 174:15, 217:4, 310:2, 310:13, 310:16, 310:17, 322:19 generate [3] - 77:8, 199:5, 202:1 **generated** [1] - 94:1 generating [1] - 101:8 generic [1] - 275:9 gentleman [1] - 165:2 GeoInsight [1] - 93:16 geometrically [1] -250:11 gesture [3] - 192:6, 265:3, 266:14 gestures [2] - 285:16, 300:18 giant [1] - 150:4 Gilmore [6] - 24:11, 24:12, 26:9, 30:13, 256:2, 256:12 given [9] - 8:2, 62:6, 135:2, 175:12, 175:15, 257:1, 288:13, 303:19, 315:7 glad [3] - 68:3, 122:8, 131:19 glass [12] - 80:11, 80:14, 129:12, 167:17, 167:18, 181:8, 238:4, 240:8, 246:7, 251:6, 261:3 glasswork [1] - 276:2 glassworks [4] -240:13, 242:5, 243:8, 247:2

Glassworks [23] -24:2, 220:17, 222:16, 224:19, 225:16, 226:8, 227:2, 227:4, 227:12, 229:4. 230:19. 232:13. 233:2. 234:7. 238:8. 240:11, 241:9, 245:5, 248:14, 264:10, 285:8, 297:13, 297:14 global [1] - 45:10 **GLX** [3] - 224:7, 242:18, 271:16 goal [3] - 72:6, 226:1, 228:5 goals [3] - 77:10, 140:19, 287:3 gonna [15] - 96:10, 96:15, 123:5, 123:12, 124:13, 137:15, 137:18, 151:10, 153:2, 168:1, 171:6, 171:13, 178:2, 254:6, 323:2 goodness [1] -281:12 GORNING [5] - 218:6, 271:7, 271:15, 280:11, 300:1 Gorning [1] - 218:10 gosh [1] - 203:19 Goulston [1] - 218:14 govern [1] - 96:12 Government [1] -5.13 gracious [1] - 220:19 Grade [2] - 2:12, 2:13 grade [5] - 160:8, 160:11, 160:14, 224:18, 231:8 grades [1] - 144:8 gradually [1] - 208:18 grain [2] - 234:16, 305:1 grand [4] - 238:16, 253:7, 265:3, 286:18 grant [2] - 23:16, 180:19 granting [1] - 23:3 graphics [1] - 283:15 grapple [1] - 279:12 grass [5] - 62:17, 68:17, 146:18, 147:5, 161:12 grasses [1] - 86:1 grateful [1] - 68:1

Grave's [1] - 284:17

110:1, 118:3, 122:6, 162:7. 171:8. 180:11, 181:4, 190:17, 195:11, 196:13, 198:1, 219:11, 222:17, 226:9. 227:16. 229:14, 229:17, 229:18, 231:15, 251:16, 260:14, 262:17, 266:1, 267:4, 269:5, 270:7, 270:15, 271:10, 276:16, 278:10, 278:12, 281:3, 281:4, 286:11, 292:6, 301:2, 301:13, 304:10, 308:17 greater [3] - 109:4, 220:18, 279:4 greatest [2] - 141:8, 301:14 greatly [1] - 119:11 Green [3] - 56:1, 267:8, 303:9 green [11] - 47:11, 54:1, 59:3, 79:12, 94:17, 111:10, 221:1, 229:5, 247:8, 270:15, 305:15 Greenberg [2] -298:1, 305:2 GREGORY [1] -169:18 Gregory [1] - 169:18 grew [1] - 149:8 grey [4] - 12:1, 16:4, 111:1, 112:14 grief [1] - 137:7 gross [1] - 32:16 ground [20] - 21:13, 24:8, 30:14, 91:10, 178:17, 178:19, 223:18, 227:17, 228:8, 233:17, 233:18, 237:18, 239:3, 240:3, 240:6, 246:1, 246:13, 248:1, 258:7, 286:5 grounds [2] - 239:16, 240:9 group [6] - 123:10, 125:16, 152:6, 179:15, 209:15, 297:9

groups [1] - 45:5

Groups [1] - 96:19

Graves' [1] - 284:12

great [44] - 8:4, 27:16,

35:18. 74:19. 75:2.

grow [1] - 47:1 guess [17] - 29:13, 68:7. 78:10. 83:13. 89:16. 102:11. 103:17, 104:6. 122:4, 127:19, 140:2, 176:9, 189:8, 268:17, 273:3, 282:15, 291:19 guessing [1] - 257:16 guest [1] - 50:1 guests [1] - 42:7 quidelines [4] - 55:2, 139:13, 139:16, 163.9 guy [1] - 304:6 guys [12] - 132:13, 189:19, 229:18, 231:15, 232:1, 233:10, 271:16, 275:1, 288:10, 302:13, 322:10, 322:17 gym [1] - 178:10

Н

Hail [1] - 330:13 half [25] - 8:2, 33:1, 43:13, 57:19, 83:1, 86:8, 86:11, 88:14, 89:2, 105:16, 105:17, 111:11, 117:4, 129:12, 155:10, 156:1, 160:9, 160:13, 162:5, 167:17, 180:1, 181:8, 257:17, 285:6, 302:16 half-inch [1] - 257:17 halfway [1] - 89:8 Hall [1] - 16:10 hallway [2] - 231:1, 235:17 halves [2] - 274:9, 274:16 hand [7] - 107:13, 221:6, 222:9, 241:3, 245:10, 312:13, 328:16 handful [1] - 78:18 handicap [2] - 46:11, 108:5 handle [2] - 42:12, 275:4 handled [3] - 41:11, 42:11, 300:17 handout [1] - 165:13

handouts [1] - 100:11

hands [5] - 131:11,

326:14, 328:19 hang [4] - 251:15, 251:17, 252:7, 268:14 hanging [3] - 87:12, 176:4, 179:2 hangs [1] - 251:3 happy [7] - 45:14, 101:19, 129:13, 177:13, 213:12, 215:11, 322:11 Harbor [1] - 274:5 harbor [1] - 274:6 hard [14] - 13:5, 78:13, 99:2, 104:7, 114:10, 115:4, 131:5, 172:15, 173:14, 225:18, 227:3, 231:7, 255:2, harder [2] - 115:4, 241:18 hardline [1] - 53:1 hardscape [1] - 147:6 Harvard [7] - 12:11, 74:1, 74:7, 74:9, 185:8, 286:2, 327:11 hate [2] - 246:14, 291:11 HAWKINSON [1] -254:15 Hawkinson [1] -254:15 hazard [1] - 128:6 hazardous [3] - 95:5, 95:11, 96:4 head [8] - 10:4, 13:14, 57:14, 57:19, 109:12, 176:1, 184:13, 224:2 headed [1] - 218:17 heading [1] - 263:13 Health [1] - 51:14 healthy [1] - 228:2 hear [17] - 4:9, 36:10, 68:10. 92:7. 95:6. 117:2. 122:9. 127:10. 130:7. 160:15, 163:11, 193:16, 277:5, 293:8, 311:14, 323:9, 325:14 heard [16] - 64:8, 136:7, 137:9, 160:8, 161:7, 180:17, 229:17, 229:18, 231:15, 273:15, 278:2, 291:10,

293:7, 295:17,

324:2, 324:11 hearing [58] - 4:16, 4:19, 5:6, 5:10, 5:16, 37:5, 38:14, 41:5, 68:19, 151:6, 175:4. 176:15. 207:2. 208:8. 214:7. 217:15. 249:11. 289:10, 291:14, 293:2, 306:2, 306:4, 306:7, 307:16, 308:13, 309:14, 309:17, 310:3, 310:4, 310:10, 310:18, 311:3, 311:5, 311:14, 312:2, 313:1, 314:2, 314:4, 314:5, 314:6, 314:15, 314:16, 315:1, 315:6, 315:9, 317:3, 319:8, 319:9, 319:18, 321:14, 321:18, 322:5, 322:7, 323:5, 323:6, 326:1, 327:10, 330:16 HEARING [2] - 1:3, 2.8 hearings [9] - 3:14, 6:11, 18:2, 70:15, 210:4, 291:8, 324:1, 324:10, 325:4 heat [4] - 68:18, 93:19, 94:15, 94:19 heating [2] - 100:5, 100:7 heavy [1] - 52:5 height [29] - 3:10, 34:13, 46:6, 46:10, 58:9, 80:7, 104:9, 109:17, 150:8, 168:16, 204:10, 219:2, 230:4, 233:7, 275:12, 279:4, 279:5, 279:7, 280:1, 288:1, 288:2, 291:17, 292:14, 294:6, 294:10, 294:15, 295:1, 296:13, 315:13 heights [6] - 109:5, 190:3, 203:17, 203:19, 233:16, 316:15 held [1] - 103:6 hell [2] - 278:6, 291:14 hello [1] - 118:15 help [9] - 13:18, 115:19, 116:2, 123:12, 128:18,

153:8, 196:17,

199:7, 293:16 helpful [6] - 48:14, 119:9, 125:14, 182:6, 249:1, 291:5 helping [2] - 19:13, 258:13 helps [2] - 237:6, 285:5 hereby [1] - 333:17 **hi** [5] - 60:13, 118:15, 136:2, 139:4, 253:13 hidden [2] - 58:4, 237:2 hierarchy [1] - 285:13 high [19] - 28:4, 57:15, 57:19, 58:1, 58:2, 86:9, 86:11, 94:17, 110:8, 111:15, 131:18, 134:11, 145:1, 235:1. 269:11. 286:13, 299:14, 299:16, 307:1 higher [2] - 86:10, 114:18 highest [1] - 172:17 Highlands [8] - 3:3, 3:4, 3:6, 4:18, 208:15, 209:16, 211:13, 213:3 highlight [1] - 220:7 highlighting [1] -305:14 highlights [1] -224:15 highly [1] - 271:19 Highway [3] - 226:6, 231:11, 270:1 hire [2] - 50:2, 276:2 hired [1] - 50:5 historic [6] - 26:14, 27:14, 30:9, 162:12, 172:2, 194:17 Historical [4] - 12:12, 327:15, 327:19 historical [2] - 29:12, 30:2 historicism [1] -26:12 history [4] - 28:14, 34:4. 170:3. 304:11 hit [3] - 52:19, 255:13, 288:8 hoc [1] - 139:9 hold [4] - 34:9, 45:4, 173:11, 214:6 Holders [1] - 36:6 holding [1] - 62:3 holes [1] - 148:9

home [2] - 132:15,

216:16 homeowner [1] -137:7 Honda [1] - 124:3 hone [1] - 117:16 honest [1] - 151:13 honestly [2] - 120:12, 125:16 hope [14] - 8:9, 17:3, 49:9, 51:12, 132:3, 164:13, 174:2, 180:15, 183:5, 206:10, 239:6, 242:5, 249:1 hopefully [6] - 36:14, 147:17, 154:8, 208:7, 232:1, 241:19 hoping [2] - 11:18, 46:4 horizontal [2] -233:14, 239:16 horizontality [1] -230:8 Hospital [1] - 9:2 hot [2] - 69:2, 100:7 hotel [1] - 123:5 hour [5] - 8:1, 22:16, 43:13, 188:9, 217:18 hours [4] - 43:12, 103:11. 127:6. 275:18 hours' [1] - 156:5 house [7] - 109:13, 137:9, 182:1, 185:10, 195:1, 195:19, 224:2 houses [5] - 57:14, 57:19, 177:17, 196:2, 196:3 housing [2] - 2:11, 172:2 Housing [1] - 5:18 huge [4] - 122:13, 177:15, 182:12, 286:17 **HUGH** [177] - 4:3, 4:9, 4:12. 6:13. 6:17. 7:3, 7:9, 7:12, 7:16, 9:16, 11:4, 12:8, 13:4, 15:13, 17:9, 17:13, 19:1, 19:8, 19:18, 20:13, 20:17, 21:2, 21:16, 22:8, 22:13, 23:10, 23:17, 30:5, 31:6, 33:17, 35:1, 35:4, 35:9, 36:4, 37:1, 37:17, 38:5, 38:11, 38:16,

39:6, 40:4, 40:8,

60:11, 65:4, 68:5, 69:7, 70:11, 76:2, 76:6, 79:11, 89:18, 92:6, 93:5, 95:17, 97:3, 97:12, 97:15, 98:5. 100:16. 102:11, 103:1, 103:15, 114:10, 116:1, 116:12, 116:16, 116:19, 117:15, 134:5, 135:1, 135:10, 135:17, 139:1, 141:19, 142:8, 144:11, 145:10, 149:14. 156:13. 164:16, 169:16, 172:5, 174:5, 174:9, 175:2, 176:12, 176:19, 179:10, 184:16, 184:19, 185:4, 189:19, 194:2, 205:11, 205:19, 206:5, 206:9, 207:3, 207:7, 207:10, 208:4, 208:9, 208:12, 209:7, 214:6, 214:11, 214:15, 215:12, 215:15, 216:2, 216:6, 216:9, 216:11, 249:6, 249:9, 249:19, 250:3, 250:5, 253:12, 254:13, 255:6, 255:9, 260:1, 260:10, 261:10, 261:13, 261:15, 275:1, 280:5, 280:12, 282:15, 283:17, 284:13, 284:17, 285:4, 297:11, 300:3, 300:9, 301:5, 302:2, 304:10, 305:16, 306:16, 307:12, 307:18, 308:4, 316:6, 317:11, 318:6, 319:5, 319:14, 320:10, 320:18, 321:4, 321:7, 322:3, 325:6, 326:8, 326:10, 326:13, 326:15, 327:1, 328:12, 328:15, 328:17, 329:2, 329:6, 330:5, 330:9, 330:19, 331:4 Hugh [9] - 1:8, 4:14,

40:12, 40:16, 43:17,

44:2, 44:5, 45:17,

8:17, 195:9, 199:2, 202:11, 293:11, 315:4, 322:16 Hugh's [1] - 273:7 human [1] - 252:10 humans [1] - 184:7 hundred [3] - 298:14, 299:17, 300:6 hundreds [1] - 113:13 husband [1] - 138:8 Hutchinson [1] -169:19 HVAC [1] - 58:1 ice [1] - 254:7 iconic [1] - 237:5 idea [21] - 26:7. 27:16. 30:8. 32:3. 34:19. 53:4, 54:7, 54:10, 74:19, 100:2, 152:2, 166:19, 194:10, 195:17, 226:14, 238:10, 238:11, 247:5, 258:12, 267:5, 305:11 ideas [5] - 117:17, 135:14, 244:2, 300:19, 306:8 identical [1] - 240:2 identification [2] -26:14, 28:12 identified [2] - 75:6, 235:12 identify [2] - 217:4, 248:14

identity [1] - 248:13 idol [1] - 190:1 ignored [1] - 151:14 **II** [7] - 3:9, 55:7, 120:9, 120:15, 219:1, 220:3, 258:8 illegal [2] - 102:16, 260:2 illumination [1] -20:10 image [7] - 61:10, 239:8, 240:19, 241:1, 241:7, 242:16, 243:10 images [5] - 60:16, 61:4, 226:13, 235:8, 236:12 imagine [1] - 137:6 immediate [1] - 54:15 impact [4] - 50:3, 54:5, 66:12, 266:6 impacted [1] - 144:15 impacts [2] - 45:12,

127:16 327:8 97.7 included [3] - 54:18, instance [7] - 10:10, impediment [2] introduced [1] - 95:3 Jackson [1] - 149:18 64:16, 211:18 13:9, 13:19, 15:6, 64:10, 177:7 includes [3] - 55:15, 104:9, 291:17, inventory [1] - 172:3 James [5] - 21:2, imperative [1] - 183:9 80:8. 97:18 310:16 invested [1] - 303:3 145:11. 149:15. impervious [1] including [6] - 28:2, instances [1] - 202:14 149:17 investigate [1] -147:11 36:9, 67:9, 121:10, instead [4] - 23:8, 153:16 **JAMES** [35] - 4:11, impinge [1] - 109:10 122:7, 150:10 68:17. 298:2. investment [1] -21:10, 38:2, 38:9, 299.11 38:12, 48:13, 49:4, implementation [1] incorporated [2] -135:15 61.12 219:11, 246:11 institute [1] - 6:8 invite [1] - 131:9 78:3, 79:15, 87:19, 90:7, 90:15, 90:18, implied [1] - 26:12 increase [1] - 177:13 institutional [1] invited [3] - 126:16, 95:15, 104:4, importance [3] increased [5] - 8:11, 304:14 141:16, 152:6 104:15, 105:8, 203:13, 225:4, 91:14, 157:6, instructing [2] involve [2] - 140:19, 286:12 157:12, 201:3 281:9. 283:8 105:15, 106:4, 330:17 106:17, 107:6, important [30] - 12:5, incredibly [1] - 195:4 INSTRUCTIONS [3] involved [3] - 32:13, 107:19, 108:12, 30:9. 115:1. 121:6. increment [2] -332:1, 332:12, 125:17, 173:18 110:2, 112:11, 122:1, 134:18, 128:17, 156:18 333:4 involvement [1] -113:1, 132:14, 139:9, 141:10, indeed [3] - 187:6, instructions [2] -123.12 140:9, 140:14, 216:4, 249:18 315:7, 333:8 150:4, 152:13, involves [1] - 141:14 162:1, 173:1, 174:1, 149:17, 205:18, independent [1] integrate [1] - 234:13 **Ipsen** [1] - 35:7 206:1, 206:7, 175:18, 183:3, 236:3 integrated [4] - 30:19, ironies [1] - 304:14 207:17, 208:6 141:8, 227:6, 184:5, 184:9, 209:3, Index [2] - 2:18, 3:19 ISD [4] - 46:4, 58:8, Jan [6] - 118:12, 213:4, 221:18, 271:17 indicate [2] - 142:2, 106:2, 107:1 118:13, 118:16, 223:3, 223:11, integration [2] -332:13 island [2] - 94:15, 230:4, 240:7, 241:6, 132:17, 134:6, 230:13, 248:2 individual [3] -94:19 151:5 246:6, 255:14, 160:17, 162:2, integrity [1] - 215:7 issue [25] - 29:15, JAN [19] - 118:15, 257:1, 257:3, 289:2 intend [1] - 82:18 169:11 30:1, 51:4, 51:13, 120:6, 126:14, **imported** [1] - 103:8 individually [1] intended [1] - 104:16 69:15, 71:12, 73:16, 127:4, 127:11, **imposing** [1] - 28:16 169:12 intense [2] - 205:2, 75:3, 94:8, 101:5, 128:3, 129:1, impressed [2] - 26:6, industrial [3] -248:8 101:17, 110:10, 129:10, 129:18, 152:10 intensive [1] - 133:12 168:13, 264:4, 122:13. 171:2. 130:10, 130:14, improper [2] - 320:19, 268:5 172:13. 181:11. intent [1] - 54:12 131:3, 131:8, 132:2, 329:10 industrial/ 181:12, 189:7, interact [1] - 269:15 132:11, 132:16, improve [5] - 18:4, 204:16, 205:13, commercial [1] interest [4] - 28:11, 133:8, 134:1, 134:4 139:19, 141:12, 254:10, 279:12, 136:12 115:8, 205:8, Jan's [1] - 182:7 152:4, 188:13 280:6, 294:17, Industry [1] - 2:11 277:17 January [1] - 24:4 improved [3] - 75:17, 314.1 industry [1] - 52:10 interested [6] - 28:8, **JC** [1] - 50:7 127:2, 141:6 infinitely [1] - 107:3 56:11, 100:12, issues [14] - 67:18, Jeff [3] - 1:15, 209:8, improvement [7] -67:19, 71:15, 77:17, inflammatory [1] -199:12. 260:5. 309:13 13:2, 13:8, 14:9, 123:9, 188:2, 173:19 264:15 **JEFF** [15] - 206:13, 84:15, 157:5, 204:15, 204:16, information [8] interesting [12] -209:6, 209:8, 157:14, 186:3 281:6, 284:2, 284:3, 37:10, 39:4, 56:2, 26:1, 27:12, 173:3, 307:17, 308:3, improvements [4] -204:2, 227:14, 292:3, 308:18, 78:15, 100:14, 308:6, 309:19, 70:18, 72:15, 123:14, 174:14, 229:9, 257:9, 316:14 310:14, 311:7, 128:18, 157:7 Italy [1] - 103:8 183:18 262:13, 280:16, 311:17, 312:12, **improving** [2] - 60:19, item [6] - 4:12, 5:4, 290:2, 298:10, informative [2] - 33:5, 312:16, 313:19, 152:2 5:8, 35:11, 327:3, 305:6 290.12 314:8, 325:11 in-ground [1] - 178:17 infrastructure [4] interface [1] - 254:19 329:2 Jefferson [2] inadequate [1] - 42:1 45:13, 157:15, internal [2] - 20:10, items [3] - 6:3, 56:7, 152:12, 155:12 inaudible [1] - 287:4 267:7, 303:5 281:6 327:1 **JFK** [1] - 3:17 inaudible) [1] initial [1] - 294:17 internally [1] - 223:7 iteration [1] - 289:18 Jim [5] - 52:14, 77:12, 168:17 itself [13] - 76:9, initiate [2] - 60:5, interpret [1] - 46:5 78:2, 78:3, 108:17 INC [1] - 1:18 78:13, 105:8, 196:6, 123:13 interpretation [5] job [7] - 51:11, 125:1, incentive [2] - 48:9, 236:8, 236:15, initiated [1] - 329:12 106:10, 238:13, 127:5, 165:7, 242:6, 236:19, 237:5, 48:11 input [2] - 197:7, 317:12, 317:13, 282:16, 283:2 239:2, 241:13, inch [6] - 83:1, 83:2, 278:16 317:15 John [4] - 215:10, 129:16, 182:13, 261:8, 332:15, interrupt [2] - 9:10, inside [2] - 240:6, 254:14, 254:15, 333:6 257:17 13:10 245:9 286:1 inches [6] - 81:19, insofar [1] - 153:14 intersection [3] -**JOHN** [1] - 254:15 J 82:7, 203:10, 258:6, installation [2] -240:10, 240:15, join [1] - 149:18 258:8, 258:9 253:4 14:13, 15:6 joy [2] - 162:10, include [1] - 308:16 intractable [1] -

J.F.K [3] - 5:4, 5:12,

installing [1] - 10:6

162:15 judgment [1] - 30:7 July [1] - 55:15 Juma [3] - 139:3, 142:9, 142:13 **JUMA** [2] - 142:11, 144.13 jump [2] - 60:11, 308.6 **jumping** [1] - 240:10 junction [1] - 13:14 juncture [1] - 60:2 jurisdiction [3] - 70:4, 71:9. 72:16 justification [2] -20:14. 20:16

Κ

Karen (3) - 131:4.

131:18, 134:13 Kathy [3] - 60:12, 60:13, 122:9 KATHY [23] - 60:13, 61:9, 63:19, 64:2, 64:12, 65:3, 65:6, 65:8, 65:16, 66:1, 66:18, 67:3, 67:6, 67:12, 68:3, 69:13, 70:6, 70:10, 75:5, 75:19, 92:5, 92:11, 93:2 keep [5] - 128:10, 139:5, 143:17, 160:12, 222:15 keeping [2] - 124:10, 166:13 keeps [2] - 33:3, 33:4 Ken [2] - 298:1, 305:2 Kennedy [3] - 5:7, 5:12, 286:2 kept [1] - 125:11 ketchup [1] - 162:8 **KEVIN** [13] - 93:15, 94:5, 95:7, 96:1, 97:6, 97:14, 98:2, 98:10, 99:2, 99:14, 322:9, 323:1, 323:16 Kevin [8] - 77:14, 93:13, 93:15, 95:3, 95:4, 95:17, 101:14, 218:14 key [8] - 168:11, 221:16, 225:13, 228:10. 230:3. 233:15. 234:1. 247:6 KeyWord [1] - 3:19 kidding [1] - 326:7

kids [2] - 187:5, 266:7

killed [3] - 128:12, 152:16, 152:17 KIM [1] - 253:13 Kim [1] - 253:14 kind [40] - 10:12, 29:14, 29:19, 35:14, 48:9, 48:11, 51:6, 53:4, 77:4, 111:14, 113:17, 127:9, 128:10, 136:18, 139:8, 143:14, 146:17, 148:12, 150:6, 152:18, 170:10, 175:14, 182:14, 196:4, 204:18, 220:11, 222:4, 240:12, 249:1, 252:18, 253:5, 253:6, 264:1, 269:13, 277:15, 278:15, 278:17, 279:4, 307:5, 315:6 kindly [1] - 104:13 kinds [5] - 97:18, 124:8, 136:11, 152:3, 192:3 knocked [1] - 192:1 knowing [3] - 148:8, 291:14 known [3] - 20:4, 53:13, 54:19 knows [3] - 127:5, 219:17, 303:18 Kukui [1] - 123:15

L

L-shaped [1] - 130:2 labelled [1] - 125:10 labelling [1] - 125:2 labor [1] - 133:12 laborious [1] - 289:19 Lakeview [2] -118:16, 124:3 lamps [3] - 159:19, 160:1, 194:7 land [12] - 47:9, 48:14, 48:17, 49:2, 123:16, 137:5, 161:6, 165:4, 166:11, 168:1, 168:5, 235:3 Landing [1] - 284:12 landscape [11] -46:15, 47:19, 62:17, 85:18, 149:8, 224:9, 226:1, 228:9, 239:1, 242:17, 247:4 landscaped [1] -47:16

landscaping [3] -

213:10, 225:18, 230.14 landscaping's [1] -226:12 lanes [4] - 61:1, 64:4 language [5] - 173:19, 233:1. 238:16. 239:2. 257:15 lap [1] - 81:14 large [12] - 22:4, 27:3, 54:13, 99:8, 139:17, 184:3, 198:10, 250:15, 252:11, 252:12, 265:2, 297:1 largely [1] - 36:16 larger [3] - 81:1, 94:11, 211:3 last [33] - 35:14, 36:19, 37:2, 39:3, 41:5, 54:17, 78:7, 80:5, 83:12, 111:16, 125:5, 141:16, 146:12, 149:6, 155:13, 163:19, 169:7, 178:2, 179:3, 185:17, 189:6, 198:9, 223:8, 229:18, 231:15, 234:1, 236:1, 249:3, 257:17, 273:8, 289:10, 296:12, 323:10 lastly [2] - 137:10, 138.6 late [8] - 33:12, 126:18, 138:11,

198:3, 200:4, 202:8, 217:18, 218:7 lateral [1] - 155:17 latter [1] - 115:10 law [1] - 158:11 lawn [1] - 166:10 layout [2] - 13:1, 252:14 layouts [1] - 302:14 lays [1] - 222:5 lead [1] - 179:6 leads [1] - 286:4 Leaf [11] - 24:2, 24:14, 26:11, 27:14, 29:2, 29:4, 29:13, 29:18, 31:2, 34:5, 220:1 learned [1] - 191:3 learning [1] - 215:5 lease [1] - 77:1 leasing [2] - 56:12, 77:3 least [22] - 63:6, 92:7, 107:11, 138:12,

154:12, 156:4, 160:5, 160:13, 162:9, 199:19, 203:17, 251:5, 251:14, 252:7, 257:17, 266:6, 270:16, 292:10, 293:15. 294:3. 295:5, 320:1 leave [3] - 189:19, 299:12, 327:4 leaving [2] - 123:3, 179.1 Lechmere [1] - 285:3 **Lee** [5] - 118:14, 135:19, 136:2, 162:19 **LEE** [1] - 136:2 **LEED** [3] - 94:12, 94:14, 94:16 left [6] - 42:3, 79:12, 103:4, 166:5, 240:19, 259:14 legal [4] - 102:12, 102:15, 102:18, 329:13 Leighton [15] - 222:9, 222:16, 225:8, 232:7, 232:10, 234:3, 234:12, 240:15, 240:16, 244:10, 245:3, 245:7, 245:11, 258:17, 266:12 **LENART** [4] - 139:4, 140:10, 140:16, 142:4 Lenart [3] - 136:1, 139:2, 142:2 length [16] - 63:10, 108:8, 119:3, 120:5, 122:11, 191:7, 204:17, 205:2, 279:2, 279:15, 284:10, 292:15, 292:17, 293:3, 301:2, 301:13 lengths [1] - 79:7 Leonard [1] - 142:3 **Lesley** [1] - 16:9 less [11] - 27:9, 43:12, 47:3, 115:1, 133:6, 180:1, 191:8, 270:19, 279:3, 301:3, 303:12 letter [12] - 55:15, 69:17, 73:1, 142:16, 144:9, 151:5, 163:14, 172:10,

172:11, 173:4,

179:14, 182:5

145:8

level [15] - 86:6, 89:13, 104:17, 114:18, 115:3, 144:6, 144:8, 190:19, 192:8, 193:17, 235:2. 244:7. 248:8. 259:1. 285:13 **Lexington** [2] - 154:1, 165:3 licensed [1] - 96:7 life [2] - 148:8, 155:1 lifes [1] - 199:6 light [4] - 72:3, 72:6, 153:3, 299:11 lighting [4] - 47:18, 156:6, 156:8, 159:17 likely [4] - 63:7, 127:15, 277:2, 306:11 limit [8] - 46:6, 108:19, 118:7, 192:19, 313:13, 318:2, 320:9, 320:17 limitation [1] - 98:18 limitations [1] -112:19 limited [1] - 30:13 line [29] - 9:10, 9:14, 11:2, 13:10, 14:5, 14:15, 14:18, 24:10, 47:10, 47:13, 48:3, 65:5, 65:10, 65:12, 83:11, 115:4, 116:18, 122:18, 123:2, 125:6, 129:6, 153:10, 166:7, 168:14, 233:15, 241:4, 246:4, 248:6, 298:9 Line [2] - 267:8, 303:10 **LINE** [1] - 333:9 lines [4] - 91:2, 177:16, 190:6, 261:3 link [2] - 46:18, 186:8 linking [2] - 182:19, 183:1 lip [1] - 251:7 list [9] - 22:9, 35:15, 36:14, 36:15, 37:15, 41:6, 260:12, 260:14, 260:17 listed [1] - 329:3 listen [1] - 22:16 listened [1] - 119:1 listening [2] - 117:6,

literally [2] - 146:5, 259:16 live [8] - 16:4, 124:2, 139:4. 142:14. 152:14, 194:11, 263:7, 288:9 lived [1] - 264:6 lively [1] - 112:9 living [3] - 87:14, 189:7, 192:2 Liza [6] - 1:15, 28:18, 40:2, 321:15, 322:4, 327:5 **LIZA** [36] - 4:6, 7:14, 19:19, 20:15, 20:18, 21:5, 21:11, 21:18, 23:12, 23:18, 25:5, 25:9, 25:12, 25:17, 29:3, 30:3, 35:3, 35:5, 39:17, 40:3, 205:13, 206:3, 206:6, 206:12, 207:6, 214:10, 250:2, 250:4, 323:19. 324:8. 324:16. 325:2. 325:8, 325:18, 327:6, 329:1 Liza's [1] - 249:19 LLC_[2] - 2:15, 3:9 load [1] - 43:11 loaded [1] - 169:4 loading [10] - 50:4, 50:14, 59:7, 119:16, 154:13, 154:17, 181:18, 181:19, 225:1, 266:2 local [1] - 179:15 located [4] - 3:4, 3:9, 66:6, 222:12 location [7] - 31:8, 77:2, 97:5, 200:17, 219:16, 250:11, 272.2 locations [1] - 15:2 locked [1] - 262:1 **Lofts** [5] - 25:11, 25:13, 26:15, 27:15, 28:19 logic [2] - 107:10, 252:14 logical [1] - 325:7 longest [1] - 207:13 Longfellow [1] - 5:7 look [62] - 9:14, 11:19, 15:18, 61:9, 62:13, 70:17, 72:9, 82:11, 84:3, 101:19, Loomis [1] - 215:3 102:8, 109:1, lose [5] - 113:19, 110:19, 111:7, 114:13, 115:7,

115:9, 120:11, 121:2, 121:5, 122:2, 125:3, 126:11, 138:17, 147:15, 150:2, 163:18, 165:12, 166:4, 172:15, 173:14, 174:3. 175:9. 183:15, 188:16, 189:4, 189:10, 190:3, 192:9, 196:13, 197:19, 198:12, 202:4, 230:9, 234:2, 235:2, 244:16, 252:4, 263:9. 265:8. 265:11, 265:12, 286:16, 289:8. 290:14, 290:16, 295:10, 295:11, 297:17, 298:15, 307:19, 328:5 looked [14] - 11:9, 15:13, 40:5, 73:18, 74:4, 101:6, 138:9, 146:14, 165:15, 202:12, 235:6, 235:7, 268:10, 283:11 looking [42] - 10:11, 10:13, 13:17, 14:2, 15:1, 15:5, 39:10, 39:15, 40:9, 54:4, 66:8, 68:18, 71:5, 84:14, 88:3, 90:9, 93:3, 111:2, 142:19, 170:18, 175:12, 176:6, 186:14, 192:10, 196:7, 196:15, 238:4, 241:2, 242:10, 243:10, 243:11, 244:9, 245:8, 246:3, 248:16, 267:12, 268:1, 270:13, 288:19, 294:14, 299.1 looks [20] - 18:7, 68:16, 110:14, 115:1, 115:6, 148:13, 150:4, 181:4. 186:16. 192:11, 224:3,

250:19, 251:13,

253:18, 261:8,

271:9, 273:17,

274:10, 278:12,

138:2, 193:8, 193:9,

324:1

303:2

losing [1] - 72:11 loss [1] - 185:7 lost [2] - 201:4, 270:4 love [6] - 93:10, 108:1, 119:2, 127:11, 163:10, 231.4 lovely [4] - 147:3, 147:4, 147:18, 160.12 low [4] - 85:15, 86:7, 237:2, 286:8 Lowell [1] - 258:5 lower [11] - 165:18, 241:16, 273:16, 294:10, 294:13, 294:15, 294:18, 295:1, 295:12, 295:13, 297:15 lowered [1] - 295:6 LP [1] - 3:17 LSB [1] - 95:6 **LSD** [1] - 95:16 LSP [2] - 95:10, 180:18 luck [1] - 137:18 lucky [1] - 331:3 lukewarm [1] - 135:13 lush [4] - 147:3, 147:4, 147:15 M

Ma'am [1] - 149:1 magic [1] - 285:6 magnificent [1] -264:1 mails [3] - 329:10, 329:15, 330:1 Main [2] - 77:4, 273:11 main [9] - 56:16, 113:17, 137:10, 221:3, 222:8, 245:8, 252:17, 252:19, 255:19 maintain [2] - 137:16, 220:12 maintained [1] -170.9 maintaining [2] -12:3, 221:15 maintenance [1] -148.18 Major [9] - 3:8, 3:12, 5:1, 216:18, 217:2, 218:19, 294:19, 306:3, 308:9 majority [2] - 71:14, 296:2

makers [1] - 183:7 mall [9] - 70:16, 70:19, 71:4, 71:6, 71:7, 72:2, 154:14, 178:15, 191:9 man [2] - 107:3, 257:7 man's [1] - 161:6 manage [1] - 113:16 management [1] -152:11 Management [1] -152:12 manager [2] - 157:9, 218:11 Manager [2] - 1:12, 2:2 maneuvers [1] -173.18 **Manning** [1] - 150:18 Map [3] - 3:2, 208:14, 211:17 map [5] - 58:15, 143:17, 145:16, 146:11, 211:14 Maple [11] - 24:2, 24:14, 26:11, 27:14, 29:2, 29:4, 29:13, 29:18, 31:2, 34:5, 220.1 mapping [1] - 232:2 Marc [1] - 172:9 March [2] - 329:11, 330.7 marked [1] - 128:9 marks [2] - 332:15, 333:6 married [1] - 149:9 marvelous [1] - 264:9 Mary's [1] - 330:13 masonry [11] -170:13, 185:13, 251:3, 257:17, 257:19, 258:9, 258:11, 258:12, 258:13, 259:3, 268:13 mass [8] - 229:2, 229:6, 234:2, 234:15, 236:15, 237:16, 245:14, 251:12 Mass [6] - 9:19, 17:17, 17:18, 95:13, 96:16, 148:14 Massachusetts [8] -1:7, 2:6, 2:7, 96:2, 96:11, 96:14, 153:14, 157:2 masses [1] - 232:11 massing [11] - 163:9, 177:5, 203:12,

229:14, 231:18, 232:9, 235:13, 257:8, 257:9, 272:15, 307:9 massive [4] - 168:15, 170:19. 171:15. 177:15 master [3] - 141:1, 304:17, 305:2 match [5] - 11:11, 11:12, 11:15, 14:6, 274:9 matches [2] - 265:5, 265.6 material [12] - 6:7, 6:9, 6:14, 82:4, 97:11, 101:12, 250:18, 251:18, 252:2, 257:16, 276:15, 276:19 materiality [2] -268:13, 300:17 materials [20] - 6:5, 81:13, 89:12, 96:5, 98:7. 170:13. 172:16. 189:12. 206:18. 207:1. 212:13, 250:14, 257:13, 270:18, 272:3, 273:11, 276:12, 277:4, 277:7, 281:1 matter [9] - 75:17, 199:15, 288:5, 310:3, 314:19, 320:11, 320:12, 320:16, 321:3 max [1] - 192:19 McGovern [2] - 172:9, 173:5 McKinnon [18] -119:14, 133:9, 217:17, 217:19, 218:4, 218:16, 249:8, 276:4, 285:2, 287:6, 288:7, 296:19, 303:18, 304:1, 304:13, 318:16, 326:5, 329:4 MCP [1] - 99:6 mean [39] - 8:9, 16:5, 16:14, 17:2, 18:16, 30:18, 33:1, 48:19, 110:9, 112:11, 120:12, 123:1, 128:6, 132:2, 133:8, 133:15, 196:12, 201:3, 201:14, 203:3, 203:8, 206:9, 223:6, 248:2, 253:9, 273:3, 273:5,

280:16, 286:6, 288:6, 288:16, 288:17, 296:4, 296:6, 296:11, 302:2, 311:12, 316:3, 323:8 meaning [1] - 253:6 meaningful [3] -230:11, 247:3, 247.14 means [2] - 155:7, 270:12 meantime [1] - 320:5 measure [1] - 27:3 measured [2] - 311:2, 311:4 measuring [2] -90:10, 94:3 mechanical [7] - 10:2, 15:2, 53:9, 53:12, 80:18, 88:10, 167:11 mechanicals [1] -182:8 mechanism [2] -18:17, 143:14 medians [1] - 128:8 meet [3] - 45:14, 126:16, 193:2 meeting [11] - 4:4, 4:7, 7:13, 31:12, 35:14, 62:3, 161:11, 214:7, 219:6, 324:14, 325:2 Meeting [2] - 1:6, 2:4 meetings [7] - 35:13, 43:2, 45:4, 45:6, 62:5, 132:5, 219:6 meets [1] - 175:17 **MEMBER** [1] - 214:13 member [1] - 201:6 Member [7] - 1:9, 1:9, 1:10, 1:10, 1:11, 1:11, 181:8 members [7] - 34:17, 34:18, 117:3, 207:10, 216:11, 326:15, 330:18 Members [3] - 176:9, 209:10, 221:9 memo [19] - 7:1, 8:4, 8:18, 35:10, 60:4, 67:17, 74:18, 117:18, 118:19, 125:8, 125:18, 126:1, 144:5, 165:15, 183:17, 183:18, 194:4, 249:13, 263:11 Memorial [5] - 2:6, 13:7, 16:17, 18:5,

286:2 memorial [1] - 286:19 memorialize [1] -181:10 memory [1] - 304:14 memos [1] - 126:9 mention [4] - 28:11, 142:19, 143:18, 195.18 mentioned [16] -84:11, 84:12, 88:10, 88:18, 90:2, 93:18, 123:15, 127:14, 128:16, 130:17, 150:11, 151:4, 161:18, 203:14, 204:2, 258:16 mentioning [1] -206:14 message [3] - 281:14, 303:19, 304:8 messy [1] - 302:9 met [1] - 125:4 metal [4] - 81:14, 258:2, 262:1, 299:11 methane [11] - 62:15, 67:17, 67:18, 146:8, 165:16, 165:17, 165:19, 166:4, 166:8, 166:13, 166:19 method [1] - 280:19 metrics [1] - 288:8 mic's [1] - 63:19 Micha [2] - 149:15, 153:19 MICHA [1] - 153:19 Michael [1] - 218:12 mics [1] - 36:9 middle [10] - 80:12, 88:4, 88:17, 203:1, 204:7, 231:1, 232:16, 273:2, 285:12, 302:4 midnight [4] - 52:8, 296:10, 304:8, 311:11 might [21] - 27:13, 48:13, 51:2, 77:9, 81:2, 83:18, 113:9, 185:17, 186:3, 194:3, 198:12, 209:19, 250:17, 252:6, 255:3, 269:15, 269:16, 292:8, 299:10, 306:8, 315:10 migration [1] - 155:16 mile [1] - 180:1

miles [1] - 22:16

million [2] - 140:17, 300:4 mind [7] - 93:12, 106:12. 122:13. 158:18, 163:17, 198:9, 251:15 minds [1] - 79:3 mini [1] - 161:7 minimize [1] - 124:9 Minor [1] - 294:2 minor [1] - 17:18 minus [1] - 285:15 minute [3] - 221:3, 232:17. 240:13 minutes [3] - 118:7, 133:9, 188:9 miss [2] - 204:6, 279:4 missed [2] - 125:7, 279:19 misses [1] - 273:13 missing [3] - 144:1, 232:4, 232:15 mission [1] - 234:5 MIT [5] - 16:8, 16:11, 17:5, 17:11, 18:7 mix [2] - 228:2, 228:17 mockup [1] - 53:3 model [37] - 82:12, 110:17, 115:14, 119:11, 119:12, 119:14, 119:18, 120:7, 133:3, 133:7, 133:11, 133:13, 134:14, 138:7, 149:7, 163:4, 173:11, 175:7, 182:12, 182:14, 188:18, 190:11, 190:16, 190:17, 195:7, 195:10, 197:14, 198:7, 198:16, 198:18, 204:19, 231:19, 259:13, 290:9, 291:1, 317:7 modelling [1] -232:12 models [10] - 133:12, 149:10. 162:17. 190:14, 190:16, 197:13, 272:13, 272:16, 290:14 modern [3] - 32:1, 122:17, 128:7 modernist [1] -162:14 modification [1] -

313:6

modified [3] - 208:19,

212:2, 309:3 modify [2] - 3:6, 212:1 modular [1] - 191:14 modulation [1] -115.8 module [2] - 191:17, 191.18 modules [3] - 191:16, 197:17, 266:9 moment [7] - 14:14, 31:14, 175:4, 186:6, 301:14, 301:17, 324:18 Monday [1] - 126:9 money [6] - 131:10, 158:4, 167:8, 183:9, 281:1, 295:11 monitor [3] - 42:8, 43:15, 51:11 monitoring [1] - 51:18 monitors [1] - 50:7 monolithic [1] - 113:5 Monsignor [8] -226:5, 230:19, 231:11, 239:3, 241:13, 244:10, 246:3, 270:1 month [2] - 68:16, 155:13 months [10] - 60:17, 81:11. 99:5. 165:11. 218:10. 219:4. 219:5. 220:15. 316:17 morning [2] - 124:17, 326:17 most [23] - 14:11, 34:10, 35:16, 79:19, 82:3, 87:15, 112:16, 118:2, 121:8, 122:3, 125:16, 170:4, 172:17, 180:5, 186:18, 223:3, 223:11, 243:4, 268:14, 277:2, 279:6, 310:8, 331:5 mostly [4] - 83:17, 111:16, 209:4, 213:9 mother [1] - 149:8 motion [10] - 215:16, 216:7, 319:6, 319:14, 320:19, 321:19, 326:11, 328:7, 328:13, 328:18 motivation [3] -280:18, 296:1, 296:5 motorist [1] - 32:8

mount [1] - 17:17

Mount [3] - 2:7, 9:1, 9:2 mounts [1] - 9:4 mouth [1] - 195:10 move [25] - 6:11, 43:8, 43:9, 43:11, 65:4, 85:7, 89:3, 114:9, 139:13, 154:10, 167:2, 167:13, 215:17, 218:1, 256:15, 272:1, 302:3, 306:1, 306:3, 322:7, 324:9, 325:19, 326:1 move-in [1] - 89:3 move-ins [3] - 43:8, 43:9, 43:11 moved [14] - 11:1, 14:17, 56:18, 56:19, 65:10, 65:11, 86:17, 86:18, 146:16, 148:2, 154:7, 307:1, 322:1, 328:14 movement [2] -162:14. 269:3 moves [4] - 114:12, 193:10, 232:10, 240:4 movies [2] - 138:10, 199:6 moving [9] - 12:9, 16:3, 42:16, 54:7, 166:17, 211:6, 215:7, 235:14, 236:18 multi [14] - 182:1, 213:8, 223:15, 224:11, 242:13, 244:1, 247:14, 248:3, 248:12, 255:1, 255:15, 255:18, 255:19 multi-family [3] -182:1, 213:8 multi-use [11] -223:15, 224:11, 242:13, 244:1, 247:14, 248:3, 248:12, 255:1, 255:15, 255:18, 255:19 Multifamily [1] - 2:11 multiple [1] - 202:12 mumbling [1] - 21:1 mundane [1] - 278:5 municipal [1] - 173:12 Murphy [3] - 1:12, 2:2, 4:13 MURPHY [12] - 4:14, 6:16, 6:19, 7:7,

7:10, 73:16, 318:13,

253:10 319:17, 326:18, 330:4, 330:7, needs [10] - 42:2, 330:14 148:17, 172:14, Museum [1] - 259:6 189:13, 264:18, must [2] - 22:18, 298:12, 304:3, 313.7 304:4. 309:3. 320:19 mustard [1] - 162:9 negotiate [1] - 177:13 mustardy [1] - 276:9 mystery [1] - 128:14 negotiation [1] -181.14 negotiations [1] -44:16 neighbor [1] - 194:17 naive [1] - 136:10 neighborhood [12] name [21] - 25:3, 3:4, 45:4, 51:10, 25:7, 26:11, 26:16, 139:19, 140:4, 28:19, 29:8, 29:16, 161:9, 188:17, 29:17, 29:18, 33:8, 209:3, 209:16, 118:9, 142:13, 215:6, 289:2, 303:6 152:12, 214:16, Neighborhood [1] -214:17, 215:2, 253:2, 253:13, neighborhoods [2] -262:15, 262:16 140:2, 163:18 names [3] - 26:18, neighboring [1] -27:3, 142:7 129:9 narrative [3] - 145:19, neighbors [17] - 43:3, 146:1, 146:6 45:6, 45:15, 48:10, narrow [1] - 66:13 50:17, 50:19, 64:8, nature [3] - 29:12, 76:15, 77:16, 101:6, 77:7, 108:15 101:18, 114:7, near [1] - 31:8 133:4, 159:16, nearby [1] - 262:11 162:18, 209:15, necessarily [8] - 79:1, 210:1 135:5, 189:16, nervous [1] - 278:1 211:8, 264:18, network [1] - 228:11 293:14, 308:16, never [8] - 22:17, 314:9 88:19, 105:3, 151:9, necessary [1] -208:1, 293:4, 293:6, 189:10 314:17 need [50] - 13:11, nevertheless [1] -33:15, 34:13, 40:1, 22:13 49:1, 49:16, 63:14, new [28] - 7:15, 44:7, 72:4, 72:18, 77:7, 71:10, 73:7, 88:4, 81:6, 85:16, 98:1, 88:5, 101:8, 135:4, 99:1, 117:8, 117:10, 136:14, 136:16, 117:16, 130:12, 159:18, 171:17, 143:1, 147:7, 147:9, 174:19, 190:7, 163:10, 170:3, 211:11, 212:15, 172:17, 174:10, 223:1, 224:2, 241:3, 174:11, 183:14, 259:6, 287:12, 184:1, 189:1, 191:1, 289:2, 305:11, 205:16, 207:3, 306:17, 325:3, 208:4, 212:9, 325:15, 328:4, 212:11, 212:15, 328:11 216:1, 218:1, New [71] - 2:9, 2:10, 260:16, 262:6, 2:15, 4:17, 35:12, 279:12, 281:5, 42:17, 43:1, 43:8, 283:19, 308:19, 43:10, 44:15, 44:18, 312:5, 312:7, 319:6, 45:1, 45:2, 45:11, 322:12 47:6, 53:17, 54:6, needed [4] - 26:9, 57:7, 60:3, 60:19,

158:9, 192:6,

62:6, 62:8, 62:11,

63:4, 63:11, 64:7, 64:15, 65:1, 71:7, 72:11, 72:12, 73:12, 74:10, 74:15, 75:17, 76:5, 77:9, 77:10, 84:19, 122:11, 123:4, 130:5, 130:18. 131:15. 135:3, 139:11, 143:7, 144:14, 145:17, 154:11, 154:19, 157:17, 165:5, 165:9, 166:1, 166:3, 167:9, 172:14, 180:11, 183:1, 188:13, 197:2, 197:3, 197:9, 275:2, 275:5, 282:1, 282:8, 290:4, 293:1 newly [1] - 61:18 news [1] - 40:9 next [33] - 35:11, 42:14, 47:5, 47:17, 49:11, 51:1, 52:12, 75:13, 75:17, 83:6, 101:1, 101:9, 118:13, 133:1, 135:19, 142:8, 164:12, 192:7, 197:5, 202:3, 206:11, 208:8, 208:12, 217:12, 277:6, 281:10, 285:13, 289:17, 291:11, 295:9, 316:13, 322:5, 323:13 next-door [2] - 101:1, nice [14] - 27:13, 63:1, 68:10, 83:18, 91:1, 120:11, 150:5, 155:13, 203:3, 205:3, 222:19, 229:12, 251:19 nicer [1] - 61:5 night [5] - 41:17, 132:7, 156:5, 218:8, 320:14 nine [3] - 6:2, 81:11, 159:14 nineties [1] - 138:11 nobody [6] - 214:10, 216:15, 250:3, 296:8, 296:12 **nobody's** [1] - 120:14 noise [2] - 50:9, 50:12 non [6] - 60:9, 127:18, 210:11, 210:12, 236:2, 252:19 non-conforming [3] -127:18, 210:11,

non-specific [1] -60:9 non-traditional [1] -236.2 none [1] - 133:17 noon [1] - 126:10 Norfolk [1] - 136:3 normally [4] - 178:8, 304:9, 317:14, 322:11 north [9] - 9:3, 10:7, 10:15, 13:7, 89:3, 89:5, 189:8, 245:8, 297:14 North [23] - 3:9, 6:1, 24:12, 147:14, 170:5, 181:14, 194:12, 219:1, 219:17, 219:19, 220:6, 222:11, 223:14, 224:13, 225:5, 234:3, 237:7, 248:15, 256:2, 264:13, 282:7, 297:18, 305:3 northern [1] - 154:5 **NOT** [2] - 332:15, 333:5 Notary [1] - 333:7 notations [2] -332:15, 333:6 note [3] - 172:8, 173:3, 333:4 noted [1] - 333:17 nothing [6] - 132:6, 138:7, 163:3, 287:6, 287:10, 331:7 notice [7] - 159:2, 199:19, 322:12, 322:16, 323:3, 323:6, 323:17 noticed [1] - 253:16 notification [1] -125:15 notify [1] - 125:18 notion [9] - 32:18, 34:4, 159:12, 163:8, 199:12. 250:13. 251:6, 252:9, 256:18 nowhere [2] - 130:3, 253.8 number [11] - 3:11, 15:8, 113:3, 141:8, 144:17, 193:5, 201:14, 201:16, 211:4, 228:3, 285:6 numbers [2] - 151:9,

210:12

252:19

non-event[1] -

151:11

NUR [27] - 33:12,
37:6, 37:11, 39:10,
39:15, 68:6, 69:8,
89:17, 90:1, 90:9,
90:16, 90:19, 91:10,
91:12, 92:1, 92:9,
93:1, 93:3, 93:10,
93:17, 99:7, 100:4,
100:9, 103:2, 176:8,
176:16, 177:2

Nur [1] - 1:11
nutshell [1] - 327:6

0

O'Brien [5] - 226:6, 231:11, 239:3, 241:13, 270:1 o'clock [2] - 5:19, 176:14 O'Connor [2] -218:18, 221:9 O'CONNOR [5] -221:8, 259:11, 272:7, 276:14, 277:11 O'Hare [2] - 33:14, 35:10 object [2] - 167:12, 190:17 objecting [2] -296:13, 321:6 objection [1] - 28:2 objectionable [1] -279:3 objects [1] - 162:2 obscured [1] - 105:7 obstacle [1] - 127:16 obtaining [1] - 58:9 obviously [17] - 16:6, 62:13, 64:5, 71:17, 82:8, 86:13, 121:6, 127:1, 131:10, 150:3, 156:11, 171:2, 284:6, 302:8, 322:10, 326:7 occupies [1] - 21:14 occupy [2] - 267:13, 268:5 occupying [1] -222:14 occurred [1] - 209:18 October [13] - 5:11, 5:17, 7:8, 35:6, 62:4, 324:1, 324:9, 324:14, 324:17, 326:1, 326:4, 326:6 **OF** [2] - 1:2, 332:17 offer [1] - 196:14 office [2] - 79:6, 150:6 officer [1] - 68:11 **OFFICIAL** [1] - 1:18 official [1] - 73:11 often [1] - 182:10 **Oil** [1] - 123:16 oil [1] - 96:4 old [8] - 31:16, 32:14, 56:15, 158:8, 170:5, 171:10, 297:8, 297.9 older [2] - 164:6, 254:4 oldest[1] - 196:3 On-Grade [2] - 2:12, 2:13 on-line [1] - 125:6 once [7] - 50:16, 75:3, 111:9, 207:14, 207:15, 267:6, 316:17 one [172] - 5:7, 7:3, 7:4, 11:5, 13:5, 20:1, 21:5, 24:8, 24:10, 26:11, 28:1, 29:15, 32:10, 33:8, 36:13, 37:1, 37:2, 37:3, 37:6, 37:9, 37:14, 38:5, 39:5, 40:2, 41:8, 41:9, 42:12, 43:1, 43:6, 47:7, 52:1, 52:16, 53:18, 55:5, 55:6, 56:9, 57:10, 58:15, 59:19, 60:18, 61:13, 62:14, 63:6, 63:9, 69:9, 69:17, 73:14, 74:14, 75:8, 76:13, 76:14, 76:17, 76:19, 77:5, 79:10, 79:11, 80:7, 80:16, 82:9, 83:2, 83:9, 83:14, 83:17, 84:12, 89:2, 92:19, 94:15, 101:18. 105:16. 105:17. 108:13. 113:16, 113:17, 113:18, 117:19, 119:4, 119:7, 120:6, 122:11, 123:15, 124:16, 125:14, 135:4, 137:12, 139:7, 139:16, 140:15, 142:16, 143:16, 143:18, 145:9, 146:12, 150:4, 154:12, 155:11, 157:6, 157:7, 157:10, 158:4, 158:9, 159:14, 160:18, 162:5, 162:11,

164:6, 167:18,

152:3

168:6, 170:7, 174:9, 180:3, 181:6, 188:8, 192:14, 197:2, 197:17, 198:6, 204:2, 204:5, 205:13, 207:19, 208:2, 210:16, 215:15. 221:2. 223:3, 225:12, 228:3, 228:17, 232:19, 234:15, 236:17, 237:10, 238:11, 244:10, 247:16, 248:6, 249:10, 258:15, 264:16, 271:15, 272:5, 272:11, 272:13, 273:13, 275:12, 279:7, 285:7, 287:9, 290:8, 291:6, 291:8, 292:16, 297:4, 298:10, 298:13, 299:9, 301:8, 302:6, 304:14. 304:18. 306:9, 310:5, 315:11, 315:12, 315:13, 317:14, 324:2, 324:7 One[12] - 222:16, 226:10, 227:15, 232:7, 232:10, 234:3, 234:12, 240:16, 245:3, 245:7, 245:11, 253:16 one's [1] - 176:4 one-bedroom [1] -192:14 ones [5] - 7:15, 81:18, 148:15 ongoing [1] - 224:8 open [10] - 42:5, 146:9, 147:16, 264:13, 298:4. 305:4, 307:2, 307:5, 314:16, 315:1 opened [2] - 314:17, 325:4 opening [8] - 173:15, 230:17, 230:19, 263:6, 270:7, 271:10, 310:3, 310:18 opens [1] - 87:2 operated [1] - 310:15 operates [1] - 144:5 opinion [3] - 34:15, 329:17, 329:18 opportunities [4] -62:8, 64:15, 72:10,

opportunity [11] -6:14, 62:19, 71:12, 142:12, 150:14, 151:17, 226:9, 227:16, 237:4, 294:5. 311:14 opposed [5] - 99:10, 142:3, 179:1, 185:11, 294:4 opposing [1] - 26:17 opposite [3] - 222:10, 259:18, 266:13 option [4] - 60:18, 178:14, 309:12, 322:15 options [9] - 10:11, 74:12, 135:11, 292:4, 292:5, 293:16, 317:6, 317:7, 324:9 Orchard [1] - 194:12 order [9] - 4:5, 46:6, 74:7. 105:2. 125:12. 168:7. 187:15. 218:2. 233:12 Ordinance [13] - 3:5, 3:15, 26:19, 31:13, 31:15, 31:16, 31:17, 110:5, 181:19, 193:1, 260:6, 307:14, 312:10 ordinance [1] - 3:13 organization [1] -252:15 organize [1] - 12:17 organizing [1] - 126:5 orient [1] - 240:12 oriented [4] - 73:3, 179:19, 180:9, 187:19 original [12] - 34:19, 36:13, 38:4, 80:17, 83:12, 109:2, 259:13, 294:8, 304:17, 327:12, 332:3. 332:10 **ORIGINAL** [1] - 332:9 originally [2] - 54:2, 83:10 otherwise [2] -151:14, 154:6 ought [9] - 23:2, 153:3, 153:4, 187:12, 214:4, 294:5, 295:6, 301:6, 321:9 outcome [3] - 9:15, 14:7, 15:8 outdoor [2] - 241:5,

244:4

outline [2] - 63:16,

220.2 outlined [7] - 60:15, 61:10, 63:12, 64:12, 64:16, 64:19, 74:16 outlining [1] - 60:18 outside [10] - 62:18, 70:3, 139:11, 146:9, 166:10, 166:12, 258:2, 263:2, 275:1, 304:11 outstanding [1] -183:17 overall [5] - 124:16, 211:4, 213:12, 223:4, 252:3 overgrown [1] -226:13 overhangs [1] - 227:9 overhead [1] - 179:1 overlap [1] - 43:15 overlay [2] - 211:18, 211:19 Overlay [7] - 3:3, 3:6, 4:18, 208:15, 211:13, 213:4, 213:6 overnight [3] - 41:16, 41:17, 42:7 overpowering [1] -204:18 overrule [1] - 318:12 overrun [1] - 106:3 overshadow [1] -177:3 oversight [1] - 96:6 oversized [1] - 192:5 overview [1] - 220:5 own [14] - 65:19, 66:1, 72:15, 96:17, 99:16, 100:1, 123:16, 126:1, 140:6, 140:11, 253:15, 278:18, 300:19 owned [2] - 16:7, 48:17 owner [6] - 48:4, 72:14. 122:14. 128:4. 130:4. 187:16 owner's [1] - 71:8 owners [2] - 130:5, 283:4 ownership [5] -48:14, 111:17, 127:19, 128:2, 140:5

Ρ

owns [1] - 187:16

p.m [4] - 1:5, 2:9, 3:2,

3.8 package [8] - 36:13, 36:15, 37:10, 39:4, 41:1, 41:3, 179:19, 212:13 Paden [1] - 1:15 PADEN [36] - 4:6, 7:14, 19:19, 20:15, 20:18, 21:5, 21:11, 21:18, 23:12, 23:18, 25:5, 25:9, 25:12, 25:17, 29:3, 30:3, 35:3, 35:5, 39:17, 40:3, 205:13, 206:3, 206:6, 206:12, 207:6, 214:10, 250:2, 250:4, 323:19, 324:8, 324:16, 325:2, 325:8, 325:18, 327:6, 329:1 Page [2] - 2:18, 333:7 page [7] - 37:15, 41:6, 90:11, 144:4, 145:16, 165:13 **PAGE** [4] - 2:1, 3:1, 332:17, 333:9 paid [4] - 132:13, 134:19, 157:12 paint [4] - 9:7, 12:4, 14:6. 15:7 painted [6] - 11:11, 31:4, 31:5, 31:6, 31:8, 84:4 painter [1] - 196:12 painters [1] - 84:9 painting [1] - 16:4 pallet [2] - 120:16, 277:1 Pam [1] - 275:19 Pamela [1] - 1:9 PAMELA [38] - 17:10, 19:7, 21:4, 25:4, 25:7, 28:18, 29:11, 30:4, 31:5, 37:8, 37:19, 38:3, 117:13, 132:9, 132:17, 133:19, 134:3, 149:1, 149:3, 168:18, 193:12, 194:5, 276:1, 276:5, 277:9, 277:12, 282:9, 283:16, 295:19, 296:8, 296:11, 296:18, 306:13, 317:9, 319:4, 324:6, 325:10, 331:1

Pan [4] - 153:11,

181:11

153:12, 153:15,

panels [3] - 156:4, 156:9, 156:10 Panera [1] - 178:13 paper [2] - 118:3, 323:3 parallel [1] - 21:9 parapet [14] - 14:5, 14:15, 14:18, 104:16, 104:18, 105:2, 105:7, 105:8, 105:11, 111:2, 111:13, 112:15, 190:3, 205:9 parapet's [1] - 105:14 parapets [3] - 80:15, 89:2, 112:12 parcel [5] - 61:18, 61:19, 63:8, 63:12, 219:1 parcels [5] - 61:17, 62:12, 63:13, 63:15, 66:10 pardon [1] - 111:18 parents [2] - 253:15, 254:3 Park [23] - 5:15, 35:8, 62:14, 62:15, 63:3, 114:19, 134:10, 143:7, 146:7, 148:4, 151:18, 152:13, 155:12, 186:17, 190:5, 222:1, 231:12, 239:4, 246:2, 252:18, 264:11, 286:2, 324:12 park [20] - 42:16, 62:18, 122:2, 137:2, 158:15, 160:3, 161:3, 161:5, 161:7, 166:11, 182:8, 228:14, 247:13, 252:17, 256:10, 286:4, 287:1, 287:12. 305:5 parked [1] - 64:10 Parking [4] - 2:13, 2:14, 65:11 parking [53] - 6:1, 23:9, 23:13, 41:11, 41:13, 41:15, 41:16, 41:17, 42:2, 42:4, 42:5, 42:13, 46:14, 47:17, 49:12, 49:13, 49:16, 49:17, 50:1, 50:10, 64:6, 64:7, 64:18, 64:19, 65:9, 69:19, 72:9, 73:13, 74:18, 77:7, 85:12, 122:12, 122:16, 123:8, 127:18, 128:5, 128:7,

128:12, 154:5, 154:13, 154:14, 154:16, 158:10, 167:14, 187:17, 191:9, 219:4, 224:17, 242:13, 262:5, 266:2, 285:1 parkland [1] - 167:15 parks [3] - 221:1, 270:2, 305:4 Parkway [8] - 20:2, 21:15, 71:2, 71:3, 72:2, 153:7, 160:3, 167:11 parkway [3] - 22:14, 160:1, 160:2 part [35] - 21:14, 23:10, 31:17, 85:13, 89:7, 89:9, 91:6, 98:3, 102:14, 105:1, 111:10, 111:12, 122:5, 134:8, 140:6, 140:11, 143:11, 152:5, 154:4, 155:6, 159:8, 173:1, 173:4, 175:6, 183:2, 191:8, 203:1, 213:16, 236:9, 242:14, 257:3, 269:19, 279:7, 304:16, 304:17 partially [1] - 213:3 participate [1] -131:10 particular [7] - 29:17, 31:3, 34:1, 42:7, 83:19, 202:3, 250.12 particularly [6] -32:16, 102:5, 135:2, 188:1, 188:10, 299.5 partnerships [2] -134:16, 134:17 parts [5] - 49:9, 85:10, 97:19, 157:18, 299:12 party [1] - 332:8 pass [6] - 41:17, 100:15, 221:4, 231:9, 236:7, 269:1 passage [2] - 64:4, 127:17 passageway [1] -253:1 passed [3] - 28:7, 310:15, 315:5 passing [2] - 26:3, 235:17

passthrough [4] -

226:19, 247:13,

268:3, 298:16 past [7] - 43:3, 45:6, 187:7, 209:19, 219:5, 220:14, 283:9 patchwork [5] -268:12, 271:1, 273:7, 277:15, 277:16 path [45] - 47:6, 47:14, 47:15, 47:18, 48:1, 48:12, 48:15, 48:16, 48:18, 48:19, 49:1, 70:1, 71:16, 72:7, 73:4, 130:3, 141:4, 143:5, 145:18, 146:4, 148:3, 154:10, 154:18, 165:5, 167:19, 186:10, 187:7, 224:11, 225:15, 230:15, 242:14, 244:1, 247:14, 248:3, 248:12, 253:3, 253:5, 255:1, 255:15, 255:18, 255:19, 257:4 paths [2] - 71:5, 228:11 pathway [3] - 223:15, 223:16, 246:9 patience [1] - 76:3 patios [1] - 239:9 PATRICIA [1] - 215:1 Patricia [1] - 215:2 pattern [1] - 200:18 patterns [2] - 239:1, 243:1 pause [2] - 175:14, 284.4 pavilions [1] - 162:7 paving [7] - 75:11, 87:4, 87:7, 239:1, 243:1, 267:3, 269:13 pay [4] - 132:14, 147:18, 168:7, 184.1 payer [1] - 137:5 paying [1] - 132:12 payment [1] - 187:15 pays [1] - 100:1 PB#175 [3] - 3:8, 3:9, 3:13 PB#286 [1] - 2:9 PB#289 [1] - 3:17 peak [1] - 188:9 peaking [1] - 80:18 peculiar [1] - 34:1

pedestrian [22] - 32:8,

61:5, 64:17, 71:5, 73:4, 127:16, 158:9, 184:4, 184:6, 185:3, 187:3, 195:15, 227:10, 231:10, 242:3, 244:5, 245:18, 246:1, 246:12, 246:16, 259:10, 286:3 pedestrian-scaled [1] - 244:5 pedestrians [6] -159:4, 186:13, 187:1, 187:4, 188:12, 256:15 PEGGY [4] - 139:4, 140:10, 140:16, 142.4 Peggy [5] - 136:1, 139:2, 142:1, 142:2 pending [1] - 54:11 penthouse [7] - 10:2, 12:15, 15:3, 16:3, 46:5, 58:5, 106:2 penthouses [1] -53:10 people [64] - 4:9, 11:18, 22:15, 22:17, 32:4, 32:6, 33:9, 34:7, 34:10, 40:17, 61:13, 70:1, 70:18, 71:17, 72:8, 73:19, 77:10, 79:8, 82:11, 86:12, 86:19, 99:17, 100:2, 113:3, 117:5, 126:10, 127:7, 128:10, 137:18, 141:8, 143:8, 144:2, 146:13, 151:13, 152:1, 152:6, 152:19, 153:5, 153:9, 155:12, 160:19, 166:18, 167:4, 167:15, 178:8, 186:14, 186:18, 187:7, 189:7, 198:11, 217:11, 238:11, 256:16, 257:1, 260:7, 267:7, 269:1, 296:2, 296:3, 298:11, 302:18, 306:19, 311:10, 312:17 Pepsi [1] - 32:17 per [4] - 57:10, 211:2, 211:9, 212:6 perceived [1] - 301:13 percent [6] - 161:15, 177:19, 203:4, 259:12, 259:19, 271:18

perception [3] -203:18, 204:11, 301:18 perceptions [1] -283:14 percolation [1] -155:17 perfect [1] - 316:19 perfectly [1] - 317:12 performance [1] -289:6 performed [2] - 55:14, 95:9 performing [1] -288:14 perhaps [15] - 13:17, 45:18, 79:8, 98:8, 100:18, 101:1, 101:10, 113:6, 114:6, 136:9, 185:15, 195:8, 198:18, 200:5, 252:19 period [6] - 310:17, 311:16, 312:3, 314:11, 321:16, 326:3 peripheral [1] -204:15 permeable [1] - 91:15 permissible [2] -201:13, 201:14 Permit [18] - 2:10, 3:8, 3:9, 3:12, 20:3, 37:5, 162:16, 173:7, 181:1, 211:7, 212:18, 216:19, 217:1, 217:8, 310:11, 313:11, 328:9 permit [9] - 3:10, 92:18, 106:11, 107:13, 168:11, 194:18, 195:2, 195:3, 205:14 Permits [2] - 2:9, 210:17 permitted [1] - 30:12 person [6] - 69:11, 81:2, 93:11, 118:11, 118:13, 137:19 personal [1] - 270:6 personally [2] -103:13, 269:17 perspective [10] -109:2, 173:6, 182:9, 199:3, 226:18, 267:5. 268:11. 270:8. 284:10. 294:10

perspectives [10] -

112:19, 115:3, 115:4, 190:10, 190:12, 190:19, 198:1, 199:5, 267:15, 317:8 persuade [1] - 302:1 petering [1] - 273:18 Petition [2] - 3:2, 209.14 petition [9] - 76:5, 208:13, 208:18, 209:12, 210:2, 211:11, 211:12, 213:19, 215:18 Phase [7] - 55:7, 120:8, 120:9, 120:13, 120:15, 220:3 phase [1] - 167:10 phased [1] - 157:16 **PHIL** [53] - 36:2, 36:5, 36:11. 37:4. 37:9. 37:13, 38:7, 38:15, 38:18, 39:14, 40:7, 40:10, 40:13, 40:19, 43:19, 44:4, 44:6, 46:1, 48:16, 49:6, 51:19, 52:11, 55:18, 56:5, 56:7, 58:19, 59:4, 59:8, 59:12, 59:16, 60:10, 61:8, 76:4, 76:7, 87:17, 90:12, 91:7, 91:11, 91:14, 92:10, 93:7, 93:13, 94:10, 99:15, 100:6, 100:10, 101:14, 102:10, 111:19, 113:12, 115:18, 120:4, 208.7 **Phil** [9] - 36:6, 76:3, 82:1, 84:11, 88:18, 99:14, 159:14, 167:5, 168:12 phonetic [2] - 115:14, 123:16 **photo** [1] - 9:13 phrased [1] - 202:10 physical [1] - 174:15 Piano [1] - 259:5 pick [1] - 268:18 picked [5] - 30:8, 79:18, 87:8, 110:16, 219:19 picking [1] - 278:19 picture [5] - 25:9, 72:11, 148:1, 284:15, 284:16 pictured [1] - 104:10 piece [24] - 27:13, 48:17, 73:18, 74:4,

75:8, 75:9, 75:10, 83:2, 88:3, 102:6, 141:10, 152:13, 170:1, 184:9, 192:9, 209:2, 212:17, 222:7, 223:11, 262:1, 267:7, 286:5, 289:3. 299:15 pieces [5] - 81:4, 150:9, 184:4, 223:3, 233:8 pillar [2] - 271:12, 273:1 pillars [4] - 271:5, 271:11, 272:6, 272:18 pillbox [1] - 164:5 pinching [1] - 231:2 pipe [1] - 169:10 pity [1] - 154:6 place [27] - 17:1, 18:19, 33:4, 42:15, 75:2, 80:19, 82:3, 83:10, 117:10, 129:14, 133:1, 157:15, 161:12, 178:10, 190:6, 222:3, 238:3, 238:16. 261:6. 266:10, 267:14, 269:1, 286:14, 298:2, 302:8, 330:16 Place [1] - 149:18 placed [4] - 50:6, 148:1, 330:2, 330:8 places [6] - 111:3, 162:9, 185:9, 212:2, 252:1, 262:3 plain [12] - 90:9, 233:17, 233:18, 237:18, 238:7, 239:3, 239:17, 240:7, 246:1, 246:7, 246:13, 248:1 Plan [2] - 95:14, 96:12 plan [30] - 46:3, 56:8, 56:15, 57:3, 98:7, 125:13, 136:13, 141:1, 141:2, 157:17, 165:9, 165:11, 213:10, 223:4, 224:1, 247:4, 256:10, 260:13, 267:13, 294:8, 294:14, 299:2, 304:17, 309:1, 309:4, 313:8, 313:16, 316:3, 318:5, 323:12 plank [1] - 191:15

planner [1] - 305:3

planners [1] - 183:7 planning [15] - 35:17, 45:9. 46:3. 55:7. 58:13, 85:8, 88:1, 136:5, 136:8, 139:8, 145:15, 158:3, 161:10, 262:7, 266:9 Planning [43] - 4:4, 5:4, 5:9, 5:14, 5:18, 7:5, 20:3, 20:11, 24:5, 24:15, 32:2, 48:8, 50:18, 54:17, 151:12, 152:15, 197:6, 201:6, 210:5, 210:16. 211:6. 211:8, 212:19, 213:7, 213:13, 214:2, 215:18, 219:7, 305:8, 312:1, 313:1, 313:3, 313:9, 313:12, 318:1, 324:5, 327:7, 328:5, 330:17, 331:10, 332:13, 333:4, 333:16 **PLANNING** [2] - 1:2, 333:1 plans [11] - 29:7, 54:12, 70:2, 94:3, 98:12, 108:9, 124:18, 125:5, 127:1, 174:18, 226.1 planted [1] - 148:9 planters [2] - 227:6, 238:19 planting [6] - 53:17, 53:19, 54:2, 54:16, 85:12, 85:14 plantings [1] - 128:8 plastic [1] - 152:7 plate [1] - 16:13 play [2] - 257:18, 285:14 played [1] - 68:15 player [1] - 217:13 playfulness [1] -162.4 playground [3] -161:11, 222:18, 266:3 playing [1] - 68:14 plaza [7] - 108:10, 225:10, 245:10, 245:12, 247:7, 258:18, 267:19 Plaza [1] - 225:6 pleased [1] - 306:9 pleasing [2] - 172:18,

269:14

plenty [1] - 40:17 plus [2] - 285:7, 285:14 podium [5] - 118:8, 280:7, 280:10, 299:5, 299:7 point [39] - 11:13, 12:1, 21:19, 26:4, 32:10, 40:15, 53:15, 81:5, 97:17, 103:2, 116:1, 140:15, 149:6, 155:6, 156:1, 158:3, 180:10, 180:16, 184:5, 186:10, 197:5, 201:12, 203:13, 221:2, 234:1, 237:9, 246:15, 247:4, 260:11, 261:13, 268:18, 269:12, 271:19, 275:11, 279:1, 285:18, 285:19, 304:13 Point [20] - 3:9, 6:1, 24:12, 181:15, 219:1, 219:17, 219:19, 220:6, 222:11, 223:14, 224:14, 225:6, 234:3, 237:7, 248:16, 256:2, 264:13, 282:7, 297:18, 305:3 point-35.2 [1] -313.19 pointed [1] - 82:1 pointer [3] - 61:7, 72:4, 72:18 points [12] - 33:14, 33:15, 137:11, 142:18, 163:3, 172:11, 173:13, 179:9, 179:14, 182:7, 190:12, 230:3 **poking** [1] - 240:16 poles [5] - 161:1, 179:2, 194:10, 194:11, 194:13 policies [1] - 199:18 policy [5] - 6:8, 27:19, 28:15, 183:7, 202:1 polluted [1] - 155:7 Pond [9] - 20:2, 20:4, 21:15, 45:7, 69:15, 127:15, 142:17, 157:5, 160:3 poor [2] - 135:3, 166:19 popular [1] - 158:1 porch [2] - 124:5,

194:19 portion [1] - 214:7 posed [1] - 77:16 positing [1] - 22:6 position [1] - 116:8 positioning [2] -13:16, 14:8 positive [2] - 130:12, 253:9 possibility [1] -150:10 possible [13] - 14:8, 14:19, 45:10, 58:4, 97:4. 110:4. 153:5. 201:10, 254:7, 267:10, 292:7, 293:17, 324:11 possibly [1] - 13:17 post-25 [1] - 92:14 posted [3] - 125:10, 125:11, 174:2 posting [2] - 96:19, 125:1 posturing [1] - 122:16 potential [11] - 54:5, 57:6, 230:9, 247:12, 248:10, 254:18, 262:12, 262:13, 269:5, 303:16, 303:17 potentially [3] -34:18, 73:6, 179:17 poured [1] - 258:2 power [1] - 201:2 powered [1] - 18:12 powers [1] - 179:2 practice [1] - 171:7 pre [1] - 161:10 pre-primary [1] -161:10 precedent [3] - 102:8, 235:7, 236:12 precise [1] - 289:13 preconditions [1] -23:15 predicament [1] -175:10 prefer [5] - 154:18, 190:10, 190:11, 202:8, 269:2 preferable [1] - 14:17 preferences [1] -199:18 preliminary [4] -50:12. 268:9. 308:12. 312:3 premature [1] - 98:11 premises [1] - 23:1 prepare [2] - 313:15, 318:4

prepared [3] - 36:2,

77:17, 277:6 presence [2] - 54:15, 68:8 present [9] - 35:17, 36:3. 53:6. 64:10. 117:5, 209:5, 219:8, 249:7, 328:6 presentation [11] -8:13, 52:19, 93:6, 140:8, 140:13, 184:10, 188:19, 218:5, 256:11, 294:12, 297:4 presentations [1] -325:15 presented [5] -123:15, 133:17, 159:11, 219:4, preserving [1] - 215:6 president [2] -218:13, 286:19 pressed [1] - 293:4 pressure [1] - 17:4 PRESTON [6] -268:17, 296:15, 305:17, 307:11, 316:1, 326:9 Preston [1] - 1:11 pretty [13] - 52:9, 78:13, 82:13, 107:4, 153:12, 193:9, 193:15, 201:5, 205:2, 239:6, 259:4, 268:7, 271:14 previous [3] - 112:10, 112:13, 278:13 previously [2] -134:15, 189:15 pricey [1] - 276:6 **primarily** [2] - 220:16, 319:19 **primary** [5] - 138:4, 161:10, 224:5, 240:5, 243:12 prime [1] - 222:12 principles [1] -279:13 printers [1] - 133:11 priority [1] - 134:11 private [10] - 66:5, 66:9, 72:14, 73:7, 75:9, 134:16, 137:7, 187:16, 226:3, 247:10 privatized [1] - 96:3 prizes [1] - 120:15 problem [10] - 64:11, 153:8, 154:2, 155:3, 155:15, 189:17, 202:2, 255:17,

275:9, 298:5 problems [1] - 256:18 procedural [3] -308:7. 320:11. 320:16 procedurally [4] -305:18, 310:15, 314:10, 323:4 procedure [3] - 35:18, 116:10, 213:8 procedures [1] -324:5 proceeds [1] - 312:1 process [42] - 19:9, 19:11, 49:7, 60:5, 60:9, 62:2, 63:16, 70:16, 74:16, 75:14, 95:19, 97:2, 98:3, 99:3, 99:4, 99:6, 123:12, 124:16, 125:15, 125:17, 127:2, 129:15, 130:9, 136:18, 139:8, 140:19, 141:13, 197:7. 197:8. 197:11. 198:3, 200:4, 200:5, 215:4, 217:3, 219:10, 221:12, 289:18, 290:12, 308:4, 308:10, 327:10 processing [1] - 7:6 product [2] - 53:7, 302:16 productive [1] - 318:7 professionalism [1] -175:6 professionals [1] -96.8 profile [1] - 131:18 program [2] - 78:17, progress [3] - 180:11, 181:5, 255:10 progressed [1] -116:6 prohibit [1] - 210:8 Project [3] - 2:10, 3:8, project [37] - 35:13, 56:12, 70:14, 78:5, 78:8, 79:2, 83:19, 84:14, 89:1, 91:18, 91:19, 94:18, 95:8, 96:13, 106:5, 133:17, 143:11, 149:11, 164:12, 188:1, 191:4, 197:2, 199:8, 201:11,

217:1, 217:8,

220:13, 226:8, 237:1, 241:13, 242:15, 250:9, 304:16, 306:18, 307:10, 320:2, 329:14 projected [3] - 79:13, 90:3. 90:5 projecting [5] - 24:6, 24:7, 24:8, 32:11, 238.7 projection [1] - 302:7 projects [10] - 53:14, 54:19, 55:5, 55:9, 92:12, 94:12, 97:11, 101:6, 210:17, 213:1 prominent [4] - 10:8, 10:18, 14:12, 289:1 prominently [1] -26.18 promising [1] - 268:4 prompted [1] - 197:8 proof [1] - 115:11 proper [2] - 103:10, 183:6 properties [2] - 45:1, 66:13 property [28] - 3:9, 22:4, 46:14, 47:10, 47:13, 48:3, 48:4, 48:5, 65:14, 66:5, 66:9, 71:8, 71:15, 72:14, 72:15, 73:8, 98:18, 129:6, 129:9, 141:11, 154:3, 155:5, 180:6, 181:14, 186:8, 187:16, 255:1, 289.4 Property [1] - 5:18 proponent [23] - 23:6, 35:17. 36:1. 68:19. 102:4. 102:7. 129:13, 174:14, 177:6, 183:19, 186:3, 189:10, 206:17, 260:19, 281:9, 281:15, 282:3, 282:14, 294:11, 295:8, 304:1, 315:8, 327:14 proponent's [1] -180:6 proponents [2] - 6:15, proportion [1] - 234:5 proposal [29] - 14:6,

24:5, 31:12, 74:17,

168:6, 201:18,

209:16, 212:9, 213:16, 215:11, 219:8, 241:2, 294:2, 308:11, 308:15, 308:19, 309:6, 309:10, 313:3, 313:4, 313:5, 313:10. 313:14. 316:12, 316:19, 327:9, 327:12, 328:2, 328:3 propose [2] - 43:6, 117.2 proposed [15] - 9:4, 47:9, 47:10, 60:7, 60:8, 65:18, 157:9, 159:15, 165:4, 167:19, 168:6, 185:16, 212:18, 241:5, 318:3 proposing [6] - 24:9, 48:3, 114:12, 161:17, 226:7, 228:19 pros [1] - 186:4 protected [1] - 166:8 protrude [2] - 14:4, 14:14 prove [1] - 42:1 provide [10] - 46:11, 47:12, 48:5, 48:12, 51:9, 61:1, 61:4, 62:19, 84:5, 317:19 provided [4] - 8:18, 53:10, 81:7, 206:18 provides [3] - 56:3, 104:18, 105:9 providing [6] - 52:18, 54:8, 78:7, 109:16, 114:5, 228:7 provisions [1] - 96:11 proximity [1] - 303:9 Public 151 - 60:14. 62:1, 68:8, 92:3, 333:7 **PUBLIC** [1] - 2:8 public [67] - 3:14, 21:9, 44:11, 54:4, 66:14, 67:1, 67:6, 95:15, 96:16, 98:13, 116:11, 116:15, 117:3, 118:5, 123:11, 134:17, 137:5, 140:19, 150:16, 151:2, 151:11, 157:7, 157:14, 158:11, 158:19, 159:11, 167:14, 197:7, 214:7, 220:13, 221:1, 224:4, 224:9, 225:4, 226:2,

235:11, 240:5, 242:2, 243:16, 247:9, 249:11, 249:12, 249:16, 265:14, 265:16, 294:5, 297:7, 303:4, 304:3, 310:2, 310:4, 310:18. 311:15. 313:1, 314:2, 314:3, 314:4, 314:15, 314:16, 315:2, 315:6, 322:12, 324:1, 324:10, 327:10, 330:16 published [1] -125:18 **PUD** [5] - 3:8, 3:12, 160:5, 216:18, 313:11 pull [2] - 257:13, 258:14 **pulling** [1] - 190:11 pump [1] - 107:18 purchased [1] - 154:9 purpose [1] - 325:12 purposes [1] - 102:18 pursuant [3] - 2:10, 3:13. 3:14 pursue [1] - 314:18 push [3] - 71:12, 192:9, 302:5 pushed [1] - 192:7 put [29] - 18:1, 26:18, 27:6, 66:8, 98:11, 98:12, 98:14, 128:7, 131:5, 132:3, 146:3, 146:5, 156:3, 157:15, 166:10, 169:12, 176:2, 186:7, 210:15, 262:4, 262:9, 274:12, 278:4, 282:1, 284:9, 297:11, 299:4. 301:16, 329:8 putting [9] - 23:8, 46:18, 96:15, 104:11, 141:9, 152:7, 165:5, 167:16, 275:14 **PVC** [1] - 84:1 Pyatt [4] - 52:14, 77:12, 78:4 **PYATT** [18] - 78:3, 79:15, 87:19, 90:7, 90:15, 90:18, 104:4, 104:15, 105:8, 105:15, 106:4, 106:17, 107:6, 107:19, 108:12, 110:2, 112:11, 113:1

redesign [2] - 18:14,

54:5

REASON [6] - 333:10,

333:11, 333:12,

reaction [1] - 307:16 205:6, 220:12, 333:13, 333:14, Rafferty [2] - 21:2, Q 220:14, 220:17, 207:12 read [13] - 57:5, 60:3, 333:15 221:16, 221:18, RAFFERTY [15] -108:9. 145:19. reasonable [5] - 19:9, quadrangle [1] -4:11. 21:10. 38:2. 165:15. 188:3. 222:16, 223:1, 30:10, 107:3, 157:18 38:9, 38:12, 48:13, 203:8, 233:19, 223:4, 223:9, 200:13, 200:16 qualifying [1] - 94:19 reasonably [1] -49:4, 132:14, 140:9, 298:13, 301:8, 223:12, 224:3, 225:5, 225:6, 225:8, quality [7] - 28:4, 312:17, 333:16 140:14, 205:18, 184.12 28:5, 69:8, 94:4, 225:10. 226:2. 206:1, 206:7, reasons [6] - 76:18, readdress [1] -103:7, 172:17, 226:4, 226:10, 207:17, 208:6 231:17 113:9. 154:9. 177:16 227:3, 227:9, 295:12. 300:12. rail [4] - 229:10, readdressing [1] quarter [4] - 115:14, 227:11, 227:13, 241:4, 246:4, 248:6 215:8 332:14 119:12, 167:18, 228:6, 228:11, reassured [2] railing [8] - 104:9, readily [1] - 266:10 182:13 229:5, 229:8, 104:10, 104:14, reading [3] - 304:2, 123:11, 180:10 quarter-inch [1] -229:11, 231:5, 104:19, 105:6, 332:13, 333:4 reassuring [1] -182:13 231:12, 232:5, 105:9 Reading [2] - 312:19, 180:18 query [1] - 184:16 232:10, 232:14, railings [2] - 108:14, rebuild [1] - 171:14 318:1 232:17, 233:5, questioning [2] -227:6 recede [1] - 15:9 reads [1] - 239:19 307:5, 307:6 234:2, 234:5, 235:5, railroad [8] - 46:15, ready [7] - 76:8, RECEIVED [1] questions [32] - 7:6, 235:12, 237:8, 49:3, 143:2, 154:9, 217:7, 217:16, 332:19 8:8, 11:3, 11:4, 237:16, 237:18, 154:11, 155:11, 306:1, 306:10, received [2] - 173:4, 238:2, 238:3, 238:8, 17:19, 38:13, 41:4, 159:2, 186:9 307:13, 328:6 329:18 238:9, 238:15, 58:12, 61:13, 68:12, Railroad [1] - 153:10 reaffirm [1] - 24:19 recently [5] - 65:11, 238:19, 239:2, 76:14, 77:16, 77:18, railroads [1] - 179:4 real [12] - 146:19, 68:14, 106:9, 239:5, 241:7, 78:1, 78:14, 82:12, Railway [1] - 181:11 160:12, 163:1, 163:14, 173:16 241:10, 242:6, 93:8, 93:11, 103:18, raise [1] - 60:3 195:12, 200:4, recess [1] - 208:11 242:14, 242:19, 108:18, 109:1, raised [8] - 70:13, 222:15, 225:13, recessed [1] - 83:2 244:2, 246:4, 109:7, 113:3, 80:16, 95:4, 105:1, 235:8, 247:17, recession [1] - 120:13 246:14, 247:5, 119:15, 126:4, 112:12, 113:3, 262:12, 262:13, recognizable [1] -176:2, 176:3, 247:14, 248:8, 258:19, 289:10 294:8 236:9 248:9, 248:11, 213:13, 255:14, raises [1] - 328:16 realistic [1] - 190:12 recognize [1] - 284:1 248:14, 248:16, 289:9, 308:7 Raising [4] - 207:9, realize [1] - 120:12 recommend [6] -255:2, 256:14, quick [10] - 42:18, 216:10, 326:14, realized [1] - 191:11 25:15, 73:6, 128:1, 58:15, 76:13, 93:17, 257:10, 261:1, 328:19 really [169] - 12:4. 128:3, 211:9, 216:2 95:3, 136:4, 224:15, 261:2, 262:17, raising [1] - 318:19 17:3, 17:5, 18:7, recommendation 181 226:17, 229:16, 263:10, 264:1, ramp [5] - 108:5, 19:14, 22:5, 30:15, - 18:9, 18:11, 19:6, 231.19 264:2, 264:8, 267:4, 108:8, 108:11, 51:5, 51:7, 51:10, 24:16, 25:1, 25:16, 267:16, 273:11, quickly [9] - 19:14, 159:3, 253:18 61:4, 62:2, 62:5, 35:2, 191:2 274:2, 275:7, 277:3, 118:18, 167:7, 62:8, 64:13, 66:7, range [3] - 268:13, recommendations [5] 277:7, 277:18, 179:12, 209:11, 282:19, 289:16 67:19, 68:10, 71:8, - 164:13, 208:19, 278:14, 278:19, 217:18, 221:11, Ranjit [1] - 107:3 89:9, 93:19, 98:12, 210:15, 213:14, 263:16, 287:18 279:10, 281:8, 112:4, 114:13, rather [15] - 33:5, 313:6 289:1, 290:11, quite [15] - 10:18, 117:9, 119:10, 46:17, 70:1, 87:7, recommended [1] -291:4, 291:5, 295:1, 12:14, 14:2, 14:13, 119:19, 121:10, 115:5, 129:14, 211:6 304:7, 305:12, 53:13, 114:5, 124:18, 130:16, 133:2, 146:4, 155:1, reconsider [1] -305:14, 309:11, 120:12, 140:12, 133:18, 137:12, 177:9, 269:3, 213:16 311:13 234:8, 239:19, 141:13, 143:1, 298:16, 314:14, reconstructed [1] -241:11, 242:16, realm[2] - 220:13, 143:11. 146:2. 317:4, 321:5 180:13 224:9 250:12, 252:12, 147:18, 148:1, rational [1] - 266:10 record [8] - 96:16, reappointment [1] -255:17 148:5, 149:11, rationale [1] - 273:16 108:7, 182:4, 329:8, 331:6 quorum [2] - 324:13, 151:6, 152:10, re [5] - 210:6, 211:11, 330:2. 330:11. Rear [1] - 2:12 330:17 153:3, 154:12, 288:11. 322:16. 332:8, 333:18 rear [3] - 46:13, 89:11. quote [2] - 129:8, 165:7, 165:14, **RECORD** [1] - 1:18 323:17 168:10 166:11 167:1, 167:3, 167:6, re-examine [1] recorder [1] - 214:17 reason [13] - 29:17, quote/unquote [1] -171:19, 172:1, 288:11 records [1] - 216:13 66:7, 77:5, 77:6, 96:7 175:5, 175:18, re-filed [2] - 210:6, recreation [3] -91:12, 113:18, 182:4, 183:11, 211:11 151:18, 152:1, 147:3, 160:15, R 183:13, 187:10, re-notice [2] - 322:16, 152:4 162:14, 162:15, 190:15, 197:5, 323:17 red [3] - 82:14, 85:19, 162:16, 165:14, 197:10, 198:18, reached [1] - 329:15 220:2 racing [1] - 256:5 333:5

199:11, 200:18,

204:13, 205:1,

201:9, 203:1, 204:2,

react [2] - 282:17,

289:17

racks [1] - 248:2

radio [2] - 10:4, 13:13

redesigns [1] - 57:7 redeveloped [1] -209:19 redo [1] - 194:18 redoing [1] - 61:16 redone [2] - 31:17, 171:6 reduce [1] - 5:1 reduced [2] - 8:11, 211:5 reducing [1] - 211:9 **Reduction** [2] - 2:11, reduction [6] - 3:10, 3:11, 219:2, 219:3, 229:1. 280:1 Refer [1] - 333:7 refined [1] - 223:9 refinements [1] - 76:9 reflect [1] - 145:7 reflected [1] - 146:10 refresher [1] - 219:18 refrigerant [1] - 57:16 regard [1] - 68:12 regarding [1] - 111:9 regards [1] - 92:3 register [1] - 89:10 regular [1] - 262:5 regulations [1] -96.12 reinforce [9] - 225:7, 226:15, 227:16, 229:6, 229:9, 230:15. 233:12. 247:8, 247:19 reinforcing [1] -228:10 reintroduce [1] -218:9 reject [1] - 309:6 rejected [1] - 113:9 relate [1] - 287:19 related [1] - 109:14 relates 131 - 56:3. 265:16. 288:2 relating [1] - 289:9 relation [1] - 123:9 relationship [8] -58:17, 219:13, 234:14, 235:9, 236:16, 241:10, 244:14, 245:16 relative [3] - 110:12, 290:16, 303:8 relatively [3] - 31:19, 210:10, 303:8 relentless [2] - 203:6, 279.2 relevant [2] - 68:6, 68:7

relief [8] - 30:10,

34:11, 53:6, 81:16, 84:6, 109:17, 112:9, 114.6 relocated [1] - 56:16 remain [1] - 127:15 remaining [1] - 75:10 remains [1] - 144:17 remarks [1] - 118:7 remediated [1] - 98:1 remediation [1] - 94:7 remember [7] - 21:6, 32:10, 32:12, 140:8, 140:12, 252:6, 327:8 remind [2] - 118:6, 208:16 reminder [1] - 330:14 reminiscent [1] - 22:2 remote [3] - 10:4, 13:13, 13:14 remove [1] - 98:7 removed [2] - 9:5, 238:15 rendered [2] - 109:2, 291.1 rendering [4] - 109:4, 109:15, 114:16, 116:4 renderings [2] -52:13, 271:17 Renna [1] - 218:14 **RENNA** [3] - 322:9, 323:1, 323:16 renovating [1] - 16:1 renovation [1] - 31:9 rent [1] - 302:19 rental [2] - 44:2, 44:4 renting [1] - 33:9 Renzo [1] - 259:5 **REP** [1] - 333:2 repair [1] - 178:11 repairing [1] - 171:9 repeat [1] - 118:19 repetitive [1] - 279:11 replace [2] - 44:19, 177:19 REPLACE [1] -332:17 replaced [1] - 185:9 report [7] - 50:16, 50:17, 55:10, 60:16, 101:19, 188:7, 191:4 reported [1] - 99:5 REPORTERS [1] reports [2] - 97:1, represent [1] - 230:1

representations [1] -

176:7

represents [1] - 214:1 reputation [1] -153:13 Request [1] - 3:18 request [9] - 23:7, 38:19, 78:15, 79:5, 207:5, 219:1, 292:10, 292:11, 328:8 requested [6] - 53:8, 79:1, 159:8, 159:9, 306:12, 325:16 requests [1] - 260:12 require [4] - 108:14, 200:11, 200:14, 210:16 required [6] - 3:13, 3:14, 92:12, 181:18, 212:19, 307:14 required) [1] - 333:7 requirement [4] -49:19, 160:6, 211:7, 211:19 Requirements [1] -2:14 requirements [8] -3:6, 92:19, 198:6, 211:19, 212:1, 212:4, 260:6, 281:1 requires [1] - 94:11 requiring [3] - 48:8, 101:8, 170:18 Research [1] - 35:8 reservations [1] -121.1 reserving [1] - 116:14 reside [1] - 215:2 residence [1] - 224:17 **Residence** [8] - 3:4, 210:3, 210:4, 210:8, 211:15, 212:1, 212:3, 212:11 residences [1] - 170:4 resident [5] - 49:19, 141:10, 226:5, 246:17, 253:14 residential [22] - 2:9, 3:11, 24:6, 24:15, 24:17, 26:8, 26:16, 26:17, 28:3, 28:10, 64:9, 101:12, 136:12, 140:18, 170:4. 220:18. 223:16, 224:5, 243:13, 327:12, 328:2, 328:3 Residents [1] -142:17 residents [4] -

130:18, 222:13,

225:15, 243:13

3:12

reviewed [5] - 8:14,

resonated [1] - 182:8 resort [1] - 280:18 resources [1] - 143:7 respect [2] - 254:2, 293:11 respectful [1] -173:12 respiratories [1] -103:12 respond [3] - 78:6, 278:1, 293:18 responding [1] -245:2 response [2] - 38:13, 232:3 Response [5] - 174:8, 215:14, 216:8, 255:8, 326:12 responses [1] - 41:7 responsibility [1] -51:8 responsible [1] -62:12 responsibly [1] -182:3 rest [7] - 52:19, 176:3, 205:4, 223:13, 224:13, 297:18, 307:3 restaurant [1] -327:13 result [3] - 78:14, 197.6 resulting [1] - 213:1 Retail [1] - 20:4 retail [26] - 3:18, 6:1, 22:19, 76:16, 77:1, 77:3, 77:4, 77:6, 151:16, 151:19, 178:5, 178:6, 178:15, 223:19, 227:19, 229:11, 241:5, 242:4, 242:12, 243:15, 247:15, 247:18, 255:16, 262:10, 327:14 retention [3] - 91:5, 91:8 rethink [1] - 17:5 rethinking [1] - 18:14 reveal [2] - 81:10, 204:19 review [10] - 6:14, 12:16, 50:3, 55:11, 97:2, 98:13, 167:7, 213:9, 217:8, 254:16 Review [3] - 2:10, 3:9,

8:17, 13:17, 24:5, 208:18 reviewing [3] - 8:4, 308:10, 309:4 revised [2] - 90:13, 309:3 revision [1] - 6:1 revisions [2] - 37:16, 327:16 revit [1] - 175:7 Revit [1] - 110:17 rezone [1] - 210:2 **rhythm** [4] - 230:5, 232:8. 242:1 Rich [1] - 218:16 rich [2] - 228:9, 242:19 RICHARD [11] -217:17, 218:4, 249:8, 276:4, 285:2, 287:6, 296:19, 304:13, 318:16, 326:5, 329:4 richer [1] - 290:2 richness [1] - 252:2 rid [1] - 270:12 right-hand [3] - 222:9, 241:3, 245:10 right-of-way [2] -47:13, 48:6 rightly [1] - 318:19 rights [1] - 101:3 Rindge [2] - 143:9, 159:3 rise [2] - 299:14, 299:16 rising [1] - 229:7 riverfront [1] - 158:14 road [1] - 23:7 Road [1] - 55:7 roads [1] - 158:16 Roberts [3] - 1:15, 209:8, 218:13 ROBERTS [15] -206:13, 209:6, 209:8, 307:17, 308:3, 308:6, 309:19, 310:14, 311:7, 311:17, 312:12, 312:16, 313:19, 314:8, 325:11 ROCKLAND [1] -169.18 Rockland [1] - 169:19 role [4] - 8:10, 8:11, 95:19, 96:6 roof [35] - 13:15, 46:3, 46:4, 46:7, 46:11, 50:7, 58:3, 58:7,

58:8, 59:14, 69:2,

80:19, 88:9, 91:9, 99:13, 100:8, 104:3, 104:11, 104:17, 105:4, 109:9, 110:3, 111:12, 112:1, 112:6, 121:11, 121:13, 121:15, 229:5. 233:15. 238:6, 240:1, 267:8, 298.9 roofs [2] - 94:17 rooftop [11] - 10:1, 12:15, 53:9, 57:8, 57:12, 57:16, 99:8, 99:9, 156:2, 156:3, 156:9 room [14] - 22:17, 46:13, 82:10, 87:13, 87:14, 88:6, 103:8, 115:16, 119:13, 161:13, 192:2, 263:7, 311:10 Room [1] - 1:6 rooms [2] - 85:9, 85:10 rooted [1] - 238:10 Rotary [2] - 144:5, 144:8 rotted [1] - 178:1 roughly [1] - 245:8 round [1] - 277:6 rounded [1] - 21:7 route [4] - 73:5, 154:11, 178:11, 269:12 row [2] - 129:16 **RRH**[1] - 15:10 ruling [4] - 106:14, 306:13, 306:14, 314:9 rumors [1] - 161:8 **run** [3] - 57:11, 314:3, 314:7 running [4] - 99:19, 126:8, 131:13, 309:16 runoff [2] - 92:14, 147:17 runs [1] - 310:9 **RUSSELL** [177] - 4:3, 4:9. 4:12. 6:13. 6:17, 7:3, 7:9, 7:12, 7:16, 9:16, 11:4, 12:8, 13:4, 15:13, 17:9, 17:13, 19:1, 19:8, 19:18, 20:13, 20:17, 21:2, 21:16, 22:8, 22:13, 23:10, 23:17, 30:5, 31:6, 33:17, 35:1, 35:4, 35:9, 36:4, 37:1,

37:17, 38:5, 38:11, 38:16, 39:6, 40:4, 40:8, 40:12, 40:16, 43:17, 44:2, 44:5, 45:17, 60:11, 65:4, 68:5, 69:7, 70:11, 76:2, 76:6, 79:11, 89:18. 92:6. 93:5. 95:17, 97:3, 97:12, 97:15, 98:5, 100:16, 102:11, 103:1, 103:15, 114:10, 116:1, 116:12, 116:16, 116:19, 117:15, 134:5, 135:1, 135:10, 135:17, 139:1, 141:19, 142:8, 144:11, 145:10, 149:14, 156:13, 164:16, 169:16, 172:5, 174:5, 174:9, 175:2, 176:12, 176:19, 179:10, 184:16, 184:19, 185:4, 189:19, 194:2, 205:11, 205:19, 206:5, 206:9, 207:3, 207:7, 207:10, 208:4, 208:9, 208:12, 209:7, 214:6, 214:11, 214:15, 215:12, 215:15, 216:2, 216:6, 216:9, 216:11, 249:6, 249:9, 249:19, 250:3, 250:5, 253:12, 254:13, 255:6, 255:9, 260:1, 260:10, 261:10, 261:13, 261:15, 275:1, 280:5, 280:12, 282:15, 283:17, 284:13, 284:17, 285:4, 297:11, 300:3, 300:9, 301:5, 302:2, 304:10, 305:16, 306:16, 307:12, 307:18, 308:4, 316:6, 317:11, 318:6, 319:5, 319:14, 320:10, 320:18, 321:4, 321:7, 322:3, 325:6, 326:8, 326:10, 326:13, 326:15, 327:1, 328:12, 328:15, 328:17, 329:2, 329:6, 330:5, 330:9, 330:19,

331:4 **Russell**[2] - 1:8, 119:5

S

sacred [1] - 34:9 sad [1] - 127:9 sadly [1] - 164:12 safe [6] - 51:9, 103:14, 127:16, 134:9, 331:5 safely [4] - 72:1, 72:8, 97:5 safety [5] - 70:17, 104:18, 122:17, 128:5, 153:13 sake [1] - 292:2 sample [2] - 82:2, 82:10 sampling [1] - 51:6 sane [1] - 248:11 **SARAH** [1] - 253:13 Sarah [1] - 253:13 satisfaction [1] -51:15 satisfactory [1] -133:18 satisfied [1] - 132:18 satisfy [1] - 302:18 sausage [1] - 162:8 **save** [1] - 300:6 saves [2] - 280:19, 295:11 saw [9] - 83:4, 145:15, 146:13, 187:5, 202:19, 235:19, 241:14, 256:8, 258:15 scale [21] - 71:18, 115:14, 119:12, 198:5, 227:10, 229:6, 234:5, 234:15, 235:10, 241:9, 245:14, 247:1, 252:10, 263:19, 264:19, 265:2, 265:6, 285:17, 291:2, 297:13, 297:18 scaled [3] - 32:7, 244:5, 246:1 scaling [1] - 71:13 scenario [1] - 215:6 Schattner [2] -149:16, 153:19 SCHATTNER [1] -153:19 schedule [6] - 6:4,

6:6, 207:2, 323:19,

324:13, 324:16

scheduled [1] - 7:11 schemes [1] - 113:13 school [3] - 121:7, 145:1, 190:14 School [2] - 5:7, 5:12 scope [1] - 55:14 scoping [1] - 55:3 screen [2] - 40:14, 243:14 Screening [1] - 2:14 screening [1] - 168:9 screens [1] - 88:9 scrutiny [1] - 248:9 sculptural [3] - 238:1, 238:9, 238:13 sealing [1] - 84:8 seamlessly [1] -224:10 Sean [1] - 107:7 Seaport [1] - 27:8 search [1] - 97:19 seat [3] - 86:7, 86:12, 87:10 seating [2] - 227:5, 267:2 **seats** [1] - 331:5 Second [1] - 1:6 second [22] - 25:13, 37:9, 37:15, 41:6, 42:10, 91:4, 167:1, 202:13, 212:17, 216:5, 217:15, 287:4, 306:2, 306:3, 315:9, 322:2, 323:6, 326:8, 326:9, 326:10, 328:15, 329:2 section [10] - 21:8, 62:13. 65:9. 75:10. 119:8, 146:6, 203:6, 299:9, 312:14, 312:16 Section [10] - 2:10, 2:11, 2:12, 2:14, 3:5, 3:13, 3:13, 313:8, 313:18, 326:3 sections [3] - 109:5, 165:10, 227:7 **Sections** [1] - 2:13 sector [2] - 134:16, 134:17 secured [1] - 113:17 **security** [1] - 177:9 seductive [1] - 256:11 see [116] - 10:3, 16:2, 16:17, 16:19, 22:3, 24:13, 33:2, 35:15, 42:19, 45:17, 52:18, 54:1, 79:8, 79:16,

80:2, 80:18, 81:6,

100:3

81:15, 84:16, 88:11, 88:12, 88:14, 88:19, 93:4, 94:18, 97:11, 102:9, 104:5, 106:15, 107:2, 109:15, 109:17, 111:14, 114:17, 115:2. 115:11. 115:12, 117:18, 119:18, 120:1, 121:16, 121:17, 125:3, 125:5, 125:6, 125:9, 126:1, 129:11, 129:19, 130:15, 139:15, 143:12, 148:15, 151:9, 152:10, 154:18, 166:4, 166:6, 166:7, 171:4, 174:9, 182:10, 183:8, 189:11, 190:18, 191:13, 195:4, 196:9, 198:18, 204:8, 205:7, 215:15, 226:18, 227:18, 228:17, 232:4, 234:9, 235:16, 238:14, 239:8, 239:10, 240:18, 241:5, 241:14, 241:18, 242:11, 243:7, 244:3, 244:11, 245:10, 246:3, 246:6, 246:9, 246:17, 248:5, 249:19, 250:18, 262:2, 263:9, 264:15, 266:17, 269:2, 272:8, 278:7, 281:10, 283:12, 283:13, 284:7, 291:3, 293:13, 298:2, 298:4, 315:11, 316:13 seeing [7] - 97:7, 109:12, 134:17, 138:11, 171:15, 275:8, 279:16 seek [1] - 249:11 seeking [1] - 187:14 seem [10] - 13:2, 28:17, 106:18, 117:4, 117:5, 122:6, 135:13, 137:3, 177:10, 191:8 seeming [1] - 149:19 self [2] - 100:3, 290:5 self-consciously [1] -290:5 self-conserve [1] -

semantics [1] - 323:8 semblances [1] -150:15 send [3] - 19:5, 20:12, 24:16 sense [15] - 62:6, 143:3, 150:9, 160:18, 162:7, 206:16, 210:7, 232:1, 249:15, 269:8, 273:1, 273:3, 283:7, 285:7, 292:7 sensitive [3] - 171:3, 201:5, 201:7 sent [5] - 8:3, 8:12, 24:18, 110:17, separate [4] - 200:14, 233:3, 233:8, 298:4 separated [2] -120:18, 155:2 separation [1] - 150:9 September [6] - 1:4, 5:5, 5:6, 37:5, 125:7, 205:15 series [4] - 115:7, 251:13, 259:15, 305:3 serious [1] - 201:18 serve [5] - 32:4, 43:1, 57:13, 223:12, 237:7 service [7] - 46:6, 74:5, 131:1, 134:19, 144:6, 144:8, 225:1 services [1] - 74:13 serving [2] - 57:15, 175.8 Serwick [1] - 115:13 session [1] - 55:3 set [15] - 10:2, 15:3, 81:7, 82:6, 88:17, 89:8, 96:18, 113:18, 114:5, 203:2, 213:9, 221:17, 239:18, 284:19, 290:16 setback [4] - 13:18, 168:11, 168:15, 203:7 Setback [1] - 2:12 Setbacks [1] - 2:12 sets [1] - 257:2 setting [1] - 96:17 seven [3] - 273:9, 285:6, 285:14 several [8] - 22:15, 35:12, 115:2, 179:5, 210:11, 219:6, 300:6, 331:4 shaded [1] - 267:1 shadow [2] - 79:16,

84.6 shall [8] - 76:4, 249:16, 313:1, 313:11, 313:14, 313:15, 318:3, 318:4 shallow [1] - 85:14 shallower [1] - 192:16 shame [2] - 160:12, 198:2 shape [3] - 207:1, 221:13, 288:18 shaped [1] - 130:2 share [4] - 50:17, 177:4, 177:16, 178:16 shared [3] - 104:13, 120:19, 129:7 sharing [1] - 104:1 SHEET [3] - 332:1, 332:18, 333:3 sheet [4] - 90:13, 250:1, 333:5, 333:6 Sheet [4] - 332:3, 332:6, 332:14, 333:8 sheets [1] - 57:2 shelf [1] - 174:6 shelter [1] - 267:18 shingle [1] - 82:6 shingling [1] - 81:14 shoehorn [1] - 137:1 shoes [1] - 292:12 shoot [1] - 318:7 shop [17] - 48:18, 51:2, 51:3, 59:15, 59:17, 67:10, 100:19, 102:15, 119:17, 124:1, 129:7, 168:2, 178:12, 186:8, 189:9, 189:12 shop's [2] - 51:8, 51:11 shopping [9] - 58:17, 121:16, 123:3, 131:14, 140:5, 154:14, 158:17, 168:4, 187:9 Shopping [2] - 69:16, 127.15 short [6] - 41:15, 42:12, 104:14, 139:6, 158:6, 208:11 short-term [2] -41:15, 42:12 shortcut [2] - 181:6, 266:17 shorter [1] - 284:14 shortest [1] - 105:17

shot [3] - 272:19, 309:2, 309:11 shouts [1] - 33:8 show [20] - 42:14, 53:8, 56:14, 57:1, 57:6, 80:19, 81:9, 81:18, 91:5, 120:7, 146:3, 148:1, 151:11, 197:14, 237:11, 269:19, 284:16, 292:4, 315:14, 317:6 showed [1] - 272:11 **showing** [3] - 57:8, 64:5, 112:10 shown [1] - 29:7 shows [11] - 50:13, 58:16, 79:2, 82:17, 90:14, 104:2, 119:3, 138:15, 145:17, 146:15, 272:6 shrubs [4] - 46:13, 46:18, 47:19, 86:1 shuttle [2] - 131:1, 131:13 side [83] - 47:9, 48:2, 48:3, 63:3, 63:6, 63:7, 66:3, 66:6, 66:9, 66:10, 66:11, 66:15, 73:14, 75:8, 84:5, 85:6, 86:3, 89:3, 111:3, 112:15, 114:14, 114:15, 122:11, 135:5, 137:2, 137:3, 143:9, 145:18, 146:16, 148:3, 148:7, 150:13, 153:1, 154:12, 154:15, 154:17, 159:6, 159:10, 178:14, 187:5, 189:8, 203:5, 203:7, 222:9, 223:1, 224:19, 225:10, 227:12, 232:17, 238:12, 239:12, 239:13, 240:17, 240:19, 241:1, 241:3, 241:11, 241:16, 242:7, 242:10, 242:17, 243:8, 245:10, 245:12, 246:8, 246:11, 246:18, 251:11, 259:15, 260:3, 264:2, 264:14, 264:16, 264:17, 264:19, 265:5, 265:7, 267:11, 297:12,

302:6, 302:7

Side [1] - 2:12

sides [8] - 44:15, 79:7, 80:2, 84:8, 151:2, 169:13, 224:1, 265:19 sidewalk [23] - 45:11, 61:16, 63:9, 63:10, 63:11, 63:15, 66:3, 66:9, 67:4, 71:6, 72:10, 75:8, 86:14, 111:5, 114:14, 114:16, 121:5, 122:10, 135:4, 146:6, 166:18, 167:12, 227:12 sidewalks [7] - 44:9, 44:12, 44:19, 61:2, 137:1, 159:13, 168:5 siding [2] - 81:14, 185:10 Sieniewicz [1] - 1:10 SIENIEWICZ [26] -15:15, 18:10, 19:10, 33:18, 72:17, 103:17, 104:6, 105:5, 105:13, 106:1, 106:15, 107:2, 107:15, 108:2, 108:15, 175:3, 179:12, 263:16, 272:12, 272:16, 279:18, 280:9, 287:11, 290:19, 303:1, 304.12 Sierra [2] - 240:18, 241:10 sight [1] - 303:2 Sign [2] - 31:16, 333:6 sign [22] - 20:7, 20:8, 21:7, 22:15, 24:6, 24:8, 25:3, 26:3, 27:19, 30:6, 30:12, 30:16, 31:3, 31:4, 31:8, 32:12, 33:16, 35:6, 191:4, 250:1, 260:3, 332:14 sign-in [1] - 250:1 signage [8] - 20:7, 20:19, 21:12, 22:3, 28:2, 33:13, 244:4 signal [4] - 71:2, 269:11, 269:14, 270:2 signals [1] - 270:7 SIGNATURE [1] -332:1 signed [4] - 209:14, 214:10, 250:3, 332:7

SIGNED [1] - 332:18

significant [4] -186:17, 228:3, 235:13, 303:4 signs [11] - 20:1, 22:10, 24:7, 27:5, 28:5, 32:4, 32:15, 33:4, 34:8, 260:5 silhouette [2] -161:18, 162:1 Silver [1] - 94:14 Simha [1] - 129:2 similar [11] - 83:14, 86:1, 89:12, 89:13, 109:15, 119:14, 139:18, 235:19, 240:2, 241:14, 284:14 **similarly** [1] - 86:18 simple [3] - 234:11, 239:15, 302:3 simplify [3] - 276:17, 277:1, 278:3 simply [11] - 11:14, 27:15, 28:12, 101:5, 115:5, 172:8, 199:15, 278:4, 309:14, 311:9, 325:13 simulations [1] - 9:13 single [6] - 169:4, 192:19, 210:13, 262:1, 263:7, 298:3 single-family [1] -210:13 singular [1] - 233:1 sit [4] - 9:9, 9:14, 14:18, 86:13 site [44] - 34:2, 42:2, 47:12, 56:8, 56:15, 58:13, 62:16, 73:5, 91:15, 93:4, 94:2, 96:7, 97:4, 97:7, 101:16, 121:19, 157:12, 160:10, 160:13, 160:14, 179:19, 180:4, 180:9, 181:4, 190:6, 201:11, 201:16, 213:10, 213:11, 219:15, 220:3, 230:5, 235:4, 237:1, 238:2, 247:17, 250:10, 264:10, 266:5, 280:3, 289:1, 290:17, 303:6, 303:13 sites [3] - 157:13, 161:1, 209:19 sitting [5] - 21:1,

104:16, 269:4,

280:7, 321:6

situation [8] - 13:3, 14:10, 15:11, 136:10, 145:4, 145:7, 193:15, 315:7 situations [1] - 12:7 six [9] - 81:8, 81:19, 82:7, 192:8, 192:15, 203:10. 259:3. 297:12. 299:16 six-foot [1] - 259:3 sixth [1] - 228:19 size [10] - 5:1, 25:6, 31:1, 53:12, 113:4, 148:8, 164:7, 172:12, 193:5, 327:18 sizes [3] - 53:14, 139:18, 272:3 sizzle [1] - 68:17 sketch [3] - 197:17, 198:19 sketch-up [1] -198:19 skilled [2] - 289:14, 304:5 skillfully [1] - 286:17 skipped [1] - 287:18 sky [1] - 175:17 **skyline** [3] - 191:11, 203:14. 300:15 slab [1] - 275:12 slain [1] - 286:19 slate [1] - 231:17 slick [1] - 245:15 slide [4] - 42:15, 42:18, 90:2, 146:12 slightly [6] - 9:9, 18:3, 86:10, 271:13, 284:13, 314:12 smack [1] - 271:12 small [12] - 16:1, 57:14, 65:9, 78:19, 85:19, 163:6, 184:4, 203:7, 204:14, 227:7, 248:5, 295:11 smaller [4] - 54:2, 139:17, 169:3, 169.5 smart [1] - 191:19 smell [1] - 124:11 smooth [2] - 231:10, 245:15 **smoothly** [1] - 6:12 snow [2] - 207:15, 207:16 so-called [2] - 251:4, 277:16 so... [4] - 135:7,

177:11, 268:16,

330:19 soccer [11] - 68:15, 114:17, 121:6, 121:9, 138:16, 166:5, 166:6, 166:9, 178:9 soft [2] - 78:11, 78:12 softscape [1] - 147:6 software [3] - 163:1, 197:16, 199:4 soil [9] - 85:16, 85:18, 101:16, 101:17, 147:10, 147:14, 155:8, 155:16, 172:19 solar [2] - 156:3, 156:9 sold [1] - 274:13 Solicitor [5] - 317:19, 318:11, 320:6, 329:7, 329:17 solid [2] - 105:1, 111:12 solidify [1] - 6:10 solution [3] - 189:16, 189:18, 257:4 solutions [2] - 180:5, 301.1 solve [1] - 153:8 solves [1] - 169:6 someone [7] - 68:10, 69:4. 94:9. 128:12. 134:19. 263:5. 328:12 Somerville [1] - 256:1 sometimes [5] - 22:3, 137:16, 198:16, 291:16, 293:12 somewhat [3] - 119:9, 275:17, 285:11 song [2] - 129:17, 129:19 sooner [2] - 183:3, 317:4 sorry [12] - 7:7, 25:10, 25:12, 40:7, 64:1, 70:12, 72:18, 92:5, 128:4, 214:14, 279:18, 313:17 sort [88] - 10:11, 12:2, 12:17, 12:19, 13:12, 14:4, 15:5, 28:16, 29:11, 31:19, 48:8, 52:4, 52:17, 53:17, 58:3, 61:14, 62:7, 62:16, 63:1, 63:16, 66:7, 67:4, 79:15, 80:11, 82:3, 83:3, 83:11, 85:5, 87:1, 87:13, 96:6, 105:11,

110:7, 114:4, 114:5,

116:17, 125:11, 125:15, 143:15, 149:19, 167:11, 167:17, 170:14, 193:14, 194:8, 194:14, 194:16, 195:11, 195:16, 201:18. 202:10. 203:11, 222:13, 222:18, 224:9, 225:3, 225:17, 226:7, 229:5, 231:1, 232:19, 233:13, 235:18, 237:5, 238:10, 238:11, 238:12. 238:17. 239:16. 240:16. 241:19. 243:7. 243:15. 244:6. 244:15, 247:1, 247:5, 247:8, 251:1, 252:3, 253:8, 265:2, 275:10, 276:18, 276:19, 287:1, 287:3, 302:10 sorts [1] - 253:18 sound [2] - 50:6, 318.7 sounds [6] - 19:7, 74:16, 132:16, 197:3, 289:19, 325:10 South [1] - 27:8 south [4] - 9:12, 10:17, 89:6, 227:12 southern [1] - 154:4 southwest [2] - 14:11, 124.6 **Sozio** [2] - 144:5, 144:8 **space** [44] - 43:9, 47:4, 113:7, 137:3, 146:9, 147:16, 148:5, 152:5, 178:7, 222:2, 222:12, 222:13, 224:17, 227:19, 229:9, 229:12, 230:18, 231:2, 240:5, 241:6, 242:3, 242:4, 243:16, 243:19, 244:5, 247:8, 256:19, 257:3, 263:18, 264:8, 264:13, 265:1, 265:10, 265:14, 265:16, 268:2, 269:3, 270:15, 298:4, 305:4, 307:2, 307:5, 327:14 spaces [17] - 41:13, 42:1, 42:3, 49:14,

49:15, 56:10, 56:13, 138:10, 148:12, 221:1, 225:4, 225:5, 226:3, 228:10, 268:5, 305:1, 305:15 spacing [1] - 54:14 speakers [1] - 255:12 speaking [2] - 139:7, 216.13 speaks [1] - 261:1 Special [20] - 2:9, 2:10, 3:8, 3:9, 3:12, 3:12, 20:3, 37:4, 162:16, 173:7, 181:1, 210:17, 211:7, 212:18, 216:19, 217:1, 217:8, 310:11, 313:10, 328:8 special [2] - 166:2, 168.11 specific [7] - 29:5, 60:8, 60:9, 109:7, 289:13. 292:11. 293:12 specifically [6] - 45:7, 58:18, 101:15, 212:2. 292:16. 310:5 specifics [1] - 110:1 **specified** [3] - 313:8, 313:13, 318:2 speculative [1] -75:16 speech [1] - 34:9 speed [4] - 32:9, 209:11, 249:2, 269:11 spell [2] - 118:9, 214:16 spend [4] - 8:1, 221:18, 235:17, 316:17 **spends** [1] - 118:1 spent [5] - 15:19, 127:6, 207:14, 219:6, 237:12 spikes [1] - 50:13 spill [1] - 243:19 spirit [2] - 31:13, 31:15 **split** [2] - 100:4, 213:5 spoken [4] - 135:18, 179:15, 257:6, 270:17 spokespeople [1] -117:7 spot [2] - 281:16, 281:18

sprinklers [1] -

170:18 Square [6] - 12:11, 74:1, 150:19, 185:8, 286:2, 327:11 square [13] - 3:17, 32:15, 32:19, 33:1, 84:3, 140:18, 211:3, 212:8, 212:10, 212:12, 212:15, 223:19. 227:19 stacks [1] - 228:15 staff [25] - 8:4, 11:8, 12:12, 70:17, 102:5, 117:17, 125:18, 127:12, 174:13, 176:6, 177:12, 183:5, 183:17, 185:15, 186:2, 198:4, 201:19, 219:7, 219:14, 263:12, 278:17, 283:2, 302:15, 318:10, 322:8 Staff [1] - 1:14 staff's [1] - 8:11 stage [4] - 99:3. 206:16, 247:5. 316:18 stair [6] - 58:6, 85:4, 86:16, 86:17, 87:1, 88:4 stairs [5] - 47:7, 56:18, 168:7, 226:12, 227:5 **stairwell** [1] - 9:3 stake [1] - 303:17 stakeholders [1] -141:14 standard [4] - 23:12, 28:4, 32:14, 52:9 standards [6] - 23:11, 94:13. 94:14. 103:6. 122:18. 193:2 standing [1] - 111:4 standpoint [4] -113:15, 229:14, 234:16, 234:17 **Starbucks** [1] - 123:6 **staring** [1] - 310:12 stars [1] - 166:3 start [19] - 4:7, 7:5, 62:3, 76:8, 132:12, 143:14, 176:17, 183:3, 191:17, 221:13, 231:17, 239:8, 239:10, 244:11, 249:16, 257:12, 262:6, 299:6, 309:16 started [9] - 49:14,

64:14, 181:9,

292:1

221:10

263.5

228:18, 263:1,

54:18, 139:12,

139:14, 141:1,

103:12, 121:12,

121:15, 122:7,

128:10, 171:9,

195:3, 220:15,

248:15, 263:13,

298:8, 323:3

80:17, 83:12

112:10, 112:13

118:18, 175:15,

37:14. 38:19. 41:2

38:10, 39:1, 41:1,

55:10, 125:19,

216:3, 217:7

164:11

333:17

107:8

204:14

327:16

320:12

160:19

250:12, 251:5,

268:14, 269:6

72:17, 73:16

170:11. 170:13.

313:7

36:11

293:15

10:3, 10:9, 10:19, 196:19, 225:14, 129:11, 130:7, storefront [2] - 240:8, studies [2] - 231:19, 235:14, 236:13, 130:11, 130:15, 243:15 11:2, 13:11, 21:9, 242:7, 290:2 24:10, 44:19, 45:14, 131:7, 131:17, stories [4] - 231:3, Studio [2] - 218:17, starting [4] - 136:8, 134:12, 135:8, 297:12. 299:9. 50:10, 54:8, 54:13, 237:8, 244:2, 135:12, 142:1, 299:16 54:15, 57:7, 61:5, studio [4] - 192:14, 314:15 142:6, 172:7, storm [4] - 91:17, 64:19, 66:6, 89:10, starts [3] - 21:8, 182:16, 184:18, 114:15, 115:2, 92:10, 92:14, 92:18 154:2, 225:11 185:2. 196:19. 115:3. 121:3. 124:2. Storrs [1] - 218:15 **studios** [1] - 228:4 213:18, 214:8, 128:18, 136:8, state [4] - 135:3, story [3] - 82:13, studs [1] - 258:2 159:7, 187:12, 214:9, 215:17, 136:11, 136:14, 230:18, 233:7 study [6] - 22:19, 216:4, 216:5, 136:16, 138:14, 187:17 straight [6] - 72:7, 217:19, 218:6, 139:14, 140:7, statement [3] - 108:7, 74:9, 88:19, 147:12, 249:18, 260:9, 159:19, 160:1, 270:14, 330:10 239:4. 302:11 260:18, 261:12, 161:9, 164:4, 167:9, statements [1] straighten [1] - 10:12 studying [1] - 256:10 261:14, 271:7, 180:12, 186:14, 333:18 stuff [13] - 79:14, stranded [1] - 143:8 271:15. 277:13. 187:2. 190:9. station [14] - 187:6, strategies [1] -280:11, 280:15, 190:19. 194:7. 224:2, 224:6, 224:7, 243:17 281:7. 282:11. 194:13, 194:16, 241:3, 242:4, strategy [2] - 174:1, 290:18, 291:6, 194:17, 195:5, 242:11, 243:6, 307:6 195:14, 195:16, 300:1, 300:8, 301:2, 244:8, 248:1, Street [108] - 2:7, 2:9, 196:3, 220:18, 301:11, 318:14, 248:11, 267:12, 2:10, 2:15, 3:8, 319:3, 319:12, 225:9, 225:11, 273:15, 295:16 stupid [1] - 144:1 3:10, 4:17, 5:1, 5:4, 319:16, 320:15, 226:16, 227:10, Station [2] - 134:10, style [1] - 120:17 5:9, 5:12, 5:18, 228:13, 240:14, 321:2, 321:5, 261:18 17:17, 27:8, 35:12, subject [1] - 157:5 240:15, 240:18, 321:11, 321:19, status [1] - 329:14 42:17, 43:1, 43:8, submission [2] -322:2, 328:14, 241:11, 242:8, stay [2] - 132:15, 43:10, 44:16, 44:18, 245:17, 259:1, 330:12, 331:2 180:7 45:2, 45:12, 47:6, submissions [2] -Steven [2] - 1:9, 1:10 260:3, 264:14, **steeper** [1] - 159:7 53:17, 54:6, 57:7, 298:3 stewardship [1] step [11] - 129:16, 60:3, 60:19, 62:6, submit [4] - 114:19, street's [1] - 141:5 173:9 200:12, 200:13, 62:8, 62:11, 63:4, stick [1] - 144:19 streets [2] - 32:5, 217:3, 229:3, 63:11, 64:7, 64:15, sticking [2] - 16:19, 297:16 231:14, 234:19, 65:1, 71:7, 72:11, submittal [4] - 36:16. strengthens [1] -277:14, 308:9, 72:12, 73:12, 74:10, 233:19 still [27] - 16:7, 27:12, 308:10 74:15, 75:17, 76:5, **submittals** [2] - 36:6, 84:5, 99:6, 122:13, strengths [1] - 235:8 stepping [2] - 297:13, 77:4, 77:9, 77:10, 124:11, 130:11, stretch [2] - 86:4, 83:15, 84:19, 316:15 **submitted** [8] - 36:18, 134:14, 155:4, 159:18 121:17, 122:11, stepping-in [1] -163:3, 170:8, 176:4, strict [1] - 289:6 123:4, 130:5, 316:15 184:11. 190:18. strikes [1] - 250:15 steps [5] - 18:7, 130:18, 131:15, 193:15, 196:1, 135:3, 136:3, 139:5, **strip** [2] - 111:6, 191:9 117:10, 159:5, submitting [1] -196:4, 199:6, striped [3] - 14:3, 230:6, 259:15 139:11, 143:8, 242:16, 247:5, 144:14, 144:16, 15:7, 15:12 Steve [6] - 200:7, subscribe [1] -251:16, 258:11, 215:16, 218:10, 145:13, 145:17, strips [1] - 22:4 276:14, 278:14, 154:11, 154:19, strong [8] - 28:1, 221:15, 282:5, subsequent [1] -298:10, 320:15, 157:17, 164:3, 223:14, 232:8, 290:3 327:18 165:1, 165:5, 165:9, 236:16, 242:6, **STEVEN** [98] - 9:18, subsidiary [1] stone [4] - 86:7, 87:7, 166:1, 166:3, 167:9, 244:1, 256:19 11:6, 19:11, 22:1, 170:13, 250:19 169:19, 172:14, stronger [2] - 245:16, 22:11, 23:5, 23:14, **substantial** [4] - 84:8, stoop [3] - 227:4, 180:11, 183:1, 293.7 27:17, 39:8, 39:12, 228:8, 265:18 188:13, 194:12, strongly [4] - 28:13, 40:1, 51:16, 52:6, stoops [6] - 226:5, 197:2, 197:3, 197:9, 224:11, 237:17, 55:12, 55:19, 56:6, substantive [1] -226:6, 228:10, 215:3, 216:15, 245:3 59:19, 63:17, 64:1, 241:17, 242:1, 216:18, 222:10, 64:3, 65:2, 67:14, struck [2] - 134:7, subway [1] - 69:16 265:19 225:8, 229:4, 232:7, 253:10 70:8, 74:14, 75:15, succeeding [1] stop [4] - 131:15, 240:11, 240:16, 76:1, 95:2, 95:8, **structure** [2] - 85:13, 152:7, 262:11, 242:10, 245:6, 97:16, 98:4, 102:3, 131:2 successful [4] -289:3 256:7, 258:18, 108:17, 112:18, STUART [2] - 315:3, stopped [1] - 80:6 266:12. 273:12. 116:9, 116:13, 319:10 storage [1] - 91:19 275:2, 275:5, 282:1, 116:17, 117:14, Stuart [2] - 1:16, succulents [1] - 85:15 store [3] - 49:7, 92:13, 282:8, 290:4, 293:1, 126:3, 127:3, 316:2 Sue [4] - 70:7, 70:11, 130:2 327:8 127:10, 127:13, studied [1] - 55:8 street [67] - 9:1, 9:11,

stored [1] - 92:15

128:14, 129:5,

sued [2] - 128:13, 158:17 sufficient [1] - 101:4 suggest [9] - 17:14, 102:4, 106:9, 181:16, 206:2, 206:3, 267:16, 317:17, 321:13 suggested [8] - 9:8, 10:10, 36:17, 48:10, 50:2, 52:1, 107:11, 129:2 suggesting [7] -46:19, 79:16, 111:18, 112:1, 199:2, 290:3, 311:19 suggestion [6] -34:12, 194:9, 211:1, 257:18, 315:3, suggestions [4] -8:18, 17:19, 194:7, 196:14 summary [2] - 96:2, 229:16 summer [3] - 69:2, 75:13, 99:18 **sun** [1] - 297:16 supermarkets [1] -52:3 supervision [1] -95:10 supplement [1] -90:13 supplemental [10] -36:16, 37:10, 37:12, 38:1, 39:3, 39:13, 39:16, 83:7, 124:18, 127:1 supplied [1] - 332:14 **supply** [2] - 99:9, 156.4 support [2] - 142:16, 180:14 supporting [1] - 10:5 **supports** [3] - 18:15, 231:5, 235:5 suppose [2] - 73:17, 260:1 supposed [3] - 124:8. 124:10, 269:19 supposedly [1] -151:8 surface [4] - 155:19, 258:11, 258:13 surfaces [1] - 257:19 surprised [2] - 93:19, 121:11

surrounded [2] -

147:5, 147:6

surrounding [4] -139:18, 140:1, 197:15, 213:12 SUSAN [4] - 65:7, 70:12, 73:9, 74:3 suspect [1] - 115:9 suspenders [2] -319:11, 319:13 sustainability [1] -68:11 SUZANNAH [8] -8:16, 9:19, 12:3, 12:10, 13:6, 17:8, 19:16, 174:17 Suzannah [8] - 1:16, 8:6, 8:15, 11:8, 19:13, 112:5, 260:11, 284:8 Suzannah's [1] -17:14 swath [1] - 47:11 sweet [2] - 281:16, 281.18 switch [1] - 299:8 symmetrical [2] -10:14, 12:19 symmetry [1] - 265:17 sympathetic [4] -106:18, 235:3, 235:4, 303:12 sympathy [1] - 34:16 synthetic [2] - 68:17, 94:1 system [1] - 158:15 systems [1] - 264:13

tea [1] - 129:8 **TEAGUE** [2] - 164:19, 169:1 Teague [1] - 165:1 team [5] - 218:12, 218:17, 250:9, 289:14, 290:13 Team [1] - 219:8 tech [2] - 103:4, 103:5 technically [1] -323:11 technique [1] - 134:2 technology [6] -124:19. 170:16. 171:1, 171:18, 185:11, 185:16 Ted [15] - 15:13, 17:11, 28:14, 29:14, 30:1, 98:5, 127:5, 193:14, 279:5, 287:13, 297:2, 318:19, 319:1, 326:5, 328:17 Ted's [4] - 29:12, 279:1, 317:2, 317:12 teed [1] - 275:17 telecom [2] - 7:18, 8:2 ten [5] - 33:14, 33:15, 81:11, 170:15, 177:18 term [4] - 41:15. 42:12. 158:6. 173:19 termination [3] -310:10, 311:3, 311.4

Т

terms [15] - 61:10, 61:12, 99:7, 103:7, table [5] - 155:7, 108:3, 115:11, 155:9. 176:17. 123:19, 133:1, 262:9, 320:4 137:4, 155:3, 195:7, tactical [1] - 173:17 195:19, 196:6, talented [1] - 284:7 268:12, 273:10 talents [1] - 257:7 terrace [9] - 54:4, talks [1] - 238:2 84:18, 85:2, 86:5, tall [6] - 259:2, 259:3, 86:10, 87:2, 87:4, 284:18, 286:11, 87:9, 87:12 295:10, 299:16 terraces [1] - 192:4 taller [3] - 111:11, terribly [1] - 306:9 273:14, 299:10 terrific 131 - 131:7. Tango [2] - 240:19, 131:17, 172:11 241:10 TERZIS [53] - 36:2, tank [1] - 91:19 36:5, 36:11, 37:4, tanks [2] - 91:9, 91:10 37:9, 37:13, 38:7, tasteless [1] - 22:10 38:15, 38:18, 39:14, tax [3] - 128:16, 40:7, 40:10, 40:13, 137:5, 156:18 40:19, 43:19, 44:4, taxes [2] - 157:6, 44:6, 46:1, 48:16, 157:12 49:6, 51:19, 52:11, taxpayer [1] - 167:8 55:18, 56:5, 56:7,

58:19, 59:4, 59:8, 59:12, 59:16, 60:10, 61:8, 76:4, 76:7, 87:17, 90:12, 91:7, 91:11, 91:14, 92:10, 93:7, 93:13, 94:10, 99:15, 100:6, 100:10. 101:14. 102:10, 111:19, 113:12, 115:18, 120:4, 208:7 Terzis [3] - 36:6, 126:16, 167:5 testify [1] - 132:12 testimony [7] - 118:5, 180:18, 182:3, 249:12, 249:17, 332:14, 333:5 testing [1] - 51:6 text [4] - 3:5, 211:17, 212:18, 310:6 texture [2] - 252:2, 277:17 textures [1] - 243:2 that's... [1] - 296:14 THE [5] - 1:2, 1:18, 36:8, 332:17 theme [1] - 252:3 themes [1] - 139:7 themselves [1] -276:19 Theodore [1] - 1:8 THEODORE [59] -11:7, 15:16, 25:11, 25:14, 25:18, 58:14, 59:2, 59:6, 59:10, 59:13, 59:18, 65:14, 65:17, 66:16, 66:19, 67:5, 67:8, 67:13, 69:9, 69:14, 98:6, 98:15. 100:17. 102:17. 113:2. 185:5. 271:3. 271:9. 272:4. 272:10. 272:14, 272:17, 284:9, 287:8. 293:18, 296:6, 296:9, 296:14, 309:13, 310:7, 310:19, 311:9, 312:9, 312:14, 313:17, 314:1, 317:16, 318:8, 319:7, 321:13, 322:1, 322:6, 322:18, 323:14, 324:15, 324:19, 325:17, 325:19, 328:16 theory [1] - 294:4

therefor [2] - 332:14,

333:5

284:5

therefore [1] - 144:17 thereof [1] - 332:7 they've [13] - 11:10, 17:6, 29:1, 50:8, 96:6, 106:12, 119:8, 148:2, 287:4, 293:2, 298:8, 304:6 thick [2] - 83:2, 258:6 thicker [1] - 84:7 thin [1] - 161:13 thinking [30] - 56:12, 78:16, 83:16, 116:6, 164:3, 207:18, 214:1, 221:19, 223:2, 223:5, 224:3, 225:3, 227:11, 232:3, 232:5, 233:11, 234:12, 237:13, 246:19, 247:6, 254:3, 255:11, 257:8, 257:12, 266:7, 267:10, 275:15, 286:1, 300:16, 304:11 thinks [1] - 46:16 thinner [1] - 169:4 third [2] - 44:9, 212:9 THIS [1] - 332:17 Thomas [3] - 177:6, 284:11, 284:17 **Thorndike** [1] - 5:9 thoughtful [1] - 173:7 thoughts [5] - 167:1, 190:2, 268:9, 278:18, 320:6 thousand [2] -299:17, 300:7 three [25] - 17:16, 33:1, 34:17, 43:12, 57:15, 57:19, 62:4, 86:8, 86:9, 105:1, 118:7, 126:8, 133:14, 146:19, 150:14, 155:9, 196:2, 213:1, 228:5, 228:18, 249:10, 255:12, 255:13, 295:5, 316:17 three-and-a-halffoot [1] - 33:1 three-bedroom [1] three-dimensional [1] - 133:14 thrive [2] - 148:6, 148:15 throughout [1] -157:1 throw [2] - 277:10,

throwing [1] - 27:18 Thursday [2] -126:17, 126:19 Tibbs [1] - 195:18 ties [1] - 252:4 tight [1] - 320:3 timbers [1] - 160:12 timekeeper[1] -214:18 timeline [2] - 51:17, 52:1 timers [2] - 297:8, 297:9 timing [2] - 310:2, 310:9 tired [1] - 151:6 TIS [2] - 55:14, 144:14 TMA [7] - 130:19, 131:4, 131:5, 134:7, 134:8, 134:14, 182:19 TMAs [1] - 135:13 **TO** [1] - 333:1 to...[1] - 81:6 today [6] - 11:10, 25:3, 72:1, 171:5, 278:2, 293:7 together [22] - 27:11, 98:11, 98:14, 104:12, 120:8, 120:12, 120:18, 131:5, 146:1, 226:4, 251:4, 251:15, 251:17, 252:4, 252:7, 257:13, 258:14, 268:15, 269:9, 269:16, 277:5, 291:4 TOM [26] - 15:15, 18:10, 19:10, 33:18, 72:17, 103:17, 104:6, 105:5, 105:13, 106:1, 106:15, 107:2, 107:15, 108:2, 108:15, 175:3, 179:12, 263:16, 272:12, 272:16, 279:18, 280:9, 287:11, 290:19, 303:1, 304:12 Tom [4] - 1:10, 103:16, 179:11, 263:15 Tom's [1] - 268:18 tone [1] - 251:3 tonight [19] - 4:16, 8:1, 78:6, 116:10, 116:11, 117:12, 129:3, 136:7, 159:11, 160:10,

175:4, 205:16, 217:4, 218:19, 220:4, 282:14, 294:12, 305:9, 315:1 tonight's [1] - 119:1 took 151 - 133:10. 162:8, 195:9, 234:19, 235:1 tool [3] - 156:19, 158:2, 158:7 tools [2] - 198:1, 203:19 top [16] - 13:15, 22:9, 82:15, 98:9, 104:16, 121:17, 154:8, 177:10, 179:2, 180:7, 192:3, 239:17, 258:1, 273:19, 327:13 tore [1] - 259:14 total [3] - 211:4, 213:1, 219:3 totally [3] - 171:13, 259:11, 259:19 touch [1] - 178:5 tough [2] - 266:4, 302:13 tour [1] - 152:15 touring [1] - 138:10 towards [9] - 27:2, 229:3, 232:7, 232:10, 236:13, 240:4, 240:14, 245:5, 246:3 towel [1] - 14:7 Tower [1] - 219:19 Towers [2] - 143:9, 159:3 towers [1] - 110:6 town [1] - 183:2 townhouse [3] -209:17, 210:9, 213:8 townhouses [3] -210:1, 252:11, 252:12 toxic [1] - 98:1 trace [1] - 73:4 track [3] - 153:13, 154:9, 154:11 tracks [4] - 143:2, 155:11, 159:2, 237:3 tradition [1] - 170:14 traditional [3] - 235:6, 235:18, 236:2 traffic [18] - 54:18, 55:3, 65:11, 68:9, 72:3, 72:6, 77:8,

77:19, 78:2, 93:8,

135:2, 145:6, 153:3, 188:2, 188:3, 188:7, 193:14, 266:18 Traffic [4] - 41:19, 55:2, 55:10, 194:3 train [8] - 224:2, 241:3, 242:3, 243:6, 244:8, 248:1, 248:11, 267:12 trained [1] - 175:16 Trainer [3] - 77:14, 93:14, 93:15 trainer [1] - 100:18 **TRAINER** [10] - 93:15, 94:5, 95:7, 96:1, 97:6, 97:14, 98:2, 98:10, 99:2, 99:14 trains [2] - 256:16, 256:17 transcript [7] -332:10, 332:15, 333:4, 333:6, 333:7, 333:16, 333:17 TRANSCRIPT [1] -332:17 Transcript(s [1] - 2:4 transcripts [1] - 7:13 transferring [1] -280:3 transform [1] - 167:5 transient [1] - 73:3 transient-oriented [1] - 73:3 transit [6] - 74:13, 122:19, 179:19, 180:9, 187:19, 251:12 transit-oriented [3] -179:19, 180:9, 187.19 transition [1] - 230:4 transitions [1] -246:10 transom [1] - 80:10 transparent [2] - 97:2, 151:13 transportation [4] -131:19. 153:12. 183:6. 303:5 transporting [1] -238:11 trash [1] - 146:18 travel [2] - 61:1, 71:16 travelling [1] - 10:9 traverses [1] - 180:3 treat [1] - 225:5

treated [1] - 264:16

treating [1] - 245:13

treatment [1] - 14:4

148:12

tree [3] - 44:15, 85:18,

trees [21] - 45:1, 47:19, 54:9, 54:13, 57:7, 61:6, 63:2, 128:8, 145:17, 146:8, 146:15, 147:1. 147:2. 147:7. 147:14. 148:4. 148:6. 148:9. 148:14, 148:19 trellis [7] - 88:8, 109:11, 109:15, 110:3, 111:13, 204.9 trellis-y [1] - 111:13 trellises [3] - 109:18, 112:4, 204:6 tremendous [2] -143:6, 248:4 trench [5] - 62:16, 146:8, 166:8, 166:13, 166:19 Tria [1] - 123:6 tricks [1] - 204:10 tried [6] - 41:3, 125:3, 125:5, 145:19, 165:6, 230:2 tries [1] - 252:8 trim [3] - 81:9, 84:2, 111:14 trouble [2] - 119:6, 317:5 troubles [1] - 300:16 troubling [1] - 301:18 truck [1] - 43:11 trucks [2] - 42:11, 42.16 true [4] - 183:12, 243:19, 283:16, 318:8 truly [1] - 219:10 truth [1] - 152:19 try [23] - 6:19, 7:19, 16:13, 17:7, 46:8, 134:2, 139:5, 152:6, 152:19, 155:15, 193:6, 216:17, 229:11, 235:3, 249:14, 252:8, 276:17, 278:17, 283:2, 283:4, 283:5, 302:1, 317:3 trying [27] - 6:3, 6:8, 16:9, 32:5, 37:17, 53:13, 57:6, 70:16, 83:8, 94:13, 116:19, 131:5, 139:13, 140:3, 223:10, 235:5, 247:19, 250:10, 252:9, 252:10, 255:2, 275:7, 286:18,

288:8, 302:10, 311:18, 315:15 Tuesday [2] - 1:4, 132:7 tune [1] - 304:2 turn [3] - 70:6, 255:9, 264:6 twice [1] - 121:14 twins [2] - 232:19, 274.16 Two [1] - 222:19 two [88] - 3:14, 19:19, 24:7, 24:9, 25:19, 26:10, 27:18, 34:16, 36:5, 36:11, 38:10, 40:5, 41:1, 42:11, 43:5, 53:18, 55:9, 56:9, 57:18, 61:1, 61:2, 61:17, 62:12, 64:17, 81:3, 86:7, 86:11, 92:13, 105:16, 105:18, 109:15, 111:11, 113:6, 114:1, 120:1, 120:8. 137:10. 137:13. 137:14. 138:3, 139:7, 166:5, 166:6, 188:9, 204:7, 210:18, 210:19, 212:7, 217:3, 218:9, 228:3, 228:17, 230:17, 230:18, 231:3, 233:2, 233:7, 257:2, 265:2, 265:18, 274:9, 274:10, 274:12, 274:15, 274:16, 274:17, 285:7, 285:10, 285:15, 294:3. 298:4. 298:17. 298:18. 299:9, 301:8, 304:18, 307:15, 308:9, 311:12, 311:16, 315:11, 316:4, 320:7, 324:1, 324:10, 327:1 two-story [2] -230:18, 233:7 two-week [1] - 311:16 **Tyler** [1] - 56:1 type [6] - 96:13, 189:11, 280:9, 280:11, 280:12, 288:17 **Type** [1] - 280:7 types [2] - 228:7,

299:8

228:15

typical [5] - 81:9,

82:3, 227:17,

typically [4] - 43:10,

57:10, 306:2, 310:1 U ugly [3] - 154:12, 194:14, 195:4 ultimately [3] - 211:5, 235:13, 293:14 umbrellas [2] - 244:4, 267:18 unable [1] - 322:4 unanimous [1] -297:5 unappealing [1] -271:14 unassigned [2] -41:12, 42:3 unattractive [1] -15:18 unbroken [1] - 202:17 unbuildable [1] -167:6 uncomfortable [3] -283:6, 300:11, 300:13 under [16] - 5:3, 34:11, 95:9, 95:13, 96:10, 143:1, 157:13, 181:19, 212:8, 251:6, 253:1, 256:2, 260:19, 262:4, 267:17, 307:14 underestimated [1] -81:3 underground [2] -91:19, 155:18 underneath [1] -165:19 underpass [1] - 143:3 understated [1] -287:3 understood [1] -281:16 unfair [2] - 33:10, 293:10 unfinished [1] -261:11 unfortunate [2] -279:9, 293:9 unfortunately [3] -91:16, 180:5, 279:6 UNIDENTIFIED [1] -214:13 unify [2] - 276:18, 278:3 unique [2] - 251:10, 303.6 unit [22] - 13:14, 57:11, 58:1, 88:14,

99:9, 99:11, 99:16,

99:18, 100:1, 100:5, 101:13, 113:19, 163:6, 211:2, 211:10, 212:6, 212:9, 212:16, 219:3, 228:7, 253:16, 302:14 units 1351 - 2:10. 3:11. 15:10, 44:7, 44:8, 57:9, 57:12, 57:18, 69:1, 88:6, 88:10, 88:16, 99:10, 138:3, 156:3, 169:12, 193:3, 193:6, 193:8. 201:4, 201:14, 201:16, 210:18, 210:19, 211:4, 212:7, 213:2, 228:1, 228:5, 228:18, 299:19, 300:3, 302.12 University [1] - 16:10 unless [8] - 58:12, 93:7, 130:4, 204:19, 272:1, 292:16, 311:6, 323:16 unlikely [1] - 271:19 unload [1] - 43:12 unreasonable [1] -30:11 untidy [1] - 14:13 up [151] - 8:15, 16:3, 16:12, 21:18, 26:18, 27:6, 30:8, 32:11, 32:18, 41:5, 43:2, 45:13, 47:4, 49:10, 51:13, 53:19, 56:14, 62:5, 63:13, 69:19, 70:9, 73:1, 73:12, 73:14, 74:15, 75:2, 76:14, 77:13, 79:8, 82:15, 84:11, 84:17, 86:5, 86:19, 87:2, 89:12, 94:8, 96:4, 96:9, 96:17, 96:18, 98:19, 101:16, 101:17, 101:18, 104:19, 109:9, 109:12, 110:8, 110:16, 111:5, 111:14, 113:6, 115:15, 115:18, 119:2, 119:13, 121:7, 121:13, 122:7, 123:10, 136:8, 138:16, 139:17, 146:12, 149:3, 149:8, 159:5, 162:2, 163:9, 166:9, 168:5, 168:14, 168:19, 170:15,

172:19, 173:1,

183:10, 183:13, 183:16, 184:3, 185:12, 185:18, 186:4, 187:5, 191:9, 193:3, 194:4, 196:10, 197:17, 197:18, 198:13, 198:19. 199:11. 200:2, 200:3, 200:8, 202:5, 202:17, 203:12, 205:3, 205:6, 209:10, 214:10, 215:9, 218:17, 219:19, 222:1, 226:12, 228:16. 229:7. 230:10. 236:13. 238:15. 240:8. 240:9. 246:8. 246:13, 249:2, 250:3, 251:6, 257:18, 258:19, 261:17, 268:18, 270:10, 271:4, 271:12, 272:18, 273:1, 275:17, 277:4, 278:4, 278:19, 279:9, 280:8, 281:13, 281:19, 291:8, 297:6, 297:13, 299:7, 301:7, 304:15, 304:19, 305:12, 320:8, 325:5, 331:5 upcoming [3] - 54:19, 55:5, 57:1 update [1] - 4:13 **Update** [1] - 2:2 upper [1] - 251:8 upscale [1] - 303:17 upstairs [1] - 39:18 urban [5] - 97:10, 123:18, 257:5, 266:6, 282:7 urge [1] - 153:16 useful [2] - 7:1, 68:4 uses [3] - 62:9, 136:12, 136:13 usual [1] - 160:14 utilities [4] - 100:2, 154:16, 160:7, 160:11 utilize [1] - 52:8 utilizes [1] - 52:7

V

valid [1] - 46:17 value [2] - 58:3, 270:11 vapor[1] - 98:8 Variance [5] - 23:4, 23:16, 29:6, 46:9, 58:10 variation [4] - 109:5, 203:17, 203:18, 204:10 variations [1] -179:16 varied [1] - 87:8 varies [2] - 105:15, 239:17 variety [7] - 74:12, 83:18, 89:13, 92:16, 150:8, 228:7, 251:16 various [1] - 269:15 vast [1] - 283:7 Vast [1] - 152:12 vehicular [1] - 144:3 ventilation [2] -103:10, 156:5 verbally [1] - 35:18 version [5] - 8:13, 211:12, 215:19, 237:10, 298:1 versus [1] - 195:7 Vertex [1] - 27:7 vertical [15] - 31:7, 82:19, 83:1, 83:11, 83:14, 84:1, 155:17, 230:5, 230:7, 230:10, 233:9, 233:12. 233:19. 238:18, 298:12 vestibule [4] - 58:6, 67:18, 86:18, 88:5 viable [1] - 317:12 viaduct [10] - 256:12, 256:16, 263:18, 264:19, 267:6, 268:18, 271:4, 271:6, 287:5, 295:17 viaducts [1] - 268:19 vibrant [1] - 243:5 Vice [1] - 1:8 vice [1] - 218:13 video [4] - 188:18, 195:8, 195:11, 198:19 view [34] - 10:9, 14:12, 58:4, 58:15, 73:2, 87:1, 90:4, 90:10, 108:4, 116:2, 158:3, 163:4, 165:9,

165:11, 177:4,

178:16, 182:7,

241:18, 242:9,

190:13, 236:11,

244:9, 245:7, 246:2,

246:5, 250:11, 250:16, 250:17, 258:17, 272:7, 275:11, 285:18, 285:19 viewed [1] - 13:11 viewpoint [1] - 10:5 views [4] - 9:11, 15:8, 163:2, 269:18 vines [1] - 47:1 violation [1] - 26:19 Virginia [1] - 302:15 virtual [1] - 138:8 vis [2] - 190:3 vis-a-vis [1] - 190:3 visible [11] - 10:6, 10:18, 15:11, 16:15, 30:12, 121:8, 121:18, 122:3, 190:7, 227:8, 237:1 vision [1] - 298:2 visitor [1] - 41:11 visitors [1] - 41:18 vista [1] - 138:17 visual [1] - 277:17 visualize [1] - 189:4 visualizing [1] - 119:6 voicing [1] - 298:6 void [2] - 298:18, 302:6 volume [4] - 229:2, 332:13, 332:15, 333:6 volumes [1] - 239:14 vote [1] - 207:4 voted [2] - 25:19, 26:2 votes [1] - 297:5 voting [3] - 207:10, 216:11. 326:15 **VP**[1] - 218:13



wait [2] - 103:10, 206:11 waiting [3] - 128:1, 128:11, 165:3 waive [1] - 318:15 Waiver [1] - 2:14 walk [18] - 8:7, 70:1, 72:8, 123:5, 150:16, 150:17, 151:3, 152:15, 153:2, 153:6, 159:1, 187:8, 187:9, 195:15, 197:18, 222:7, 231:18, 259:7 walk-by [1] - 197:18 walked [2] - 147:2, 187:2

walking [12] - 63:1, 66:16, 73:10, 74:10, 114:14, 138:14, 150:11, 152:15, 195:14, 254:4, 286:10. 291:13 walkthrough [1] -163:1 walkthroughs [1] -186:6 walkway [2] - 261:7, 286:3 wall [16] - 9:10, 53:3, 86:7, 86:12, 146:17, 150:1, 258:4, 258:6, 259:3, 259:4, 259:6, 259:12, 259:14, 259:17, 280:13, 286:9 walls [1] - 258:9 wants [12] - 71:9, 100:15, 118:11, 135:6, 231:5, 241:12, 260:12, 263:6. 275:11. 291:15. 302:10. 303:15 War [1] - 258:8 warehouse [2] -150:5, 150:6 warn [1] - 260:4 warranted [1] - 28:17 warts [1] - 169:9 waste [2] - 95:5, 95:11 wastes [1] - 101:7 water [16] - 78:12, 91:5, 91:8, 91:17, 92:10, 92:18, 100:7, 146:14, 147:9, 147:11, 147:17, 155:7, 155:9, 155:18, 178:1 watercolor [1] - 116:4 watercolors [1] -116:7 watered [1] - 148:19 waterfront [1] - 287:2 **WATKINS** [23] -60:13, 61:9, 63:19, 64:2, 64:12, 65:3, 65:6, 65:8, 65:16, 66:1, 66:18, 67:3, 67:6, 67:12, 68:3, 69:13, 70:6, 70:10, 75:5, 75:19, 92:5, 92:11, 93:2 Watkins [2] - 60:13, 122.9 ways [8] - 42:11, 92:16, 204:4, 235:2,

258:10, 283:5, 289:7, 298:6 weak [1] - 129:8 website [6] - 96:17, 96:18. 100:13. 123:13, 125:2, 125:3 week [10] - 36:19, 37:2, 39:3, 43:3, 52:1, 52:2, 106:11, 125:5, 141:16, 311:16 weekend [3] - 52:5, 125:7, 127:7 weekends [1] - 127:8 weekly [1] - 52:4 weeks [7] - 38:10, 41:1, 45:7, 294:1, 307:15, 311:12, 320.7 weigh [1] - 316:6 welcome [2] - 65:3, 204:11 wells [1] - 44:15 west [7] - 127:17, 158:1, 224:1, 229:7, 239:12, 239:13, 255:19 westbound [2] -243:12, 244:9 wheelchair [1] -137:19 Wheeler [1] - 144:16 wheeler [1] - 169:8 WHEN [1] - 332:18 whistles [2] - 299:18, 300:7 white [4] - 14:7, 88:1, 231:19, 272:16 Whole [9] - 50:4, 50:15, 51:4, 52:6, 58:18, 59:7, 59:8, 123:4, 123:6 whole [20] - 18:7, 31:19, 39:2, 43:14, 63:7, 85:16, 121:12, 121:14, 125:1, 152:5, 154:7, 158:15, 199:7, 218:12, 224:8, 226:16, 288:18, 308:5, 323:3, 328:4 wholly [1] - 213:2 wide [5] - 48:6, 61:2, 97:8, 253:1, 286:6 widened [1] - 66:3 wider [3] - 63:10, 154:11, 159:13 wild [2] - 30:5, 127:17 Wilder [3] - 142:10,

145:10, 145:12

WILDER [4] - 145:12, 145:13, 149:2, 149:5 WILLIAMSON [2] -95:15. 149:17 Williamson [2] -145:11, 149:18 willing [4] - 112:8, 113:11, 186:1, 295:3 win [1] - 120:14 wind [1] - 168:18 window [2] - 80:8, 80:10 windows [12] - 80:5, 80:6, 80:9, 80:13, 82:8, 83:12, 85:11, 88:5, 101:10, 124:6, 124:14, 189:15 WINTER [53] - 9:18, 11:6, 19:11, 22:1, 22:11, 23:5, 23:14, 39:8, 39:12, 40:1, 51:16, 52:6, 55:12, 55:19, 56:6, 67:14, 97:16, 98:4, 102:3, 126.3 127.3 127:10. 127:13. 128:14, 129:5, 129:11, 130:7, 130:11, 130:15, 131:7, 131:17, 134:12, 135:8, 135:12, 142:1, 142:6, 172:7, 182:16, 184:18, 185:2, 213:18, 214:8, 215:17, 216:4, 217:19, 249:18, 260:9, 260:18, 261:12, 261:14, 281:7, 282:11, 290:18 Winter [1] - 1:9 winter [2] - 39:5, 99:17 winters [1] - 178:8 **WINTERS** [38] -17:10, 19:7, 21:4, 25:4, 25:7, 28:18, 29:11, 30:4, 31:5, 37:8, 37:19, 38:3, 117:13, 132:9, 132:17, 133:19, 134:3, 149:1, 149:3, 168:18, 193:12, 194:5, 276:1, 276:5, 277:9, 277:12, 282:9, 283:16, 295:19, 296:8, 296:11, 296:18, 306:13, 317:9,

325:10, 331:1 Winters [1] - 1:9 wintertime [1] - 254:5 wireless [1] - 12:15 wires [5] - 160:13, 194:10, 194:14, 194:19, 195:5 wisdom [1] - 152:8 wise [1] - 250:11 wish [17] - 117:3, 156:14, 163:12, 164:17, 172:6, 174:7, 182:18, 201:17, 202:5, 202:10, 214:11, 215:13, 255:7, 260:8, 278:15, 279:13, 293:12 WITH [1] - 332:17 withdraw [4] - 3:18, 327:4, 328:1, 328:8 woman [1] - 152:16 wonder [8] - 8:7, 23:15, 29:8, 263:3, 263:4, 265:17, 270:4, 272:12 wondered [1] -253:19 wonderful [6] -135:14, 158:7, 163:2, 239:7, 264:2, 287:14 wondering [5] -11:12, 132:18, 257:2, 266:19, 276.8 wood [24] - 84:3, 87:10. 109:11. 111:13. 170:6. 170:16, 170:19, 171:1, 171:16, 177:17, 185:8, 185:10, 185:11, 191:16, 195:19, 196:1, 196:5, 258:1, 280:8. 280:13. 299:11 wooden [1] - 177:17 Worcester [1] - 97:10 word [2] - 290:10, 296:7 words [2] - 195:9, 316:8 Works [3] - 60:14, 62:1, 92:3 works [8] - 75:14, 95:19. 126:12. 131:9. 223:5. 224:10, 237:6, 281:2

319:4, 324:6,

Works' [1] - 68:8 World [1] - 258:8 worries [1] - 116:4 worry [3] - 218:3, 266:1, 287:7 worrying [1] - 73:10 worse [6] - 144:18, 145:4, 145:7, 178:18, 188:6 worth [2] - 131:12, 288:19 wow [3] - 16:18, 121:12, 253:6 wrapped [1] - 259:13 wrapping [1] - 246:8 wraps [1] - 21:16 wrestling [1] - 34:3 write [2] - 34:8, 284:8 written [3] - 207:4, 308:1, 314:13 www.reportersinc. com [1] - 1:19



Yahoo [1] - 96:18 Yard [1] - 2:12 year [14] - 75:18, 92:13, 92:14, 118:2, 122:6, 197:4, 197:5, 198:10, 199:9, 207:19, 209:13, 293:2, 293:9 year's [1] - 63:9 years [18] - 25:19, 27:1, 27:10, 28:1, 97:13, 157:1, 157:2, 157:3, 166:15, 170:5, 170:15, 171:5, 171:10, 177:18, 191:5, 216:14, 256:10, 264:5 yellow [5] - 59:3, 59:4, 65:5, 65:10, 65:12 yellow-green [1] -59:3 yellowish [1] - 12:2 yesterday [3] - 66:17, 126:1. 187:2 yourselves [1] - 223:8

Ζ

zero [1] - 144:18 ZipCar [3] - 56:9, 56:10, 261:19 zipping [1] - 22:16 zone [1] - 85:5 **zoned** [1] - 3:4 **Zoning** [32] - 2:5, 3:2, 3:5, 4:18, 6:1, 7:17, 17:15, 18:1, 18:11, 20:1, 20:5, 24:1, 26:19, 29:5, 29:9, 31:11, 49:19, 110:5, 163:12, 163:13, 164:10, 178:3, 181:19, 193:1, 199:14, 199:15, 201:17, 208:14, 211:16, 212:3, 212:11, 310:5 **zoning** [1] - 3:7 **zooming** [1] - 187:4