

PLANNING BOARD  
FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, April 7, 2015

7:00 p.m.

in

Second Floor Meeting Room  
344 Broadway  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

H. Theodore Cohen, Chair  
Catherine Preston Connolly, Vice Chair  
Hugh Russell, Member  
Steven Cohen, Member  
Louis J. Bacci, Jr., Member  
Ahmed Nur, Associate Member  
Thacher Tiffany, Associate Member

Iram Farooq, Acting Assistant City Manager  
for Community Development Department

**Community Development Staff:**

Jeff Roberts  
Stuart Dash  
Suzannah Bigolin

---

**REPORTERS, INC.**  
**CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD**  
617.786.7783/617.639.0396  
[www.reportersinc.com](http://www.reportersinc.com)

**I N D E X****PAGE****GENERAL BUSINESS**

Update from Acting Assistant City Manger for  
the Community Development Department 3

Continued discussion of potential zoning  
changes to the PUD-KS District. This follows  
up on the K2 zoning recommendations for the  
Volpe Center block in Kendall Square. 7

Keyword Index

**P R O C E E D I N G S**

\* \* \* \* \*

H. THEODORE COHEN: Good evening everyone. Welcome to the April 7th meeting of the Planning Board. We have just one agenda item if we go through General Business, which is a discussion between staff and the Board with regard to the creation of the PUD-KS District with regard to the Volpe site. This is a discussion and is not a public hearing, and so we do not anticipate that there will be any public comment taken unless Board Members choose to invite someone to speak or if they have any questions.

Iram, is there any scheduling update you wish to discuss?

IRAM FAROOQ: Sure. Just a reminder that no meeting next week. And then although next week the fun item is that the City

Council's Ordinance Committee will be having a public hearing on the Central Square planning which was part of the K2-C2 planning process.

And your next public hearing is on April 21st which is Chestnut Hill Realty.

And then on April 28th we will have the Normandy Twining Zoning coming back to the Board for their continued hearing.

And in between on April 22nd the City Council's Housing Committee will have their continued public hearing on the incentive zoning, which is the payment from commercial structures to the -- for -- payment to the affordable housing trust. Payment that goes to the affordable housing trust to support low, moderate, and potentially middle income housing. Some of you were at the City Council roundtable last night on Volpe, so

this in some ways will feel a bit like a follow-up discussion for those of you who were there. And I think it's fair to say that the concerns and questions that the Council asked us were very similar to the questions that you have asked over the last few months as we've discussed the -- as we've been discussing Zoning on the Volpe site, and the focus really was on housing, what's -- housing and open space? Like, what's the right amount of affordable housing? What's the right amount of middle income housing to have on, say, what should the open space look and feel like? How it should be -- how it should be engaging the public realm and how can it, how can we make sure that it has the most public feel and does not feel like a closed in corporate space.

There were some questions about the

innovation space provisions that are in K2, and also I think on the open space point what counts as open space? Because the way we have conceptualized it now, there are roadways, pathways, and some amount of rooftop space can be part of open space, but not -- well, yes.

And the -- there was a question at Council asking if that's the right set of elements, if some of those might want to be carved out of the open space provision.

Also thinking about tall buildings and what role they have to play in this part of the -- in this part of the city. I think really the -- that is kind of the set of things, the major highlights from my notes. But then many of you were there so I'm sure you'll add as we go along, but we -- I'd like to turn it over to Jeff to go into more

detail on some of the things that we talked about and kind of walk you through the next steps of the -- the next evolution of the Zoning as we see it.

All right, Jeff.

THACHER TIFFANY: What time is the housing meeting? The housing committee?

IRAM FAROOQ: I think it's 5:30 but I will, I will confirm that for you, Jeff, you should start.

THACHER TIFFANY: Okay, thanks.

JEFF ROBERTS: Okay.

Jeff Roberts Community Development.  
It's good to be here again. Can everybody hear me? Yes.

Let's start this.

IRAM FAROOQ: It's 5:30.

THACHER TIFFANY: Thank you.

JEFF ROBERTS: So we're back and we

were at the Planning Board a couple of times, first back in January and then we had sort of a continued discussion in February talking about this PUD-KS District proposal. It is a -- we're talking about a Zoning District but we're talking mostly about the Volpe Center site, a 14-acre site owned by the Federal Government in Kendall Square.

Just to bring people back up to speed on what this proposal is all about, the Kendall Square study made some recommendations that applies broadly to this area of Cambridge and had some specific Zoning recommendations applying to different areas -- subareas within the area. And this is the second of sort of four, the MIT Zoning was adopted in 2013. And on this site we're talking about, and taking an existing district, which is a PUD Overlay Zoning



District, and applying some changes to that district and the requirements in that district that would incorporate the recommendations of the K2 study. However, it would also retain some of the provisions that are existing in the current Zoning, and those include requirements for housing a strict mixed use requirement for new development in the district as well as requirements for open space.

I'm not going to go in detail through all of the different elements of the K2 recommendations. A lot of those were in the initial proposal and are still in the package of materials that we sent to the Board. And that package includes the full zoning text with suggested changes in with some notes about where we've made modifications since the initial proposal.

So, the -- when we talked to the Planning Board the last time, there were a couple of issues that -- well, there were a number of issues that were raised. And as we were processing those and summarizing them, we grouped them into two major categories and that's how we're going to review the Zoning changes.

We -- there's one set of -- as one category that has to do with urban design and open space, there were a lot of questions about the height of buildings and how the, how it would play into Planning Board review. There are also questions about the open space requirement, and we've taken a good look at those. I'm going to talk a little bit about the Zoning changes, and then I'm going to jump to the next piece talking about pieces that have to do with -- we're calling it

housing and economic considerations, because a lot of it has to do with affordability requirements as well as some other housing goals that we talked about and tried to incorporate.

After I talk through the Zoning changes, Suzannah is going to talk a little bit about some of the work that she's been doing on related to urban design guidelines which is an important piece of this and something that we've really gone back to to look at very strongly as part of this process because we think it's a really key component to make the Zoning work.

So this is just getting people situated again with the K2 plan. This is the conceptual vision that was put forward as part of that plan envisioning a mix of uses. The yellow for residential buildings, the

blue for commercial buildings within that Volpe site which is in the foreground as well as open space and looking at a denser development scheme. This looks at about just shy of three million square feet of additional development, not including the Volpe building which is going to be treated as a separate component.

And this is a version which shows about the same amount of development. It was -- this was a version that was done by CBT planners and architects as part of the East Cambridge Planning Team's sort of parallel study that was conducted while we were doing the K2 study, and it gave us an opportunity to look at it a different way. But, again, the overall scheme of it in terms of the mix of uses, the height, and the mix of open spaces all very similar.

And another element of that came from the K2 study was this notion of connections and establishing a stronger streetscape, establishing essentially pathways, connecting open spaces. This, this part of the K2 study is, was part of what launched the Connect Kendall Square competition which we talked about a little bit last time. I know some Planning Board members have stayed current with what's happening on that. I think on Thursday is when we're going to hear the announcement about the selected winner of that competition. But that process was very interesting because it gave us an opportunity to look at connections -- that question of connections and what does it mean to connect different areas of the neighborhood as well as connecting different resources within the neighborhood together and really taking

what's now kind of this master or this sort of super block scheme of Kendall Square and knitting it more into an urban fabric.

So the overall context I talked about briefly, this is just to show what those different -- where those different areas are and how the puzzle pieces sort of fit together. And one of the things that we did when we were addressing some of the Planning Board's questions was to zoom in on one particular area which we didn't really talk about the last time as an analog to this development site, and that's the Cambridge Research Park Development. You can see it's sort of in the green on this slide. And then just to the right of the slide here. That's a slightly smaller site, but it's a site that was -- it had Zoning in place, PUD Overlay Zoning. And in the late 90s, I think after a

series of different schemes was permitted by the Planning Board for a PUD which has a mix of different uses and building types. It really converted what was once sort of an urban ground field site with a lot of residual industrial uses into a much more urbanistic mix of uses and spaces.

And I just -- I bring this up to, partially to note that the Zoning for that district really doesn't have that much. It's, I think it came up yesterday that the Zoning in a lot of ways is a framework for a development on a large site like this. And in the case of this Zoning which is the PUD-3 District, it establishes just very simply what the aggregate floor area limitations are, the height limitations, the parking, whatever the parking requirements are. It has a minimum 15 percent open space

requirement and some other provisions, particularly criteria that would inform the Planning Board's review. And what came out as a result of that, is a project with a mix of housing and commercial development. It wasn't required to have that, but it ultimately, through the Planning Board review process and the ongoing development and also just the -- partly the -- I think the willpower of the person who was behind the development resulted in this mix of uses. It has open space. The open space is more than what the minimum requirement is. That's actually often the case in PUD developments. Last time I talked about North Point, which has more open space than required. And I think most importantly it has a -- it has a system of streets of pathways and open spaces and a mix of different uses that really sort



of fit together and contribute more positively to the whole. And I think that's -- it just helps to illustrate what we're looking for through a development on the Volpe site and how a major part of that process is not what occurs at the Zoning stage but what occurs at that subsequent review stage.

And so as sort of inspired by that, one of the major modifications that we went forward with was to lay out a much more descriptive set of requirements for what would need to be provided in a master plan which is sort of one of the way that PUDs can be permitted and what would be, what would be included in that. And that's all described in the Zoning and it's laid out here, but the point of having all of those different components laid out is so that the Planning

Board can have a clear set of criteria and guidelines, which Suzannah will talk about a little bit later that will help inform how a proposal performs in covering all of these elements.

One of the things that I wanted to note in particular is that we've introduced a -- it may seem a little bit subtle, but we've introduced a new concept in this formulation of a master plan, of a housing plan. I think in the past we've looked at PUDs as showing simply what sites are commercial and what sites are residential. I think for this, just given the interest in housing, we think it's important for a development proposal to go that one step further and really talk more about what's the quality and the character of the housing is they anticipate, what are the mix of unit types going to be? Is it going

to be -- where is the housing? Is it going to accommodate families? Where is the housing that may accommodate single workers or seniors? And how does that orient itself to the overall development in terms of where the interfaces are with open space with a neighborhood, with amenities like ground floor retail. These are all elements that would come out in a much stronger way as part of this review than I think we've seen in the past.

I just wanted to touch briefly on height and we did in our modifications based on the Planning Board's comments go through those criteria in the Zoning for the Planning Board to evaluate buildings that are taller. I just wanted to show this because I realize I neglected in the package to resubmit the height map, but I wanted to remind everyone

of what the overall idea is. We've not recommended any changes at this point to the height limits, but the idea is to have a more flexible requirement of -- between 250 and 300 feet, and that would be 300 feet only for residential uses in this core part of the site and where it's adjacent to other commercial uses. And then as it gets closer to residential uses in the neighborhood, those height limitations would be reduced.

And so now we get into open space, and that was really one of the key issues that the Planning Board talked about in the past and was discussed last night. And so we wanted to really dial it all the way back and think about well, what is it -- what are the reasons that we really care about open space on this site? What is it that we're trying to accomplish? And I think that size is a

factor here. I think certainly it matters. And this is a site where we're anticipating having a significant amount of open space that's going to be accessible and available to the public. But size isn't really the only thing. I think the level of accessibility is also important and other aspects that have come through in the Connect Kendall Square competition, like the quality of the open space, the relationship to buildings, how it might be programmed, and what kind of activities that we might anticipate would take place there.

And in terms of the Zoning, again, looking at what, sort of what Zoning can and can't do. Zoning can set what the hard requirements are. We can set a minimum size requirement which we, which we imagine -- which will have to be met and we might

imagine can be exceeded. So the question came up the last time, well, if we set the minimum too low, then are we locking ourselves into that low number? And I don't necessarily think that's true. I think that setting a lower minimum means more flexibility in site arrangement but doesn't necessarily lock the city or the Planning Board into having to accept a number of -- an amount of open space that's felt to be not adequate.

And then the accessibility requirements, a lot of that has to do with the definitions that we apply of what's private or what's publicly accessible, what's public, what's owned and controlled by the public versus what might be in terms of other, in other categories.

The other elements of it really are

more addressed through that site plan review and master plan review process. And so we did look at that very closely in terms of design guidelines, and Suzannah will talk about some of the work we've done in that area in the second part.

So the modifications that we've proposed at the last time we talked about how the current Zoning had a sort of this two-tier system of a 42 percent open space requirement. That's actually only about six acres of open space on the site, as well as a requirement that seven and a half acres has to be a public park. That's actually more than the 42 percent. So part of it was we were trying to sort of make sense of those numbers. And I think what we arrived at is that we would want to recommend that it really just be one number. The requirement

for open space should be one figure. We recommended it be 40 percent. Why 40 and not 42 percent? Again, it's -- it has to do with a little bit more of flexibility and it also has to do with the fact that we are -- we're changing what the standards are for that 40 percent. While the current Zoning says that the 42 percent includes all open space of any type, what we're saying is that within that 40 percent, we're only focusing in on that open space that is going to contribute to the public realm and be truly accessible to the public. And in this case it includes -- we've characterized it to include public pathways and connections that connect desire lines. We've included public parks and gathering spaces, significant gathering spaces, and have also pulled into that definition open space that is publicly



beneficial that's available on the federal facility parcel itself. And we talked a little bit about -- and it was discussed at the meeting last night, and we talked the last time about what is this -- what is really the quality and character of this federal open space? And as we heard more about it and learned more about it, we started to feel not only that it can play an important role in the overall system of public open space in this area, but we think it really must play an important and interconnected role in the open space system. So one of the pieces of the Planning Board review is going to be looking at not just what the amount of open space is but in terms of the federal open space, how well is that connected and integrated with the rest of the open space on the site to really make it a

true system.

So I want to talk a little bit about something that some of you have seen at the presentation last night. We did spend a little time taking both the open space requirements and the height requirements, the allowable gross floor area, and looking at the -- somewhat at the Kendall Square, the Kendall Square design guidelines that were developed through the K2 study, and we started to try to apply that to this site. And there are some things that this helps to show you us. It helps to show us what, what some of the alternatives are. Whether there really is enough flexibility to accommodate this development with this arrangement in height limits and arrangements of open space, but also, you know, what are the -- once you put all these different things together, how

do they affect one another? There are certain things that this does not do. It doesn't really talk about architectural quality. It doesn't talk about sort of some of the detailed issues with site design and relationship between buildings. There's a lot of -- I just want to make sure that we point out a lot of detail that's not necessarily covered in this.

I also wanted to point out that while you'll certainly see that some of these look familiar, if you looked at the Connect Kendall Square proposals, we were inspired by those when we were trying to come up with different ranges of open space. I want to make sure that we're clear, these are not exact representations of what those, what those proposals were. I think we were using those as a starting point, but we were also

trying to show a little bit more, in a little bit more of an accurate way what we think of -- if we look at just the incorporating the buildings themselves and the amount of square footage, that would be accommodated, we wanted to, we wanted to make sure that we were really comparing apples to apples when we were looking at these alternatives.

So these are -- so these are four of the alternatives that we came to look at. And I'm just going to go through them to talk a little bit about what -- sort of what they show and what we've learned.

This is a version that takes the open space and has them a little bit more distributed throughout the site so that there's a little bit of open space on each portion but they're all interconnected. We also, you know, in fact, in all of these we

looked very strongly at what we think a connected street system should be for this. And those, again, they're not, it's not well defined whether those streets would be, you know, full, sort of city streets, just like any other city street or whether it would be more limited in terms of access or vehicular access. The idea is to use those in a way to sort of break down the size of the blocks to -- in a way that's more consistent with what's in the neighborhood.

So as you can see from here, there's a -- the buildings have -- they are -- they're not all at the maximum height. There is some variation in height and some articulation abilities to articulate the massing, but it's -- but in this case there is -- a lot of the buildings are reaching 200 feet or more.

This is a version that looks at if all the open space was concentrated on -- oh, and actually, I should say more specifically, this is -- we'll call it six-plus acres of open space. It's hard to nail down an exact figure, but this -- we wanted to look at options that would comfortably meet the 40 percent open space requirement, and this is six acres of open space.

And again, here this is a similar amount of open space but all concentrated in one area. And what you see is a result here the buildings would have to really maximize the height a lot more and they'd have to be much closer together, so there's less of a separation between buildings which is one of the key urban design guidelines in the Kendall Square guidelines to try to have, try to maintain as buildings get taller, to

maintain more separation. This kind of scheme becomes a bit more difficult to do that.

Here's a scheme that's maybe a little bit in between with some larger open space and some smaller open space. Again, the buildings get to be fairly tall, but you can see there's a little bit more articulation and a little bit more variation in the height as well as a bit more separation between the buildings.

And this is the option that actually reduces the open space a bit, reduces it to more like five and a half acres so it's closer to what the minimum requirement would be. And here you can see there's less total open space, but there is much more variation in the heights. I don't know if the heights are easy to read on this or not. Maybe

they're not.

AHMED NUR: The blue ones are not.

JEFF ROBERTS: Okay. I'm sorry.

Well, what you see here are heights that range -- so the heights along this section remain at that lowered maximum of 85 feet here and 120 feet here, and in the previous examples, as you get into this area closer to Broadway, a lot more buildings are at the -- in that range between 200 and 300 feet. And here you see them ranging more from the buildings of 65 feet to 85 feet to 180 feet to 200 to 250. And there's a lot more variations and a lot more play in the heights of buildings.

So, and I think Suzannah is going to talk a little bit more about the issues having to do with the quality of the open space and how everything connects. But I'm



going to shift a little bit just to stay on the Zoning piece to talk about the housing question and economic considerations which we talked a little bit about in the material that we sent you. And where we left off the last time in February, we talked about this balance between the cost of a project and the value of a project and how, you know, privately financed project in order for it to go forward, you have to find some way for those things -- for the value of the project to support the cost. And so we looked at that a little bit more closely. We tried to put together a bit of a -- just a summary of what all of the different things that are being layered into this Zoning. So you have the cost of a typical development project in terms of the construction. Parking is a big part of that construction cost, whether it's

above grade or below grade. Below grade could be very, very expensive. And then the financing. And financing is sort of what it is now, but it can change over time. We may see financing costs go up at some point in the future.

And then all of the city requirements that have costs associated with them. So anywhere that we're requiring something that places a restriction or a limitation on how a private developer can use that land it has a cost implication. And then the big piece of this I think is we've acknowledged the federal component of it. The notion that this is not a -- it's not a cash transaction. It's an equity transaction, meaning that the Federal Government is going to be expecting services in the form of a -- the construction of an approximately 400,000 square foot

facility which has fairly significant costs. We looked at some of the numbers that have been done for the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, looking at what those construction costs are, it could be \$300 or \$400 square foot. And this is something that a developer would have to do upfront and not really be expecting a return from it the same way that a private building would get that return.

This is just to note that there are some costs sort of down at the bottom, anything where the city's requiring a payment is a fairly fixed cost, developer can say with pretty clear certainty what the cost of that is going to be. Many of the other costs are somewhat known, but are -- can be extremely variable. Financing can be variable over years, it can change.

Construction costs can be very variable. All

the things that go along with construction costs can still vary. And then the federal, that federal portion of it possibly very sizable portion of the cost is something that we don't really, we don't really know, might be able to guess but we're not really sure what that's going to be at this point.

And then we also took a look at some of this information to say well, what is the value that's going to be balancing this out? And we borrowed just kind of -- I feel a little bit bad, sort of cherry picking from things, but this is some information that HR and A Advisors did for the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority. And the point of showing this is to note a few things:

First of all, there can be a range of variability when it comes to the cost. When it comes to the value of a project, but also

to point out just the really significant difference between the value of lab development in Kendall Square, commercial lab development in Kendall Square, and development of residential developments in Kendall Square. And that gets very relevant, I think, when we sort of talk about affordable housing requirements because this is the -- this is a value estimate that was done based on what the current inclusionary housing requirements are for Cambridge. And as more -- as if there is any additional affordable housing requirements that get layered on to this, that, that starts to really bring down the value of the portion of the project that already has relatively the less value to it. So it really can be some significant impacts of making variations that affect that cost and value balance. And a

lot of it is really unknown at this point, but we still, we still have to be conscious of that.

I wanted to --

STEVEN COHEN: Jeff?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: Can I just interrupt? Going back to the value again. Are you saying those are rental rents?

JEFF ROBERTS: No.

STEVEN COHEN: What do you mean by the --

JEFF ROBERTS: Now I'm going to have to explain. This was an analysis that was done that looked at supportable land value. So essentially what it's saying is that one way to describe it is to say if you were just going into the private market to buy land to develop, how much, you know, would you want

to be paying for that land.

STEVEN COHEN: I see.

JEFF ROBERTS: So it's a way of looking at if you buy land that supports, you know, X square feet of lab development, the value might be \$120 to \$175 times X.

STEVEN COHEN: Gotcha.

JEFF ROBERTS: So the thing that's interesting about this analysis is when looking at this particular site and this particular case, is that it takes the land cost out of the -- sort of out of the equation. It looks at just the development cost. And because we're looking at a proposal that's going to be balancing, not paying directly for land, but balancing, you know, for value against cost of constructing a building, it gives us the ability to do a little bit of the comparison. And we have

tried to crunch the numbers a bit. I mean, when I've tried to crunch the numbers a bit, what I found out it's difficult to nail down an exact answer because of the availability and the range. They're going to be in the same ballpark I think. If you look at -- if you add up all the costs of this, of what the -- what the proposal is structured as against the value of three million square feet of development that we're anticipating, there's going to be a relatively close balance and it's hard to make a judgment as to whether it's going to be strongly one way or the other.

So I wanted to just move from there to talk about something that I think is -- that I think we really can't miss in this, which is that the K2 study really placed a very strong priority on the development of



housing, and even -- and within that study, the Volpe site was particularly looked at as an area that would really support a great portion of that housing development. So -- and if you remember from the first picture, the Volpe site itself is within the larger context of Kendall Square, it's not really that big, but we're looking at about -- I think about a thousand units of housing that exists in the district now. Looking at about a thousand new units being created on everything that's not the Volpe site, and then a thousand units or more just on the Volpe site itself.

So putting this together, putting that point together with the last slide and analyzing the difference between commercial and residential development in Kendall Square I think is really important because, you

know, one way you might consider to create more value of the project and create more public benefits is to allow a greater balance of commercial versus residential development. But I think we -- we have to remember that in terms of the benefit that this project is going to be creating, it's not just about the affordable units and it's not just about other things that a developer would pay for that the city would then receive. It's really about trying to create a much stronger residential character and mixed use character in Kendall Square as a whole, and that's key to supporting everything having to do with activating the open space, connecting to neighborhoods, supporting ground floor retail, and really creating a more lively area that's active and into the evening and during weekends. So that's something that we

always -- I think it's important for me at least as I start to get into the details to step back and remember that this is something that's creating a significant amount of housing is really something that we're trying really hard to do.

I showed this the last time we had a presentation, just doing a little comparison of mixed use projects, and I think the point is still the same, which is that in Kendall Square a lot of the mixed use projects that we've seen have -- some of them have provided a greater percentage to affordable housing, but overall the balance has really been much more commercial development than residential. And, again, we're -- because here we're -- we have a much greater component of housing that we're requiring and that we're expecting even though the -- even if the percentages are

what they are under current inclusionary, the amount of housing that we're generating is really very significant. And, again, just comparing, just looking at the percentages even under the current inclusionary requirements, we're looking at a substantial contribution of affordable housing.

And, again, so here's the -- just the numerical break down of all of that. We're looking at a, you know, looking at again about a thousand units of housing up to a thousand units of housing, and we're looking at as a component of that, up to about 150 affordable housing units under current inclusionary requirements. And those units I would say are more or less guaranteed because if the Zoning is adopted and then implemented as it's proposed, they would, they would need to build that full base of residential in

order to be able to maximize the commercial development. So I think there was some conversation the last time about would those affordable low to moderate income units, would they actually be produced? And I think we could be fairly confident that they would.

In the middle income housing category we have the incentive provision which allows greater heights in exchange for providing middle income units. We would still retain that. I think there was still some question about is that strong enough, and we looked at that more closely and I'll talk about that in a second.

I wanted to also jump to talking about the incentive zoning provisions, which I didn't -- we talked about it the last time, I didn't put a number on it. So the -- for every square foot of commercial development

in a PUD, they're required to make payments to the Affordable Housing Trust. Those payments can be used very flexibly. And one of the things that we've been talking about is ways that the -- ways that incentive zoning or payments, payments to the Affordable Housing Trust might be turned back to turn down the affordability in private development. And that could be done elsewhere in the city where it's found to be needed. It could also be within this project itself, within a PUD project itself. Those incentive zoning payments could be used to say well, if we can use that to subsidize, can we get a greater percentage? And it can be done through a direct negotiation over and based on what the economic considerations are of the time and what the prices might be.

In terms of the total number, we

imagine that it would be between around 15 and 18 million going into the Affordable Housing Trust. And that would be just under the what's recommended by the current -- by the incentive zoning study that was completed. The City Council still has to review and act on it. That could very well change through that review. So we don't know what the final number would be.

And then I also would note on this slide that -- and we note it in the material, that we have another study going on of the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and the City's Inclusionary Housing Policy, looking comprehensively at both the economics of providing affordable housing as well as the need for affordable housing in the city, updating the needs assessment that was done back in 1997 which that was the basis of the

original inclusionary ordinance. So we will know a lot more about what the need is for for affordable housing and what the expectations could be when that, when that study is completed. Our recommendation at this point was to -- oh, and another important point that was, that we made is that any change that is made citywide, would also apply to this district. So if the Zoning is constructed such that the inclusionary housing requirements apply, then any future that apply before any PUD project is permitted would carry through there as well.

So our recommendation in that study also is including middle income housing. So it's including all income levels up to 120 percent of area and median income.

So in terms of middle income housing, I



just wanted to -- we had a conversation. I realize that there still may be a little bit of confusion about how that height incentive works. That in order to get to 300 feet of height for a residential project, 25 percent of the floor area above that is the amount -- equals the amount of middle income housing that would need to be provided. That could be distributed throughout the building, it would be distributed throughout the building, but because the requirement is based on square footage and not necessarily based on units, it provides the opportunity to get those to be larger unit sizes. And, again, this is part of the -- this would be part of the Planning Board's review of the project. It's something that the Planning Board would be able to say to a developer, but that they need to either provide more clarity or to do

better to meet the goals for middle income housing if that's, if that's something that's going to be included in the project.

So there were some other things that we wanted to include regarding housing and they weren't specifically brought up but at the last discussion on Volpe they've been brought up by the Board in the past. Wanting units that are for families with children. Those are unit types that we've found that the market currently is not, is not producing as many of those units as we would like it to be producing, and so having some requirements in place are important. We just, as an initial step, we propose having a minimum baseline requirement of five percent for three-bedroom units, and that's something that could look at some more. And then just looking -- and this goes back to looking at the question of

having a housing plan, looking more generally of the liveability of units and factors that have to do with really how, how well does housing perform not just in terms of providing units but in terms of providing neighborhood character, having access and relationships to open space. We talked about things like having storage, making sure that these units were really going to be -- they're really going to work well with residents who are families and other residents who might be living there for a longer term.

And then this last slide is really just a summary of the modifications we made. We've modified the purpose a little bit to go through some of the urban design goals that we talked about.

We updated the requirements for a PUD

proposal which I talked about a little bit. And Suzannah will talk a little bit more about in terms of the design guidelines.

We updated the open space requirements as I described.

We updated the height review criteria, which Suzannah is going to talk about a little bit more.

And in terms of the housing, we have -- we've added those additional provisions for three-bedroom and family size units.

So I'm going to turn it over to Suzannah now and she'll talk to the design guidelines and hopefully we'll have as much time as we want to go over questions and discuss it further. So I look forward to doing that.

Thanks.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Thanks, Jeff.

Thanks. Suzannah Bigolin, CDD.

As Jeff said, we went over the study as part of the PUD project and following the Planning Board's initial comments. And we looked back at the design guidelines and realized there is sort of comprehensive in those, in terms of active frontages and the form of built form that's required.

We noted that in regard to the Volpe site there is a bit of a gap when it comes visions for the site and the sort of site planning and the overall sort of open space and building configuration and connectivity as well. We've proposed to attach some additional guidelines to the overall Kendall Square guidelines, and these are to focus on the sort of urban structure which includes the layout of connections, open space, and buildings. It's the relationship of these

elements that will form the future sort of, of the site and they will sort of come together to create a place, so that's the most important element.

The vision synthesizes a lot of the background information. So it looks at the analysis we undertook as well, and it's driven the changes to the PUD purpose and also the master plan objectives in the criteria that we've included. And it's about creating a place that's recognizable and that also strengthens the local identity and also about integrating the Volpe site with the surrounding urban fabric. So connecting to Kendall Square and also the eastern Cambridge neighborhoods.

And its focus is on creating as many different places and stitching them together as a community.

The height and massing elements, the Zoning speaks about a site massing plan and the guidelines then sort of expand upon what's required. So we would be looking at variation in interesting building heights, the podium levels, and looking at how we can scale down new building of sensitive interfaces. And we also want to consider the location of tall buildings as they relate to K-views and how they can sort of enhance and identify Kendall Square by defining edges or intersections and also serving as landmarks.

So there's just an example there of the University Park building heights type of plan that was prepared for that. So that looks at the layout of building forms and the massing, and then also the sort of higher, taller elements. So that's the type of -- sort of requirements that we'd be looking for.

With regard to the building height criteria, we have sort of amended that to be more consistent with the design guidelines, so that would apply to building heights above 125 feet, and it would be what the Planning Board needs to consider in regard to such buildings. So that is also looking at the shadow and wind impacts and light and wind impacts and how the spacing between buildings impacts those issues is a key element. And that's sort of expanded upon in the overall Kendall Square guidelines. And it's basically about establishing a strong podium form that will frame public spaces and streets and that's more of a human scale. And then as you step up to a taller height, you need to step back. So there will be more spacing between the tower forms that's required in the design guidelines.



And just to note, this site layout options we studied did generally comply with these sort of separation and setbacks, although in some cases they didn't because of the overall sort of open space demands.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Suzannah, could you just give us some information, not just talking about height, but stories? So 85 feet is what, seven stories?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Around seven, yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And 125 is eleven -- ten, eleven?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Ten, eleven.

HUGH RUSSELL: If you're talking residential or commercial.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, so if we're talking residential.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I would say ten

to twelve.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, ten to twelve, maybe eleven as an average.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And the residential that could go up to 300 let's say, what are we talking about 27, 26? 25?

HUGH RUSSELL: 25, 27, something like that.

AHMED NUR: Twelve feet ceiling.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And what is the tallest building in Cambridge right now?

HUGH RUSSELL: Eastgate.

JEFF ROBERTS: The tallest building is currently in Cambridge and the Green Building at MIT, and I think there's a couple other buildings, maybe Eastgate is maybe above 300 feet, 310. Maybe 315. That's as tall as it goes in Cambridge.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: And in Kendall

Square the Marriott, I think, is around 250. With the mechanicals it might be taller. And then the Broad, the new Broad and Ames Street housing are all around 250.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: With the connectivity aspects of the design guidelines, it's really about creating the intrinsic part of Kendall Square and not the connected island that it is at the moment. This is an example of the site planning elements that we need to consider, and looking at the connections through the site and avoiding the cul-de-sacs and the campus-style suburban office development form that has previously occurred. And it's so hoping to create a lot of pedestrian/cyclist approach that integrates with the surrounding urban form and community.

As part of this element, we're looking at a connectivity plan that will need to be provided as part of the master plan, and that will identify the -- sort of all the different kind of connections that we hope will sort of variance scale for more intimate alleyways and then to more landscaped major streets. So there will be a multiplicity of pathways of connections through the sites, and the hope is that it creates a much more safe accessible lively and diversity street in Kendall Square.

One of the key connections that has been identified mostly through the Connect Kendall competition is the connection to Broad Canal, and that's a significant opportunity for this site. So the guidelines we've prepared seem to improve that connection.

And then also overall looking at high quality pedestrian and bicyclist connections throughout the PUD. So that's throughout all uses including the Federal Government site, residential, commercial as well.

The guidelines also look at the high level of sort of active frontages that need to take place along these connections. So high levels of transparency. And this idea of seamlessness between indoor and outdoor spaces, and there's just some examples there already occurring in Kendall Square.

With more sort of consideration of the open space as Jeff mentioned, the overall objective is to look at creating a cohesive network of high quality open spaces and places and that's expected to be a key feature of the site. And obviously it was a key aspect of the Connect Kendall

competition. So we're looking at the hierarchy of different places and that will include hubs, parks, gardens, courtyards, small gathering spaces, play areas, so it will be a variety of spaces that need to be provided in the open space plan that will form the master plan.

And then a key component will be the idea of a public gathering space or public park, and that's to encourage community events and civic engagements either in a central location, and I think the councillors or one of the councillors mentioned that last night they would prefer a central location or a key location at gateways or entries to the site. And I might just add the guidelines aren't strict limitations, so creative solutions and measures can always be a part of the PUD process and that's up to the

Planning Board in their decisionmaking.

We also found that there's a need for a really strong visual and physical connections through the site. And, again, that's to Broad Canal and Point Park. And the idea is that you can see through the site. You have a view lined out of the site and connections to sunlight and greenery when you're in the building.

IRAM FAROOQ: Do any of the Board Members have thoughts from yesterday's discussion while Jeff is rebooting the computer?

HUGH RUSSELL: I thought the Council members were very interested in a lot of things that don't interest us, like how do we get control over the Federal Government. The most provocative suggestion is Leland Cheung who suggested that we should have a thousand

foot building in Kendall Square and I'll come back to that later.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: The guidelines also encourage consideration to solar outer space. So we don't want them to be dominated by buildings. We want these spaces to be protected from wind and highly, lots of plantings and greenery.

We also looked at the rooftop open space as -- that has potential to provide something different and unique and can be successful, and it also does provide for flexibility. So it is an option that we have included in the design guidelines and in the Zoning text changes, but some of the ideas behind a successful rooftop open space would be looking at accessibility, the connection to adjacent buildings and also preferably with visual connections to sidewalks and



nearby buildings.

As part of the Connect Kendall process, the idea of open space is a way to create more of a way finding approach throughout Kendall Square, was a key sort of component or idea expressed. So we're wanting open space to look at ways that it can sort of assist with way finding, and that may potentially be at strategic points, and intersections have been identified in that plan and also looking at enhancing the green spine and open space length through the site.

These final elements have really come through the Connect Kendall competition and looking at sort of ways to make Kendall Square or the site much more fun and inviting through way finding, public art, and sculpture. And that's also to help identify Kendall Square and enhance its identity to

looking at ways that we can sort of identify that throughout the open space plan that we want from the master plan and hopefully that will be a component of the PUD. And the main ideas from the Connect Kendall competition have looked at the idea of sort of blending a public art and science and technology as a way to sort of identify Kendall Square.

And then another consistent aspect in the competition entries was programming and creating a more active district. So that's an element that we've included in the design guidelines. Looking at different social activities that can be incorporated and also looking at different days, times, weekends, and throughout the years, so seasonal plantings and how we can enhance these different programmatic ideas throughout the Volpe site.

The guidelines then also do talk about the relationship between public open space and private open space. And the idea there is we want to create a seamlessness between public and private, and that's been principally driven by the government open space and how it can be a component of the overall network. So we're looking at wanting to encourage active edges, more of an inviting, sort of accessible approach. And then that seamlessness between private and public.

And that summarizes the design guideline change.

Thank you.

JEFF ROBERTS: So I'll just, I guess, close off by saying that, you know, what we presented in the material, we sent you and what we talked about tonight

represents kind of a snapshot of a lot of work and thought that Suzannah and I and along with Midge Lee, our research associate, have really worked on, and Stuart who is on the other side of the computer.

And so we presented this in the form of a draft zoning text and a set of design guidelines. The idea is that there is still a lot of policy decisions and discussions that need to be had, need to be made. At some point the next step in the process will be for the Planning Board when they feel it's at an appropriate level, we forward it to the City Council with a Zoning Petition, and then it would essentially come back to the Planning Board as well as to the City Council for public hearings and there will be ongoing process and discussion. We would probably give a lot more presentations like this. And

ultimately would come to the City Council for the possibility of a vote. Before that the Planning Board would have the opportunity to give a recommendation. It's not unusual for the Planning Board to submit a petition, have it come back, and then make more recommended changes.

But I just wanted to make sure that everyone on the Board was aware of how the process would work. But certainly we're happy to, as well as answering questions, happy to work on any additional elements or the Board could suggest changes that we would be happy to make based on your discussion tonight or in future meetings.

So with that I'll turn it over to you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jeff, thank you so much, and thank, you, and, Iram and Suzannah and Stuart and everyone else who has

worked on this. You've done a tremendous amount of work and a tremendous amount of presentation for us. And I think, you know, there are a lot of issues that we need to talk about amongst ourselves that we haven't really discussed. And I think yesterday was, you know, a thousand foot building aside, was very informative being at the City Council roundtable and hearing each councillor's individual point of view. And, you know, I think, you know, it was presented to them that the Zoning will be a framework for the development of Volpe parcel. And everybody wants to make sure that what is developed is the best result we can get and that it will be a beautiful area that will have the amenities that we want, that it will have the housing we want, the public space we want, and will be a great benefit to the city. And

obviously we're asking the City a lot and we're asking of the ultimate developer a lot, and so they're going to have to be tradeoffs I think in recommendations we make and submit decision that the City Council makes as to, you know, where to go and which direction. And so, you know, I understand there are some issues that we may not be able to resolve right now, but I would like us to talk about them and to bring them out on to the table and see what we're all thinking about it. I don't know if we will reach any consensus, certainly not tonight and maybe over the next couple of meetings we will get closer to consensus or we'll reach a point where we say some people think, you know, we want height versus open space. Or some people say we want more affordable housing versus something else. And then it will ultimately be up to

the City Council to make the decision. And of course we have to keep in mind that as Jeff pointed out, you know, there are costs and values. And that at some point things may simply get, may be too demanding and things will be too expensive and developers are simply going to say I can't do this and walk away. And, you know, we don't want to kill the goose with the golden egg, but we want to make sure we can get everything that we think we can get and that is beneficial to the city.

So I don't know whether we want to talk about subject wise or we just go around the table.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Can I ask a question of staff before we dive in?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Certainly.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Jeff,



in going through this and then in hearing you and Suzannah both present, as a threshold question I want to understand the difference between public open space and publicly beneficial open space. Because my reading of the definition would suggest that the federal -- federally-owned open space would in fact be public open space, not publicly beneficial open space. But the way it was being talked about made it sound like because wasn't owned by the City of Cambridge, you were treating it as publicly beneficial. Is that correct?

JEFF ROBERTS: I'll try to describe it this way because it is pretty complicated, I acknowledge that.

You know, public open space has -- under the Zoning definition there's different types of open space.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

JEFF ROBERTS: There's public open space, there's publicly beneficial open space, there's green space, there's various other things. Public -- it's true public open space doesn't necessarily need to be owned by the City, but it generally has to have some use limitations that will essentially enable it to be accessible to the public at all reasonable times. I think the issue when it comes to the federal open space, is maybe just the jurisdictional issues that the City would not be able to put limitations on space that is owned and controlled by a Federal Government entity. So it's partly just a way to have some flexibility in the Zoning because we do want to be able to include that both numerically and just in terms of the overall site

planning and connectedness of the open space. We want the federal open space to be a part of that system, but we also have to acknowledge that we, we are limited in our ability to put real restrictions on it from a legal standpoint.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, following up on that, I'm just curious, in the Moakley Courthouse, that we've got a picture of up there, there's the walkway around the courthouse. Is that federal space or is that city space? Does anybody know?

JEFF ROBERTS: It is federal space.

IRAM FAROOQ: It's federal.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's federal space. Is the entire walkway around the courthouse federal space?

IRAM FAROOQ: I believe so. I mean, I think this is useful for us to hear. I

don't think our response is a firm response.  
We can certainly --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

IRAM FAROOQ: Now that you raised it, we should discuss a little bit more on the staff side because in some ways what's more public than the Federal Government?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.  
And the definition actually does contemplate or other public entities.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So I mean I guess that's where I get kind of confused. Is I get that the Federal Government owns and controls their own space, and conceivably we can count something as public open space and then, you know, the very next day they change it into something totally not open space. So I get what you're

saying about the control aspect of it, but it does -- as we struggle with the -- I mean, with the publicly beneficial versus public aspect of it, it would help to understand why federal space wouldn't be public. Because I guess -- and I guess I'm betraying my bias here is I would like to focus on the public, although frankly it is mostly because there are aspects of the definition of publicly beneficial, like, that it has to be -- that it -- publicly beneficial can count as something that is visible but not physically accessible. That to me is of limited value. And so to the extent I can put everything in the public open space category which doesn't include such outs, I would rather do that. But --

JEFF ROBERTS: Well, that's an area where we've been more explicit in the Zoning

for this district than anything that's counted within that has to be not just visible to the public but truly has to be publicly accessible. So that's the --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So then I think you get into a drafting challenge because you're using a defined term that includes those and then you're contradicting it.

JEFF ROBERTS: I'd, I'd contemplated things like creating a whole new category of open space to refer to open space just in this district and decided that was maybe a little too much, but I know absolutely of what you're talking about because I've thought through all of these issues when trying to draft it.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay.

JEFF ROBERTS: And I think the idea

was just to try to leave as much flexibility as we could so that we don't get ourselves into a legal quandary down the road, but also make the intent very clear that all of this open space that's in that required amount is part of a public open space system.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: All right. Thank you.

JEFF ROBERTS: Whether it -- whoever owns it and however it's controlled.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

HUGH RUSSELL: Could I follow up on that?

I think we're talking about the 40 percent; is that right?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Uh-huh.

HUGH RUSSELL: So what kinds of things that aren't building count in the 40

percent? I mean obviously, you know, plazas, walkways do. Do service streets that might be shared, do those count?

THACHER TIFFANY: Pathways.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think that's at our discretion based on my reading of it. Is that if a street is primarily vehicular but could allow for pedestrian and cycling and other forms of use, that's at the Planning Board's discretion as to whether or not it counts.

Is that correct, Jeff? Is that the intent?

JEFF ROBERTS: The intent is that there are some spaces that might serve an open space function, but it would depend on how it's designed, how it's used, how accessible it is, how connected it is to the rest of the network. That's why we left some



of those categories subject to Planning Board approval because absent any context it's hard to say whether a service road or a shared street would be, would really serve that function of being open space until you actually see it as part of an overall design.

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, it makes a lot of difference to me. You have 40 percent in one category. If there then have to be other spaces added on to that. In many Zoning Ordinances, but not in ours, there's a lot coverage restriction. Tend to be in suburban towns, they tend to be fairly low numbers, you know, 10, 15, 20 percent trying to enforce some kind of suburban aesthetic. But everybody talking about that the 40 percent is really just another way of saying buildings can't cover more than 60 percent of the land?

JEFF ROBERTS: It's partly that, but it's also, it's also meant to, meant to indicate that the space that is not occupied by buildings is meant to be usable functional space that allows pedestrian access and public access and provides space for recreation and public gathering that we don't want to see. For instance, 60 percent lot coverage and the rest being surface parking. That wouldn't be consistent with the goals that we have with the district. And just to answer the question more specifically, anything that's not building and not open space, a lot of that would be surface parking if that were something that were included. Part of the role of having this open space requirements is it's another mechanism that provides for better urban design and moving the parking in places where it's not in the

public realm.

HUGH RUSSELL: But for example we might -- if the -- those cross streets that show on your studies are actually streets, that cars can go on and that shops might be on, we might actually want to see some parking on those streets just as a way of enhancing the access to the retail and reinforcing the retail.

I'm digging into this because I want it to be clear to the people who are trying to understand the design it what counts. And the greyer it is, the harder it is. And also the larger the number, the -- there's a -- you end up with a -- the larger the number, the higher the buildings. So I just been trying to do a simple calculation. Because I understand that the FAR in the district is to be 47.0; is that correct?

And if you take the 400,000 square feet of the Volpe Center and divide it by a total area of 14 acres, that's 0.7 FAR. So, and then if you give a 30 percent bonus in floor area to 40 percent of the development program, i.e. the housing, that's another 1.2 FAR. So the, so the FAR is effectively 6. Now if you're only going to use 60 percent of the site for buildings, that means the average building has to be ten stories tall. And which is 110 to 150 feet not counting mechanicals which might, on the non-residential building might be entire stories. And the studies that you have presented here are -- vary somewhat, but, you know, it -- I think that's the conclusion these studies come to, that the average building is going to be ten or twelve stories tall. And so I'm wondering if we need to

build in a little bit more looseness into the requirements and there might be -- so that it can't be -- so that it doesn't get to be too uniformly. It doesn't look like the one in the upper left-hand corner and the other two -- I studied these for two hours last night because we didn't get a chance to speak. We got a chance to listen. And, you know, basically the heights max, is maximized out for like the half the site. It's a real, real chunk of it. And the ways you can get more flexibility is to lower the amount of open space or conversely count more things in what's open space. So that's if you do that, if you reduce that requirement to 25 percent, that would reduce the height from ten, average height from ten-stories to eight stories, which is not overwhelming if -- it's pretty overwhelming if that much reduction of

open space. Although the David Glenn's project, the Cambridge Research Park now called Kendall Square? Is -- has got 22 percent open space. And in fact, the open space in that seems quite generous. The buildings are big and fat and so the spaces between them can be big and fat essentially and also it tags on to the adjacent space in the Broad Canal which helps.

So, I would advocate trying to give them more flexibility in what is counted as open space so that they might be able to have a creative possibilities. And then I would adopt maybe 40 percent of the Leland Cheung's suggestion of allowing the housing to go up a little higher. A little. Another 100 feet say. A lot. But, you know, a few towers of 400 feet rising out of a mass that's mostly 250 -- for a while I was thinking well, why

don't we write the Zoning so you got to build a building like the building -- the John Hancock building in Chicago. It's a single tower. It's got open space around it. It's 100 stories or 110 stories tall. There's housing on top. There's a hotel. There's offices. There's five floors of parking I think above grade in that building. And then you have lots of open space. The FAA might not let us do it, but they might. I mean, I don't think that's what we want to do. But I think to the extent that we have a few buildings that are 300 feet tall now out of the city rising out of a base that may be 100, if the base in this section ramps up a little bit, maybe the tallest parts can get a little taller and maybe we can leverage some more middle income housing out of that height. Put it in as a possibility, not an

expectation. Because, again, I look at these things and I don't mean to criticize them, but if you're a designer, you're going to try to be cleverer than if you're a planner.

Another comment I'd make in open space is that the Council, several people on Council expressed the idea that the open space should be in the middle of the development. I think that's -- I think there should be some open space in the middle, but in fact, if you look -- the adjacent properties particularly on the urban redevelopment zone don't have much open space. There isn't much open space on Binney Street. The street is open space. They're a connection through the Alexandria to the larger space in the field beyond, but I think the open space here needs to be -- a lot of it needs to be on the edges to be shared



better with the open space deficit of the adjacent area, and also to pull it all together to make you feel it's a continuous thing, open spaces linking the Marriott Hotel with what's happening across the street say. You know, the Sixth Street connector comes down to the Marriott; is that correct? Or does it come down Ames Street?

IRAM FAROOQ: It transforms into Ames Street.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ames Street.

So we're talking about a Fifth Street cross site connector --

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- that would also presumably become a pedestrian route back. And that's the one that comes into the Marriott lobby.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: It would be nice to blow up a real hole through that building.

H. THEODORE COHEN: What?

HUGH RUSSELL: A real hole through the building so that, I mean --

STUART DASH: That occurred in a few plans in the Connect Kendall.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yeah, right. The islands are next, too.

And it's a -- all of a balancing act and trying to set the framework so that we can achieve the varied goals which are quite different. I just think it would be nicer as a designer to have a little more freedom to consider some more options. And, you know, that can be written in as qualifications, as things we can do in, you know, somebody can make arguments to us. So those can be in the -- you put those in as things that we can

think about, you then maybe spur the imagination. I bet Suzannah's got a half a dozen up her sleeve. So I think if we -- if that gets done, then I think we're very close to something that we ought to recommend but that's my point of view. And there are another six people here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, yes, let's continue with open space, but let me put some comments into perspective. Things we didn't talk about today so much is that while it's certainly not set in stone at the moment, the GSA is talking about they would like four to five acres for their federal use in Volpe. So if we've got a 14-acre site and they take four to five acres out of it, you've got nine or ten acres left. So the open space that may be connected to the Volpe building really becomes significant in terms of what is

counted in the open space and what isn't counted in open space. And it was also, you know, there's some issue -- obviously we don't get to say what they get to build for themselves, but a 400,000 square foot facility on four to five acres, they could have one big tower surrounded by a lot of open space or they could have this huge sprawling one or two-story facility that's taking up the whole thing. So we don't know exactly what it's going to be, and I think we have to figure out some way of dealing with what may be their open space and what gets to count.

I'd just like to comment on Councillor Cheung's comment, which I think was in the context of his talking to people around the country and around the world who don't know Cambridge and say oh, isn't, you know,

Harvard and MIT, they're in Boston. And he's saying no, it's in Cambridge. And they don't have a concept of what Cambridge is. And so he was talking, you know, somewhat tongue in cheek I think of a thousand-story building as being, you know, a Sears Tower, an Empire State Building, something that says this is Cambridge right here, that's puny little Boston across the river. And so, you know, I think part of it is should be something spectacular, this site as a gateway to Cambridge. And I think, Hugh, you're indeed correct of, you know, juggling the open space versus the housing versus everything else we want. Yeah, you can have a lot of -- you know, build the Sears Tower and make it all, you know, 80 stories of housing and that's going to accommodate a lot of the housing and then you can have a lot of open space all

around it. Or the alternative is you've reduced your open space and have a lot of lower buildings. So, you know, there's a range of things that we can do. And where it goes and how it goes, I think a lot of it has to be left open to the developers to come up with their best shot. You know, I personally think that in keeping with Council Cheung's idea, that corner of Third Street and Broadway, rather than being open space, could be some spectacular building that you come across the bridge and there it is, welcome to Cambridge, you know, as opposed to Microsoft's sign shining through the window.

So I think, you know, these are all great, you know, possible alternatives, but I think we both have to be clear enough, thought, that a developer knows what they can and can't do, but also flexible enough that

if they come up with something that's really great, you know, that we can say yeah, we really want that and we'll trade off something. And, you know, and thinking about it all, you know, once we can figure out what counts as open space, you know, maybe 40 percent isn't the right number. Maybe it's -- if we're counting a lot more things in it, maybe it's 35 percent or maybe it's 30 percent to get the other things that we want. So it's, you know, obviously a very difficult thing to decide in the abstract because we don't have a developer who's coming before us saying this is what I'd like to do. You know, how can we allow that -- we need to build the framework that will allow a lot of other things.

And the last thing I wanted to just say in terms of background is that I guess with

the GSA was talking about in terms of timing is that they would like to enter into a contract with the developer fall of 2016. So they're working backwards from that in terms of going out with an RFP or an RFQ or however they want to highlight it. And I think they want to have Zoning in place so that when the developers are bidding on it, they know what Zoning will allow. And so, you know, I think we're looking at something for us, you know, and City Council acting, you know, probably early in the fall, late fall, probably the latest that works with --

IRAM FAROOQ: Do you mean a vote by late fall or do you mean sending it by late fall? Because the GSA is -- if you work back from fall of 2016, they would actually -- contract, they would actually need to put out their RFP roughly in the spring of 2016 which



means that our -- since there's not a lot of time in the beginning of the year for Council action, and there may be a new Council since this is an election year --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Election year, right.

IRAM FAROOQ: I guess our operating assumption is that it would be good to have the Zoning done this calendar year.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes. That was where I was working to. That, you know, things were at City Council and they voted before the end of the calendar year before the --

IRAM FAROOQ: I did want to say one thing on the open space because we're talking about the percentage of open space, and I think you are all correct. And as Jeff talked about in this presentation and in last

time we met as well, having a slightly lower percentage doesn't necessarily mean that the final outcome in a PUD is going to be matched to that minimum amount because just our experience has shown that generally that master planning process ends up in something more significant. Also the open space -- it's sort of an enlightened self-interest piece as well because that is an amenity for the developer to be able to offer to tenants and future buildings, but I do -- I think I would be remiss if I didn't mention that the percentage of open space was something that certainly residents from East Cambridge and the residential buildings in the area feel quite strongly about. And so that's just something for the Board to keep in mind.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

So that actually is a great segue into what I

was going to say which it struck me as Hugh was speaking that we of course come at this as the designer and word person, and while we share the same goal, I was like I'd be all for the lower number to give them the more flexibility because what I want to ensure is that we get the really high quality stuff. I don't -- you know, putting stuff in there that they can count, like roadways and above grade roof terraces and things like that, drives me nuts. And I would rather see that percentage go way down and know that what we are getting is truly public space of value to the public, and then let the developers work out all the extras that they want to add on for their amenities and to make their site work and all of that in their designer ways to make the site pretty for themselves and add on to it as much as they want. But I'd

rather have a small percentage -- smaller percentage that really is something good that we know we're getting.

STEVEN COHEN: I agree.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: While we're still talking about the open space, I think it's for one thing important to figure out how many acres that the Federal Government wants us to keep. Originally they said four and now it's four to five. Next thing it will be four to six. What are we working with? Because I've heard four before.

JEFF ROBERTS: Can I answer that question actually just to make sure -- I'll just try to reiterate what's been on the record before. So they have, they've indicated that they think that the result of this deal will be that the Federal Government

will retain three to four acres of land on which the building will be located. And they've, they've hedged that because it's really, it's not so much a matter of the government demanding what acreage they will need, but it will come through the RFP process. A developer will have to design a federal building in a site that meets all the requirements both for building design and for site design and security and the -- where they get that number is just based on a general estimate of what they think that result will be. But it will actually be up to the developer and the design process to determine what the final portion of that site will be that's federal.

AHMED NUR: Thank you, Jeff.

HUGH RUSSELL: So just two comments on that:

I think you can identify the federal building in all of these schemes because it has a darker open space around it and it's the -- it's a particular rectangle. And so in these schemes the government gets even less. Now I'm pretty sure that if they need five acres, it's going to be almost impossible to get the commercial development that will actually pay for the process. Now, that's my feeling just looking at the numbers that it's going -- in order to get what they want, they're not -- they can't keep that much land and get what they want in terms of a new building because it won't work for the developers. That's my gut feeling.

AHMED NUR: Okay, so --

JEFF ROBERTS: And just to interject again.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the process.

JEFF ROBERTS: I was going to interject again just on this note that what we were including in our model is a 50-foot buffer. A 50-foot open buffer around federal facility which is, it's a very just high level way to illustrate what that, what the security requirements would result in. Again, we don't know enough about what the shape and size of that building will be and what other requirements might come into play that might change the size and shape of that site, but we just stuck with that 50-foot buffer. And you're right, that site would -- I don't think that gets to necessarily the three acres, but it's just to show that part of that will have to -- one of those buildings is going to have to have a substantial buffer around it.

AHMED NUR: That was one of my

points, and I think I got the answer that I was looking for.

Second, the confusion between open space, Federal Government versus open space what's shared and what's not. My experience in Federal Government buildings, there's a security guard right at the front and usually everyone's ID'd and so it's not much of a public space, or when I went to, you know. So it would be -- the question would be is there a shared green open space that -- because you've -- Jeff, mentioned the integration between the open spaces. Is it a good idea to have the federal versus the public or the city's? And I think it would be a bad idea to have -- while I think it's a great idea to have all the green spaces on the southeast corner where the sunny side is, so that way there's no shades or even as



maybe Hugh alluded to, have any and some of it in between the buildings, because I think the open space, green open space when they talk about open space, if it's in between courtyard from around the building, it tends to be surrounded by the residents and sort of exclude in that area. It's hard for public to go into that area and feel safe. Whereas if we brought it over to corner Broadway and Third, it's open to other pedestrian walking across Broadway and Third, and as well as they can come out and it's the sunny side as opposed to in addition from suffering from snow and winter and all that open space will be wasted.

And in addition to that I wondered what contributed to that 2.5 percent we were looking at originally? Even 22 percent the PUD-3 to 40 percent open space which in my

case I don't think it will be used well over the wintertime unless we sort of a glass or, you know, frames.

The third comment or rather concern is the incentives, 18 million incentives could be used I think to create more open space, public open space. \$18 million is a lot. Average house in East Cambridge is \$800,000. Put houses together, demolition and put green space there. No offense to anyone in East Cambridge. Heather is looking at me.

And my last comment, I don't know where it went. I'm all set.

STEVEN COHEN: I want to talk primarily about affordable housing issues and I'm going to put that aside.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's -- well, let's finish talking about the extent that the discussions can be segregated to the

others --

STEVEN COHEN: That's what I just said, I said putting it aside.

So first of all, obviously we cannot dictate to the Federal Government what they do. A it's their land, and, B, they're the Federal Government. And but, I don't think it's enough for us to simply say that and sort of wait for them to decide, you know, what they're going to do and what their program is and what their requirements are or wait for their ultimate developer to make those determinations. I really think that we, and right now our staff, should be working closely with the Federal Government not only to figure out what their program is now and what the requirements are, but to start communicating to them, you know, what our desires are. They're not our

requirements because our requirements aren't binding on them, but as part of this planning process, I think, you know, we should be planning for their use and expressing strong clear preferences to them where their building will be, how much land, either massing of the building and so forth. I, you know, we can't and shouldn't and won't be a passive, you know, passenger in their planning process. I mean we should be active. And in fact, I think we should be taking the lead with them in deciding what they're doing and where.

Second thing, on the open space I agree entirely with the direction that we're going in that Catherine initiated. And it actually speaks to one overriding thing which I'm going to mention a number of times, I think over the months as we discussed this. As we

talk about all the goals that we want to achieve here, I would put high in those goals, clarity. I know that might be breaking new ground in the Cambridge Zoning Code. But clarity and simplicity so that even an ordinary person, such as even a City Councillor, could read our Zoning and understand what it says. I mean, you don't have to be a lawyer or a Zoning Specialist and you don't have to do all sorts of fancy calculations and, you know, and I think I'm -- I'm going to come back to that when we talk about the affordable housing. But certainly on the open space exactly as Catherine says, instead of dealing with a whole bunch of strange and technical and unclear permutations about what may or may not be counted, let's just come up with a percentage and say this is what you have to

provide. And it's exactly as you say, it's green, usable, beneficial, enjoyable public space. And a general at the 40 percent, again, I don't know what would be included in the 40 percent, public streets that cut through here, is that part of the 40 percent? But one way or the other it seems to me to be kind of, you know, old traditional conventional thinking that when you do a planning, if you really want to do something that's beneficial for the city, what we want to do is create as much open space as possible. I'm just not sure that it needs to be as simple as that. It really does get down to the quality of the open space; how it's developed, what the site furniture is, what the uses are, where the location -- is it benefitting the public at large or just the residents of the buildings or the workers

in those buildings? And I'm not sure that you have to hit such a high percentage to create really good urban space. And, again, the example that we just saw where it was only 22 percent open space, I guess I don't know that entire development intimately, but to the extent that I have walked through it and experienced it, it seems lovely and it seems like a good appealing useful amount of open space and that's only 22 percent.

Let me see, other than affordable. I guess one other thing that I guess Catherine sort of started this discussion and then Hugh picked up on it, and okay, maybe not a thousand feet or maybe a thousand feet. But as a planning matter, I guess it's more the question of do we want to do something spectacular here?

Did you use the words spectacular, Ted?

You know, really what is it that we're trying to accomplish here? I mean, this is the closest we really come to raw unbridled planning where we have a blank slate other than the little federal punctuation mark. A reasonably blank slate where we can really think about what we want to do and we don't have to do it the same way we've always done it. It doesn't have to be the same sort of pattern of development that exists elsewhere in Kendall Square. So, you know, Hugh suggested maybe it's 400 feet. I don't know what the number is. But the concept of taking off all binders, putting aside all conventional thinking and saying wow, what can we do here that would be really cool? You know, I'd kind of like to talk about that amongst ourselves.

So I'll put aside my thoughts about



affordable housing until the appropriate moment.

IRAM FAROOQ: I just wanted to respond to one of your -- well, maybe two of your earlier thoughts, which is -- or comments about our conversations with Volpe. So I just wanted to let the Board know that we actually are in conversation with the Volpe. The DOT as well as the Volpe, the DOT and the GTA folks working on the project, and we've been meeting with them. Around these discussions we've been meeting with them more frequently, and then we meet less frequently. But we are absolutely in conversation with them. They have been very open and willing to work collaboratively. They have gone out and spoken to some of the neighborhood groups and East Cambridge Planning Team, and they are Area 4. Staff

has gone out and spoken to the Area 4 coalition. But we have -- the vision that came from the K2 study, we have expressed very clearly to the Volpe team as something that the city cares about, because that's what we have right now and it's absolutely up to being transformed as a result of this discussion. And I think in some ways how many acres the Federal Government has or what their building might end up looking like is a little bit of a red herring in this conversation, and I would say that in terms of our determination of what the vision is for the site, we could even put that aside and create what we think the ideal outcomes are to be for this site, how we want the connections to work, what we want the -- how we want the open space to function. What are our thoughts about affordable housing. I

think the fact that there is a federal building in the mix is something just to keep in mind as we are thinking about what kinds of public benefits we want, because it anchors the land value a little bit and says here's a big item that the developer who is selected will have to do. But in none of these instances does it truly -- I think the Federal Government doesn't know, so that's why they're not able to give us the answers that we all want to know. And their process is happening in parallel to ours. So they're trying to reach conclusions around the end of the year so they can plug in their information into the RFQ, the RFP as well. But just, like, please know that those conversations are ongoing. Volpe, when they had their industry day to talk to potential developers to put an RFI, they invited us to

speaking about the city's vision. It was not just Volpe's goals being articulated to potential developers, but they recognized and were very emphatic that selected developers would have to work with the city. And the Zoning would be something that the city is developing and talking about that vision. So I think that the work we do here will really inform their thinking as well.

STEVEN COHEN: Just so I understand, Iram, I mean obviously the developer needs to know that we're establishing the Zoning for the rest of the site.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: But are you conveying that we'd like to have input into what they do with their building and location, size, height, so forth?

IRAM FAROOQ: So I guess what I'm

saying is that if we determine our vision agnostic of the fact that there is going to be a federal building on the site, that is a vision that will inform the developer and the Volpe Center as they try to figure out where they fall, because they -- every indication from our conversations with them has been that they would like to work with the City's goals and not kind of, you know, come down with a big foot and just say here's our plan. So I think to the extent that we can articulate our vision, it's most helpful for them.

STEVEN COHEN: Just one thing, did I get it right that they're talking about about 400,000 feet for their building?

IRAM FAROOQ: That's correct.  
That's the approximate number right now.

STUART DASH: Two points: I want to

mention the Cambridge Research Park gets referred to the 22 percent, it's an odd 22 percent I suggest at this point with a major building, buildings absent from the middle of that site. So the perception of that site is still, I'd say, is sort of a mix of how what 22 percent feels like as you're strolling through that site in terms of sky and in terms of not necessarily surface but in terms of sky.

And also mention that we -- part of our trying to keep it open, when we're saying it could be many things, is keeping in mind that even the notion of stipulating minimum amount of green, which is where we were last time we talked to you, might foreclose possibilities that we think are just terrific. If someone came to us and said we want to do a rhombus right in the middle of the site, that's

paved, that's not green, but we might say oh, God, that would be wonderful. So we're trying to sort of have them come back to you with wonderful ideas and to have you, as you've looked at the Connect Kendall kind of thing, and say what are the opportunities here and can we create something special? But not try to go with the -- something special can be a little park kind of thing of what we think now but leave that more open. It is a challenge I think.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Councillor Carlone?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: Just a quick comment. East Cambridge riverfront is 30 percent open space, 12 out of 40 acres, but that includes the canal which obviously makes that space feel very large. I think the PUD required as much as 20 percent. And

what we did with the Galleria is we allowed them to include the atrium as part of the open space so that we could get it in the right place. I think Hugh remembers they had some strange arcade directions.

And oh, there was another element -- and oh, the location for Volpe, yes, we don't know it, but it can't be where the building is now.

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY:

Sequencing. They will not -- one thing that's missing from the constraints, I followed this. You know, Volpe is saying their building comes first. So the current Volpe site cannot be the home of the future Volpe building. So when you start to look at layouts, we need to understand that that Volpe -- they want to move once and they don't want any dark period. So we know a



section of the site that the Volpe building will not go.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: And my urban design colleague is absolutely correct. Fortunately I haven't picked up --

ATTORNEY JAMES RAFFERTY: It's election year. You better be careful who you associate with.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: I still have a few months.

But the other thing is if you think about locations, and, you know, we're not speaking for the Volpe, but we said this yesterday, they either want a front door location or they're willing to accept a hidden location. Somehow I don't think they want a hidden location. But that's up to them. So it's either Broadway, Third Street, or Binney.

Binney, it's hard to pull off. I think it's going to be Broadway and I think it's going to be right next to the Sixth Street walkway. And if you make that assumption, that way the new -- their development is done and off to the side of everything else that's going to be under construction for years. So I think you can make certain assumptions about that. And I think that eases your problem -- or the City's issue by knowing it's a corner site, if you will, with the front door and Broadway. I think Third and Broadway is the prime location whether it's a park or a building. And a developer's going to tell them that, that that is the prime location. And Binney Street frankly is a back door location, and we want to upgrade it, but it is a back door location. And so --

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm looking at Joe Maguire sitting behind you. He won't agree with you.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: His Binney Street -- he has upgraded his Binney Street with the major development and he's done piecemeal on the other. But the other, between Third and Sixth Street it's not as exciting, let's put it that way, as their end. And he can make it that way, I agree. But it just -- what I'm getting at is it's probably a corner site. You probably -- they probably want a corner site, and you then have to figure out logically where that corner is. That's all. There aren't that many choices.

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: Just one other point, the Binney Street project is 30 percent open space and it wasn't required to

be that but that's what it turned out to be.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, great.

Anyone else have any further comments on open space?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Jeff, could you put up the testing scenarios again?

The upper right-hand corner, the one with the park on the -- that's approximately the Volpe site, the green area on the corner? We were told from the GSA last night that they wanted five acres.

JEFF ROBERTS: I think the discussion from the --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I'm not saying that's the site. I'm saying that's the size of your site.

JEFF ROBERTS: I think what was said was three to -- the approximate was between three to four acres, but they weren't sure

exactly how it was going to be because it depends on the development scheme as a whole.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But when I was sitting at the Council meeting last night --

IRAM FAROOQ: Somebody did say five.

H. THEODORE COHEN: They did say four to five yesterday.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: The GSA said five acres.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think Mr. Ishihara would like to speak.

THE STENOGRAPHER: One speaking at a time, please.

DAVID ISHIHARA: My name is David Ishihara, I-s-h-i-h-a-r-a.

So last night what happened in the conversation for rough order of magnitude numbers we've been talking about, Jeff's right, three to four acres. So for ease of

conversation, we were talking about 10 acres being the exchange parcel, four acres for the Volpe site. One of the councillors began by saying it's a 15-acre site, so call it 10 and five, and that's where it went off the track. So it is three to four acres.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But it is approximately that size?

DAVID ISHIHARA: Beats the heck out of me.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That's the total with all the green --

JEFF ROBERTS: That's five plus. So all the green together, including what's ringing the government site would be six.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: What I'm saying is that size plot is missing from this as Volpe?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No.

It's half that size.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: No.

HUGH RUSSELL: Three quarters.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Three quarters then. Let's say three quarters.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Kind scaling off that drawing I need to see that. And I know it's not Volpe's intent, but that size parcel could possibly be fenced off and held from public use.

JEFF ROBERTS: No. I think the idea is that the federal open space would -- so there are standards for the design of federal open space that require it to be public. So it will be public space. And I think the security requirements -- so one of the examples I talked about the last time was this -- so if you see on the bottom, right

corner, so that's in Chicago and that was part of the open space that was designed to link some of the existing open space in the area with a kind of a courtyard that's part of the -- I think it's a postal building of some sort. It requires having some kind of security measures mostly so that vehicles don't get through. It doesn't have to be fenced off and shut off from public.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Not my intention. Just saying that that's a -- has anyone tried to walk through the Volpe site as it exists today? It's impossible. You can't do it.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: You can walk across it.

DAVID ISHIHARA: It's across the street, cut to the --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right, you



have to jump the fence.

DAVID ISHIHARA: No.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Could you enlighten us a little on your security requirements?

DAVID ISHIHARA: Well, I think these pictures here are provided by the GSA and it's tough for me because I don't like to speak for other people, especially if they work for different federal agencies, why not do it in a public setting. So --

IRAM FAROOQ: What about the transcriptionist.

DAVID ISHIHARA: Perfect. She's got my name right and everything.

These pictures were provided by the GSA to illustrate the point that as Bob Zarnetske, the region one GSA administrator said last evening. We have no intentions of

sort of sticking out like a sore thumb. Our goal here is to blend. This is federal property. This is Moakley Courthouse and there's a pretty significant trial underway right now, and that sidewalk is open in front of that federal building and these are other federal buildings that the public enjoys. And this is an example of the -- you know, aesthetic way of putting vehicle bollards around a federal building.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I got you. But we have no assurances or no way to make that happen if the feds -- the Federal Government decides not to make it happen. We have no controls. And that's more of what I'm getting at. Is there any way that we can work some assurances into this?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No.

H. THEODORE COHEN: No.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: So we can't count on it either?

H. THEODORE COHEN: No. I think that's what they told us yesterday, they are a kinder and gentler Federal Government that's going to bend over backwards to accommodate the City and the City's goals, but bottom line is they get to do whatever they want.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: So --

STEVEN COHEN: But they're here to help us.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I understand. So in my mind they're kind of excluding from this they're on their own because we can't really depend on this.

HUGH RUSSELL: I tend to say that the people who are working on the project today are -- had a vision that's like our

vision, but something may happen. I mean, you know --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- there weren't all these precautions before some crazy guy parked a truck in front of the Oklahoma federal building, you know.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right. I agree. We're in a tough spot with the Volpe site because we can't do anything with them, but we depend on some of their good will I guess.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, and I'm saying we can do things with them. It's not legally binding. We can't impose requirements. You know, but, you know, I think it's reasonable for us to assume that they are honorable, well intentioned people and agencies, and as best as we can tell, their interests and

goals and values here are the same or at least consistent with ours. And, you know, I think if we're clear about what we're trying to achieve and they're clear about what they're trying to achieve, that we can try to achieve both sets of goals. It's not legally binding. They could change their mind tomorrow, new administration, new administrator, that's true. But with that caveat I still think we can make a lot of progress.

IRAM FAROOQ: And that's actually your point in some ways is --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I'm going along with yours.

IRAM FAROOQ: -- part of the reason why the City has been so keen for decades to see something happen on the site, because right now even though we have a wonderful set

of people on the Volpe project, right now it's completely controlled by the Federal Government. Whereas, in the scenario of the transaction occurs as planned, we would have a significant -- control over significant part of the outcome.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I agree completely. And I would like to see some landmark work being done here, and I agree, but I just want to see where we can go.

IRAM FAROOQ: You want to push the limit on this.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I want to see where we can go.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right.

JEFF ROBERTS: I want to make one point because it's reiterating something we said when we first introduced this. The way the Zoning is constructed, it envisions the

Volpe facility while it's not strictly subject to city regulation, it envisions that that site will be a part of the overall, the Planning Board's overall review of it. If we wanted to construct a Zoning a different way, we could have said we're just going to ignore anything that's owned by the Federal Government and only have a PUD that includes what's not federal, but we didn't do it that way. We structured it so that the open space and the lot area that the federal site is on are going to be very important to the private developer who is doing this, which means that this will be reviewed in a wholistic way both by staff and by Planning Board when it proceeds.

STEVEN COHEN: Jeff, technical question, and maybe, Mr. Ishihara, you could help me with it. Is the Federal Government

going to end up owning this land and leasing it to a developer or is it selling it to a developer?

DAVID ISHIHARA: No. It's an exchange deal. The Federal Government will retain ownership only of that small portion that the Volpe Center resides on. The rest of the portion or the rest of the parcel, we refer to as the exchange parcel, when the Volpe Center is complete and we move into it, the GSA will then turn over the balance of the property to a private developer for their ownership, no lease.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right.

STUART DASH: To your point and sort of adding on to what Jeff's notion is that we should remember that if Volpe wants to get the greatest value they can get for the 10



acres, the people who come in on the 10 acre are going to say we don't want the blank next to us, we want something terrific next to us. That's going to be a big influence on the quality of their development, the people who buy the 10 acres what they want next to them.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, great. That was going to be my last summarization point. And I think now we'll take a five-minute break and then Steve is going to kick off the affordable housing discussion.

(A short recess was taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could we all sit down, please.

Affordable housing. Steve, why don't you kick us off.

STEVEN COHEN: Okay, I'll try to keep it brief and simple on the affordable housing. I think -- the staff recommended --

well, let's talk about two elements of affordable housing here.

One, the basic affordable housing which is currently included in the Zoning Code, and then the other is the height incentive going to 300 feet, two separate issues.

But just for the base affordable zoning staff has recommended that this is going to be considered by the City Council in the months and years to come and that we should probably just require here no more than the city requires generally as part of the affordable or inclusionary zoning housing policies in the city. And I think I tend to disagree with that, because I think that this is a unique situation, a unique site. And I think it's unique for a couple of reasons.

No. 1, it's a public ownership now. I think as we change around with our affordable

Zoning Ordinances, I mean one of my concerns would be and perhaps will be sort of changing the rules for people who have paid for land or for buildings based on a certain set of assumptions, but that's not the case here. Here it's owned by the Federal Government already. Their purchase price here is for present purposes is essentially irrelevant. I think also that we're upzoning the site. I mean, we're permitting more development on the site than is currently permitted, and to me when you do something like that, that's an opportunity to build in more, you know, public benefits. Again, to simply impose new and higher requirements on other land and other properties in the city without independently of an upzoning, I think that, that is problematic for me and it raises concerns of fairness and so forth. But it's

not the issue here. I mean we're upzoning and I think it's an opportunity to create more public benefits. I don't think there is going to be that many other opportunities in the city of this size and to create public affordable housing units. So for all those reasons, I just think it's a unique opportunity and I think that we should -- and well, and also the suggestion has been made that the city may be revisiting or is revisiting its affordable housing policy and it should be consistent with that. But they may be revisiting, but I don't know how long that is going to be and what the outcome of that process will be, and it's perfectly possible that there won't be the sort of changes that we might, you know, wish. So I do think that this opportunity sufficiently unique that we can look at it as a separate

opportunity, separate from the affordable housing policies in the rest of the city, and I just think that we could do more there. And part of it, and I won't get into that detail really right now, but I think part of what we do here and whatever we do here on affordable zoning, I think it should be more clear and more direct and simple than exists in the rest of that housing code. I mean, for instance, if for the -- either way it is. Now the FAR is four and with bonuses I guess it's 5.2 and maybe some other things there, whatever that FAR actually works out to be, let's say it's 5.2 for the sake of argument, I would prefer to say well, you know, for the residential portion the FAR is 5.2 and some percentage of that say even 15 percent, maybe more, but even 15 percent is affordable. Right now it actually works out to about

eleven-point something percent of the final gross floor area. I mean even just saying that it's 15 percent of the final gross floor area is actually, you know, roughly a 30 percent increase over what current percentages are. And whether 15 is enough, you know, I don't know what the exact numbers. I just think that we should be talk begun this as an opportunity to do more affordable housing.

And also as I was just talking to Jeff about, from my personal perspective, I think our priority when we talk about affordable housing should in fact be moderate and middle income housing. I'm really fearful that we will end up with a city, as happening in many places, where there are certain public housing opportunities for lower income and the upper income people of course have plenty

of opportunities, and it's those folks in the middle, you know, ordinary good hardworking people with decent incomes who are actually priced out of the market. And I'd really like to see a greater portion of our affordable housing opportunities in this site devoted to those folks.

And then there's the bonus for height. And I guess, again, I wish we could just simplify the whole thing and not deal about -- you know, bonuses and incentives and so forth. It's -- I think, you know, we should just say -- I mean, if we're saying that 300 feet is permissible, say fine, 300 feet is the height limit or 400 or whatever we agree on and just come up with a percentage of applicable FAR which is going to be affordable whether it be, you know, middle, moderate, or whatever we decide on,

and just make it really clear and straightforward so that again, an ordinary resident of Cambridge can, you know, understand clearly what the city's policies are for affordable housing and they don't need to do fancy calculations or, you know, hire a consultant or get some sort of, you know, foreign language interpreter to understand what our most fundamental housing policies are.

So those are my brief preliminary thoughts.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anybody else want to follow up on that?

Catherine.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So I had a couple of thoughts about the housing in general that is outlined in the Zoning. And one of the things I noted was that we're



eliminating the minimum lot area per dwelling unit and/or we're proposing to rather, and but we're requiring a minimum number percentage rather of three-bedroom units.

And then that was maybe on balance okay until you started talking about microunits. And that made me, I guess, less comfortable with the no minimum lot area per dwelling unit and the five percent and wanting to see a lot more -- I don't want to be prescriptive about this, because I do want complete flexibility. But I feel like we ought to know what we're getting, too. And either that five percent should come up or there should be a -- you know, a maximum percentage that can be microunits or a maximum total number of units or some kind of control on that. But I worry that, you know, we'll end up essentially with dorms that have

apartments for the, you know, housemother and her kids in them. And those might be very profitable or -- but they -- and I might also add, survey needed housing purpose. I'm not against microunits. We have a lot of young professionals who would like to live in the city who would prefer that kind of living arrangement as a starting place so that they can afford to be in the city. But the combination of trying to get more large units that can be afforded by families and eliminating the lot area per dwelling unit for the district leave me with this feeling that I don't know what the mix of unit sizes we're going to get in the housing is, and that is something that really impacts what our affordable housing stock looks like because you, you know, if it's all studios and microunits that are affordable, we

haven't done much to increase affordability for families.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: I only have two comments -- general comments and very simple.

One was the -- my fifth item that I'd forgotten earlier. Once I remembered I figured I'd leave it for housing. And that is the -- I'm really excited from what I can hear, including the Chairman of the Council saying about the thousand feet Councillor -- I don't think the 4.0 is going to work in that area. This is where I think affordable housing can go into and at least startup with 400 feet or 500 feet. So I guess we're out of the range of the FAA. You know. The federal aviation. And so that's the only thing I have to say with regarding to affordability. Maybe we can build up high

and maybe bring in, too, students. MIT students, Harvard students, or other institutions whether it's Lesley or whatnot. This past summer while we were doing our house, we migrated to Arlington and the kids going to school, both at the high school, and nearby and it was just a five mile outside of Cambridge to the Arlington line on Pleasant Street, Route 60. It was hell driving back and forth. It was like what is going on, right? And the reason why I'm saying that is that because students and professionals really want to work where they live. And so we're going to lose them if we don't provide housing for them. And, therefore, maybe there should be a provision. Instead of saying a family of three minimum, husband and wife, partners with a child, how about four or five students? You know, go find

partners, roommates in this case, and you are allowed as a family as an incentive for affordable housing to come in and you guys can take over this three bedroom and share the rent. As long as you have some sort of a contract, a language that would allow.

Because singles are always discriminated against when it comes to housing. And they don't count and we expect them to pay taxes and they don't make much money.

I think that's all I have to say.

H. THEODORE RUSSELL: Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: So, I've been thinking about how do we determine what the need is for housing? And I think ultimately it has to go back to thinking about what are the mix of living situations and the mix of incomes who want to see the entire city? And in my 50 or so years in the city, things have

changed quite a bit. And I was part of that change when I bought my \$14,000 house a block away from here.

STEVEN COHEN: It's probably worth 20 or 25 right now.

AHMED NUR: \$14,000.

HUGH RUSSELL: That was underpriced. It should have been 16.

And, you know, I was a young -- I was in a job. There I was like three years into an architecture job and everybody in the office was buying a house. And I thought hey, this is cool, you know, I can fix it up. And I was making \$15,000 a year which was a pretty good salary, you know, in 1969. And so I bought off of Antrim Street and then I started learning about my neighbors who were by in large people who held, you know, sort of the ordinary jobs that people have to keep

the country running. They might be building things, they might be driving, you know, trucks. They might be -- and gradually over the last 50 years, almost every one of those people has moved off the street. And then when they sold their house, somebody like me bought it. And I was not the first -- the first was my next-door neighbor the Clems (phonetic). George Metzker came. He's been there for 35, 40 years. And so I don't think I'm part of the problem. But I listen to our Senior Senator a lot because I think she's a remarkably perceptive person who says, you know, what's happening economically in the country is that we're shipping all the -- those middle jobs away and the rich are taking all the money and, you know, so that the middle is sort of drifting down to being unable to meet their needs and then the banks

are ripping them off which accelerates the process. Anyway, what is it -- I think the vision that I have for the city is one where there are people living in the city who can do all the different jobs in the city. And some of those jobs are standing behind the counter at Au Bon Pain. And some of those jobs are, you know, directing the most interesting research in the world or being, you know, the smartest professor of, you know, African-American studies in the world, with TV programs. There are all different people who live here. And so if we -- if we were to have a model sort of in our minds of well, here's the income distribution that we think is a healthy income distribution and that makes our city self-sufficient in some ways. And, yeah, we are a knowledge-based city. We're going to have more of the



Harvard and MIT types than the private folks because that's our, that's in a way, that's our industrial, that's our economic base.

And so then we probably know what housing is available. So we can say okay, this is, this is the distribution of people we have in terms of income and here's what -- and here's the places where the housing fails. And my gut feeling is like Steve's that there's a gap in the middle. The city has felt, based on the waiting list of people for affordable units, that there's a still a huge unmet gap at the lower end of the spectrum, the lower to middle end of the spectrum. And then there's the family size in this distribution. I'm always skeptical about building three-bedroom apartments in places because I think they would be occupied by three singles with -- but, you know, on my

street most of the units are that size and there are a lot of people with kids. It's not like it used to be 70 years ago when there were six kids in every apartment. I mean, the city's population peaked before World War II because of the number of children in the city or just after the world war -- sometime in there. And it was substantially higher than the current population.

So anyway, that's kind of the theoretical ground is I'd like to see where we're not served.

I also wanted to say that I lived in two microapartments in the city in buildings that were both built about 90 years ago. One of them was an illegal apartment in what was a laundry room 90 years ago in a basement, and the other was a building on Prescott

Street that was built that had two microunits because it had a funny cut off corner and they couldn't fit the regular size unit in it. And in mid-Cambridge there were a lot of smallish units and there were a lot of -- we had the most number of single person households in the city last time I looked at this which was probably 30 years ago. And it relates again to people who were working at Harvard I think or studying at Harvard. So without knowing what our philosophy is, without knowing what the supply is, it's very hard to say what the goals for this site should be. And I'd rather base it on some kind of bigger thinking. I won't go any farther.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I guess it's as simple as I concur with all of you on the

clarity and the information we need.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I too concur with the comments. I especially concur with Steve's comments that I think this project, for a lot of reason, is truly generous and it does not have to track what is happening elsewhere in the city. My gut feeling is that 15 percent -- well, 11.2, 11.3 percent is too low and that it ought to be at a minimum, you know, 15 percent of the total number of units in the project, if not, something higher than that. And I understand the argument that there is a study going on and that we, you know, we can amend what we're doing and City Council can amend what we're doing to take into account the study. But I think, you know, from a planning purpose it makes sense to say that we think this is the minimum number and, you know, I'm

not disagreeing with you, Hugh, but we need more information to come up with that number to decide what we think is the right number. But I think we ought to have a number when we send it to City Council and then let them look at a lot of the other considerations and decide if that's the right number or not.

So that's one point.

The other point is as someone who thought about the possibility of downsizing into a three-bedroom apartment and staying in Cambridge, they don't exist. I mean, they just do not exist unless you're talking about something extremely expensive or, you know, perhaps a floor in a three-family or something like that. But a new, modern facility that would accommodate, you know, my family or a family with a couple of little kids, they're so rare and so few and far

between. And, you know, we've had so many other projects that have said well, this is really not an appropriate location for three families. And I think this is an appropriate location for three-bedroom units. And, you know, let the developers and the market sort out whether it's going to be three students who live there as roommates or whether it's going to be, you know, a family with a couple of kids or a single parent with a couple of kids or it's going to be, you know, empty nesters who have downsized. That could all be figured out. And so I think the five percent is too low of a number. In my mind ten percent makes more sense. But I agree that, you know, we are a city that has bifurcated into the rich and the poor and the middle has pretty much disappeared and it has impacts on everything. I mean, the school

system is suffering from it. And I think there are just a lot of reasons that we ought to try to come back into a city that has a variety of people and a variety of incomes and that we ought to be providing housing or providing the opportunity to get housing at every level. And so I think, you know -- and, you know, be great to do it citywide, but this is a project where I think developers are going to be very interested in doing it and that this is a concession, you know, when we balance everything of what we want, open space, and this that and the next thing, getting an appropriate mix of housing stock makes sense here. And so I would, you know, like us to look into that more and be able to come up with something that we feel that we can recommend to City Council who will then look at it in a citywide basis and

look at a lot of other concerns and come up with a final decision on that. But I think we'd be remiss not to make a recommendation to them for what we think is the appropriate mix on this spot.

IRAM FAROOQ: May I -- I just wanted to speak to the idea of what kind of city we want and what kind of residents we are trying to keep or attract and what kind of diversity we want to have in terms of -- and I think we've, we've asked -- posed that question to ourselves and often steps back from it for fear of too much social engineering that ended up kind of where Ted did, which is if we can -- if we can end up with a city where, where there are a wide range of options for different kinds of sizes of families for individuals, and also at different income levels, then that's maybe a good outcome



where you have as a buyer or a tenant or a perspective tenant, you have a range of options that you can choose from. So, that's kind of where we have ended up. So we haven't really been able to pin down numbers. At some point we think back to the rent control, but that's a benchmark. But it's, again, the nature of business and industry in the city has evolved in the meantime and so who is here has changed. And, you know, we discuss a lot the middle income slice. The data actually reveals that that is a shrinking -- the state already reveals that that's a shrinking subset but, we don't really know why that is happening. Is it really price or is it not having the right range of options or are people making choices based on other amenities like, you know, wanting a yard or for kids to play in. So we

have not -- short of -- we've often -- our housing crew often dreams of having some mechanism to do an exit interview when people leave Cambridge and be able to say tell us why you're going. But of course we haven't quite figured out the tools to do that yet.

But anyway, those are kind of the range of things that we think about. And I think you're right to be questioning what is the -- what's the mix and how many three bedrooms we need, because that is really the greatest need. I mean, that is one thing we can see from our -- the waiting list for inclusionary housing units in the city and also the city stock. That the need is greatest for the families of two, you know, with two kids roughly. So basically you have three bedroom would be an important piece of that puzzle which is why it's called out here. And I

think that number is kind of what we're, the Board wants to peg it. And the market slice very often does get out -- you know, the three grad students will almost always be able to out compete the two middle class -- I mean family, the two parent family with sort of general middle class. But it's not -- at least the -- if we have that set in the pool, the inclusionary units will be available in that -- in the large size. And we've often also tried to negotiate for having more of the family size units be in the inclusionary side. So usually that happens -- ends up happening as an after-the-fact negotiation, but I think it's worth thinking about whether that should somehow be in the specified, in the Zoning as well.

I would caution against, you know, when thinking about the percentages of

affordability, I mean the percentage of units that are subject to affordable restriction, that just the base in this particular district, even though we are increasing the FAR, the base number of units is very large. So even a small increase of one percent is actually a pretty significant impact financially for the project. Jeff showed you the bar charts that showed, you know, you were able to easily negotiate the -- well, not easily, but able to, on the courthouse project, negotiate the 30 percent, you know, like one third, one third, one third, but it is such a tiny slice of that project that it gets subsidized by a huge amount of commercial where that is not going to be the case on this project.

STUART DASH: I mentioned the issues that folks -- that you guys have brought up

in terms of the fact to understand the housing future and whether the income distribution and things like that are very much the topics of the inclusionary study. So those, you know, that's the consulting team working with the Affordable Housing Trust and the housing staff working on just those questions. So that was our thinking when we sort of said rather than trying to figure it all out, let's, you know, let's announce something like that. But I understand that, you know, there are questions that -- and the intention is that it's -- over the next many number of months is that will be finishing up, but understanding the feeling of, you know, where are we right now.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, is it --

IRAM FAROOQ: That's actually a good

point because we thought we would be throwing darts against a wall if we were just trying to pick numbers, whereas we would be able to make a more informed decision once we had the results of the study in even if it's not adopted as a citywide policy.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I realize that, you know, what you've been saying, and I realize they're not through with the study yet, but is it possible for them to come and speak to us sometime even while they're in the process to just give us some --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: An idea.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- ideas?

IRAM FAROOQ: It's just started. But it is expected to conclude by the summer. So we could ask if that's possible to do during one of the hearings.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. Somebody

could just come in and give us some ideas of what they found and what they're looking at.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: The trends.

STUART DASH: Or the scope.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: How about just the trends?

STEVEN COHEN: And the scope would be interesting. And certainly, you know, they might have insight into the correct mix. But I don't know how much study we really need to know that there's a need for affordable housing and that this is an opportunity to provide it. So we can use our own common sense and judgment to some extent here.

And, you know, Hugh when you say, you know, you'd like to know where the demand is, you know, my sense is that, cost aside for the moment, that there's, for all intents and

purposes, unlimited demand about the low end and in the middle. And so, you know, maybe the question is less -- where's the demand and more of the question of both you and I think Ted raised and others which is, you know, what kind of city do we want to live in and come at it that way. As I said, at least in answering that question insofar as housing goes, I mean my answer was more middle income housing opportunities. And I think you alluded to that also as you talked about, you know, the construction people and the school teachers and so forth who have become priced out right now.

The other thing, though, about the study for the rest of the city, Stuart, is my sense, again, as Ted says this is kind of a unique situation and opportunity here. And it's perfectly conceivable to me anyway, you



know, unless our further discussions in the months to come lead me elsewhere, it's perfectly conceivable to me that we may, you know, wish and conclude that it's appropriate to have more affordable housing in this unique situation than might be appropriate citywide otherwise. I'm inclined to believe that that's the case. But be that as it may, I hate to, you know, unnecessarily shackle the opportunities here to total unknown process elsewhere.

STUART DASH: I think that our concern is that we and as Jeff has described, is that the format for this deal, the exchange thing for, you know, basically a few hundred million dollar building in exchange for demand -- changes the dynamic for this all open land is there's another language used for it, but I don't want to go into it.

But that it's basically, you know, that changes it for us. We want to be careful again of as you say, shackle the deal unnecessarily. And we're trying to be cautious with that and trying to at the same time be aware of the fact that there is certainly the need for housing --

STEVEN COHEN: I guess I hear you and I understand that. But, you know, again I guess there are a number of moving pieces here. One of them is, you know, FAR and one of them is open space and one of them is height and one of them is affordable housing. And, you know, to some extent, you know, as we make these decisions, we have to prioritize our goals. I'd put the affordable housing -- for myself I'd put the affordable housing goal, you know, pretty high up. And if I have to compromise some of the others,

perhaps a little bit less open green space or a little bit more permitted FAR, you know, I think I would be personally I might be willing to make those compromises in order to make it practical and realistic for the developer to provide more affordable units.

In any event, actually I think that question of priority and practicality and the financial components of those questions are things that we as a Board should be talking about in the months to come.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Councillor Carlone, did you want to add something?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: Just a few things, because we've been talking about this, too. On three bedrooms, I totally agree, five percent is great but it's insignificant. If we want families, perhaps and this has been proposed by Mayor Maher,

that the affordability is transferred into square feet instead of units that match the typical and, therefore, you can get more three bedrooms if that's the need. It might be less units, but the square footage or the cost is about the same. I -- the way I look at it is really one out of nine units enough in the city? It's not. That's 11 percent. Fifteen percent, one out of seven, is that enough? No, it's not. So the city has to step up. We're in a unique financial situation. So I'm not putting it all on the developers literally behind me. I think the city in --

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: I got to come back to that one. Come back to the Binney Street with respect to that one when Dennis is over.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: I meant that, I don't think it's all their

responsibility. That's what I'm trying to say. I think the city has to do it. And even if we get to 80/20, is that going to be a society we want? It's not. And so we have to look broader than that. New York City is looking -- I was going -- you had said this in a presentation the other night and I was hoping on the 28th to give a brief one related to another project, but New York City's literally looking at a 50/50 proposal. It's not all developer by any stretch of the imagination. It's city resources and looking at every available site that the city controls. And certainly there are areas where we do control.

The other way to look at it is a PUD setting aside a certain percentage. Not this PUD. In general I'm talking about. The large PUDs where a certain percentage is set

aside for a non-profit to build some affordable housing. Non-profits cannot afford the land. And what we're doing indirectly is raising land value throughout the whole city. So this is a real broad, broad, broad issue that, yes, it's relative to this site in the city, but I think the city definitely has to step up. And we're in a position where we can do that more than what we're talking about in excess. Much more.

Thank you.

IRAM FAROOQ: Dennis, the 50/50 is municipally owned parcels, right?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: I'm sorry?

IRAM FAROOQ: The 50/50 New York is city owned parcels?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: The

50/50 is looking at a neighborhood, an area and incorporate city owned parcels.

Absolutely. And I've done a sketch for a site in Central Square where it actually works out to 50/50, and I'll gladly show that to you when it's appropriate.

But, again, it's not this site in particular, but it's -- look, every year we take \$11 million and we use it to lower our tax rate which is already the lowest in the state. It saves \$100 per million dollar house in taxes. It just seems stupid. So there's some additional money that could be used. There's different ways of putting it together. But no question, available land. And it means putting parking below grade, yes. But that's the price of the land then. If the city owns the parking lot, that becomes the price of the land. It's just a

different attitude, and it -- we're really in a -- I sound like I'm on a political soapbox, but I really am passionate about this. We really are in a true crisis and we're not focusing on it. My kids can't live here. They've already told me.

STEVEN COHEN: They just don't want to live near you.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: One lives in (inaudible) but when they have a child they can't afford to live here. It's pretty sad.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mr. Maguire.

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: I would like to remind the Board what was done with the Binney Street project on the affordable housing that we had 220,000 square feet of housing that became part of the project and 15 percent of that housing was inclusionary,



40 percent was middle income. And I will tell you from the economics that we're looking at is that the sale price, if we were to sell that building, would be below what it cost to actually build. So what's happening, and in our case, and we knew this at the time that we were accepting this, so this is not a complaint, because we got something very good for the community in the whole package, is that the number of units that are there, you know, are being subsidized by the actual commercial development. So, and that's -- and that was a good deal for us when we had that, and -- but I just want to remind you what you've done in the past.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, thank you. And the point of this is that the rest of the development will subsidize to the extent necessary the --

HUGH RUSSELL: But in this case, the rest of the development's got to build a \$200 million facility by the Department of --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That's the subsidy.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, but then they have no land there --

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

IRAM FAROOQ: Well, and they'll be closer to -- well, here's the PUD-KS mix. So this much will have to subsidize the -- well, this would be larger, and so this is the section that would subsidize. Whereas in Alexandria, for instance, here's the commercial, here's the residential, and this is the section that gets subsidized. So this I think is --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: But those are percentages, right?

IRAM FAROOQ: Those are percentages, yes. And here's the actual square footage.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, well, it's ten o'clock now. Are there other issues that people --

AHMED NUR: Just one clarification if I may ask.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

AHMED NUR: The -- in here you indicated, Iram, 80 percent of the median income, \$71,000 for a family of three approximately. For some reason I find that really low, but, you know, the minimum wage is rising to 22,500. Is that a two parent working or a single mother with two kids?

IRAM FAROOQ: It's based on the area income. So it doesn't distinguish between how many people are working, it's just the

income for the family.

AHMED NUR: Okay. And that family can be pretty much one parent working with two kids?

IRAM FAROOQ: It could be one parent working with two kids, two parents working with one kid.

AHMED NUR: Thank you.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean, obviously we're going to have to continue this discussion another time. I just like to toss out some other issues for staff to be thinking about.

IRAM FAROOQ: It would also be useful while you are doing your set of comments for any guidance that the Board wants to give us on some of the questions that you've raised where you've said you'd

like to see a certain percentage. It would be helpful to know what ballpark you're thinking of.

STEVEN COHEN: More.

AHMED NUR: More.

IRAM FAROOQ: Okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You know, I think the affordable housing should be a minimum of 15 percent of the total number of units. I think the -- and I'm not sure that's the right number, and it might be 20 percent.

STEVEN COHEN: It has the virtue of being what most people think the law already is.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Exactly.

I was just explaining to my son the other day. He said well, I understand 15 percent isn't really 15 percent, but it's

something like 11 percent. And I -- and he's an economic consultant so he understood when I explained to him. Oh, gotcha.

So I don't know what the current number is but, you know, I'm thinking that the 15 to 20 percent range.

AHMED NUR: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But I am mindful of what Mr. McDonald says and what other people have said is that at some point the project will not --

AHMED NUR: Maguire?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Maguire.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would be thrilled if you had eleven and a half percent low and a eleven and a half percent median.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's a nice number.

HUGH RUSSELL: Just double the number but the subsidy goes down.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, I would be satisfied even if the low percentage were lower and the median were higher. And the median will require a lesser internal substantive. And the less the substantive per unit, the less the units the developer can afford to provide.

AHMED NUR: And so Joe Maguire just told us 15 and 20, you know.

STEVEN COHEN: We get a lot of commercial square footage, I think, to subsidize there.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: But so does this -- I mean let's not lose sight. Why Iram put up the slide here with the absolute numbers. You know, the Alexandria property has slightly less commercial than

the PUD-KS proposal.

STEVEN COHEN: Is that right?

HUGH RUSSELL: Up to about the same.

JEFF ROBERTS: It's about the same.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Close.

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: Again, the Binney Street project was 1.75 million square foot project. 1.5 was commercial. 220,000 square feet of residential.

STEVEN COHEN: So it's 90/10. That's 90/10 and we're talking about what, 60/40 here? That's a big difference.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. It's the last bar.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: We when you look at the graph, the PUD-KS proposal, the economics on that are going to be very difficult with the amount of housing that's being proposed



period. And, you know, can it work? It can be, but I think you got to look very carefully at the economics as you raise the total percentage of subsidized units. And just anecdotally in talking with other owners, this is not something that I've experienced, but I do know that one, an owner doesn't necessarily get income growth in subsidized units. In fact, they may just have the opposite happen to them. And as you increase the amount of subsidized units, you may be destabilizing the residential buildings if you've gone -- if you've gone too far. So some way of looking at how a project is actually renting, okay, it would be valuable to the program in having it survive as you grow the percentage because without that you can actually destabilize owners.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes.

JEFF ROBERTS: So, I just want to -- maybe just wanted to respond to a couple of things.

Just first of all, I think that probably no one in this room would like to simplify the Zoning more than I would, but it's a very difficult thing to do in reality, and especially in this case where I think one of the things we tried to point out is that the inclusionary requirements, despite being hard to explain, have been applied very consistently and very strictly to all projects in the city over the past 15 years and have really had been one of the best performing inclusionary programs in the state and was even held up as a model nationwide. And a lot of that is because it is what it is. And it's based on studies that were done

back in the late 90s looking at the types of questions that he was raising; what are the affordability issues? What are the income levels and the households that are most cost-burdened in the city and most in need of assistance? And how does that help to balance the income diversity of the city? And that is the study that we're repeating at this point. So I think when we -- this has been said before, but I think when we were saying that the recommendation is to really hold and look at that study, it's not from a notion that we think that this area isn't different or it isn't a unique and special area, but that these issues that we're discussing for the past 30 minutes or so or 45 minutes or so, are the exact questions that we really need answers to and that we think we're going to get some answers from

this, from this study. And that we don't really have the answers right now that we'd like to otherwise have.

STUART DASH: And that scope is on our purchasing website and the bid is an RFP is in the website. We'd get that to you in hard copy and we'll send the link to you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Great.

Just some other areas I would like to discuss at some point.

Whether there should be, you know, the mix of retail. I know we're limiting the size, but whether there should be some restrictions on the types and mix of the retail. I know there are some places where we've said no to banks and no to other types of things. And, you know, whether we can have the retail not just be all upscale but be something that works for the people of all

incomes and for the neighbors so that we can get East Cambridge people coming and using the retail here. I appreciate all the restaurants and coffee shops in Kendall Square area. As one of the City Councillor said yesterday, he's not buying coffee very often. So that's something just to think about.

I would recommend that Board Members, if they have questions about language, send them on to Jeff so that, you know, we can address some. I've got questions about the GFA calculations, but it's not something I'm going to get into at this point.

I think that was -- oh, one thing we didn't discuss and maybe we can discuss it another time, is why we limit -- eliminate institutional dormitory use from the calculations? You touched upon that. But

maybe in our further conversation we can -- maybe you can tell us why that's a good idea.

JEFF ROBERTS: I'm sorry, could you -- eliminating it from what section?

STEVEN COHEN: From the FAR calculation. It doesn't count as the gross floor area.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And I think those, other than some preliminary language, those were my main topics of concern.

Anyone else have things they want to raise for next time?

STEVEN COHEN: I just want to say it was great to actually talk planning and policy here with -- we don't get to do that that often whatever the outcome.

STUART DASH: And, Ted, I briefly want to mention this has been a funny interchangeable thing that I've heard, but

the East Cambridge and Area 4 Harrington and East Cambridge and we sort of clumped them under Eastern Cambridge, but it should be clear that there are a few close neighborhoods as we call it naming them.

AHMED NUR: Kendall Square.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Oh, good.

Thanks for clarifying that for me in terms of East Cambridge. You're right. There are other areas.

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, do you mind if before -- I don't know if you had something else to add, but just before we conclude there's been a lot of discussion about open space, about height, and about affordable housing in terms of changing the possible changes to what's been proposed in the requirements. And I wonder if it's possible to do a straw poll to see where the

Board Members feel that what could can be changed. Because there were different ideas that were put out and some were sort of mixed in terms of which way they were proposing to go. And I think to move things along, it would be helpful if we knew with a little bit of -- it doesn't have to be a final answer now, but if we had some sense of what direction we should go on some of those issues.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I mean we could -- I was going to suggest that on one of them that we all are basically in agreement with Catherine's principle of how we look at open space. Because I heard Steve and -- and I think we all are pretty much thinking about trying to require the right amount of quality open space as the best way to achieve our goals.



LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And a little more clarity on what's considered, because there's 300-foot buildings. No one's going on the roof.

JEFF ROBERTS: So the response to that. So the idea is what the Planning Board's suggesting is that every open space should be, should have a precise definition. The Planning Board would have not any flexibility in determining what does or doesn't count in open space -- because that's really the difference, I think the key difference, is how much flexibility does the Planning Board have to approve variations or how much has it left completely and strictly in a Zoning Ordinance and not discretionary at all.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think what I was suggesting was that we have a

lower percentage, not the 40 percent, but a lower percentage, maybe 25 and have no flexibility on that. And have it be insistent on it being ground floor, open to the air, and publicly accessible. Physically publicly accessible. And to the extent that there is other open space, whether it is publicly owned, privately owned, publicly controlled, whatever, there is infinite flexibility to work with the developer on that. But, you know, to get to the, you know, the rhombus example, there's a lot of green open space in the rhombus that right down the strip that would count and the paved area would not. But I think that is -- that's what I'm looking for, is a smaller percentage but very defined so that everybody, including the community, knows what we're getting.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Hard number, right?

STEVEN COHEN: And flexibility where it is, it doesn't have to be one place --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes, correct.

STEVEN COHEN: -- it doesn't have to be broken up.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:  
Absolutely.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is that a two-tier system or if it's a minimum here's the minimum we would like to see more but that's the minimum.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I mean staff was kind of driving us towards the one number and I guess my feeling is that if it's going to be one number, I wanted it to be a quality number.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And a well defined number?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Numbers are by definition well defined.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: You got a lot of grey in there.

STEVEN COHEN: Like 15 percent?

AHMED NUR: Jeff, and as the height, I think Steve was alluding to Hugh's response of 400, you know, for the residential site, and I was kind of liking that instead of a 300 if we can go up higher, and other Board Members can obviously --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think what I'm hearing is that there is some flexibility on the Board to go higher in order to achieve both the affordable housing and the open space goals.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Correct.

STEVEN COHEN: But I personally have absolutely no idea what that number should be and how you even make that decision.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I agree.

AHMED NUR: Hugh just said 400 and I thought 350.

HUGH RUSSELL: In this discussion I always think of specifics and the more intuitive people think about principles, so --

AHMED NUR: Okay. I remain corrected.

HUGH RUSSELL: Steve and I are actually saying the same thing.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And then I guess on affordable housing, you know, I think more of everything or -- well, more of everything but some people think maybe less of something

and you get more of the other. You know, I think it would be good if we could hear something from the people who are going to be doing the study to give us some guidance to, you know, to help us to organize our own thoughts. Because I understand that the arguments for and against, you know, the affordable being more for low and low income people and the argument for it to work for moderate working people, and it's a philosophical difference. And, but so I think rather than pinning us all down on it right now if we could get some more input.

IRAM FAROOQ: A proposal, yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That would be good, and then maybe we can reach some conclusion or perhaps make some, you know, alternative recommendations to City Council and let them make the political decision

about how it should go.

HUGH RUSSELL: I just like to remind you of a comment I made probably four or five times. I've done a lot of work for development companies that started by doing mixed income housing developments under HMFA programs about four years ago and their early developments had a mix of low, moderate, and market rate. And when the moderate dropped out of the formula, it caused them a lot of management problems because with a three-tier you can have somebody who goes from one tier without -- to another tier without having to leave their home.

IRAM FAROOQ: That's true.

HUGH RUSSELL: If you write the regulations appropriately. And that's the major -- a lot of people's financial circumstances is that they vary a bit.

Particularly say people in construction trades who might have a year where they're not working very much. And then they might have a year where there's all the overtime. And, you know, it's --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And I know from experience with my people, they're leaving in droves, they can't live here. And they, you know, they make a pretty good living but there's just no way. And they drive here everyday.

IRAM FAROOQ: Well, then we definitely want them living here.

STUART DASH: Right down Antrim Street.

STEVEN COHEN: Jeff and I had a discussion earlier, and I want to ask you this question after your comment, are they leaving because they can't afford to live



here or are they leaving because they can do better? They can get a bigger house or a bigger yard --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: -- elsewhere?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: There's a little bit of availability problem for families, but besides that it's price. There's just no -- someone with a, you know, who needs a two bedroom and they're, you know, three or four thousand dollars a month. And there aren't many of them. So put it this way, a big percentage of our construction people are driving 70 or 80 miles one way to work in Cambridge. So....

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE:

Expensive.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jeff, do you have as much guidance as we can give you?

JEFF ROBERTS: That was very helpful.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I think this was a great meeting. I really thought it was excellent to be able to talk about these things.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Thanks for staff for giving us the time.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

And we look forward to the next iteration of this and the next discussion on it.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We have a motion to adjourn?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So moved.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second?

All in favor?

(Show of hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you all  
for coming.

(Whereupon, at 10:25 p.m., the  
Planning Board Adjourned.)

\* \* \* \* \*

**ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS**

The original transcript and Errata Sheet has been delivered to Community Development Department electronically.

**INSTRUCTIONS**

After reading this volume of the Planning Board transcript, note any change or correction and the reason therefor on this sheet. Sign and date this Errata Sheet.

<b>PAGE</b>	<b>LINE</b>	
_____	_____	<b>CHANGE:</b> _____ <b>REASON:</b> _____
_____	_____	<b>CHANGE:</b> _____ <b>REASON:</b> _____
_____	_____	<b>CHANGE:</b> _____ <b>REASON:</b> _____
_____	_____	<b>CHANGE:</b> _____ <b>REASON:</b> _____
_____	_____	<b>CHANGE:</b> _____ <b>REASON:</b> _____
_____	_____	<b>CHANGE:</b> _____ <b>REASON:</b> _____

I have read the foregoing transcript of the Planning Board, and except for any corrections or changes noted above, I hereby subscribe to the transcript as an accurate record of the statement(s) made by me.

\_\_\_\_\_

**C E R T I F I C A T E****COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
BRISTOL, SS.**

I, Catherine Lawson Zelinski, a  
Certified Shorthand Reporter, the undersigned  
Notary Public, certify:

That the hearing herein before set  
forth is a true and accurate record of the  
proceedings.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, I have hereunto set  
my hand this 8th day of May, 2015.

---

Catherine L. Zelinski  
Notary Public  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
License No. 147703

My Commission Expires:  
April 29, 2022

**THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS  
TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION  
OF THE SAME IN ANY RESPECT UNLESS UNDER THE  
DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE  
CERTIFYING REPORTER.**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>\$</b></p> <p><b>\$100</b> [1] - 175:11  <b>\$11</b> [1] - 175:9  <b>\$120</b> [1] - 39:6  <b>\$14,000</b> [2] - 150:2, 150:6  <b>\$15,000</b> [1] - 150:14  <b>\$175</b> [1] - 39:6  <b>\$18</b> [1] - 106:7  <b>\$200</b> [1] - 178:2  <b>\$300</b> [1] - 35:5  <b>\$400</b> [1] - 35:5  <b>\$71,000</b> [1] - 179:12  <b>\$800,000</b> [1] - 106:8</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p><b>2.5</b> [1] - 105:17  <b>20</b> [6] - 81:14, 119:19, 150:5, 181:11, 182:6, 183:11  <b>200</b> [3] - 29:18, 32:10, 32:13  <b>2013</b> [1] - 8:17  <b>2015</b> [2] - 1:4, 205:9  <b>2016</b> [3] - 96:3, 96:17, 96:19  <b>2022</b> [1] - 205:15  <b>21st</b> [1] - 4:6  <b>22</b> [7] - 86:3, 105:18, 111:5, 111:10, 118:2, 118:7  <b>22,500</b> [1] - 179:15  <b>220,000</b> [2] - 176:17, 184:8  <b>22nd</b> [1] - 4:10  <b>25</b> [6] - 49:5, 58:6, 58:7, 85:15, 150:5, 194:2  <b>250</b> [5] - 20:4, 32:13, 59:1, 59:4, 86:19  <b>26</b> [1] - 58:6  <b>27</b> [2] - 58:6, 58:7  <b>28th</b> [2] - 4:7, 173:8  <b>29</b> [1] - 205:15</p>	<p>119:16, 151:10, 177:1, 194:1  <b>400</b> [6] - 86:18, 112:12, 143:15, 147:15, 196:10, 197:6  <b>400,000</b> [4] - 34:19, 84:1, 92:5, 117:16  <b>42</b> [4] - 23:10, 23:15, 24:3, 24:8  <b>45</b> [1] - 187:17  <b>47.0</b> [1] - 83:19</p>	<p><b>90s</b> [2] - 14:19, 187:1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>A</b></p> <p><b>abilities</b> [1] - 29:16  <b>ability</b> [2] - 39:18, 75:5  <b>able</b> [17] - 36:6, 45:1, 49:18, 71:8, 74:13, 74:18, 86:12, 98:10, 115:10, 159:17, 161:5, 162:4, 163:5, 164:10, 164:11, 166:3, 202:6  <b>absent</b> [2] - 81:2, 118:4  <b>absolute</b> [1] - 183:18  <b>absolutely</b> [7] - 78:14, 113:14, 114:6, 121:4, 175:3, 195:10, 197:2  <b>abstract</b> [1] - 95:12  <b>accelerates</b> [1] - 152:1  <b>accept</b> [2] - 22:9, 121:15  <b>accepting</b> [1] - 177:7  <b>access</b> [6] - 29:7, 29:8, 51:6, 82:5, 82:6, 83:8  <b>accessibility</b> [3] - 21:7, 22:12, 64:17  <b>accessible</b> [11] - 21:4, 22:15, 24:12, 60:11, 67:10, 74:9, 77:13, 78:4, 80:18, 194:5, 194:6  <b>accommodate</b> [6] - 19:2, 19:3, 26:15, 93:18, 131:7, 157:17  <b>accommodated</b> [1] - 28:5  <b>accomplish</b> [2] - 20:19, 112:2  <b>account</b> [1] - 156:16  <b>accurate</b> [3] - 28:2, 204:16, 205:7  <b>achieve</b> [7] - 90:12, 109:2, 133:4, 133:5, 133:6, 192:18, 196:17  <b>acknowledge</b> [2] - 73:16, 75:4  <b>acknowledged</b> [1] - 34:13  <b>acre</b> [1] - 137:1  <b>acreage</b> [1] - 101:5  <b>acres</b> [25] - 23:12, 23:13, 30:4, 30:9, 31:14, 84:3, 91:14,</p>	<p>91:16, 91:17, 92:6, 100:9, 101:1, 102:7, 103:15, 114:9, 119:16, 124:11, 124:19, 125:9, 125:19, 126:1, 126:2, 126:6, 137:1, 137:6  <b>act</b> [2] - 47:7, 90:10  <b>Acting</b> [2] - 1:12, 2:3  <b>acting</b> [1] - 96:11  <b>action</b> [1] - 97:3  <b>activating</b> [1] - 42:15  <b>active</b> [6] - 42:18, 53:7, 61:7, 66:11, 67:9, 108:11  <b>activities</b> [2] - 21:12, 66:14  <b>actual</b> [2] - 177:11, 179:2  <b>add</b> [8] - 6:18, 40:7, 62:16, 99:15, 99:19, 146:4, 171:13, 191:13  <b>added</b> [2] - 52:10, 81:10  <b>adding</b> [1] - 136:17  <b>addition</b> [2] - 105:13, 105:16  <b>additional</b> [6] - 12:6, 37:12, 52:10, 53:15, 69:12, 175:13  <b>address</b> [1] - 189:12  <b>addressed</b> [1] - 23:1  <b>addressing</b> [1] - 14:9  <b>adequate</b> [1] - 22:11  <b>adjacent</b> [5] - 20:7, 64:18, 86:8, 88:11, 89:2  <b>adjourn</b> [1] - 202:16  <b>Adjourned</b> [1] - 203:6  <b>administration</b> [1] - 133:8  <b>administrator</b> [2] - 129:18, 133:9  <b>adopt</b> [1] - 86:14  <b>adopted</b> [3] - 8:17, 44:17, 166:6  <b>Advisors</b> [1] - 36:14  <b>advocate</b> [1] - 86:10  <b>aesthetic</b> [2] - 81:15, 130:9  <b>affect</b> [2] - 27:1, 37:19  <b>afford</b> [5] - 146:9, 174:3, 176:11, 183:9, 200:19  <b>affordability</b> [7] - 11:2, 46:8, 147:1, 147:19, 164:1, 172:1, 187:3  <b>Affordable</b> [4] - 46:2,</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>0</b></p>	<p><b>22,500</b> [1] - 179:15  <b>220,000</b> [2] - 176:17, 184:8  <b>22nd</b> [1] - 4:10  <b>25</b> [6] - 49:5, 58:6, 58:7, 85:15, 150:5, 194:2  <b>250</b> [5] - 20:4, 32:13, 59:1, 59:4, 86:19  <b>26</b> [1] - 58:6  <b>27</b> [2] - 58:6, 58:7  <b>28th</b> [2] - 4:7, 173:8  <b>29</b> [1] - 205:15</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b></p> <p><b>5.2</b> [3] - 141:12, 141:14, 141:16  <b>50</b> [2] - 149:19, 151:4  <b>50-foot</b> [3] - 103:3, 103:4, 103:12  <b>50/50</b> [5] - 173:10, 174:13, 174:17, 175:1, 175:5  <b>500</b> [1] - 147:15  <b>5:30</b> [2] - 7:8, 7:17</p>	<p><b>absent</b> [2] - 81:2, 118:4  <b>absolute</b> [1] - 183:18  <b>absolutely</b> [7] - 78:14, 113:14, 114:6, 121:4, 175:3, 195:10, 197:2  <b>abstract</b> [1] - 95:12  <b>accelerates</b> [1] - 152:1  <b>accept</b> [2] - 22:9, 121:15  <b>accepting</b> [1] - 177:7  <b>access</b> [6] - 29:7, 29:8, 51:6, 82:5, 82:6, 83:8  <b>accessibility</b> [3] - 21:7, 22:12, 64:17  <b>accessible</b> [11] - 21:4, 22:15, 24:12, 60:11, 67:10, 74:9, 77:13, 78:4, 80:18, 194:5, 194:6  <b>accommodate</b> [6] - 19:2, 19:3, 26:15, 93:18, 131:7, 157:17  <b>accommodated</b> [1] - 28:5  <b>accomplish</b> [2] - 20:19, 112:2  <b>account</b> [1] - 156:16  <b>accurate</b> [3] - 28:2, 204:16, 205:7  <b>achieve</b> [7] - 90:12, 109:2, 133:4, 133:5, 133:6, 192:18, 196:17  <b>acknowledge</b> [2] - 73:16, 75:4  <b>acknowledged</b> [1] - 34:13  <b>acre</b> [1] - 137:1  <b>acreage</b> [1] - 101:5  <b>acres</b> [25] - 23:12, 23:13, 30:4, 30:9, 31:14, 84:3, 91:14,</p>	<p><b>0</b></p> <p><b>0.7</b> [1] - 84:3</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p><b>30</b> [8] - 84:4, 95:9, 119:16, 123:18, 142:4, 155:8, 164:12, 187:16  <b>300</b> [11] - 20:5, 32:10, 49:4, 58:5, 58:17, 87:13, 138:6, 143:14, 196:12  <b>300-foot</b> [1] - 193:3  <b>310</b> [1] - 58:17  <b>315</b> [1] - 58:17  <b>344</b> [1] - 1:6  <b>35</b> [2] - 95:9, 151:10  <b>350</b> [1] - 197:7</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6</b></p> <p><b>6</b> [1] - 84:7  <b>60</b> [4] - 81:18, 82:8, 84:8, 148:9  <b>60/40</b> [1] - 184:12  <b>617.786.7783/617.639.0396</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>65</b> [1] - 32:12</p>	<p><b>90s</b> [2] - 14:19, 187:1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>A</b></p> <p><b>abilities</b> [1] - 29:16  <b>ability</b> [2] - 39:18, 75:5  <b>able</b> [17] - 36:6, 45:1, 49:18, 71:8, 74:13, 74:18, 86:12, 98:10, 115:10, 159:17, 161:5, 162:4, 163:5, 164:10, 164:11, 166:3, 202:6  <b>absent</b> [2] - 81:2, 118:4  <b>absolute</b> [1] - 183:18  <b>absolutely</b> [7] - 78:14, 113:14, 114:6, 121:4, 175:3, 195:10, 197:2  <b>abstract</b> [1] - 95:12  <b>accelerates</b> [1] - 152:1  <b>accept</b> [2] - 22:9, 121:15  <b>accepting</b> [1] - 177:7  <b>access</b> [6] - 29:7, 29:8, 51:6, 82:5, 82:6, 83:8  <b>accessibility</b> [3] - 21:7, 22:12, 64:17  <b>accessible</b> [11] - 21:4, 22:15, 24:12, 60:11, 67:10, 74:9, 77:13, 78:4, 80:18, 194:5, 194:6  <b>accommodate</b> [6] - 19:2, 19:3, 26:15, 93:18, 131:7, 157:17  <b>accommodated</b> [1] - 28:5  <b>accomplish</b> [2] - 20:19, 112:2  <b>account</b> [1] - 156:16  <b>accurate</b> [3] - 28:2, 204:16, 205:7  <b>achieve</b> [7] - 90:12, 109:2, 133:4, 133:5, 133:6, 192:18, 196:17  <b>acknowledge</b> [2] - 73:16, 75:4  <b>acknowledged</b> [1] - 34:13  <b>acre</b> [1] - 137:1  <b>acreage</b> [1] - 101:5  <b>acres</b> [25] - 23:12, 23:13, 30:4, 30:9, 31:14, 84:3, 91:14,</p>	<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>1</b> [1] - 138:18  <b>1.2</b> [1] - 84:6  <b>1.5</b> [1] - 184:8  <b>1.75</b> [1] - 184:7  <b>10</b> [6] - 81:14, 126:1, 126:4, 136:19, 137:1, 137:6  <b>100</b> [3] - 86:16, 87:5, 87:15  <b>10:25</b> [1] - 203:5  <b>11</b> [2] - 172:8, 182:1  <b>11.2</b> [1] - 156:8  <b>11.3</b> [1] - 156:9  <b>110</b> [2] - 84:11, 87:5  <b>12</b> [1] - 119:16  <b>120</b> [2] - 32:7, 48:17  <b>125</b> [2] - 56:5, 57:12  <b>14</b> [1] - 84:3  <b>14-acre</b> [2] - 8:7, 91:15  <b>147703</b> [1] - 205:14  <b>15</b> [17] - 15:19, 47:1, 81:14, 141:17, 141:18, 142:3, 142:6, 156:8, 156:10, 176:19, 181:9, 181:18, 181:19, 182:5, 183:11, 186:14, 196:7  <b>15-acre</b> [1] - 126:4  <b>150</b> [2] - 44:13, 84:11  <b>16</b> [1] - 150:8  <b>18</b> [2] - 47:2, 106:5  <b>180</b> [1] - 32:13  <b>1969</b> [1] - 150:15  <b>1997</b> [1] - 47:19</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p> <p><b>4</b> [3] - 113:19, 114:1, 191:1  <b>4.0</b> [1] - 147:12  <b>40</b> [20] - 24:2, 24:6, 24:10, 30:7, 79:15, 79:19, 81:8, 81:16, 84:5, 86:14, 95:6, 105:19, 110:3, 110:5, 110:6,</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>7</b></p> <p><b>7</b> [1] - 1:4  <b>70</b> [2] - 154:3, 201:14  <b>7:00</b> [1] - 1:5  <b>7th</b> [1] - 3:4</p>	<p><b>90s</b> [2] - 14:19, 187:1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>A</b></p> <p><b>abilities</b> [1] - 29:16  <b>ability</b> [2] - 39:18, 75:5  <b>able</b> [17] - 36:6, 45:1, 49:18, 71:8, 74:13, 74:18, 86:12, 98:10, 115:10, 159:17, 161:5, 162:4, 163:5, 164:10, 164:11, 166:3, 202:6  <b>absent</b> [2] - 81:2, 118:4  <b>absolute</b> [1] - 183:18  <b>absolutely</b> [7] - 78:14, 113:14, 114:6, 121:4, 175:3, 195:10, 197:2  <b>abstract</b> [1] - 95:12  <b>accelerates</b> [1] - 152:1  <b>accept</b> [2] - 22:9, 121:15  <b>accepting</b> [1] - 177:7  <b>access</b> [6] - 29:7, 29:8, 51:6, 82:5, 82:6, 83:8  <b>accessibility</b> [3] - 21:7, 22:12, 64:17  <b>accessible</b> [11] - 21:4, 22:15, 24:12, 60:11, 67:10, 74:9, 77:13, 78:4, 80:18, 194:5, 194:6  <b>accommodate</b> [6] - 19:2, 19:3, 26:15, 93:18, 131:7, 157:17  <b>accommodated</b> [1] - 28:5  <b>accomplish</b> [2] - 20:19, 112:2  <b>account</b> [1] - 156:16  <b>accurate</b> [3] - 28:2, 204:16, 205:7  <b>achieve</b> [7] - 90:12, 109:2, 133:4, 133:5, 133:6, 192:18, 196:17  <b>acknowledge</b> [2] - 73:16, 75:4  <b>acknowledged</b> [1] - 34:13  <b>acre</b> [1] - 137:1  <b>acreage</b> [1] - 101:5  <b>acres</b> [25] - 23:12, 23:13, 30:4, 30:9, 31:14, 84:3, 91:14,</p>	<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>1</b> [1] - 138:18  <b>1.2</b> [1] - 84:6  <b>1.5</b> [1] - 184:8  <b>1.75</b> [1] - 184:7  <b>10</b> [6] - 81:14, 126:1, 126:4, 136:19, 137:1, 137:6  <b>100</b> [3] - 86:16, 87:5, 87:15  <b>10:25</b> [1] - 203:5  <b>11</b> [2] - 172:8, 182:1  <b>11.2</b> [1] - 156:8  <b>11.3</b> [1] - 156:9  <b>110</b> [2] - 84:11, 87:5  <b>12</b> [1] - 119:16  <b>120</b> [2] - 32:7, 48:17  <b>125</b> [2] - 56:5, 57:12  <b>14</b> [1] - 84:3  <b>14-acre</b> [2] - 8:7, 91:15  <b>147703</b> [1] - 205:14  <b>15</b> [17] - 15:19, 47:1, 81:14, 141:17, 141:18, 142:3, 142:6, 156:8, 156:10, 176:19, 181:9, 181:18, 181:19, 182:5, 183:11, 186:14, 196:7  <b>15-acre</b> [1] - 126:4  <b>150</b> [2] - 44:13, 84:11  <b>16</b> [1] - 150:8  <b>18</b> [2] - 47:2, 106:5  <b>180</b> [1] - 32:13  <b>1969</b> [1] - 150:15  <b>1997</b> [1] - 47:19</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p>	<p><b>4</b> [3] - 113:19, 114:1, 191:1  <b>4.0</b> [1] - 147:12  <b>40</b> [20] - 24:2, 24:6, 24:10, 30:7, 79:15, 79:19, 81:8, 81:16, 84:5, 86:14, 95:6, 105:19, 110:3, 110:5, 110:6,</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>8</b></p> <p><b>80</b> [3] - 93:17, 179:11, 201:14  <b>80/20</b> [1] - 173:3  <b>85</b> [3] - 32:6, 32:12, 57:8  <b>8th</b> [1] - 205:9</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>9</b></p> <p><b>90</b> [2] - 154:16, 154:18  <b>90/10</b> [2] - 184:10, 184:11</p>	<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>1</b> [1] - 138:18  <b>1.2</b> [1] - 84:6  <b>1.5</b> [1] - 184:8  <b>1.75</b> [1] - 184:7  <b>10</b> [6] - 81:14, 126:1, 126:4, 136:19, 137:1, 137:6  <b>100</b> [3] - 86:16, 87:5, 87:15  <b>10:25</b> [1] - 203:5  <b>11</b> [2] - 172:8, 182:1  <b>11.2</b> [1] - 156:8  <b>11.3</b> [1] - 156:9  <b>110</b> [2] - 84:11, 87:5  <b>12</b> [1] - 119:16  <b>120</b> [2] - 32:7, 48:17  <b>125</b> [2] - 56:5, 57:12  <b>14</b> [1] - 84:3  <b>14-acre</b> [2] - 8:7, 91:15  <b>147703</b> [1] - 205:14  <b>15</b> [17] - 15:19, 47:1, 81:14, 141:17, 141:18, 142:3, 142:6, 156:8, 156:10, 176:19, 181:9, 181:18, 181:19, 182:5, 183:11, 186:14, 196:7  <b>15-acre</b> [1] - 126:4  <b>150</b> [2] - 44:13, 84:11  <b>16</b> [1] - 150:8  <b>18</b> [2] - 47:2, 106:5  <b>180</b> [1] - 32:13  <b>1969</b> [1] - 150:15  <b>1997</b> [1] - 47:19</p>

<p>46:7, 47:2, 165:6  <b>affordable</b> [56] - 4:15,  4:16, 5:11, 37:8,  37:13, 42:8, 43:13,  44:7, 44:14, 45:4,  47:16, 47:17, 48:3,  71:18, 106:15,  109:13, 111:11,  113:1, 114:19,  137:11, 137:15,  137:18, 138:2,  138:3, 138:7,  138:13, 138:19,  140:6, 140:11,  141:1, 141:7,  141:18, 142:10,  142:13, 143:6,  143:18, 144:5,  146:17, 146:19,  147:13, 149:3,  153:12, 164:2,  167:12, 169:5,  170:13, 170:16,  170:17, 171:6,  174:2, 176:16,  181:8, 191:16,  196:17, 197:17,  198:8  <b>afforded</b> [1] - 146:11  <b>African</b> [1] - 152:11  <b>African-American</b> [1]  - 152:11  <b>after-the-fact</b> [1] -  163:14  <b>agencies</b> [2] - 129:10,  132:18  <b>agenda</b> [1] - 3:6  <b>aggregate</b> [1] - 15:16  <b>agnostic</b> [1] - 117:2  <b>ago</b> [5] - 154:3,  154:16, 154:18,  155:8, 199:7  <b>agree</b> [11] - 100:4,  108:14, 123:2,  123:10, 132:9,  134:7, 134:9,  143:16, 158:15,  171:17, 197:5  <b>agreement</b> [1] -  192:13  <b>ahmed</b> [2] - 100:5,  147:3  <b>Ahmed</b> [1] - 1:10  <b>AHMED</b> [20] - 32:2,  58:9, 100:6, 101:17,  102:16, 103:19,  147:4, 150:6, 179:7,  179:10, 180:2,  180:8, 181:5, 182:7,  182:12, 183:10,  191:6, 196:8, 197:6,  197:12</p>	<p><b>air</b> [1] - 194:5  <b>Alexandria</b> [3] -  88:16, 178:14,  183:18  <b>alleyways</b> [1] - 60:7  <b>allow</b> [6] - 42:3, 80:8,  95:15, 95:16, 96:9,  149:6  <b>allowable</b> [1] - 26:7  <b>allowed</b> [2] - 120:1,  149:2  <b>allowing</b> [1] - 86:15  <b>allows</b> [2] - 45:8, 82:5  <b>alluded</b> [2] - 105:1,  168:11  <b>alluding</b> [1] - 196:9  <b>almost</b> [3] - 102:7,  151:4, 163:4  <b>alternative</b> [2] - 94:1,  198:18  <b>alternatives</b> [4] -  26:14, 28:8, 28:10,  94:16  <b>amend</b> [2] - 156:14,  156:15  <b>amended</b> [1] - 56:2  <b>amenities</b> [4] - 19:7,  70:17, 99:16,  161:18  <b>amenity</b> [1] - 98:9  <b>American</b> [1] - 152:11  <b>Ames</b> [4] - 59:3, 89:8,  89:10, 89:11  <b>amount</b> [24] - 5:11,  5:12, 6:5, 12:10,  21:3, 22:10, 25:16,  28:4, 30:11, 43:4,  44:2, 49:6, 49:7,  70:2, 79:5, 85:12,  98:4, 111:9, 118:14,  164:15, 184:19,  185:11, 192:17  <b>analog</b> [1] - 14:12  <b>analysis</b> [3] - 38:14,  39:9, 54:7  <b>analyzing</b> [1] - 41:17  <b>anchors</b> [1] - 115:5  <b>AND</b> [1] - 204:1  <b>AND/OR</b> [1] - 205:18  <b>anecdotally</b> [1] -  185:5  <b>announce</b> [1] -  165:11  <b>announcement</b> [1] -  13:12  <b>answer</b> [6] - 40:4,  82:12, 100:14,  104:1, 168:9, 192:7  <b>answering</b> [2] - 69:11,  168:8  <b>answers</b> [4] - 115:10,</p>	<p>187:18, 187:19,  188:2  <b>anticipate</b> [3] - 3:11,  18:18, 21:13  <b>anticipating</b> [2] -  21:2, 40:10  <b>Antrim</b> [2] - 150:16,  200:14  <b>ANY</b> [2] - 205:17,  205:17  <b>anyway</b> [4] - 152:2,  154:11, 162:7,  168:19  <b>apartment</b> [3] - 154:4,  154:17, 157:11  <b>apartments</b> [2] -  146:1, 153:17  <b>appealing</b> [1] - 111:9  <b>apples</b> [2] - 28:7  <b>applicable</b> [1] -  143:17  <b>applied</b> [1] - 186:12  <b>applies</b> [1] - 8:12  <b>APPLY</b> [1] - 205:17  <b>apply</b> [6] - 22:14,  26:11, 48:9, 48:11,  48:12, 56:4  <b>applying</b> [2] - 8:14,  9:1  <b>appreciate</b> [1] - 189:3  <b>approach</b> [3] - 59:18,  65:4, 67:10  <b>appropriate</b> [9] -  68:13, 113:1, 158:3,  158:4, 159:14,  160:4, 169:4, 169:6,  175:6  <b>appropriately</b> [1] -  199:17  <b>approval</b> [1] - 81:2  <b>approve</b> [1] - 193:14  <b>approximate</b> [2] -  117:18, 124:18  <b>april</b> [1] - 205:15  <b>April</b> [5] - 1:4, 3:4,  4:6, 4:7, 4:10  <b>arcade</b> [1] - 120:5  <b>architects</b> [1] - 12:12  <b>architectural</b> [1] -  27:3  <b>architecture</b> [1] -  150:11  <b>Area</b> [3] - 113:19,  114:1, 191:1  <b>area</b> [37] - 8:13, 8:15,  14:11, 15:16, 23:6,  25:11, 26:7, 30:12,  32:8, 41:3, 42:18,  48:18, 49:6, 70:16,  77:18, 84:3, 84:5,  89:2, 98:15, 105:7,</p>	<p>105:8, 124:9, 128:4,  135:11, 142:2,  142:4, 145:1, 145:8,  146:12, 147:13,  175:1, 179:17,  187:13, 187:15,  189:5, 190:7,  194:15  <b>areas</b> [7] - 8:15,  13:17, 14:6, 62:4,  173:14, 188:9,  191:10  <b>argument</b> [3] -  141:14, 156:13,  198:9  <b>arguments</b> [2] -  90:18, 198:7  <b>Arlington</b> [2] - 148:5,  148:8  <b>arrangement</b> [3] -  22:7, 26:16, 146:8  <b>arrangements</b> [1] -  26:17  <b>arrived</b> [1] - 23:17  <b>art</b> [2] - 65:17, 66:7  <b>articulate</b> [2] - 29:16,  117:12  <b>articulated</b> [1] - 116:2  <b>articulation</b> [2] -  29:16, 31:8  <b>aside</b> [9] - 70:7,  106:16, 107:3,  112:14, 112:19,  114:14, 167:18,  173:17, 174:1  <b>aspect</b> [4] - 61:19,  66:9, 77:1, 77:4  <b>aspects</b> [3] - 21:8,  59:7, 77:9  <b>assessment</b> [1] -  47:18  <b>assist</b> [1] - 65:8  <b>assistance</b> [1] - 187:6  <b>Assistant</b> [2] - 1:12,  2:3  <b>associate</b> [2] - 68:3,  121:8  <b>Associate</b> [2] - 1:10,  1:11  <b>associated</b> [1] - 34:8  <b>assume</b> [1] - 132:17  <b>assumption</b> [2] -  97:8, 122:4  <b>assumptions</b> [2] -  122:8, 139:5  <b>assurances</b> [2] -  130:12, 130:17  <b>atrium</b> [1] - 120:2  <b>attach</b> [1] - 53:14  <b>attitude</b> [1] - 176:1  <b>ATTORNEY</b> [2] -</p>	<p>120:10, 121:6  <b>attract</b> [1] - 160:9  <b>Au</b> [1] - 152:7  <b>AUDIENCE</b> [1] -  128:15  <b>Authority</b> [2] - 35:4,  36:15  <b>availability</b> [2] - 40:4,  201:7  <b>available</b> [6] - 21:4,  25:1, 153:5, 163:9,  173:13, 175:15  <b>average</b> [5] - 58:3,  84:10, 84:17, 85:17,  106:8  <b>aviation</b> [1] - 147:17  <b>avoiding</b> [1] - 59:14  <b>aware</b> [2] - 69:9,  170:6</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <p><b>Bacci</b> [1] - 1:10  <b>BACCI</b> [36] - 124:5,  124:14, 125:3,  125:8, 126:7,  126:11, 126:16,  127:2, 127:4, 127:7,  128:10, 128:19,  129:3, 130:11,  131:1, 131:10,  131:13, 132:3,  132:8, 133:14,  134:7, 134:13,  155:18, 166:13,  167:3, 167:5, 178:4,  184:5, 193:1, 195:1,  196:1, 196:5,  196:19, 200:6,  201:4, 201:6  <b>background</b> [2] -  54:6, 95:19  <b>backwards</b> [2] - 96:4,  131:6  <b>bad</b> [2] - 36:12,  104:16  <b>balance</b> [9] - 33:7,  37:19, 40:12, 42:3,  43:14, 136:11,  145:5, 159:12,  187:7  <b>balancing</b> [4] - 36:10,  39:15, 39:16, 90:10  <b>ballpark</b> [2] - 40:6,  181:2  <b>banks</b> [2] - 151:19,  188:16  <b>bar</b> [2] - 164:9, 184:14  <b>base</b> [8] - 44:19,  87:14, 87:15, 138:7,  153:3, 155:14,</p>
--	---	--	--	---

<p>164:3, 164:5  <b>based</b> [14] - 19:13,  37:10, 46:17, 49:11,  49:12, 69:14, 80:6,  101:11, 139:4,  152:18, 153:11,  161:18, 179:17,  186:19  <b>baseline</b> [1] - 50:15  <b>basement</b> [1] - 154:18  <b>basic</b> [1] - 138:3  <b>basis</b> [2] - 47:19,  159:19  <b>beats</b> [1] - 126:9  <b>beautiful</b> [1] - 70:16  <b>became</b> [1] - 176:18  <b>become</b> [2] - 89:16,  168:13  <b>becomes</b> [3] - 31:2,  91:19, 175:19  <b>bedroom</b> [9] - 50:16,  52:11, 145:4, 149:4,  153:17, 157:11,  158:5, 162:17,  201:10  <b>bedrooms</b> [3] -  162:10, 171:16,  172:4  <b>began</b> [1] - 126:3  <b>beginning</b> [1] - 97:2  <b>begun</b> [1] - 142:9  <b>behind</b> [5] - 16:10,  64:16, 123:2, 152:6,  172:13  <b>below</b> [4] - 34:1,  175:16, 177:4  <b>benchmark</b> [1] -  161:7  <b>bend</b> [1] - 131:6  <b>beneficial</b> [11] - 25:1,  72:11, 73:5, 73:9,  73:12, 74:3, 77:3,  77:10, 77:11, 110:2,  110:11  <b>benefit</b> [2] - 42:6,  70:19  <b>benefits</b> [4] - 42:3,  115:4, 139:14,  140:3  <b>benefitting</b> [1] -  110:18  <b>best</b> [5] - 70:15, 94:7,  132:19, 186:15,  192:18  <b>bet</b> [1] - 91:2  <b>betraying</b> [1] - 77:6  <b>better</b> [5] - 50:1,  82:18, 89:1, 121:7,  201:2  <b>between</b> [28] - 3:7,  4:10, 20:4, 27:6,</p>	<p>30:16, 31:5, 31:10,  32:10, 33:7, 37:2,  41:17, 47:1, 56:9,  56:18, 61:10, 67:2,  67:4, 67:11, 73:4,  86:7, 104:3, 104:13,  105:2, 105:4, 123:8,  124:18, 158:1,  179:18  <b>beyond</b> [1] - 88:17  <b>bias</b> [1] - 77:6  <b>bicyclist</b> [1] - 61:2  <b>bid</b> [1] - 188:5  <b>bidding</b> [1] - 96:8  <b>bifurcated</b> [1] -  158:17  <b>big</b> [11] - 33:18,  34:12, 41:8, 86:6,  86:7, 92:7, 115:6,  117:10, 137:4,  184:12, 201:13  <b>bigger</b> [3] - 155:15,  201:2, 201:3  <b>Bigolin</b> [2] - 1:15,  53:1  <b>BIGOLIN</b> [9] - 52:19,  57:10, 57:14, 57:19,  58:19, 59:6, 64:3,  89:14, 89:19  <b>binders</b> [1] - 112:14  <b>binding</b> [3] - 108:2,  132:15, 133:7  <b>Binney</b> [9] - 88:14,  121:19, 122:16,  123:5, 123:18,  172:16, 176:16,  184:6  <b>binney</b> [1] - 122:1  <b>bit</b> [46] - 5:1, 10:16,  11:8, 13:8, 18:3,  18:8, 24:4, 25:3,  26:2, 28:1, 28:2,  28:12, 28:15, 28:17,  31:2, 31:5, 31:8,  31:9, 31:10, 31:13,  32:17, 33:1, 33:4,  33:13, 33:14, 36:12,  39:19, 40:1, 40:2,  49:2, 51:16, 52:1,  52:2, 52:8, 53:10,  76:5, 85:1, 87:16,  114:11, 115:5,  150:1, 171:1, 171:2,  192:6, 199:19,  201:7  <b>blank</b> [3] - 112:4,  112:6, 137:2  <b>blend</b> [1] - 130:2  <b>blending</b> [1] - 66:6  <b>block</b> [3] - 2:6, 14:2,  150:2</p>	<p><b>blocks</b> [1] - 29:9  <b>blow</b> [1] - 90:2  <b>blue</b> [2] - 12:1, 32:2  <b>Board</b> [44] - 3:5, 3:8,  3:13, 4:9, 8:1, 9:15,  10:2, 10:13, 13:9,  15:2, 16:7, 18:1,  19:16, 20:13, 22:9,  25:14, 49:17, 50:8,  56:6, 63:1, 63:10,  68:12, 68:16, 69:3,  69:5, 69:9, 69:13,  81:1, 98:17, 113:7,  135:15, 163:2,  171:10, 176:15,  180:17, 189:9,  192:1, 193:9,  193:14, 196:12,  196:16, 203:6,  204:6, 204:15  <b>BOARD</b> [1] - 1:1  <b>Board's</b> [8] - 14:10,  16:3, 19:14, 49:16,  53:4, 80:10, 135:4,  193:7  <b>Bob</b> [1] - 129:17  <b>bollards</b> [1] - 130:9  <b>Bon</b> [1] - 152:7  <b>bonus</b> [2] - 84:4,  143:8  <b>bonuses</b> [2] - 141:11,  143:11  <b>borrowed</b> [1] - 36:11  <b>Boston</b> [2] - 93:1,  93:9  <b>bottom</b> [3] - 35:11,  127:19, 131:8  <b>bought</b> [3] - 150:2,  150:16, 151:7  <b>break</b> [3] - 29:9, 44:9,  137:10  <b>breaking</b> [1] - 109:4  <b>bridge</b> [1] - 94:12  <b>brief</b> [3] - 137:18,  144:11, 173:8  <b>briefly</b> [3] - 14:5,  19:12, 190:17  <b>bring</b> [5] - 8:9, 15:8,  37:15, 71:10, 148:1  <b>BRISTOL</b> [1] - 205:3  <b>broad</b> [3] - 174:5,  174:6  <b>Broad</b> [5] - 59:3,  60:16, 63:5, 86:9  <b>broader</b> [1] - 173:5  <b>broadly</b> [1] - 8:12  <b>Broadway</b> [9] - 1:6,  32:9, 94:10, 105:9,  105:11, 121:18,  122:2, 122:12,  122:13</p>	<p><b>broken</b> [1] - 195:8  <b>brought</b> [4] - 50:6,  50:7, 105:9, 164:19  <b>buffer</b> [4] - 103:4,  103:13, 103:18  <b>build</b> [11] - 44:19,  85:1, 87:1, 92:4,  93:16, 95:16,  139:13, 147:19,  174:1, 177:5, 178:2  <b>Building</b> [2] - 58:15,  93:7  <b>building</b> [61] - 12:7,  15:3, 35:9, 39:18,  49:9, 49:10, 53:13,  55:5, 55:7, 55:14,  55:16, 56:1, 56:4,  58:11, 58:13, 63:9,  64:1, 70:7, 79:19,  82:13, 84:10, 84:13,  84:18, 87:2, 87:3,  87:8, 90:2, 90:5,  91:18, 93:5, 94:11,  101:2, 101:8, 101:9,  102:2, 102:14,  103:9, 105:5, 108:6,  108:7, 114:10,  115:2, 116:17,  117:3, 117:16,  118:4, 120:8,  120:14, 120:16,  121:1, 122:14,  128:5, 130:6,  130:10, 132:7,  151:1, 153:17,  154:19, 169:16,  177:4  <b>buildings</b> [46] - 6:12,  10:12, 11:19, 12:1,  19:16, 21:11, 27:6,  28:4, 29:13, 29:18,  30:13, 30:16, 30:19,  31:7, 31:11, 32:9,  32:12, 32:15, 53:19,  55:9, 56:7, 56:9,  58:16, 64:6, 64:18,  65:1, 81:18, 82:4,  83:16, 84:9, 86:6,  87:13, 94:3, 98:11,  98:15, 103:17,  104:6, 105:2,  110:19, 111:1,  118:4, 130:7, 139:4,  154:15, 185:13,  193:3  <b>built</b> [3] - 53:8,  154:16, 155:1  <b>bunch</b> [1] - 109:16  <b>burdened</b> [1] - 187:5  <b>BUSINESS</b> [1] - 2:2  <b>business</b> [1] - 161:8  <b>Business</b> [1] - 3:7</p>	<p><b>buy</b> [3] - 38:18, 39:4,  137:6  <b>buyer</b> [1] - 161:1  <b>buying</b> [2] - 150:12,  189:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>C</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>calculation</b> [2] -  83:17, 190:6  <b>calculations</b> [4] -  109:11, 144:6,  189:13, 189:19  <b>calendar</b> [2] - 97:9,  97:13  <b>CAMBRIDGE</b> [1] - 1:2  <b>Cambridge</b> [37] - 1:7,  8:13, 12:13, 14:13,  35:3, 36:14, 37:11,  54:15, 58:11, 58:14,  58:18, 73:11, 86:2,  92:19, 93:2, 93:3,  93:8, 93:12, 94:13,  98:14, 106:8,  106:11, 109:4,  113:18, 118:1,  119:15, 144:3,  148:8, 155:4,  157:12, 162:4,  189:2, 191:1, 191:2,  191:3, 191:9,  201:15  <b>campus</b> [1] - 59:15  <b>campus-style</b> [1] -  59:15  <b>canal</b> [1] - 119:17  <b>Canal</b> [3] - 60:16,  63:5, 86:9  <b>cannot</b> [3] - 107:4,  120:15, 174:2  <b>CAPTURING</b> [1] -  1:18  <b>care</b> [1] - 20:17  <b>careful</b> [2] - 121:7,  170:2  <b>carefully</b> [1] - 185:3  <b>cares</b> [1] - 114:5  <b>Carlone</b> [2] - 119:13,  171:13  <b>CARLONE</b> [10] -  119:14, 121:3,  121:9, 123:4,  171:14, 172:18,  174:15, 174:19,  176:9, 201:16  <b>carry</b> [1] - 48:13  <b>cars</b> [1] - 83:5  <b>carved</b> [1] - 6:11  <b>case</b> [13] - 15:14,  16:14, 24:13, 29:17,  39:11, 106:1, 139:5,</p>
--	--	---	--	--



<p>149:1, 164:17, 169:8, 177:6, 178:1, 186:9</p> <p><b>cases</b> [1] - 57:4</p> <p><b>cash</b> [1] - 34:15</p> <p><b>categories</b> [3] - 10:6, 22:18, 81:1</p> <p><b>category</b> [5] - 10:10, 45:7, 77:15, 78:11, 81:9</p> <p><b>CATHERINE</b> [28] - 72:16, 72:19, 74:1, 76:8, 76:12, 78:5, 78:18, 79:7, 79:11, 80:5, 98:18, 126:19, 127:6, 130:18, 144:16, 178:18, 179:3, 183:15, 184:15, 193:18, 195:5, 195:9, 195:15, 196:3, 196:14, 197:4, 202:8, 202:17</p> <p><b>Catherine</b> [7] - 1:8, 108:16, 109:15, 111:12, 144:15, 205:4, 205:12</p> <p><b>Catherine's</b> [1] - 192:14</p> <p><b>caused</b> [1] - 199:10</p> <p><b>caution</b> [1] - 163:18</p> <p><b>cautious</b> [1] - 170:5</p> <p><b>caveat</b> [1] - 133:10</p> <p><b>CBT</b> [1] - 12:11</p> <p><b>CDD</b> [1] - 53:1</p> <p><b>ceiling</b> [1] - 58:9</p> <p><b>Center</b> [6] - 2:6, 8:7, 84:2, 117:5, 136:7, 136:10</p> <p><b>central</b> [2] - 62:12, 62:14</p> <p><b>Central</b> [2] - 4:2, 175:4</p> <p><b>certain</b> [7] - 27:2, 122:8, 139:4, 142:17, 173:17, 173:19, 181:1</p> <p><b>certainly</b> [12] - 21:1, 27:11, 69:10, 71:13, 72:18, 76:2, 91:12, 98:14, 109:14, 167:8, 170:7, 173:14</p> <p><b>certainty</b> [1] - 35:14</p> <p><b>CERTIFICATION</b> [1] - 205:16</p> <p><b>Certified</b> [2] - 205:5, 205:13</p> <p><b>certify</b> [1] - 205:5</p> <p><b>CERTIFYING</b> [1] - 205:18</p>	<p><b>Chair</b> [2] - 1:8, 1:8</p> <p><b>chair</b> [1] - 191:11</p> <p><b>Chairman</b> [1] - 147:10</p> <p><b>challenge</b> [2] - 78:6, 119:11</p> <p><b>chance</b> [2] - 85:7, 85:8</p> <p><b>change</b> [11] - 34:4, 35:18, 47:8, 48:8, 67:14, 76:18, 103:11, 133:7, 138:19, 150:2, 204:6</p> <p><b>CHANGE</b> [6] - 204:8, 204:9, 204:10, 204:11, 204:12, 204:13</p> <p><b>changed</b> [3] - 150:1, 161:10, 192:2</p> <p><b>changes</b> [16] - 2:5, 9:1, 9:17, 10:8, 10:17, 11:7, 20:2, 54:8, 64:15, 69:7, 69:13, 140:17, 169:17, 170:2, 191:17, 204:16</p> <p><b>changing</b> [3] - 24:6, 139:2, 191:16</p> <p><b>character</b> [5] - 18:17, 25:6, 42:12, 51:6</p> <p><b>characterized</b> [1] - 24:14</p> <p><b>charts</b> [1] - 164:9</p> <p><b>cheek</b> [1] - 93:5</p> <p><b>cherry</b> [1] - 36:12</p> <p><b>Chestnut</b> [1] - 4:6</p> <p><b>Cheung</b> [1] - 63:18</p> <p><b>Cheung's</b> [3] - 86:14, 92:16, 94:8</p> <p><b>Chicago</b> [2] - 87:3, 128:1</p> <p><b>child</b> [2] - 148:18, 176:11</p> <p><b>children</b> [2] - 50:9, 154:7</p> <p><b>choices</b> [2] - 123:16, 161:17</p> <p><b>choose</b> [2] - 3:13, 161:3</p> <p><b>chunk</b> [1] - 85:11</p> <p><b>circumstances</b> [1] - 199:19</p> <p><b>city</b> [62] - 6:14, 22:8, 29:5, 29:6, 34:7, 42:10, 46:10, 47:17, 70:19, 72:12, 75:12, 87:14, 110:11, 114:5, 116:5, 116:6, 135:2, 138:12, 138:14, 139:16, 140:5, 140:10,</p>	<p>141:2, 142:16, 146:7, 146:9, 149:18, 149:19, 152:3, 152:4, 152:5, 152:17, 152:19, 153:10, 154:7, 154:15, 155:7, 156:7, 158:16, 159:3, 160:7, 160:15, 161:9, 162:14, 168:6, 168:16, 172:8, 172:10, 172:14, 173:2, 173:12, 173:13, 174:5, 174:7, 174:8, 174:18, 175:2, 175:18, 186:14, 187:5, 187:7</p> <p><b>CITY</b> [1] - 1:2</p> <p><b>City</b> [28] - 1:12, 2:3, 3:19, 4:10, 4:18, 47:6, 68:14, 68:16, 69:1, 70:8, 71:1, 71:5, 72:1, 73:11, 74:7, 74:13, 96:11, 97:12, 109:6, 131:7, 133:17, 138:9, 156:15, 157:5, 159:18, 173:5, 189:5, 198:18</p> <p><b>City's</b> [5] - 47:13, 117:8, 122:10, 131:7, 173:10</p> <p><b>city's</b> [5] - 35:12, 104:15, 116:1, 144:4, 154:5</p> <p><b>citywide</b> [5] - 48:8, 159:8, 159:19, 166:6, 169:7</p> <p><b>civic</b> [1] - 62:11</p> <p><b>clarification</b> [2] - 79:12, 179:7</p> <p><b>clarifying</b> [1] - 191:8</p> <p><b>clarity</b> [5] - 49:19, 109:3, 109:5, 156:1, 193:2</p> <p><b>class</b> [2] - 163:5, 163:7</p> <p><b>clear</b> [12] - 18:1, 27:16, 35:14, 79:4, 83:11, 94:17, 108:5, 133:3, 133:4, 141:8, 144:1, 191:4</p> <p><b>clearly</b> [2] - 114:4, 144:4</p> <p><b>Clems</b> [1] - 151:8</p> <p><b>cleverer</b> [1] - 88:4</p> <p><b>close</b> [5] - 40:11, 67:17, 91:4, 184:5, 191:4</p> <p><b>closed</b> [1] - 5:18</p>	<p><b>closely</b> [4] - 23:3, 33:13, 45:13, 107:15</p> <p><b>closer</b> [6] - 20:8, 30:15, 31:15, 32:9, 71:14, 178:10</p> <p><b>closest</b> [1] - 112:3</p> <p><b>clumped</b> [1] - 191:2</p> <p><b>coalition</b> [1] - 114:2</p> <p><b>Code</b> [2] - 109:5, 138:4</p> <p><b>code</b> [1] - 141:9</p> <p><b>coffee</b> [2] - 189:4, 189:6</p> <p><b>COHEN</b> [94] - 3:3, 38:5, 38:7, 38:11, 39:2, 39:7, 57:6, 57:12, 57:17, 58:4, 58:10, 59:5, 69:17, 72:18, 75:7, 75:15, 76:3, 79:17, 90:3, 91:8, 97:5, 97:10, 100:4, 100:5, 106:14, 106:17, 107:2, 116:10, 116:15, 117:14, 119:12, 124:2, 125:6, 130:19, 131:3, 131:11, 132:13, 134:15, 135:17, 136:14, 136:15, 137:7, 137:13, 137:17, 144:13, 147:3, 150:4, 155:17, 156:2, 165:18, 166:7, 166:14, 166:19, 167:7, 170:8, 171:12, 176:7, 176:13, 177:16, 178:6, 179:4, 179:9, 180:10, 181:4, 181:7, 181:13, 181:16, 182:8, 182:13, 182:18, 183:3, 183:12, 184:2, 184:10, 186:1, 188:8, 190:5, 190:8, 190:13, 191:7, 195:3, 195:7, 196:7, 197:1, 197:16, 198:15, 200:16, 201:5, 201:18, 202:4, 202:10, 202:15, 202:19, 203:3</p> <p><b>Cohen</b> [2] - 1:8, 1:9</p> <p><b>cohesive</b> [1] - 61:15</p> <p><b>collaboratively</b> [1] - 113:16</p> <p><b>colleague</b> [1] - 121:4</p>	<p><b>combination</b> [1] - 146:10</p> <p><b>comfortable</b> [1] - 145:7</p> <p><b>comfortably</b> [1] - 30:7</p> <p><b>coming</b> [4] - 4:8, 95:13, 189:2, 203:4</p> <p><b>comment</b> [9] - 3:12, 88:5, 92:15, 92:16, 106:4, 106:12, 119:15, 199:3, 200:18</p> <p><b>comments</b> [11] - 19:14, 53:4, 91:10, 101:18, 113:6, 124:3, 147:5, 156:3, 156:4, 180:17</p> <p><b>commercial</b> [20] - 4:13, 12:1, 16:5, 18:12, 20:8, 37:3, 41:17, 42:4, 43:15, 45:1, 45:19, 57:16, 61:5, 102:8, 164:16, 177:12, 178:15, 183:13, 183:19, 184:8</p> <p><b>Commission</b> [1] - 205:15</p> <p><b>committee</b> [1] - 7:7</p> <p><b>Committee</b> [2] - 4:1, 4:11</p> <p><b>common</b> [1] - 167:14</p> <p><b>COMMONWEALTH</b> [1] - 205:3</p> <p><b>communicating</b> [1] - 107:18</p> <p><b>community</b> [5] - 54:19, 59:19, 62:10, 177:9, 194:18</p> <p><b>Community</b> [5] - 1:12, 1:13, 2:4, 7:13, 204:3</p> <p><b>companies</b> [1] - 199:5</p> <p><b>comparing</b> [2] - 28:7, 44:4</p> <p><b>comparison</b> [2] - 39:19, 43:8</p> <p><b>compete</b> [1] - 163:5</p> <p><b>competition</b> [8] - 13:7, 13:13, 21:9, 60:15, 62:1, 65:14, 66:5, 66:10</p> <p><b>complaint</b> [1] - 177:8</p> <p><b>complete</b> [2] - 136:10, 145:11</p> <p><b>completed</b> [2] - 47:6, 48:5</p> <p><b>completely</b> [3] - 134:2, 134:8, 193:15</p> <p><b>complicated</b> [1] -</p>
--	--	--	---	--

<p>73:15  <b>comply</b> [1] - 57:2  <b>component</b> [9] - 11:13, 12:8, 34:14, 43:17, 44:13, 62:8, 65:5, 66:4, 67:7  <b>components</b> [2] - 17:19, 171:9  <b>comprehensive</b> [1] - 53:6  <b>comprehensively</b> [1] - 47:15  <b>compromise</b> [1] - 170:19  <b>compromises</b> [1] - 171:4  <b>computer</b> [2] - 63:13, 68:5  <b>conceivable</b> [2] - 168:19, 169:3  <b>conceivably</b> [1] - 76:16  <b>concentrated</b> [2] - 30:2, 30:11  <b>concept</b> [3] - 18:9, 93:3, 112:13  <b>conceptual</b> [1] - 11:17  <b>conceptualized</b> [1] - 6:4  <b>concern</b> [3] - 106:4, 169:13, 190:10  <b>concerns</b> [4] - 5:4, 139:1, 139:19, 160:1  <b>concession</b> [1] - 159:11  <b>conclude</b> [3] - 166:16, 169:4, 191:14  <b>conclusion</b> [2] - 84:16, 198:17  <b>conclusions</b> [1] - 115:13  <b>concur</b> [3] - 155:19, 156:3, 156:4  <b>conducted</b> [1] - 12:14  <b>confident</b> [1] - 45:6  <b>configuration</b> [1] - 53:13  <b>confirm</b> [1] - 7:9  <b>confused</b> [1] - 76:14  <b>confusion</b> [2] - 49:3, 104:3  <b>Connect</b> [10] - 13:6, 21:8, 27:12, 60:14, 61:19, 65:2, 65:14, 66:5, 90:7, 119:5  <b>connect</b> [2] - 13:16, 24:15  <b>connected</b> [5] - 25:18, 29:2, 59:10,</p>	<p>80:18, 91:18  <b>connectedness</b> [1] - 75:1  <b>connecting</b> [4] - 13:4, 13:18, 42:15, 54:14  <b>connection</b> [4] - 60:15, 60:19, 64:17, 88:16  <b>connections</b> [15] - 13:2, 13:15, 13:16, 24:15, 53:18, 59:13, 60:5, 60:9, 60:13, 61:2, 61:8, 63:3, 63:7, 64:19, 114:17  <b>connectivity</b> [3] - 53:13, 59:7, 60:2  <b>connector</b> [2] - 89:6, 89:13  <b>connects</b> [1] - 32:19  <b>Connolly</b> [1] - 1:8  <b>CONNOLLY</b> [28] - 72:16, 72:19, 74:1, 76:8, 76:12, 78:5, 78:18, 79:7, 79:11, 80:5, 98:18, 126:19, 127:6, 130:18, 144:16, 178:18, 179:3, 183:15, 184:15, 193:18, 195:5, 195:9, 195:15, 196:3, 196:14, 197:4, 202:8, 202:17  <b>conscious</b> [1] - 38:2  <b>consensus</b> [2] - 71:12, 71:15  <b>consider</b> [5] - 42:1, 55:8, 56:6, 59:12, 90:15  <b>consideration</b> [2] - 61:13, 64:4  <b>considerations</b> [4] - 11:1, 33:3, 46:17, 157:6  <b>considered</b> [2] - 138:9, 193:2  <b>consistent</b> [6] - 29:10, 56:3, 66:9, 82:10, 133:2, 140:12  <b>consistently</b> [1] - 186:13  <b>constraints</b> [1] - 120:12  <b>construct</b> [1] - 135:5  <b>constructed</b> [2] - 48:10, 134:19  <b>constructing</b> [1] - 39:17  <b>construction</b> [10] - 33:18, 33:19, 34:18,</p>	<p>35:4, 35:19, 36:1, 122:7, 168:12, 200:1, 201:14  <b>consultant</b> [2] - 144:7, 182:2  <b>consulting</b> [1] - 165:5  <b>contemplate</b> [1] - 76:9  <b>contemplated</b> [1] - 78:10  <b>context</b> [4] - 14:4, 41:7, 81:2, 92:17  <b>continue</b> [2] - 91:9, 180:11  <b>Continued</b> [1] - 2:5  <b>continued</b> [3] - 4:9, 4:12, 8:3  <b>continuous</b> [1] - 89:3  <b>contract</b> [3] - 96:3, 96:18, 149:6  <b>contradicting</b> [1] - 78:8  <b>contribute</b> [2] - 17:1, 24:11  <b>contributed</b> [1] - 105:17  <b>contribution</b> [1] - 44:7  <b>CONTROL</b> [1] - 205:18  <b>control</b> [6] - 63:17, 77:1, 134:5, 145:17, 161:7, 173:15  <b>controlled</b> [5] - 22:16, 74:15, 79:10, 134:2, 194:9  <b>controls</b> [3] - 76:15, 130:15, 173:14  <b>conventional</b> [2] - 110:9, 112:15  <b>conversation</b> [8] - 45:3, 49:1, 113:8, 113:14, 114:12, 125:17, 126:1, 190:1  <b>conversations</b> [3] - 113:6, 115:17, 117:7  <b>conversely</b> [1] - 85:13  <b>converted</b> [1] - 15:4  <b>conveying</b> [1] - 116:15  <b>cool</b> [2] - 112:16, 150:13  <b>copy</b> [1] - 188:7  <b>core</b> [1] - 20:6  <b>corner</b> [12] - 85:5, 94:9, 104:18, 105:9, 122:11, 123:12, 123:13, 123:15, 124:7, 124:9, 128:1,</p>	<p>155:2  <b>corporate</b> [1] - 5:18  <b>correct</b> [12] - 73:13, 80:12, 83:19, 89:7, 93:13, 97:18, 117:17, 121:4, 132:3, 167:9, 195:6, 196:19  <b>corrected</b> [1] - 197:13  <b>correction</b> [1] - 204:7  <b>corrections</b> [1] - 204:16  <b>cost</b> [17] - 33:7, 33:12, 33:17, 33:19, 34:12, 35:13, 35:14, 36:4, 36:18, 37:19, 39:12, 39:14, 39:17, 167:18, 172:6, 177:5, 187:5  <b>cost-burdened</b> [1] - 187:5  <b>costs</b> [10] - 34:5, 34:8, 35:1, 35:5, 35:11, 35:15, 35:19, 36:2, 40:7, 72:3  <b>Council</b> [25] - 4:19, 5:5, 6:9, 47:6, 63:14, 68:14, 68:16, 69:1, 70:8, 71:5, 72:1, 88:6, 88:7, 94:8, 96:11, 97:2, 97:3, 97:12, 125:4, 138:9, 147:10, 156:15, 157:5, 159:18, 198:18  <b>Council's</b> [2] - 4:1, 4:11  <b>councillor</b> [2] - 119:12, 171:12  <b>Councillor</b> [4] - 92:15, 109:7, 147:11, 189:5  <b>COUNCILLOR</b> [10] - 119:14, 121:3, 121:9, 123:4, 171:14, 172:18, 174:15, 174:19, 176:9, 201:16  <b>councillor's</b> [1] - 70:9  <b>councillors</b> [3] - 62:12, 62:13, 126:3  <b>count</b> [12] - 76:16, 77:11, 79:19, 80:3, 85:13, 92:14, 99:9, 131:2, 149:9, 190:6, 193:11, 194:14  <b>counted</b> [5] - 78:2, 86:11, 92:1, 92:2, 109:18  <b>counter</b> [1] - 152:7  <b>counting</b> [2] - 84:11,</p>	<p>95:8  <b>country</b> [3] - 92:18, 151:1, 151:15  <b>counts</b> [4] - 6:3, 80:11, 83:12, 95:6  <b>couple</b> [10] - 8:1, 10:3, 58:15, 71:14, 138:17, 144:17, 157:18, 158:9, 158:10, 186:3  <b>course</b> [4] - 72:2, 99:2, 142:19, 162:5  <b>Courthouse</b> [2] - 75:9, 130:3  <b>courthouse</b> [3] - 75:11, 75:17, 164:11  <b>courtyard</b> [2] - 105:5, 128:4  <b>courtyards</b> [1] - 62:3  <b>cover</b> [1] - 81:18  <b>coverage</b> [2] - 81:12, 82:9  <b>covered</b> [1] - 27:9  <b>covering</b> [1] - 18:4  <b>crazy</b> [1] - 132:5  <b>create</b> [14] - 42:1, 42:2, 42:11, 54:3, 59:17, 65:3, 67:4, 106:6, 110:12, 111:3, 114:15, 119:7, 140:2, 140:5  <b>created</b> [1] - 41:11  <b>creates</b> [1] - 60:10  <b>creating</b> [9] - 42:7, 42:17, 43:4, 54:11, 54:17, 59:8, 61:15, 66:11, 78:11  <b>creation</b> [1] - 3:8  <b>creative</b> [2] - 62:17, 86:13  <b>crew</b> [1] - 162:2  <b>crisis</b> [1] - 176:4  <b>criteria</b> [6] - 16:2, 18:1, 19:15, 52:6, 54:10, 56:2  <b>criticize</b> [1] - 88:2  <b>cross</b> [2] - 83:3, 89:13  <b>crunch</b> [2] - 40:1, 40:2  <b>cul</b> [1] - 59:14  <b>cul-de-sacs</b> [1] - 59:14  <b>curious</b> [1] - 75:8  <b>current</b> [13] - 9:6, 13:9, 23:9, 24:7, 37:10, 44:1, 44:5, 44:14, 47:4, 120:14, 142:5, 154:9, 182:4  <b>cut</b> [3] - 110:5, 128:18, 155:2</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p><b>cycling</b> [1] - 80:9</p>	<p>101:5</p>	<p>98:10, 101:7, 101:14, 107:12, 115:6, 116:11, 117:4, 135:13, 136:2, 136:3, 136:12, 171:6, 173:11, 183:8, 194:10</p>	<p>187:14, 192:2</p>	<p><b>dive</b> [1] - 72:17</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>D</b></p>	<p><b>demands</b> [1] - 57:5</p>	<p>101:14, 107:12, 115:6, 116:11, 117:4, 135:13, 136:2, 136:3, 136:12, 171:6, 173:11, 183:8, 194:10</p>	<p><b>difficult</b> [5] - 31:2, 40:3, 95:11, 184:18, 186:8</p>	<p><b>diversity</b> [3] - 60:11, 160:9, 187:7</p>
<p><b>dark</b> [1] - 120:19 <b>darker</b> [1] - 102:3 <b>darts</b> [1] - 166:2 <b>DASH</b> [9] - 90:6, 117:19, 136:16, 164:18, 167:4, 169:12, 188:4, 190:17, 200:14 <b>Dash</b> [1] - 1:14 <b>data</b> [1] - 161:12 <b>date</b> [1] - 204:7 <b>David</b> [2] - 86:1, 125:14 <b>DAVID</b> [7] - 125:14, 126:9, 128:17, 129:2, 129:6, 129:14, 136:4 <b>days</b> [1] - 66:15 <b>de</b> [1] - 59:14 <b>deal</b> [6] - 100:19, 136:5, 143:10, 169:14, 170:3, 177:13 <b>dealing</b> [2] - 92:12, 109:15 <b>decades</b> [1] - 133:17 <b>decent</b> [1] - 143:3 <b>decide</b> [5] - 95:12, 107:9, 143:19, 157:3, 157:7 <b>decided</b> [1] - 78:13 <b>decides</b> [1] - 130:14 <b>deciding</b> [1] - 108:12 <b>decision</b> [6] - 71:5, 72:1, 160:2, 166:4, 197:3, 198:19 <b>decisionmaking</b> [1] - 63:1 <b>decisions</b> [2] - 68:9, 170:15 <b>deficit</b> [1] - 89:1 <b>defined</b> [5] - 29:4, 78:7, 194:17, 196:2, 196:4 <b>defining</b> [1] - 55:11 <b>definitely</b> [2] - 174:8, 200:13 <b>definition</b> [7] - 24:19, 73:6, 73:18, 76:9, 77:9, 193:8, 196:4 <b>definitions</b> [1] - 22:14 <b>delivered</b> [1] - 204:3 <b>demand</b> [4] - 167:17, 168:1, 168:3, 169:17 <b>demanding</b> [2] - 72:5,</p>	<p><b>demolition</b> [1] - 106:9 <b>Dennis</b> [2] - 172:17, 174:13 <b>DENNIS</b> [10] - 119:14, 121:3, 121:9, 123:4, 171:14, 172:18, 174:15, 174:19, 176:9, 201:16 <b>denser</b> [1] - 12:3 <b>Department</b> [4] - 1:12, 2:4, 178:3, 204:4 <b>describe</b> [2] - 38:17, 73:14 <b>described</b> [3] - 17:16, 52:5, 169:13 <b>descriptive</b> [1] - 17:12 <b>design</b> [26] - 10:10, 11:9, 23:4, 26:9, 27:5, 30:17, 51:17, 52:3, 52:13, 53:5, 56:3, 56:19, 59:7, 64:14, 66:12, 67:13, 68:7, 81:6, 82:18, 83:12, 101:7, 101:9, 101:10, 101:14, 121:4, 127:14 <b>designed</b> [2] - 80:17, 128:2 <b>designer</b> [4] - 88:3, 90:14, 99:3, 99:17 <b>desire</b> [1] - 24:15 <b>desires</b> [1] - 107:19 <b>despite</b> [1] - 186:11 <b>destabilize</b> [1] - 185:18 <b>destabilizing</b> [1] - 185:12 <b>detail</b> [4] - 7:1, 9:11, 27:8, 141:5 <b>detailed</b> [1] - 27:5 <b>details</b> [1] - 43:2 <b>determination</b> [1] - 114:13 <b>determinations</b> [1] - 107:13 <b>determine</b> [3] - 101:15, 117:1, 149:14 <b>determining</b> [1] - 193:10 <b>develop</b> [1] - 38:19 <b>developed</b> [3] - 26:10, 70:14, 110:16 <b>developer</b> [24] - 34:11, 35:6, 35:13, 42:9, 49:18, 71:2, 94:18, 95:13, 96:3,</p>	<p><b>developer's</b> [1] - 122:14 <b>developers</b> [11] - 72:6, 94:6, 96:8, 99:14, 102:15, 115:19, 116:3, 116:4, 158:6, 159:10, 172:13 <b>developing</b> [1] - 116:7 <b>development</b> [43] - 9:8, 12:4, 12:6, 12:10, 14:13, 15:13, 16:5, 16:8, 16:11, 17:4, 18:15, 19:5, 26:16, 33:17, 37:3, 37:4, 37:5, 39:5, 39:13, 40:10, 40:19, 41:4, 41:18, 42:4, 43:15, 45:2, 45:19, 46:9, 59:15, 70:13, 84:5, 88:9, 102:8, 111:6, 112:10, 122:5, 123:6, 125:2, 137:5, 139:10, 177:12, 177:18, 199:5 <b>Development</b> [6] - 1:12, 1:13, 2:4, 7:13, 14:14, 204:4 <b>development's</b> [1] - 178:2 <b>developments</b> [4] - 16:14, 37:5, 199:6, 199:8 <b>devoted</b> [1] - 143:7 <b>dial</b> [1] - 20:15 <b>dictate</b> [1] - 107:5 <b>difference</b> [8] - 37:2, 41:17, 73:3, 81:8, 184:12, 193:12, 193:13, 198:11 <b>different</b> [33] - 8:14, 9:12, 12:16, 13:17, 13:18, 14:6, 15:1, 15:3, 16:19, 17:18, 26:19, 27:15, 33:15, 54:18, 60:5, 62:2, 64:11, 66:13, 66:15, 66:18, 73:18, 90:13, 129:10, 135:5, 152:5, 152:12, 160:17, 160:18, 175:14, 176:1,</p>	<p><b>directing</b> [1] - 152:8 <b>DIRECTION</b> [1] - 205:18 <b>direction</b> [3] - 71:6, 108:15, 192:9 <b>directions</b> [1] - 120:5 <b>directly</b> [1] - 39:16 <b>disagree</b> [1] - 138:15 <b>disagreeing</b> [1] - 157:1 <b>disappeared</b> [1] - 158:18 <b>discretion</b> [2] - 80:6, 80:10 <b>discretionary</b> [1] - 193:16 <b>discriminated</b> [1] - 149:7 <b>discuss</b> [7] - 3:16, 52:16, 76:5, 161:11, 188:10, 189:16 <b>discussed</b> [5] - 5:7, 20:14, 25:3, 70:6, 108:19 <b>discussing</b> [2] - 5:8, 187:16 <b>discussion</b> [18] - 2:5, 3:7, 3:10, 5:2, 8:3, 50:7, 63:12, 68:18, 69:14, 111:13, 114:8, 124:13, 137:11, 180:12, 191:14, 197:8, 200:17, 202:12 <b>discussions</b> [4] - 68:9, 106:19, 113:12, 169:1 <b>distinguish</b> [1] - 179:18 <b>distributed</b> [3] - 28:16, 49:9, 49:10 <b>distribution</b> [5] - 152:15, 152:16, 153:6, 153:16, 165:3 <b>district</b> [14] - 8:19, 9:2, 9:3, 9:9, 15:10, 41:10, 48:9, 66:11, 78:1, 78:13, 82:11, 83:18, 146:13, 164:4 <b>District</b> [6] - 2:5, 3:9, 8:4, 8:5, 9:1, 15:15</p>	<p><b>done</b> [2] - 12:11, 23:5, 35:3, 37:10, 38:15, 46:9, 46:16, 47:18, 70:1, 91:4, 97:9, 112:8, 122:5, 123:7, 134:9, 147:1, 175:3, 176:15, 177:15, 186:19, 199:4 <b>door</b> [5] - 121:14, 122:12, 122:17, 122:18, 151:8 <b>dormitory</b> [1] - 189:18 <b>dorms</b> [1] - 145:19 <b>DOT</b> [2] - 113:9 <b>double</b> [1] - 183:1 <b>down</b> [2] - 29:9, 30:5, 35:11, 37:15, 40:3, 44:9, 46:8, 55:7, 79:3, 89:7, 89:8, 99:12, 110:15, 117:9, 137:14, 151:18, 161:5, 183:2, 194:14, 198:12, 200:14 <b>downsized</b> [1] - 158:12 <b>downsizing</b> [1] - 157:10 <b>dozen</b> [1] - 91:3 <b>draft</b> [2] - 68:7, 78:17 <b>drafting</b> [1] - 78:6 <b>drawing</b> [1] - 127:8 <b>dreams</b> [1] - 162:2 <b>drifting</b> [1] - 151:18 <b>drive</b> [1] - 200:11 <b>driven</b> [2] - 54:8, 67:6 <b>drives</b> [1] - 99:11 <b>driving</b> [4] - 148:9, 151:2, 195:16, 201:14 <b>dropped</b> [1] - 199:9 <b>droves</b> [1] - 200:8 <b>during</b> [2] - 42:19, 166:18 <b>dwelling</b> [3] - 145:1, 145:8, 146:12 <b>dynamic</b> [1] - 169:17</p>

E			
<p><b>early</b> [2] - 96:12, 199:7</p> <p><b>ease</b> [1] - 125:19</p> <p><b>eases</b> [1] - 122:9</p> <p><b>easily</b> [2] - 164:10, 164:11</p> <p><b>East</b> [10] - 12:12, 98:14, 106:8, 106:10, 113:18, 119:15, 189:2, 191:1, 191:2, 191:9</p> <p><b>Eastern</b> [1] - 191:3</p> <p><b>eastern</b> [1] - 54:15</p> <p><b>eastgate</b> [1] - 58:12</p> <p><b>Eastgate</b> [1] - 58:16</p> <p><b>easy</b> [1] - 31:19</p> <p><b>economic</b> [5] - 11:1, 33:3, 46:17, 153:3, 182:2</p> <p><b>economically</b> [1] - 151:14</p> <p><b>economics</b> [4] - 47:15, 177:2, 184:17, 185:3</p> <p><b>edges</b> [3] - 55:11, 67:9, 88:19</p> <p><b>effectively</b> [1] - 84:7</p> <p><b>egg</b> [1] - 72:9</p> <p><b>eight</b> [1] - 85:17</p> <p><b>either</b> [8] - 49:19, 62:11, 108:6, 121:14, 121:18, 131:2, 141:10, 145:13</p> <p><b>election</b> [3] - 97:4, 97:5, 121:7</p> <p><b>electronically</b> [1] - 204:4</p> <p><b>element</b> [6] - 13:1, 54:4, 56:10, 60:1, 66:12, 120:6</p> <p><b>elements</b> [12] - 6:10, 9:12, 18:5, 19:8, 22:19, 54:1, 55:1, 55:18, 59:12, 65:13, 69:12, 138:1</p> <p><b>eleven</b> [7] - 57:13, 57:14, 58:3, 142:1, 182:16, 182:17</p> <p><b>eleven-point</b> [1] - 142:1</p> <p><b>eliminate</b> [1] - 189:17</p> <p><b>eliminating</b> [3] - 145:1, 146:12, 190:4</p> <p><b>elsewhere</b> [6] - 46:10, 112:10, 156:7, 169:2, 169:11,</p>	<p>201:5</p> <p><b>emphatic</b> [1] - 116:4</p> <p><b>Empire</b> [1] - 93:6</p> <p><b>empty</b> [1] - 158:11</p> <p><b>enable</b> [1] - 74:9</p> <p><b>encourage</b> [3] - 62:10, 64:4, 67:9</p> <p><b>end</b> [12] - 83:15, 97:13, 114:10, 115:13, 123:10, 136:1, 142:16, 145:18, 153:13, 153:14, 160:15, 168:1</p> <p><b>ended</b> [2] - 160:14, 161:4</p> <p><b>ends</b> [2] - 98:6, 163:13</p> <p><b>enforce</b> [1] - 81:15</p> <p><b>engagements</b> [1] - 62:11</p> <p><b>engaging</b> [1] - 5:15</p> <p><b>engineering</b> [1] - 160:13</p> <p><b>enhance</b> [3] - 55:10, 65:19, 66:17</p> <p><b>enhancing</b> [2] - 65:11, 83:8</p> <p><b>enjoyable</b> [1] - 110:2</p> <p><b>enjoys</b> [1] - 130:7</p> <p><b>enlighten</b> [1] - 129:4</p> <p><b>enlightened</b> [1] - 98:8</p> <p><b>ensure</b> [1] - 99:6</p> <p><b>enter</b> [1] - 96:2</p> <p><b>entire</b> [4] - 75:16, 84:13, 111:6, 149:18</p> <p><b>entirely</b> [1] - 108:15</p> <p><b>entities</b> [1] - 76:10</p> <p><b>entity</b> [1] - 74:15</p> <p><b>entries</b> [2] - 62:15, 66:10</p> <p><b>envisioning</b> [1] - 11:18</p> <p><b>envisions</b> [2] - 134:19, 135:2</p> <p><b>equals</b> [1] - 49:7</p> <p><b>equation</b> [1] - 39:13</p> <p><b>equity</b> [1] - 34:16</p> <p><b>ERRATA</b> [1] - 204:1</p> <p><b>Errata</b> [2] - 204:2, 204:7</p> <p><b>especially</b> [3] - 129:9, 156:3, 186:9</p> <p><b>essentially</b> [7] - 13:4, 38:16, 68:15, 74:9, 86:7, 139:8, 145:19</p> <p><b>establishes</b> [1] - 15:15</p> <p><b>establishing</b> [4] - 13:3, 13:4, 56:13,</p>	<p>116:12</p> <p><b>estimate</b> [2] - 37:9, 101:12</p> <p><b>evaluate</b> [1] - 19:16</p> <p><b>evening</b> [3] - 3:3, 42:18, 129:19</p> <p><b>event</b> [1] - 171:7</p> <p><b>events</b> [1] - 62:11</p> <p><b>everyday</b> [1] - 200:11</p> <p><b>evolution</b> [1] - 7:3</p> <p><b>evolved</b> [1] - 161:9</p> <p><b>exact</b> [5] - 27:17, 30:5, 40:4, 142:7, 187:17</p> <p><b>exactly</b> [5] - 92:11, 109:14, 110:1, 125:1, 181:16</p> <p><b>example</b> [6] - 55:13, 59:11, 83:2, 111:4, 130:8, 194:12</p> <p><b>examples</b> [3] - 32:8, 61:11, 127:18</p> <p><b>exceeded</b> [1] - 22:1</p> <p><b>excellent</b> [1] - 202:6</p> <p><b>except</b> [1] - 204:15</p> <p><b>excess</b> [1] - 174:10</p> <p><b>exchange</b> [6] - 45:9, 126:2, 136:5, 136:9, 169:15, 169:16</p> <p><b>excited</b> [1] - 147:9</p> <p><b>exciting</b> [1] - 123:9</p> <p><b>exclude</b> [1] - 105:7</p> <p><b>excluding</b> [1] - 131:14</p> <p><b>exist</b> [2] - 157:12, 157:13</p> <p><b>existing</b> [3] - 8:18, 9:6, 128:3</p> <p><b>exists</b> [4] - 41:10, 112:10, 128:13, 141:8</p> <p><b>exit</b> [1] - 162:3</p> <p><b>expand</b> [1] - 55:3</p> <p><b>expanded</b> [1] - 56:11</p> <p><b>expect</b> [1] - 149:9</p> <p><b>expectation</b> [1] - 88:1</p> <p><b>expectations</b> [1] - 48:4</p> <p><b>expected</b> [2] - 61:17, 166:16</p> <p><b>expecting</b> [3] - 34:17, 35:8, 43:18</p> <p><b>expensive</b> [4] - 34:2, 72:6, 157:14, 201:17</p> <p><b>experience</b> [3] - 98:5, 104:5, 200:7</p> <p><b>experienced</b> [2] - 111:8, 185:7</p> <p><b>expires</b> [1] - 205:15</p> <p><b>explain</b> [2] - 38:14, 186:12</p>	<p>190:5</p> <p><b>far</b> [2] - 157:19, 185:14</p> <p><b>Farooq</b> [1] - 1:12</p> <p><b>FAROOQ</b> [37] - 3:17, 7:8, 7:17, 63:10, 75:14, 75:18, 76:4, 76:11, 89:9, 96:14, 97:7, 97:15, 113:3, 116:14, 116:19, 117:17, 125:5, 129:12, 133:12, 133:16, 134:11, 160:6, 165:19, 166:15, 174:13, 174:17, 178:9, 179:1, 179:17, 180:5, 180:15, 181:6, 184:13, 198:14, 199:15, 200:12, 202:14</p> <p><b>fat</b> [2] - 86:6, 86:7</p> <p><b>favor</b> [1] - 203:1</p> <p><b>fearful</b> [1] - 160:13</p> <p><b>fearful</b> [1] - 142:15</p> <p><b>feature</b> [1] - 61:18</p> <p><b>February</b> [2] - 8:3, 33:6</p> <p><b>federal</b> [35] - 25:1, 25:7, 25:17, 34:14, 36:2, 36:3, 73:7, 74:11, 75:2, 75:11, 75:13, 75:14, 75:15, 75:17, 77:5, 91:14, 101:8, 101:16, 102:1, 103:4, 104:14, 112:5, 115:1, 117:3, 127:13, 127:14, 129:10, 130:2, 130:6, 130:7, 130:10, 132:7, 135:9, 135:11, 147:17</p> <p><b>Federal</b> [23] - 8:8, 34:17, 61:4, 63:17, 74:15, 76:7, 76:14, 100:9, 100:19, 104:4, 104:6, 107:5, 107:7, 107:15, 114:9, 115:9, 130:13, 131:5, 134:2, 135:7, 135:19, 136:5, 139:6</p> <p><b>federally</b> [1] - 73:7</p> <p><b>federally-owned</b> [1] - 73:7</p> <p><b>feds</b> [1] - 130:13</p> <p><b>feet</b> [35] - 12:5, 20:5, 29:19, 32:7, 32:11, 32:12, 32:13, 39:5,</p>
		<p><b>F</b></p> <p><b>FAA</b> [2] - 87:9, 147:16</p> <p><b>fabric</b> [2] - 14:3, 54:14</p> <p><b>facility</b> [8] - 25:2, 35:1, 92:6, 92:9, 103:5, 135:1, 157:17, 178:3</p> <p><b>fact</b> [13] - 24:5, 28:19, 73:8, 86:4, 88:11, 108:11, 115:1, 117:2, 142:14, 163:14, 165:1, 170:6, 185:9</p> <p><b>factor</b> [1] - 21:1</p> <p><b>factors</b> [1] - 51:2</p> <p><b>fails</b> [1] - 153:9</p> <p><b>fair</b> [1] - 5:3</p> <p><b>fairly</b> [5] - 31:7, 35:1, 35:13, 45:6, 81:13</p> <p><b>fairness</b> [1] - 139:19</p> <p><b>fall</b> [7] - 96:3, 96:12, 96:15, 96:16, 96:17, 117:6</p> <p><b>familiar</b> [1] - 27:12</p> <p><b>families</b> [10] - 19:2, 50:9, 51:11, 146:11, 147:2, 158:4, 160:17, 162:16, 171:18, 201:8</p> <p><b>family</b> [14] - 52:11, 148:17, 149:2, 153:15, 157:15, 157:18, 158:9, 163:6, 163:12, 179:12, 180:1, 180:2</p> <p><b>fancy</b> [2] - 109:10, 144:6</p> <p><b>FAR</b> [12] - 83:18, 84:3, 84:7, 141:11, 141:13, 141:16, 143:17, 164:5, 170:11, 171:2,</p>	

<p>40:10, 49:4, 56:5, 57:9, 58:9, 58:17, 84:1, 84:11, 86:16, 86:18, 87:13, 111:15, 112:12, 117:16, 138:6, 143:14, 143:15, 147:11, 147:15, 172:2, 176:17, 184:9</p> <p><b>felt</b> [2] - 22:10, 153:11</p> <p><b>fence</b> [1] - 129:1</p> <p><b>fenced</b> [2] - 127:10, 128:9</p> <p><b>few</b> [10] - 5:7, 36:16, 86:17, 87:12, 90:6, 121:10, 157:19, 169:15, 171:15, 191:4</p> <p><b>field</b> [2] - 15:5, 88:17</p> <p><b>fifteen</b> [1] - 172:9</p> <p><b>fifth</b> [1] - 147:6</p> <p><b>Fifth</b> [1] - 89:12</p> <p><b>figure</b> [9] - 24:1, 30:6, 92:12, 95:5, 100:8, 107:16, 117:5, 123:14, 165:10</p> <p><b>figured</b> [3] - 147:8, 158:13, 162:6</p> <p><b>final</b> [8] - 47:9, 65:13, 98:3, 101:15, 142:1, 142:3, 160:2, 192:7</p> <p><b>financed</b> [1] - 33:9</p> <p><b>financial</b> [3] - 171:9, 172:11, 199:18</p> <p><b>financially</b> [1] - 164:8</p> <p><b>financing</b> [4] - 34:3, 34:5, 35:17</p> <p><b>fine</b> [1] - 143:14</p> <p><b>finish</b> [1] - 106:18</p> <p><b>finishing</b> [1] - 165:15</p> <p><b>firm</b> [1] - 76:1</p> <p><b>first</b> [9] - 8:2, 36:17, 41:5, 107:4, 120:14, 134:18, 151:7, 151:8, 186:5</p> <p><b>fit</b> [3] - 14:7, 17:1, 155:3</p> <p><b>five</b> [22] - 31:14, 50:16, 87:7, 91:14, 91:16, 92:6, 100:11, 102:7, 124:11, 125:5, 125:7, 125:9, 126:5, 126:13, 137:10, 145:9, 145:14, 148:7, 148:19, 158:13, 171:17, 199:3</p> <p><b>five-minute</b> [1] - 137:10</p> <p><b>fix</b> [1] - 150:13</p>	<p><b>fixed</b> [1] - 35:13</p> <p><b>flexibility</b> [16] - 22:7, 24:4, 26:15, 64:13, 74:17, 79:1, 85:12, 86:11, 99:6, 145:12, 193:10, 193:13, 194:3, 194:10, 195:3, 196:16</p> <p><b>flexible</b> [2] - 20:4, 94:19</p> <p><b>flexibly</b> [1] - 46:3</p> <p><b>Floor</b> [1] - 1:6</p> <p><b>floor</b> [11] - 15:16, 19:8, 26:7, 42:16, 49:6, 84:4, 142:2, 142:3, 157:15, 190:7, 194:4</p> <p><b>floors</b> [1] - 87:7</p> <p><b>focus</b> [4] - 5:9, 53:16, 54:17, 77:7</p> <p><b>focusing</b> [2] - 24:10, 176:5</p> <p><b>folks</b> [5] - 113:10, 143:1, 143:7, 153:1, 164:19</p> <p><b>follow</b> [3] - 5:2, 79:13, 144:14</p> <p><b>follow-up</b> [1] - 5:2</p> <p><b>followed</b> [1] - 120:13</p> <p><b>following</b> [2] - 53:3, 75:7</p> <p><b>follows</b> [1] - 2:5</p> <p><b>foot</b> [8] - 34:19, 35:6, 45:19, 64:1, 70:7, 92:5, 117:10, 184:7</p> <p><b>footage</b> [5] - 28:5, 49:12, 172:5, 179:2, 183:13</p> <p><b>FOR</b> [1] - 1:2</p> <p><b>foreclose</b> [1] - 118:16</p> <p><b>foregoing</b> [1] - 204:15</p> <p><b>FOREGOING</b> [1] - 205:16</p> <p><b>foreground</b> [1] - 12:2</p> <p><b>foreign</b> [1] - 144:8</p> <p><b>forgotten</b> [1] - 147:7</p> <p><b>form</b> [9] - 34:18, 53:8, 54:1, 56:14, 59:15, 59:19, 62:7, 68:6</p> <p><b>format</b> [1] - 169:14</p> <p><b>forms</b> [3] - 55:16, 56:18, 80:9</p> <p><b>formula</b> [1] - 199:10</p> <p><b>formulation</b> [1] - 18:9</p> <p><b>forth</b> [7] - 108:7, 116:18, 139:19, 143:12, 148:10, 168:13, 205:7</p> <p><b>fortunately</b> [1] - 121:5</p> <p><b>forward</b> [6] - 11:17, 17:11, 33:10, 52:16,</p>	<p>68:13, 202:11</p> <p><b>four</b> [20] - 8:16, 28:9, 91:13, 91:16, 92:6, 100:10, 100:11, 100:12, 100:13, 101:1, 124:19, 125:7, 125:19, 126:2, 126:6, 141:11, 148:18, 199:3, 199:7, 201:11</p> <p><b>frame</b> [1] - 56:14</p> <p><b>frames</b> [1] - 106:3</p> <p><b>framework</b> [4] - 15:12, 70:12, 90:11, 95:16</p> <p><b>frankly</b> [2] - 77:8, 122:16</p> <p><b>freedom</b> [1] - 90:14</p> <p><b>frequently</b> [2] - 113:13</p> <p><b>FROM</b> [1] - 128:15</p> <p><b>front</b> [5] - 104:7, 121:14, 122:12, 130:5, 132:6</p> <p><b>frontages</b> [2] - 53:7, 61:7</p> <p><b>full</b> [3] - 9:16, 29:5, 44:19</p> <p><b>fun</b> [2] - 3:19, 65:16</p> <p><b>function</b> [3] - 80:16, 81:5, 114:18</p> <p><b>functional</b> [1] - 82:4</p> <p><b>fundamental</b> [1] - 144:9</p> <p><b>funny</b> [2] - 155:2, 190:18</p> <p><b>furniture</b> [1] - 110:16</p> <p><b>future</b> [7] - 34:6, 48:12, 54:1, 69:15, 98:11, 120:15, 165:2</p>	<p>57:2, 74:7, 98:5, 138:12</p> <p><b>generating</b> [1] - 44:2</p> <p><b>generous</b> [2] - 86:5, 156:6</p> <p><b>gentler</b> [1] - 131:5</p> <p><b>George</b> [1] - 151:9</p> <p><b>GFA</b> [1] - 189:13</p> <p><b>given</b> [1] - 18:14</p> <p><b>gladly</b> [1] - 175:5</p> <p><b>glass</b> [1] - 106:2</p> <p><b>Glenn's</b> [1] - 86:1</p> <p><b>goal</b> [3] - 99:4, 130:2, 170:18</p> <p><b>goals</b> [16] - 11:4, 50:1, 51:17, 82:10, 90:12, 109:1, 109:3, 116:2, 117:9, 131:7, 133:1, 133:6, 155:13, 170:16, 192:19, 196:18</p> <p><b>God</b> [1] - 119:2</p> <p><b>golden</b> [1] - 72:9</p> <p><b>goose</b> [1] - 72:9</p> <p><b>gotcha</b> [2] - 39:7, 182:3</p> <p><b>government</b> [4] - 67:6, 101:5, 102:5, 126:15</p> <p><b>Government</b> [23] - 8:8, 34:17, 61:4, 63:17, 74:15, 76:7, 76:15, 100:9, 100:19, 104:4, 104:6, 107:5, 107:7, 107:15, 114:9, 115:9, 130:14, 131:5, 134:3, 135:8, 135:19, 136:5, 139:6</p> <p><b>grad</b> [1] - 163:4</p> <p><b>grade</b> [6] - 34:1, 87:8, 99:10, 175:16</p> <p><b>gradually</b> [1] - 151:3</p> <p><b>graph</b> [1] - 184:17</p> <p><b>great</b> [13] - 41:3, 70:19, 94:16, 95:2, 98:19, 104:17, 124:2, 137:7, 159:8, 171:17, 188:8, 190:14, 202:5</p> <p><b>greater</b> [6] - 42:3, 43:13, 43:17, 45:9, 46:15, 143:5</p> <p><b>greatest</b> [3] - 136:19, 162:11, 162:15</p> <p><b>green</b> [15] - 14:15, 65:11, 74:4, 104:11, 104:17, 105:3, 106:9, 110:2, 118:15, 119:1,</p>	<p>124:9, 126:12, 126:14, 171:1, 194:13</p> <p><b>Green</b> [1] - 58:14</p> <p><b>greenery</b> [2] - 63:8, 64:8</p> <p><b>grey</b> [1] - 196:6</p> <p><b>greyer</b> [1] - 83:13</p> <p><b>gross</b> [4] - 26:7, 142:2, 142:3, 190:6</p> <p><b>ground</b> [6] - 15:5, 19:7, 42:16, 109:4, 154:12, 194:4</p> <p><b>grouped</b> [1] - 10:6</p> <p><b>groups</b> [1] - 113:18</p> <p><b>grow</b> [1] - 185:17</p> <p><b>growth</b> [1] - 185:8</p> <p><b>GSA</b> [9] - 91:13, 96:1, 96:16, 124:10, 125:8, 129:7, 129:16, 129:18, 136:11</p> <p><b>GTA</b> [1] - 113:10</p> <p><b>guaranteed</b> [1] - 44:16</p> <p><b>guard</b> [1] - 104:7</p> <p><b>guess</b> [22] - 36:6, 67:17, 76:13, 77:6, 95:19, 97:7, 111:5, 111:12, 111:16, 116:19, 132:12, 141:11, 143:9, 145:7, 147:15, 155:18, 170:8, 170:10, 195:17, 197:16</p> <p><b>guidance</b> [3] - 180:17, 198:4, 201:19</p> <p><b>guideline</b> [1] - 67:14</p> <p><b>guidelines</b> [24] - 11:9, 18:2, 23:4, 26:9, 30:17, 30:18, 52:3, 52:14, 53:5, 53:15, 53:16, 55:3, 56:3, 56:12, 56:19, 59:8, 60:17, 61:6, 62:16, 64:3, 64:14, 66:13, 67:1, 68:8</p> <p><b>gut</b> [3] - 102:15, 153:9, 156:7</p> <p><b>guy</b> [1] - 132:5</p> <p><b>guys</b> [2] - 149:3, 164:19</p>
		<h2>G</h2> <p><b>Galleria</b> [1] - 120:1</p> <p><b>gap</b> [3] - 53:10, 153:10, 153:13</p> <p><b>gardens</b> [1] - 62:3</p> <p><b>gateway</b> [1] - 93:11</p> <p><b>gateways</b> [1] - 62:15</p> <p><b>gathering</b> [5] - 24:17, 62:4, 62:9, 82:7</p> <p><b>GENERAL</b> [2] - 1:3, 2:2</p> <p><b>general</b> [6] - 101:12, 110:3, 144:18, 147:5, 163:7, 173:18</p> <p><b>General</b> [1] - 3:6</p> <p><b>generally</b> [5] - 51:1,</p>	<h2>H</h2> <p><b>half</b> [7] - 23:13, 31:14, 85:10, 91:2, 127:1, 182:16, 182:17</p> <p><b>Hancock</b> [1] - 87:3</p> <p><b>hand</b> [3] - 85:5, 124:7,</p>	

<p>205:9  <b>hands</b> [1] - 203:2  <b>happy</b> [3] - 69:11, 69:12, 69:14  <b>hard</b> [11] - 21:16, 30:5, 40:12, 43:6, 81:2, 105:7, 122:1, 155:13, 186:12, 188:7, 195:1  <b>harder</b> [1] - 83:13  <b>hardworking</b> [1] - 143:2  <b>Harrington</b> [1] - 191:1  <b>Harvard</b> [5] - 93:1, 148:2, 153:1, 155:10  <b>hate</b> [1] - 169:9  <b>healthy</b> [1] - 152:16  <b>hear</b> [6] - 7:15, 13:11, 75:19, 147:10, 170:8, 198:2  <b>heard</b> [4] - 25:7, 100:13, 190:19, 192:15  <b>hearing</b> [9] - 3:11, 4:2, 4:5, 4:9, 4:12, 70:9, 73:1, 196:15, 205:6  <b>HEARING</b> [1] - 1:3  <b>hearings</b> [2] - 68:17, 166:18  <b>Heather</b> [1] - 106:11  <b>heck</b> [1] - 126:9  <b>hedged</b> [1] - 101:3  <b>height</b> [31] - 10:12, 12:18, 15:17, 19:13, 19:19, 20:3, 20:10, 26:6, 26:17, 29:14, 29:15, 30:14, 31:9, 49:3, 49:5, 52:6, 55:1, 56:1, 56:16, 57:8, 71:16, 85:16, 85:17, 87:19, 116:18, 138:5, 143:8, 143:15, 170:13, 191:15, 196:8  <b>heights</b> [10] - 31:18, 32:4, 32:5, 32:15, 45:9, 55:5, 55:14, 56:4, 85:9  <b>held</b> [3] - 127:10, 150:18, 186:17  <b>hell</b> [1] - 148:9  <b>help</b> [7] - 18:3, 65:18, 77:4, 131:12, 135:19, 187:6, 198:5  <b>helpful</b> [4] - 117:12, 181:2, 192:6, 202:2  <b>helps</b> [4] - 17:3,</p>	<p>26:12, 26:13, 86:9  <b>hereby</b> [1] - 204:16  <b>herein</b> [1] - 205:6  <b>hereunto</b> [1] - 205:8  <b>herring</b> [1] - 114:11  <b>hidden</b> [2] - 121:16, 121:17  <b>hierarchy</b> [1] - 62:2  <b>high</b> [11] - 61:1, 61:6, 61:9, 61:16, 99:7, 103:5, 109:2, 111:2, 147:19, 148:6, 170:18  <b>higher</b> [9] - 55:17, 83:16, 86:16, 139:15, 154:9, 156:12, 183:5, 196:12, 196:16  <b>highlight</b> [1] - 96:6  <b>highlights</b> [1] - 6:16  <b>highly</b> [1] - 64:7  <b>Hill</b> [1] - 4:6  <b>hire</b> [1] - 144:7  <b>hit</b> [1] - 111:2  <b>HMFA</b> [1] - 199:6  <b>hold</b> [1] - 187:12  <b>hole</b> [2] - 90:2, 90:4  <b>home</b> [2] - 120:15, 199:14  <b>honorable</b> [1] - 132:17  <b>hope</b> [2] - 60:5, 60:10  <b>hopefully</b> [2] - 52:14, 66:3  <b>hoping</b> [2] - 59:17, 173:8  <b>Hotel</b> [1] - 89:4  <b>hotel</b> [1] - 87:6  <b>hours</b> [1] - 85:6  <b>house</b> [7] - 106:8, 148:5, 150:2, 150:12, 151:6, 175:12, 201:2  <b>households</b> [2] - 155:7, 187:4  <b>housemother</b> [1] - 146:1  <b>houses</b> [1] - 106:9  <b>Housing</b> [7] - 4:11, 46:2, 46:7, 47:3, 47:13, 47:14, 165:6  <b>housing</b> [114] - 4:15, 4:16, 4:18, 5:9, 5:10, 5:11, 5:12, 7:7, 9:7, 11:1, 11:3, 16:5, 18:10, 18:14, 18:18, 19:1, 19:3, 33:2, 37:8, 37:11, 37:13, 41:1, 41:4, 41:9, 43:5, 43:13, 43:17, 44:2, 44:7,</p>	<p>44:11, 44:12, 44:14, 45:7, 47:16, 47:17, 48:3, 48:11, 48:16, 48:19, 49:7, 50:2, 50:5, 51:1, 51:4, 52:9, 59:4, 70:18, 71:18, 84:6, 86:15, 87:6, 87:18, 93:14, 93:17, 93:18, 106:15, 109:13, 113:1, 114:19, 137:11, 137:15, 137:19, 138:2, 138:3, 138:13, 140:6, 140:11, 141:2, 141:9, 142:10, 142:14, 142:15, 142:18, 143:6, 144:5, 144:9, 144:17, 146:4, 146:15, 146:17, 147:8, 147:14, 148:15, 149:3, 149:8, 149:15, 153:5, 153:8, 159:5, 159:6, 159:14, 162:2, 162:14, 165:2, 165:7, 167:12, 168:8, 168:10, 169:5, 170:7, 170:13, 170:17, 170:18, 174:2, 176:17, 176:18, 176:19, 181:8, 184:19, 191:16, 196:17, 197:17, 199:6  <b>HR</b> [1] - 36:13  <b>hubs</b> [1] - 62:3  <b>huge</b> [3] - 92:8, 153:13, 164:15  <b>Hugh</b> [11] - 1:9, 93:12, 99:1, 105:1, 111:13, 112:11, 120:4, 149:12, 157:1, 167:16, 197:6  <b>HUGH</b> [34] - 57:15, 58:2, 58:7, 58:12, 63:14, 79:13, 79:18, 81:7, 83:2, 89:11, 89:15, 90:1, 90:4, 90:8, 101:18, 102:19, 123:1, 125:10, 127:3, 131:17, 132:4, 149:13, 150:7, 178:1, 178:8, 182:15, 183:1, 184:3, 192:11, 195:11, 197:8, 197:14, 199:2, 199:16</p>	<p><b>Hugh's</b> [1] - 196:9  <b>human</b> [1] - 56:15  <b>hundred</b> [1] - 169:16  <b>husband</b> [1] - 148:17</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>I</b></p> <p><b>I-s-h-i-h-a-r-a</b> [1] - 125:15  <b>i.e</b> [1] - 84:6  <b>ID'd</b> [1] - 104:8  <b>idea</b> [23] - 20:1, 20:3, 29:8, 61:9, 62:9, 63:5, 65:3, 65:6, 66:6, 67:3, 68:8, 78:19, 88:7, 94:9, 104:14, 104:16, 104:17, 127:12, 160:7, 166:13, 190:2, 193:6, 197:2  <b>ideal</b> [1] - 114:15  <b>ideas</b> [7] - 64:15, 66:5, 66:18, 119:4, 166:14, 167:1, 192:2  <b>identified</b> [2] - 60:14, 65:10  <b>identify</b> [6] - 55:11, 60:4, 65:18, 66:1, 66:8, 102:1  <b>identity</b> [2] - 54:12, 65:19  <b>ignore</b> [1] - 135:6  <b>Il</b> [1] - 154:6  <b>illegal</b> [1] - 154:17  <b>illustrate</b> [3] - 17:3, 103:6, 129:17  <b>imagination</b> [2] - 91:2, 173:12  <b>imagine</b> [3] - 21:18, 22:1, 47:1  <b>impact</b> [1] - 164:7  <b>impacts</b> [6] - 37:18, 56:8, 56:9, 56:10, 146:16, 158:19  <b>implemented</b> [1] - 44:17  <b>implication</b> [1] - 34:12  <b>important</b> [13] - 11:10, 18:15, 21:7, 25:10, 25:12, 41:19, 43:1, 48:7, 50:14, 54:4, 100:8, 135:12, 162:18  <b>importantly</b> [1] - 16:17  <b>impose</b> [2] - 132:15, 139:14  <b>impossible</b> [2] - 102:8, 128:13</p>	<p><b>improve</b> [1] - 60:18  <b>IN</b> [2] - 205:8, 205:17  <b>inaudible</b> [1] - 176:10  <b>INC</b> [1] - 1:17  <b>incentive</b> [9] - 4:12, 45:8, 45:16, 46:5, 46:13, 47:5, 49:3, 138:5, 149:2  <b>incentives</b> [3] - 106:5, 143:11  <b>inclined</b> [1] - 169:7  <b>include</b> [7] - 9:7, 24:14, 50:5, 62:3, 74:18, 77:16, 120:2  <b>included</b> [9] - 17:16, 24:16, 50:3, 54:10, 64:14, 66:12, 82:15, 110:4, 138:4  <b>includes</b> [7] - 9:16, 24:8, 24:13, 53:17, 78:8, 119:17, 135:8  <b>including</b> [8] - 12:6, 48:16, 48:17, 61:4, 103:3, 126:14, 147:10, 194:18  <b>Inclusionary</b> [2] - 47:13, 47:14  <b>inclusionary</b> [14] - 37:10, 44:1, 44:5, 44:15, 48:1, 48:11, 138:13, 162:13, 163:9, 163:12, 165:4, 176:19, 186:11, 186:16  <b>income</b> [31] - 4:17, 5:12, 45:4, 45:7, 45:10, 48:16, 48:17, 48:18, 48:19, 49:7, 50:1, 87:18, 142:15, 142:18, 142:19, 152:15, 152:16, 153:7, 160:18, 161:11, 165:2, 168:9, 177:1, 179:12, 179:18, 180:1, 185:8, 187:3, 187:7, 198:8, 199:6  <b>incomes</b> [4] - 143:3, 149:18, 159:4, 189:1  <b>incorporate</b> [3] - 9:3, 11:5, 175:2  <b>incorporated</b> [1] - 66:14  <b>incorporating</b> [1] - 28:3  <b>increase</b> [4] - 142:5, 147:1, 164:6, 185:11  <b>increasing</b> [1] - 164:4  <b>indeed</b> [1] - 93:12</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p><b>independently</b> [1] - 139:17</p> <p><b>Index</b> [1] - 2:9</p> <p><b>indicate</b> [1] - 82:3</p> <p><b>indicated</b> [2] - 100:18, 179:11</p> <p><b>indication</b> [1] - 117:6</p> <p><b>indirectly</b> [1] - 174:4</p> <p><b>individual</b> [1] - 70:10</p> <p><b>individuals</b> [1] - 160:18</p> <p><b>indoor</b> [1] - 61:10</p> <p><b>industrial</b> [2] - 15:6, 153:3</p> <p><b>industry</b> [2] - 115:18, 161:8</p> <p><b>infinite</b> [1] - 194:9</p> <p><b>influence</b> [1] - 137:4</p> <p><b>inform</b> [4] - 16:2, 18:3, 116:9, 117:4</p> <p><b>information</b> [7] - 36:9, 36:13, 54:6, 57:7, 115:15, 156:1, 157:2</p> <p><b>informative</b> [1] - 70:8</p> <p><b>informed</b> [1] - 166:4</p> <p><b>initial</b> [4] - 9:14, 9:19, 50:14, 53:4</p> <p><b>initiated</b> [1] - 108:16</p> <p><b>innovation</b> [1] - 6:1</p> <p><b>input</b> [2] - 116:16, 198:13</p> <p><b>insight</b> [1] - 167:9</p> <p><b>insignificant</b> [1] - 171:18</p> <p><b>insistent</b> [1] - 194:4</p> <p><b>insofar</b> [1] - 168:8</p> <p><b>inspired</b> [2] - 17:9, 27:13</p> <p><b>instance</b> [3] - 82:8, 141:10, 178:14</p> <p><b>instances</b> [1] - 115:8</p> <p><b>instead</b> [4] - 109:15, 148:16, 172:2, 196:11</p> <p><b>institutional</b> [1] - 189:18</p> <p><b>institutions</b> [1] - 148:3</p> <p><b>INSTRUCTIONS</b> [2] - 204:1, 204:5</p> <p><b>integrated</b> [1] - 25:18</p> <p><b>integrates</b> [1] - 59:18</p> <p><b>integrating</b> [1] - 54:13</p> <p><b>integration</b> [1] - 104:13</p> <p><b>intent</b> [4] - 79:4, 80:13, 80:14, 127:9</p> <p><b>intention</b> [2] - 128:11, 165:13</p> <p><b>intentioned</b> [1] -</p>	<p>132:18</p> <p><b>intentions</b> [1] - 129:19</p> <p><b>intents</b> [1] - 167:19</p> <p><b>interchangeable</b> [1] - 190:19</p> <p><b>interconnected</b> [2] - 25:13, 28:18</p> <p><b>interest</b> [3] - 18:14, 63:16, 98:8</p> <p><b>interested</b> [2] - 63:15, 159:10</p> <p><b>interesting</b> [5] - 13:14, 39:9, 55:5, 152:9, 167:8</p> <p><b>interests</b> [1] - 132:19</p> <p><b>interfaces</b> [2] - 19:6, 55:8</p> <p><b>interject</b> [2] - 102:17, 103:2</p> <p><b>internal</b> [1] - 183:6</p> <p><b>interpreter</b> [1] - 144:8</p> <p><b>interrupt</b> [1] - 38:7</p> <p><b>intersections</b> [2] - 55:12, 65:10</p> <p><b>interview</b> [1] - 162:3</p> <p><b>intimate</b> [1] - 60:6</p> <p><b>intimately</b> [1] - 111:6</p> <p><b>intrinsic</b> [1] - 59:9</p> <p><b>introduced</b> [3] - 18:7, 18:9, 134:18</p> <p><b>intuitive</b> [1] - 197:10</p> <p><b>invite</b> [1] - 3:13</p> <p><b>invited</b> [1] - 115:19</p> <p><b>inviting</b> [2] - 65:16, 67:10</p> <p><b>IRAM</b> [37] - 3:17, 7:8, 7:17, 63:10, 75:14, 75:18, 76:4, 76:11, 89:9, 96:14, 97:7, 97:15, 113:3, 116:14, 116:19, 117:17, 125:5, 129:12, 133:12, 133:16, 134:11, 160:6, 165:19, 166:15, 174:13, 174:17, 178:9, 179:1, 179:17, 180:5, 180:15, 181:6, 184:13, 198:14, 199:15, 200:12, 202:14</p> <p><b>Iram</b> [6] - 1:12, 3:15, 69:18, 116:11, 179:11, 183:17</p> <p><b>irrelevant</b> [1] - 139:8</p> <p><b>ishihara</b> [1] - 135:18</p> <p><b>ISHIHARA</b> [7] - 125:14, 126:9, 128:17, 129:2,</p>	<p>129:6, 129:14, 136:4</p> <p><b>Ishihara</b> [2] - 125:10, 125:15</p> <p><b>island</b> [1] - 59:10</p> <p><b>islands</b> [1] - 90:9</p> <p><b>issue</b> [5] - 74:11, 92:3, 122:10, 140:1, 174:6</p> <p><b>issues</b> [18] - 10:3, 10:4, 20:12, 27:5, 32:17, 56:10, 70:4, 71:8, 74:13, 78:16, 106:15, 138:6, 164:18, 179:5, 180:13, 187:3, 187:15, 192:10</p> <p><b>item</b> [4] - 3:6, 3:19, 115:6, 147:6</p> <p><b>iteration</b> [1] - 202:12</p> <p><b>itself</b> [6] - 19:4, 25:2, 41:6, 41:14, 46:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>J</b></p> <p><b>JAMES</b> [2] - 120:10, 121:6</p> <p><b>January</b> [1] - 8:2</p> <p><b>Jeff</b> [26] - 1:14, 6:19, 7:5, 7:9, 7:13, 38:5, 52:19, 53:2, 61:14, 63:12, 69:17, 72:3, 72:19, 80:12, 97:18, 101:17, 104:12, 124:5, 135:17, 142:11, 164:8, 169:13, 189:11, 196:8, 200:16, 201:18</p> <p><b>JEFF</b> [33] - 7:12, 7:19, 32:3, 38:6, 38:10, 38:13, 39:3, 39:8, 58:13, 67:16, 73:14, 74:2, 75:13, 77:18, 78:10, 78:19, 79:9, 80:14, 82:1, 100:14, 102:17, 103:1, 124:12, 124:17, 126:13, 127:12, 134:16, 184:4, 186:2, 190:3, 191:11, 193:5, 202:1</p> <p><b>Jeff's</b> [2] - 125:18, 136:17</p> <p><b>job</b> [2] - 150:10, 150:11</p> <p><b>jobs</b> [5] - 150:19, 151:16, 152:5, 152:6, 152:8</p> <p><b>Joe</b> [2] - 123:1,</p>	<p>183:10</p> <p><b>John</b> [1] - 87:2</p> <p><b>JOSEPH</b> [5] - 123:17, 172:15, 176:14, 184:6, 184:16</p> <p><b>Jr</b> [1] - 1:10</p> <p><b>JR</b> [36] - 124:5, 124:14, 125:3, 125:8, 126:7, 126:11, 126:16, 127:2, 127:4, 127:7, 128:10, 128:19, 129:3, 130:11, 131:1, 131:10, 131:13, 132:3, 132:8, 133:14, 134:7, 134:13, 155:18, 166:13, 167:3, 167:5, 178:4, 184:5, 193:1, 195:1, 196:1, 196:5, 196:19, 200:6, 201:4, 201:6</p> <p><b>judgment</b> [2] - 40:12, 167:14</p> <p><b>juggling</b> [1] - 93:13</p> <p><b>jump</b> [3] - 10:18, 45:15, 129:1</p> <p><b>jurisdictional</b> [1] - 74:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>K</b></p> <p><b>K-views</b> [1] - 55:10</p> <p><b>K2</b> [11] - 2:6, 6:1, 9:4, 9:12, 11:16, 12:15, 13:2, 13:5, 26:10, 40:18, 114:3</p> <p><b>K2-C2</b> [1] - 4:3</p> <p><b>keen</b> [1] - 133:17</p> <p><b>keep</b> [9] - 72:2, 98:17, 100:10, 102:12, 115:2, 118:12, 137:18, 150:19, 160:9</p> <p><b>keeping</b> [2] - 94:8, 118:13</p> <p><b>Kendall</b> [41] - 2:6, 8:8, 8:11, 13:7, 14:2, 21:9, 26:8, 26:9, 27:13, 30:18, 37:3, 37:4, 37:6, 41:7, 41:18, 42:13, 43:10, 53:15, 54:15, 55:11, 56:12, 58:19, 59:9, 60:12, 60:15, 61:12, 61:19, 64:1, 65:2, 65:5, 65:14, 65:15, 65:19, 66:5, 66:8, 86:3, 90:7, 112:11, 119:5, 189:4, 191:6</p>	<p><b>key</b> [12] - 11:13, 20:12, 30:17, 42:13, 56:10, 60:13, 61:17, 61:19, 62:8, 62:15, 65:5, 193:12</p> <p><b>Keyword</b> [1] - 2:9</p> <p><b>kick</b> [2] - 137:11, 137:16</p> <p><b>kid</b> [1] - 180:7</p> <p><b>kids</b> [13] - 146:2, 148:5, 154:2, 154:4, 157:19, 158:10, 158:11, 161:19, 162:16, 176:5, 179:16, 180:4, 180:6</p> <p><b>kill</b> [1] - 72:9</p> <p><b>kind</b> [34] - 6:15, 7:2, 14:1, 21:12, 31:1, 36:11, 60:5, 68:1, 76:13, 81:15, 110:8, 112:17, 117:9, 119:5, 119:9, 127:7, 128:4, 128:6, 131:14, 145:17, 146:7, 154:11, 155:15, 160:7, 160:8, 160:9, 160:14, 161:4, 162:7, 163:1, 168:6, 168:17, 195:16, 196:11</p> <p><b>kinder</b> [1] - 131:5</p> <p><b>kinds</b> [3] - 79:18, 115:3, 160:17</p> <p><b>knitting</b> [1] - 14:3</p> <p><b>knowing</b> [3] - 122:10, 155:11, 155:12</p> <p><b>knowledge</b> [1] - 152:18</p> <p><b>knowledge-based</b> [1] - 152:18</p> <p><b>known</b> [1] - 35:16</p> <p><b>knows</b> [2] - 94:18, 194:18</p> <p><b>KS</b> [6] - 2:5, 3:9, 8:4, 178:10, 184:1, 184:17</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>L</b></p> <p><b>lab</b> [3] - 37:2, 37:3, 39:5</p> <p><b>laid</b> [2] - 17:17, 17:19</p> <p><b>land</b> [23] - 34:11, 38:15, 38:18, 39:1, 39:4, 39:11, 39:16, 81:19, 101:1, 102:13, 107:6, 108:6, 115:5, 136:1, 139:3, 139:15,</p>
---	--	---	---	---

<p>169:18, 174:3, 174:4, 175:15, 175:17, 175:19, 178:7</p> <p><b>landmark</b> [1] - 134:9</p> <p><b>landmarks</b> [1] - 55:12</p> <p><b>landscaped</b> [1] - 60:7</p> <p><b>language</b> [5] - 144:8, 149:6, 169:18, 189:10, 190:9</p> <p><b>large</b> [8] - 15:13, 110:18, 119:18, 146:10, 150:18, 163:10, 164:5, 173:19</p> <p><b>larger</b> [7] - 31:5, 41:6, 49:14, 83:14, 83:15, 88:17, 178:12</p> <p><b>last</b> [34] - 4:19, 5:6, 10:2, 13:8, 14:12, 16:15, 20:14, 22:2, 23:8, 25:4, 25:5, 26:4, 33:6, 41:16, 43:7, 45:3, 45:17, 50:7, 51:14, 62:13, 85:6, 95:18, 97:19, 106:12, 118:15, 124:10, 125:4, 125:16, 127:18, 129:19, 137:8, 151:4, 155:7, 184:13</p> <p><b>late</b> [5] - 14:19, 96:12, 96:15, 187:1</p> <p><b>latest</b> [1] - 96:13</p> <p><b>launched</b> [1] - 13:6</p> <p><b>laundry</b> [1] - 154:18</p> <p><b>law</b> [1] - 181:14</p> <p><b>Lawson</b> [1] - 205:4</p> <p><b>lawyer</b> [1] - 109:9</p> <p><b>lay</b> [1] - 17:11</p> <p><b>layered</b> [2] - 33:16, 37:14</p> <p><b>layout</b> [3] - 53:18, 55:16, 57:1</p> <p><b>layouts</b> [1] - 120:17</p> <p><b>lead</b> [2] - 108:12, 169:2</p> <p><b>learned</b> [2] - 25:8, 28:13</p> <p><b>learning</b> [1] - 150:17</p> <p><b>lease</b> [1] - 136:13</p> <p><b>leasing</b> [1] - 136:1</p> <p><b>least</b> [5] - 43:2, 133:2, 147:14, 163:8, 168:7</p> <p><b>leave</b> [6] - 79:1, 119:10, 146:13, 147:8, 162:4, 199:14</p> <p><b>leaving</b> [3] - 200:8,</p>	<p>200:19, 201:1</p> <p><b>Lee</b> [1] - 68:3</p> <p><b>left</b> [6] - 33:5, 80:19, 85:5, 91:17, 94:6, 193:15</p> <p><b>left-hand</b> [1] - 85:5</p> <p><b>legal</b> [2] - 75:6, 79:3</p> <p><b>legally</b> [2] - 132:14, 133:6</p> <p><b>Leland</b> [2] - 63:18, 86:14</p> <p><b>length</b> [1] - 65:12</p> <p><b>Lesley</b> [1] - 148:3</p> <p><b>less</b> [14] - 30:15, 31:16, 37:17, 44:16, 102:6, 113:13, 145:7, 168:3, 171:1, 172:5, 183:7, 183:8, 183:19, 197:19</p> <p><b>lesser</b> [1] - 183:6</p> <p><b>level</b> [5] - 21:6, 61:7, 68:13, 103:6, 159:7</p> <p><b>levels</b> [5] - 48:17, 55:6, 61:9, 160:19, 187:4</p> <p><b>leverage</b> [1] - 87:17</p> <p><b>License</b> [1] - 205:14</p> <p><b>light</b> [1] - 56:8</p> <p><b>limit</b> [3] - 134:12, 143:15, 189:17</p> <p><b>limitation</b> [1] - 34:10</p> <p><b>limitations</b> [6] - 15:16, 15:17, 20:10, 62:17, 74:8, 74:14</p> <p><b>limited</b> [3] - 29:7, 75:4, 77:13</p> <p><b>limiting</b> [1] - 188:12</p> <p><b>limits</b> [2] - 20:3, 26:17</p> <p><b>line</b> [2] - 131:8, 148:8</p> <p><b>LINE</b> [1] - 204:8</p> <p><b>lined</b> [1] - 63:7</p> <p><b>lines</b> [1] - 24:16</p> <p><b>link</b> [2] - 128:3, 188:7</p> <p><b>linking</b> [1] - 89:4</p> <p><b>list</b> [2] - 153:11, 162:13</p> <p><b>listen</b> [2] - 85:8, 151:11</p> <p><b>literally</b> [2] - 172:13, 173:10</p> <p><b>live</b> [10] - 146:6, 148:13, 152:13, 158:8, 168:6, 176:5, 176:8, 176:11, 200:8, 200:19</p> <p><b>liveability</b> [1] - 51:2</p> <p><b>lived</b> [1] - 154:14</p> <p><b>lively</b> [2] - 42:17, 60:11</p> <p><b>lives</b> [1] - 176:10</p> <p><b>living</b> [6] - 51:12,</p>	<p>146:7, 149:17, 152:4, 200:10, 200:13</p> <p><b>lobby</b> [1] - 89:18</p> <p><b>local</b> [1] - 54:12</p> <p><b>located</b> [1] - 101:2</p> <p><b>location</b> [16] - 55:9, 62:12, 62:14, 62:15, 110:17, 116:17, 120:7, 121:15, 121:16, 121:17, 122:13, 122:16, 122:17, 122:18, 158:3, 158:5</p> <p><b>locations</b> [1] - 121:12</p> <p><b>lock</b> [1] - 22:8</p> <p><b>locking</b> [1] - 22:3</p> <p><b>logically</b> [1] - 123:14</p> <p><b>look</b> [35] - 5:13, 10:15, 11:12, 12:16, 13:15, 23:3, 27:11, 28:3, 28:10, 30:6, 36:8, 40:6, 50:17, 52:16, 61:6, 61:15, 65:7, 85:4, 88:1, 88:11, 120:16, 140:19, 157:6, 159:16, 159:19, 160:1, 172:6, 173:5, 173:16, 175:8, 184:16, 185:2, 187:12, 192:14, 202:11</p> <p><b>looked</b> [13] - 18:11, 27:12, 29:1, 33:12, 35:2, 38:15, 41:2, 45:12, 53:5, 64:9, 66:6, 119:5, 155:7</p> <p><b>looking</b> [52] - 12:3, 17:4, 21:15, 25:15, 26:7, 28:8, 35:4, 39:4, 39:10, 39:14, 41:8, 41:10, 44:4, 44:6, 44:10, 44:12, 47:14, 50:18, 50:19, 51:1, 55:4, 55:6, 55:19, 56:7, 59:13, 60:1, 61:1, 62:1, 64:17, 65:11, 65:15, 66:1, 66:13, 66:15, 67:8, 96:10, 102:10, 104:2, 105:18, 106:11, 114:10, 123:1, 167:2, 173:6, 173:10, 173:12, 175:1, 177:3, 185:14, 187:1, 194:16</p> <p><b>looks</b> [6] - 12:4, 30:1, 39:13, 54:6, 55:15, 146:17</p> <p><b>looseness</b> [1] - 85:1</p>	<p><b>lose</b> [2] - 148:14, 183:16</p> <p><b>Lou</b> [1] - 155:17</p> <p><b>LOUIS</b> [36] - 124:5, 124:14, 125:3, 125:8, 126:7, 126:11, 126:16, 127:2, 127:4, 127:7, 128:10, 128:19, 129:3, 130:11, 131:1, 131:10, 131:13, 132:3, 132:8, 133:14, 134:7, 134:13, 155:18, 166:13, 167:3, 167:5, 178:4, 184:5, 193:1, 195:1, 196:1, 196:5, 196:19, 200:6, 201:4, 201:6</p> <p><b>Louis</b> [1] - 1:10</p> <p><b>lovely</b> [1] - 111:8</p> <p><b>low</b> [14] - 4:17, 22:3, 22:4, 45:4, 81:13, 156:9, 158:14, 168:1, 179:14, 182:16, 183:4, 198:8, 199:8</p> <p><b>lower</b> [12] - 22:6, 85:12, 94:3, 98:1, 99:5, 142:18, 153:13, 153:14, 175:9, 183:5, 194:1, 194:2</p> <p><b>lowered</b> [1] - 32:6</p> <p><b>lowest</b> [1] - 175:10</p> <p><b>ly</b> [1] - 113:14</p>	<p>123:17, 172:15, 176:14, 184:6, 184:16</p> <p><b>mark</b> [1] - 112:5</p> <p><b>market</b> [6] - 38:18, 50:11, 143:4, 158:6, 163:2, 199:9</p> <p><b>Marriott</b> [4] - 59:1, 89:4, 89:7, 89:18</p> <p><b>mass</b> [1] - 86:18</p> <p><b>Massachusetts</b> [1] - 1:7</p> <p><b>MASSACHUSETTS</b> [1] - 205:3</p> <p><b>massing</b> [5] - 29:17, 55:1, 55:2, 55:16, 108:7</p> <p><b>master</b> [9] - 14:1, 17:13, 18:10, 23:2, 54:9, 60:3, 62:7, 66:3, 98:6</p> <p><b>match</b> [1] - 172:2</p> <p><b>matched</b> [1] - 98:3</p> <p><b>material</b> [3] - 33:4, 47:11, 67:18</p> <p><b>materials</b> [1] - 9:15</p> <p><b>matter</b> [2] - 101:4, 111:16</p> <p><b>matters</b> [1] - 21:1</p> <p><b>max</b> [1] - 85:9</p> <p><b>maximize</b> [2] - 30:13, 45:1</p> <p><b>maximized</b> [1] - 85:9</p> <p><b>maximum</b> [4] - 29:14, 32:6, 145:15, 145:16</p> <p><b>Mayor</b> [1] - 171:19</p> <p><b>McDonald</b> [1] - 182:9</p> <p><b>mean</b> [35] - 13:16, 38:11, 40:1, 75:18, 76:13, 77:2, 80:1, 87:10, 88:2, 90:5, 96:14, 96:15, 98:2, 108:10, 109:8, 112:2, 116:11, 132:1, 139:1, 139:10, 140:1, 141:9, 142:2, 143:13, 154:5, 157:12, 158:19, 162:12, 163:6, 164:1, 168:9, 180:10, 183:16, 192:11, 195:15</p> <p><b>meaning</b> [1] - 34:16</p> <p><b>means</b> [5] - 22:6, 84:9, 97:1, 135:13, 175:16</p> <p><b>meant</b> [4] - 82:2, 82:4, 172:18</p> <p><b>meantime</b> [1] - 161:9</p>
---	--	---	---	--



**measures** [2] - 62:18, 128:7  
**mechanicals** [2] - 59:2, 84:12  
**mechanism** [2] - 82:17, 162:3  
**median** [5] - 48:18, 179:11, 182:17, 183:5, 183:6  
**meet** [4] - 30:7, 50:1, 113:13, 151:19  
**meeting** [8] - 3:4, 3:18, 7:7, 25:4, 113:11, 113:12, 125:4, 202:5  
**Meeting** [1] - 1:6  
**meetings** [2] - 69:15, 71:14  
**meets** [1] - 101:8  
**Member** [5] - 1:9, 1:9, 1:10, 1:10, 1:11  
**members** [2] - 13:9, 63:15  
**Members** [5] - 3:13, 63:11, 189:9, 192:1, 196:13  
**mention** [5] - 98:12, 108:18, 118:1, 118:11, 190:18  
**mentioned** [4] - 61:14, 62:13, 104:12, 164:18  
**met** [2] - 21:19, 98:1  
**Metzker** [1] - 151:9  
**microapartments** [1] - 154:15  
**Microsoft's** [1] - 94:14  
**microunits** [5] - 145:6, 145:16, 146:5, 146:19, 155:1  
**mid** [1] - 155:4  
**mid-Cambridge** [1] - 155:4  
**middle** [27] - 4:17, 5:12, 45:7, 45:10, 48:16, 48:19, 49:7, 50:1, 87:18, 88:8, 88:10, 118:4, 118:19, 142:14, 143:2, 143:19, 151:16, 151:18, 153:10, 153:14, 158:18, 161:11, 163:5, 163:7, 168:2, 168:9, 177:1  
**Midge** [1] - 68:3  
**might** [43] - 6:10, 21:11, 21:12, 21:19, 22:17, 36:5, 39:6,

42:1, 46:7, 46:18, 51:12, 59:2, 62:16, 80:2, 80:15, 83:3, 83:5, 83:6, 84:12, 84:13, 85:2, 86:12, 87:9, 87:10, 103:10, 103:11, 109:3, 114:10, 118:16, 119:1, 140:17, 146:2, 146:3, 151:1, 151:2, 151:3, 167:9, 169:6, 171:3, 172:4, 181:11, 200:2, 200:3  
**migrated** [1] - 148:5  
**mile** [1] - 148:7  
**miles** [1] - 201:15  
**million** [10] - 12:5, 40:9, 47:2, 106:5, 106:7, 169:16, 175:9, 175:11, 178:3, 184:7  
**mind** [8] - 72:2, 98:17, 115:3, 118:13, 131:14, 133:7, 158:14, 191:12  
**mindful** [1] - 182:8  
**minds** [1] - 152:14  
**minimum** [20] - 15:19, 16:13, 21:17, 22:3, 22:6, 31:15, 50:15, 98:4, 118:14, 145:1, 145:3, 145:8, 148:17, 156:10, 156:19, 179:14, 181:9, 195:12, 195:13, 195:14  
**minute** [1] - 137:10  
**minutes** [2] - 187:16, 187:17  
**miss** [1] - 40:17  
**missing** [2] - 120:12, 126:17  
**MIT** [5] - 8:16, 58:15, 93:1, 148:1, 153:1  
**mix** [22] - 11:18, 12:17, 12:18, 15:2, 15:7, 16:4, 16:11, 16:19, 18:19, 115:2, 118:6, 146:14, 149:17, 159:14, 160:5, 162:10, 167:9, 178:10, 188:12, 188:14, 199:8  
**mixed** [6] - 9:8, 42:12, 43:9, 43:11, 192:3, 199:6  
**Moakley** [2] - 75:8, 130:3  
**model** [3] - 103:3, 152:14, 186:17

**moderate** [7] - 4:17, 45:4, 142:14, 143:19, 198:10, 199:8, 199:9  
**modern** [1] - 157:16  
**modifications** [5] - 9:18, 17:10, 19:13, 23:7, 51:15  
**modified** [1] - 51:16  
**moment** [4] - 59:10, 91:12, 113:2, 167:19  
**money** [3] - 149:10, 151:17, 175:13  
**month** [1] - 201:11  
**months** [7] - 5:7, 108:19, 121:10, 138:10, 165:14, 169:2, 171:11  
**most** [12] - 5:17, 16:17, 54:4, 63:18, 117:12, 144:9, 152:8, 154:1, 155:6, 181:14, 187:4, 187:5  
**mostly** [5] - 8:6, 60:14, 77:8, 86:18, 128:7  
**mother** [1] - 179:16  
**motion** [1] - 202:15  
**move** [4] - 40:15, 120:18, 136:10, 192:5  
**moved** [2] - 151:5, 202:18  
**moving** [2] - 82:18, 170:10  
**multiplicity** [1] - 60:8  
**municipally** [1] - 174:14  
**must** [1] - 25:12

## N

**naïl** [2] - 30:5, 40:3  
**name** [2] - 125:14, 129:15  
**naming** [1] - 191:5  
**nationwide** [1] - 186:17  
**nature** [1] - 161:8  
**near** [1] - 176:8  
**nearby** [2] - 65:1, 148:7  
**necessarily** [9] - 22:5, 22:8, 27:9, 49:12, 74:6, 98:2, 103:14, 118:9, 185:8  
**necessary** [1] - 177:19  
**need** [36] - 17:13,

44:18, 47:17, 48:2, 49:8, 49:19, 56:17, 59:12, 60:2, 61:7, 62:5, 63:2, 68:10, 70:4, 74:6, 84:19, 95:15, 96:18, 101:6, 102:6, 120:17, 127:8, 144:6, 149:15, 156:1, 157:1, 162:11, 162:12, 162:15, 167:11, 170:7, 172:4, 187:5, 187:18  
**needed** [2] - 46:11, 146:4  
**needs** [8] - 47:18, 56:6, 88:18, 88:19, 110:13, 116:11, 151:19, 201:10  
**neglected** [1] - 19:18  
**negotiate** [3] - 163:11, 164:10, 164:12  
**negotiation** [2] - 46:16, 163:14  
**neighbor** [1] - 151:8  
**neighborhood** [8] - 13:17, 13:19, 19:7, 20:9, 29:11, 51:6, 113:18, 175:1  
**neighborhoods** [3] - 42:16, 54:16, 191:5  
**neighbors** [2] - 150:17, 189:1  
**nesters** [1] - 158:12  
**network** [3] - 61:16, 67:8, 80:19  
**new** [14] - 9:8, 18:9, 41:11, 55:7, 59:3, 78:11, 97:3, 102:14, 109:4, 122:5, 133:8, 139:14, 157:16  
**New** [3] - 173:5, 173:9, 174:17  
**next** [21] - 3:18, 3:19, 4:5, 7:2, 7:3, 10:18, 68:11, 71:13, 76:18, 90:9, 100:11, 122:3, 137:2, 137:3, 137:6, 151:8, 159:13, 165:14, 190:12, 202:11, 202:12  
**next-door** [1] - 151:8  
**nice** [2] - 90:1, 182:18  
**nicer** [1] - 90:13  
**night** [10] - 4:19, 20:14, 25:4, 26:4, 62:14, 85:6, 124:10, 125:4, 125:16, 173:7

**nine** [2] - 91:16, 172:7  
**non** [3] - 84:13, 174:1, 174:2  
**non-profit** [1] - 174:1  
**non-profits** [1] - 174:2  
**non-residential** [1] - 84:13  
**none** [1] - 115:7  
**Normandy** [1] - 4:8  
**North** [1] - 16:15  
**NOT** [1] - 205:17  
**Notary** [2] - 205:5, 205:13  
**note** [9] - 15:9, 18:6, 35:10, 36:16, 47:10, 47:11, 57:1, 103:2, 204:6  
**noted** [3] - 53:9, 144:19, 204:16  
**notes** [2] - 6:16, 9:17  
**notion** [5] - 13:2, 34:14, 118:14, 136:17, 187:13  
**number** [42] - 10:4, 22:4, 22:9, 23:19, 45:18, 46:19, 47:9, 83:14, 83:15, 95:7, 99:5, 101:11, 108:18, 112:13, 117:18, 145:3, 145:17, 154:6, 155:6, 156:11, 156:19, 157:2, 157:3, 157:4, 157:7, 158:14, 163:1, 164:5, 165:14, 170:10, 177:10, 181:9, 181:11, 182:4, 182:19, 183:2, 195:1, 195:17, 195:18, 195:19, 196:2, 197:2  
**numbers** [12] - 23:17, 35:2, 40:1, 40:2, 81:13, 102:10, 125:18, 142:8, 161:5, 166:3, 183:18, 196:3  
**numerical** [1] - 44:9  
**numerically** [1] - 74:18  
**NUR** [20] - 32:2, 58:9, 100:6, 101:17, 102:16, 103:19, 147:4, 150:6, 179:7, 179:10, 180:2, 180:8, 181:5, 182:7, 182:12, 183:10, 191:6, 196:8, 197:6,

<p>197:12  <b>Nur</b> [1] - 1:10  <b>nuts</b> [1] - 99:11</p>	<p>154:16, 157:8,  162:12, 164:6,  164:13, 166:18,  170:11, 170:12,  170:13, 172:7,  172:9, 172:16,  172:17, 173:8,  176:9, 179:7, 180:3,  180:5, 180:7, 185:7,  186:6, 186:9,  186:15, 189:5,  189:15, 192:12,  195:4, 195:16,  195:18, 199:12,  201:15</p>	<p>104:11, 104:13,  105:3, 105:4,  105:10, 105:14,  105:19, 106:6,  106:7, 108:14,  109:14, 110:12,  110:15, 111:5,  111:10, 113:15,  114:18, 118:12,  119:10, 119:16,  120:3, 123:19,  124:4, 127:13,  127:15, 128:2,  128:3, 130:5,  135:10, 159:13,  169:18, 170:12,  171:1, 191:15,  192:14, 192:18,  193:7, 193:11,  194:4, 194:7,  194:13, 196:18</p>	<p><b>ought</b> [6] - 91:5,  145:12, 156:9,  157:4, 159:2, 159:5  <b>ourselves</b> [5] - 22:4,  70:5, 79:2, 112:18,  160:12  <b>outcome</b> [5] - 98:3,  134:6, 140:14,  160:19, 190:16  <b>outcomes</b> [1] -  114:15  <b>outdoor</b> [1] - 61:10  <b>outer</b> [1] - 64:4  <b>outlined</b> [1] - 144:18  <b>outs</b> [1] - 77:16  <b>outside</b> [1] - 148:7  <b>overall</b> [17] - 12:17,  14:4, 19:5, 20:1,  25:10, 43:14, 53:12,  53:15, 56:11, 57:5,  61:1, 61:14, 67:8,  74:19, 81:6, 135:3,  135:4  <b>Overlay</b> [2] - 8:19,  14:18  <b>overriding</b> [1] -  108:17  <b>overtime</b> [1] - 200:4  <b>overwhelming</b> [2] -  85:18, 85:19  <b>own</b> [4] - 76:15,  131:15, 167:14,  198:5  <b>owned</b> [13] - 8:7,  22:16, 73:7, 73:11,  74:7, 74:14, 135:7,  139:6, 174:14,  174:18, 175:2,  194:8  <b>owner</b> [1] - 185:7  <b>owners</b> [2] - 185:6,  185:19  <b>ownership</b> [3] -  136:6, 136:13,  138:18  <b>owning</b> [1] - 136:1  <b>owns</b> [3] - 76:15,  79:10, 175:18</p>	<p>127:10, 136:8,  136:9  <b>parcels</b> [3] - 174:14,  174:18, 175:2  <b>parent</b> [5] - 158:10,  163:6, 179:15,  180:3, 180:5  <b>parents</b> [1] - 180:6  <b>Park</b> [5] - 14:14,  55:14, 63:5, 86:2,  118:1  <b>park</b> [5] - 23:14,  62:10, 119:9,  122:14, 124:8  <b>parked</b> [1] - 132:6  <b>parking</b> [10] - 15:17,  15:18, 33:18, 82:9,  82:14, 82:19, 83:7,  87:7, 175:16,  175:18  <b>parks</b> [2] - 24:16, 62:3  <b>part</b> [44] - 4:3, 6:6,  6:13, 6:14, 11:12,  11:18, 12:12, 13:5,  13:6, 17:5, 19:9,  20:6, 23:6, 23:15,  33:19, 49:15, 53:3,  59:9, 60:1, 60:3,  62:18, 65:2, 75:2,  79:6, 81:6, 82:16,  93:10, 103:15,  108:2, 110:6,  118:11, 120:2,  128:2, 128:4,  133:16, 134:6,  135:3, 138:12,  141:4, 141:5, 150:1,  151:11, 176:18  <b>partially</b> [1] - 15:9  <b>particular</b> [7] - 14:11,  18:7, 39:10, 39:11,  102:4, 164:3, 175:8  <b>particularly</b> [4] - 16:2,  41:2, 88:12, 200:1  <b>partly</b> [3] - 16:9,  74:16, 82:1  <b>partners</b> [2] - 148:18,  149:1  <b>parts</b> [1] - 87:16  <b>passenger</b> [1] - 108:9  <b>passionate</b> [1] - 176:3  <b>passive</b> [1] - 108:9  <b>past</b> [8] - 18:11,  19:11, 20:13, 50:8,  148:4, 177:15,  186:14, 187:16  <b>pathways</b> [6] - 6:5,  13:4, 16:18, 24:15,  60:9, 80:4  <b>pattern</b> [1] - 112:10  <b>paved</b> [2] - 119:1,</p>
<b>O</b>				
<p><b>o'clock</b> [1] - 179:5  <b>objective</b> [1] - 61:15  <b>objectives</b> [1] - 54:9  <b>obviously</b> [10] -  61:18, 71:1, 80:1,  92:3, 95:11, 107:4,  116:11, 119:17,  180:11, 196:13  <b>occupied</b> [2] - 82:3,  153:18  <b>occurred</b> [2] - 59:16,  90:6  <b>occurring</b> [1] - 61:12  <b>occurs</b> [3] - 17:6,  17:7, 134:4  <b>odd</b> [1] - 118:2  <b>OF</b> [5] - 1:2, 205:3,  205:16, 205:17,  205:18  <b>offense</b> [1] - 106:10  <b>offer</b> [1] - 98:10  <b>office</b> [2] - 59:15,  150:12  <b>offices</b> [1] - 87:7  <b>OFFICIAL</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>often</b> [8] - 16:14,  160:12, 162:1,  162:2, 163:3,  163:10, 189:7,  190:16  <b>Oklahoma</b> [1] - 132:6  <b>old</b> [1] - 110:8  <b>once</b> [6] - 15:4, 26:18,  95:5, 120:18, 147:7,  166:4  <b>one</b> [84] - 3:5, 10:9,  14:8, 14:10, 17:9,  17:14, 18:6, 18:16,  20:12, 23:19, 24:1,  25:14, 27:1, 30:12,  30:16, 38:16, 40:13,  42:1, 46:3, 60:13,  62:13, 81:9, 85:4,  89:17, 92:7, 92:9,  97:15, 100:8,  103:16, 103:19,  108:17, 110:7,  111:12, 113:4,  117:14, 120:11,  123:17, 124:7,  125:12, 126:3,  127:17, 129:18,  134:16, 138:3,  139:1, 144:19,  147:6, 151:4, 152:3,</p>	<p>104:11, 104:13,  105:3, 105:4,  105:10, 105:14,  105:19, 106:6,  106:7, 108:14,  109:14, 110:12,  110:15, 111:5,  111:10, 113:15,  114:18, 118:12,  119:10, 119:16,  120:3, 123:19,  124:4, 127:13,  127:15, 128:2,  128:3, 130:5,  135:10, 159:13,  169:18, 170:12,  171:1, 191:15,  192:14, 192:18,  193:7, 193:11,  194:4, 194:7,  194:13, 196:18  <b>operating</b> [1] - 97:7  <b>opportunities</b> [7] -  119:6, 140:4,  142:18, 143:1,  143:6, 168:10,  169:10  <b>opportunity</b> [14] -  12:15, 13:14, 49:13,  60:17, 69:3, 139:13,  140:2, 140:8,  140:18, 141:1,  142:9, 159:6,  167:13, 168:18  <b>opposed</b> [2] - 94:13,  105:13  <b>opposite</b> [1] - 185:10  <b>option</b> [2] - 31:12,  64:13  <b>options</b> [6] - 30:7,  57:2, 90:15, 160:16,  161:3, 161:17  <b>order</b> [7] - 33:9, 45:1,  49:4, 102:11,  125:17, 171:4,  196:17  <b>ordinance</b> [1] - 48:1  <b>Ordinance</b> [3] - 4:1,  47:13, 193:16  <b>Ordinances</b> [2] -  81:11, 139:1  <b>ordinary</b> [4] - 109:6,  143:2, 144:2,  150:19  <b>organize</b> [1] - 198:5  <b>orient</b> [1] - 19:4  <b>original</b> [2] - 48:1,  204:2  <b>originally</b> [2] -  100:10, 105:18  <b>otherwise</b> [2] - 169:7,  188:3</p>	<p>104:11, 104:13,  105:3, 105:4,  105:10, 105:14,  105:19, 106:6,  106:7, 108:14,  109:14, 110:12,  110:15, 111:5,  111:10, 113:15,  114:18, 118:12,  119:10, 119:16,  120:3, 123:19,  124:4, 127:13,  127:15, 128:2,  128:3, 130:5,  135:10, 159:13,  169:18, 170:12,  171:1, 191:15,  192:14, 192:18,  193:7, 193:11,  194:4, 194:7,  194:13, 196:18  <b>operating</b> [1] - 97:7  <b>opportunities</b> [7] -  119:6, 140:4,  142:18, 143:1,  143:6, 168:10,  169:10  <b>opportunity</b> [14] -  12:15, 13:14, 49:13,  60:17, 69:3, 139:13,  140:2, 140:8,  140:18, 141:1,  142:9, 159:6,  167:13, 168:18  <b>opposed</b> [2] - 94:13,  105:13  <b>opposite</b> [1] - 185:10  <b>option</b> [2] - 31:12,  64:13  <b>options</b> [6] - 30:7,  57:2, 90:15, 160:16,  161:3, 161:17  <b>order</b> [7] - 33:9, 45:1,  49:4, 102:11,  125:17, 171:4,  196:17  <b>ordinance</b> [1] - 48:1  <b>Ordinance</b> [3] - 4:1,  47:13, 193:16  <b>Ordinances</b> [2] -  81:11, 139:1  <b>ordinary</b> [4] - 109:6,  143:2, 144:2,  150:19  <b>organize</b> [1] - 198:5  <b>orient</b> [1] - 19:4  <b>original</b> [2] - 48:1,  204:2  <b>originally</b> [2] -  100:10, 105:18  <b>otherwise</b> [2] - 169:7,  188:3</p>	<p><b>ought</b> [6] - 91:5,  145:12, 156:9,  157:4, 159:2, 159:5  <b>ourselves</b> [5] - 22:4,  70:5, 79:2, 112:18,  160:12  <b>outcome</b> [5] - 98:3,  134:6, 140:14,  160:19, 190:16  <b>outcomes</b> [1] -  114:15  <b>outdoor</b> [1] - 61:10  <b>outer</b> [1] - 64:4  <b>outlined</b> [1] - 144:18  <b>outs</b> [1] - 77:16  <b>outside</b> [1] - 148:7  <b>overall</b> [17] - 12:17,  14:4, 19:5, 20:1,  25:10, 43:14, 53:12,  53:15, 56:11, 57:5,  61:1, 61:14, 67:8,  74:19, 81:6, 135:3,  135:4  <b>Overlay</b> [2] - 8:19,  14:18  <b>overriding</b> [1] -  108:17  <b>overtime</b> [1] - 200:4  <b>overwhelming</b> [2] -  85:18, 85:19  <b>own</b> [4] - 76:15,  131:15, 167:14,  198:5  <b>owned</b> [13] - 8:7,  22:16, 73:7, 73:11,  74:7, 74:14, 135:7,  139:6, 174:14,  174:18, 175:2,  194:8  <b>owner</b> [1] - 185:7  <b>owners</b> [2] - 185:6,  185:19  <b>ownership</b> [3] -  136:6, 136:13,  138:18  <b>owning</b> [1] - 136:1  <b>owns</b> [3] - 76:15,  79:10, 175:18</p>	<p>127:10, 136:8,  136:9  <b>parcels</b> [3] - 174:14,  174:18, 175:2  <b>parent</b> [5] - 158:10,  163:6, 179:15,  180:3, 180:5  <b>parents</b> [1] - 180:6  <b>Park</b> [5] - 14:14,  55:14, 63:5, 86:2,  118:1  <b>park</b> [5] - 23:14,  62:10, 119:9,  122:14, 124:8  <b>parked</b> [1] - 132:6  <b>parking</b> [10] - 15:17,  15:18, 33:18, 82:9,  82:14, 82:19, 83:7,  87:7, 175:16,  175:18  <b>parks</b> [2] - 24:16, 62:3  <b>part</b> [44] - 4:3, 6:6,  6:13, 6:14, 11:12,  11:18, 12:12, 13:5,  13:6, 17:5, 19:9,  20:6, 23:6, 23:15,  33:19, 49:15, 53:3,  59:9, 60:1, 60:3,  62:18, 65:2, 75:2,  79:6, 81:6, 82:16,  93:10, 103:15,  108:2, 110:6,  118:11, 120:2,  128:2, 128:4,  133:16, 134:6,  135:3, 138:12,  141:4, 141:5, 150:1,  151:11, 176:18  <b>partially</b> [1] - 15:9  <b>particular</b> [7] - 14:11,  18:7, 39:10, 39:11,  102:4, 164:3, 175:8  <b>particularly</b> [4] - 16:2,  41:2, 88:12, 200:1  <b>partly</b> [3] - 16:9,  74:16, 82:1  <b>partners</b> [2] - 148:18,  149:1  <b>parts</b> [1] - 87:16  <b>passenger</b> [1] - 108:9  <b>passionate</b> [1] - 176:3  <b>passive</b> [1] - 108:9  <b>past</b> [8] - 18:11,  19:11, 20:13, 50:8,  148:4, 177:15,  186:14, 187:16  <b>pathways</b> [6] - 6:5,  13:4, 16:18, 24:15,  60:9, 80:4  <b>pattern</b> [1] - 112:10  <b>paved</b> [2] - 119:1,</p>
<b>P</b>				
<p><b>p.m</b> [2] - 1:5, 203:5  <b>package</b> [4] - 9:14,  9:16, 19:18, 177:9  <b>PAGE</b> [2] - 2:1, 204:8  <b>paid</b> [1] - 139:3  <b>Pain</b> [1] - 152:7  <b>parallel</b> [2] - 12:13,  115:12  <b>parcel</b> [6] - 25:2,  70:13, 126:2,</p>				

<p>194:14  <b>pay</b> [3] - 42:9, 102:9, 149:9  <b>paying</b> [2] - 39:1, 39:16  <b>payment</b> [4] - 4:13, 4:14, 4:15, 35:12  <b>payments</b> [5] - 46:1, 46:3, 46:6, 46:13  <b>peaked</b> [1] - 154:5  <b>pedestrian</b> [5] - 61:2, 80:8, 82:5, 89:16, 105:10  <b>pedestrian/cyclist</b> [1] - 59:17  <b>peg</b> [1] - 163:2  <b>people</b> [44] - 8:9, 11:15, 71:16, 71:17, 83:11, 88:6, 91:7, 92:17, 129:9, 131:18, 132:18, 134:1, 137:1, 137:5, 139:3, 142:19, 143:3, 150:18, 150:19, 151:5, 152:4, 152:13, 153:6, 153:11, 154:2, 155:9, 159:4, 161:17, 162:3, 168:12, 179:6, 179:19, 181:14, 182:10, 188:19, 189:2, 197:10, 197:19, 198:3, 198:9, 198:10, 200:1, 200:7, 201:14  <b>people's</b> [1] - 199:18  <b>per</b> [5] - 145:1, 145:8, 146:12, 175:11, 183:8  <b>percent</b> [72] - 15:19, 23:10, 23:15, 24:2, 24:3, 24:7, 24:8, 24:10, 30:8, 48:18, 49:5, 50:16, 79:16, 80:1, 81:8, 81:14, 81:16, 81:18, 82:8, 84:4, 84:5, 84:8, 85:15, 86:4, 86:14, 95:7, 95:9, 95:10, 105:17, 105:18, 105:19, 110:3, 110:5, 110:6, 111:5, 111:10, 118:2, 118:3, 118:7, 119:16, 119:19, 123:19, 141:17, 141:18, 142:1, 142:3, 142:5, 145:9, 145:14, 156:8, 156:9, 156:10,</p>	<p>158:14, 158:15, 164:6, 164:12, 171:17, 172:8, 172:9, 176:19, 177:1, 179:11, 181:9, 181:12, 181:19, 182:1, 182:6, 182:16, 182:17, 194:1, 196:7  <b>percentage</b> [25] - 43:13, 46:15, 97:17, 98:2, 98:13, 99:12, 100:1, 100:2, 109:19, 111:2, 141:17, 143:17, 145:4, 145:15, 164:1, 173:17, 173:19, 181:1, 183:4, 185:4, 185:17, 194:1, 194:2, 194:17, 201:13  <b>percentages</b> [6] - 43:19, 44:4, 142:6, 163:19, 178:19, 179:1  <b>perception</b> [1] - 118:5  <b>perceptive</b> [1] - 151:13  <b>perfect</b> [1] - 129:14  <b>perfectly</b> [3] - 140:15, 168:19, 169:3  <b>perform</b> [1] - 51:4  <b>performing</b> [1] - 186:16  <b>performs</b> [1] - 18:4  <b>perhaps</b> [5] - 139:2, 157:15, 171:1, 171:18, 198:17  <b>period</b> [2] - 120:19, 185:1  <b>permissible</b> [1] - 143:14  <b>permitted</b> [5] - 15:1, 17:15, 48:13, 139:11, 171:2  <b>permitting</b> [1] - 139:10  <b>permutations</b> [1] - 109:17  <b>person</b> [5] - 16:10, 99:3, 109:6, 151:13, 155:6  <b>personal</b> [1] - 142:12  <b>personally</b> [3] - 94:7, 171:3, 197:1  <b>perspective</b> [3] - 91:10, 142:12, 161:2  <b>Petition</b> [1] - 68:14</p>	<p><b>petition</b> [1] - 69:5  <b>philosophical</b> [1] - 198:11  <b>philosophy</b> [1] - 155:11  <b>phonetic</b> [1] - 151:9  <b>physical</b> [1] - 63:3  <b>physically</b> [2] - 77:12, 194:5  <b>pick</b> [1] - 166:3  <b>picked</b> [2] - 111:14, 121:5  <b>picking</b> [1] - 36:12  <b>picture</b> [2] - 41:5, 75:9  <b>pictures</b> [2] - 129:7, 129:16  <b>piece</b> [6] - 10:18, 11:10, 33:2, 34:12, 98:9, 162:18  <b>piecemeal</b> [1] - 123:7  <b>pieces</b> [4] - 10:18, 14:7, 25:14, 170:10  <b>pin</b> [1] - 161:5  <b>pinning</b> [1] - 198:12  <b>place</b> [10] - 14:18, 21:13, 50:14, 54:3, 54:11, 61:8, 96:7, 120:4, 146:8, 195:4  <b>placed</b> [1] - 40:18  <b>places</b> [9] - 34:10, 54:18, 61:17, 62:2, 82:19, 142:17, 153:8, 153:18, 188:15  <b>plan</b> [19] - 11:16, 11:18, 17:13, 18:10, 23:1, 23:2, 51:1, 54:9, 55:2, 55:14, 60:2, 60:3, 62:6, 62:7, 65:11, 66:2, 66:3, 117:10  <b>planned</b> [1] - 134:4  <b>planner</b> [1] - 88:4  <b>planners</b> [1] - 12:12  <b>planning</b> [14] - 4:3, 53:12, 59:11, 75:1, 98:6, 108:2, 108:4, 108:10, 110:10, 111:16, 112:4, 156:17, 190:14  <b>PLANNING</b> [1] - 1:1  <b>Planning</b> [36] - 3:5, 8:1, 10:2, 10:13, 12:13, 13:9, 14:9, 15:2, 16:3, 16:7, 17:19, 19:14, 19:15, 20:13, 22:8, 25:14, 49:16, 49:17, 53:4, 56:5, 63:1, 68:12, 68:16, 69:3, 69:5,</p>	<p>80:10, 81:1, 113:19, 135:4, 135:15, 193:6, 193:9, 193:14, 203:6, 204:6, 204:15  <b>plans</b> [1] - 90:7  <b>plantings</b> [2] - 64:8, 66:17  <b>play</b> [8] - 6:13, 10:13, 25:9, 25:12, 32:14, 62:4, 103:10, 161:19  <b>plazas</b> [1] - 80:1  <b>Pleasant</b> [1] - 148:8  <b>plenty</b> [1] - 142:19  <b>plot</b> [1] - 126:17  <b>plug</b> [1] - 115:14  <b>plus</b> [2] - 30:4, 126:13  <b>podium</b> [2] - 55:6, 56:13  <b>Point</b> [2] - 16:15, 63:5  <b>point</b> [38] - 6:2, 17:18, 20:2, 27:8, 27:10, 27:19, 34:5, 36:7, 36:15, 37:1, 38:1, 41:16, 43:9, 48:6, 48:7, 68:11, 70:10, 71:15, 72:4, 91:6, 118:3, 123:18, 129:17, 133:13, 134:17, 136:16, 137:9, 142:1, 157:8, 157:9, 161:6, 166:1, 177:17, 182:10, 186:10, 187:9, 188:10, 189:14  <b>pointed</b> [1] - 72:3  <b>points</b> [3] - 65:9, 104:1, 117:19  <b>policies</b> [4] - 138:14, 141:2, 144:4, 144:10  <b>policy</b> [4] - 68:9, 140:11, 166:6, 190:15  <b>Policy</b> [1] - 47:14  <b>political</b> [2] - 176:2, 198:19  <b>poll</b> [1] - 191:19  <b>pool</b> [1] - 163:8  <b>poor</b> [1] - 158:17  <b>population</b> [2] - 154:5, 154:10  <b>portion</b> [10] - 28:18, 36:3, 36:4, 37:15, 41:4, 101:15, 136:6, 136:8, 141:16, 143:5  <b>posed</b> [1] - 160:11  <b>position</b> [1] - 174:9  <b>positively</b> [1] - 17:2</p>	<p><b>possibilities</b> [2] - 86:13, 118:16  <b>possibility</b> [3] - 69:2, 87:19, 157:10  <b>possible</b> [7] - 94:16, 110:13, 140:16, 166:10, 166:17, 191:17, 191:19  <b>possibly</b> [2] - 36:3, 127:10  <b>postal</b> [1] - 128:5  <b>potential</b> [4] - 2:5, 64:10, 115:18, 116:3  <b>potentially</b> [2] - 4:17, 65:9  <b>practical</b> [1] - 171:5  <b>practicality</b> [1] - 171:8  <b>precautions</b> [1] - 132:5  <b>precise</b> [1] - 193:8  <b>prefer</b> [3] - 62:14, 141:15, 146:7  <b>preferably</b> [1] - 64:18  <b>preferences</b> [1] - 108:5  <b>preliminary</b> [2] - 144:11, 190:9  <b>prepared</b> [2] - 55:15, 60:18  <b>Prescott</b> [1] - 154:19  <b>prescriptive</b> [1] - 145:10  <b>present</b> [2] - 73:2, 139:8  <b>presentation</b> [5] - 26:4, 43:8, 70:3, 97:19, 173:7  <b>presentations</b> [1] - 68:19  <b>presented</b> [4] - 67:18, 68:6, 70:11, 84:15  <b>Preston</b> [1] - 1:8  <b>PRESTON</b> [28] - 72:16, 72:19, 74:1, 76:8, 76:12, 78:5, 78:18, 79:7, 79:11, 80:5, 98:18, 126:19, 127:6, 130:18, 144:16, 178:18, 179:3, 183:15, 184:15, 193:18, 195:5, 195:9, 195:15, 196:3, 196:14, 197:4, 202:8, 202:17  <b>presumably</b> [1] - 89:16  <b>pretty</b> [14] - 35:14, 73:15, 85:19, 99:18,</p>
--	---	---	---	--

<p>102:6, 130:4, 150:15, 158:18, 164:7, 170:18, 176:12, 180:3, 192:16, 200:9</p> <p><b>previous</b> [1] - 32:8</p> <p><b>previously</b> [1] - 59:16</p> <p><b>price</b> [6] - 139:7, 161:16, 175:17, 175:19, 177:3, 201:8</p> <p><b>priced</b> [2] - 143:4, 168:13</p> <p><b>prices</b> [1] - 46:18</p> <p><b>primarily</b> [2] - 80:7, 106:15</p> <p><b>prime</b> [2] - 122:13, 122:15</p> <p><b>principally</b> [1] - 67:6</p> <p><b>principle</b> [1] - 192:14</p> <p><b>principles</b> [1] - 197:10</p> <p><b>prioritize</b> [1] - 170:16</p> <p><b>priority</b> [3] - 40:19, 142:13, 171:8</p> <p><b>private</b> [11] - 22:15, 34:11, 35:9, 38:18, 46:8, 67:3, 67:5, 67:11, 135:12, 136:12, 153:1</p> <p><b>privately</b> [2] - 33:9, 194:8</p> <p><b>problem</b> [3] - 122:10, 151:11, 201:7</p> <p><b>problematic</b> [1] - 139:18</p> <p><b>problems</b> [1] - 199:11</p> <p><b>proceedings</b> [1] - 205:7</p> <p><b>proceeds</b> [1] - 135:16</p> <p><b>process</b> [23] - 4:4, 11:12, 13:13, 16:8, 17:6, 23:2, 62:19, 65:2, 68:11, 68:18, 69:10, 98:6, 101:7, 101:14, 102:9, 102:19, 108:3, 108:10, 115:11, 140:15, 152:2, 166:12, 169:11</p> <p><b>processing</b> [1] - 10:5</p> <p><b>produced</b> [1] - 45:5</p> <p><b>producing</b> [2] - 50:11, 50:13</p> <p><b>professionals</b> [2] - 146:6, 148:12</p> <p><b>professor</b> [1] - 152:10</p> <p><b>profit</b> [1] - 174:1</p> <p><b>profitable</b> [1] - 146:3</p> <p><b>profits</b> [1] - 174:2</p> <p><b>program</b> [4] - 84:6,</p>	<p>107:11, 107:16, 185:16</p> <p><b>programatic</b> [1] - 66:18</p> <p><b>programmed</b> [1] - 21:11</p> <p><b>programming</b> [1] - 66:10</p> <p><b>programs</b> [3] - 152:12, 186:16, 199:7</p> <p><b>progress</b> [1] - 133:11</p> <p><b>project</b> [36] - 16:4, 33:7, 33:8, 33:9, 33:11, 33:17, 36:19, 37:16, 42:2, 42:6, 46:11, 46:12, 48:12, 49:5, 49:16, 50:3, 53:3, 86:2, 113:10, 123:18, 131:18, 134:1, 156:5, 156:11, 159:9, 164:8, 164:12, 164:14, 164:17, 173:9, 176:16, 176:18, 182:11, 184:7, 184:8, 185:15</p> <p><b>projects</b> [4] - 43:9, 43:11, 158:2, 186:14</p> <p><b>properties</b> [2] - 88:12, 139:16</p> <p><b>property</b> [3] - 130:3, 136:12, 183:19</p> <p><b>proposal</b> [13] - 8:4, 8:10, 9:14, 9:19, 18:4, 18:15, 39:15, 40:8, 52:1, 173:10, 184:1, 184:17, 198:14</p> <p><b>proposals</b> [2] - 27:13, 27:18</p> <p><b>propose</b> [1] - 50:15</p> <p><b>proposed</b> [6] - 23:8, 44:18, 53:14, 171:19, 184:19, 191:17</p> <p><b>proposing</b> [2] - 145:2, 192:4</p> <p><b>protected</b> [1] - 64:7</p> <p><b>provide</b> [8] - 49:19, 64:10, 64:12, 110:1, 148:14, 167:13, 171:6, 183:9</p> <p><b>provided</b> [7] - 17:13, 43:12, 49:8, 60:3, 62:6, 129:7, 129:16</p> <p><b>provides</b> [3] - 49:13, 82:6, 82:18</p> <p><b>providing</b> [6] - 45:9,</p>	<p>47:16, 51:5, 159:5, 159:6</p> <p><b>provision</b> [3] - 6:11, 45:8, 148:16</p> <p><b>provisions</b> [5] - 6:1, 9:5, 16:1, 45:16, 52:10</p> <p><b>provocative</b> [1] - 63:18</p> <p><b>public</b> [67] - 3:11, 3:12, 4:2, 4:5, 4:12, 5:15, 5:17, 21:5, 22:16, 22:17, 23:14, 24:12, 24:13, 24:14, 24:16, 25:11, 42:3, 56:14, 62:9, 65:17, 66:7, 67:2, 67:5, 67:12, 68:17, 70:18, 73:4, 73:8, 73:17, 74:2, 74:5, 74:10, 76:7, 76:10, 76:17, 77:3, 77:5, 77:7, 77:15, 78:3, 79:6, 82:6, 82:7, 83:1, 99:13, 99:14, 104:9, 104:15, 105:7, 106:7, 110:2, 110:5, 110:18, 115:4, 127:11, 127:15, 127:16, 128:9, 129:11, 130:7, 138:18, 139:14, 140:3, 140:5, 142:17</p> <p><b>Public</b> [2] - 205:5, 205:13</p> <p><b>publicly</b> [14] - 22:15, 24:19, 73:4, 73:8, 73:12, 74:3, 77:3, 77:9, 77:11, 78:4, 194:5, 194:6, 194:8</p> <p><b>PUD</b> [24] - 2:5, 3:9, 8:4, 8:19, 14:18, 15:2, 16:14, 46:1, 46:12, 48:12, 51:19, 53:3, 54:8, 61:3, 62:19, 66:4, 98:3, 119:19, 135:8, 173:16, 173:18, 178:10, 184:1, 184:17</p> <p><b>PUD-3</b> [2] - 15:14, 105:19</p> <p><b>PUD-KS</b> [6] - 2:5, 3:9, 8:4, 178:10, 184:1, 184:17</p> <p><b>PUDs</b> [3] - 17:14, 18:11, 173:19</p> <p><b>pull</b> [2] - 89:2, 122:1</p> <p><b>pulled</b> [1] - 24:18</p> <p><b>punctuation</b> [1] - 112:5</p>	<p><b>puny</b> [1] - 93:8</p> <p><b>purchase</b> [1] - 139:7</p> <p><b>purchasing</b> [1] - 188:5</p> <p><b>purpose</b> [4] - 51:16, 54:8, 146:4, 156:18</p> <p><b>purposes</b> [2] - 139:8, 168:1</p> <p><b>push</b> [1] - 134:11</p> <p><b>put</b> [25] - 11:17, 26:19, 33:14, 45:18, 74:13, 75:5, 77:14, 87:19, 90:19, 91:9, 96:18, 106:9, 106:16, 109:2, 112:19, 114:14, 115:19, 123:9, 124:6, 170:16, 170:17, 183:17, 192:3, 201:12</p> <p><b>putting</b> [9] - 41:15, 99:8, 107:3, 112:14, 130:9, 172:12, 175:14, 175:16</p> <p><b>puzzle</b> [2] - 14:7, 162:18</p>	<p>168:5, 180:19</p> <p><b>raises</b> [1] - 139:18</p> <p><b>raising</b> [2] - 174:4, 187:2</p> <p><b>ramps</b> [1] - 87:15</p> <p><b>range</b> [11] - 32:5, 32:10, 36:17, 40:5, 94:4, 147:16, 160:16, 161:2, 161:17, 162:7, 182:6</p> <p><b>ranges</b> [1] - 27:15</p> <p><b>ranging</b> [1] - 32:11</p> <p><b>rare</b> [1] - 157:19</p> <p><b>rate</b> [2] - 175:10, 199:9</p> <p><b>rather</b> [10] - 77:16, 94:10, 99:11, 100:1, 106:4, 145:2, 145:4, 155:14, 165:9, 198:12</p> <p><b>raw</b> [1] - 112:3</p> <p><b>reach</b> [4] - 71:12, 71:15, 115:13, 198:16</p> <p><b>reaching</b> [1] - 29:18</p> <p><b>read</b> [3] - 31:19, 109:7, 204:15</p> <p><b>reading</b> [3] - 73:5, 80:6, 204:6</p> <p><b>real</b> [6] - 75:5, 85:10, 85:11, 90:2, 90:4, 174:5</p> <p><b>realistic</b> [1] - 171:5</p> <p><b>reality</b> [1] - 186:8</p> <p><b>realize</b> [4] - 19:17, 49:2, 166:7, 166:9</p> <p><b>realized</b> [1] - 53:6</p> <p><b>really</b> [94] - 5:9, 6:15, 11:11, 11:13, 13:19, 14:11, 15:4, 15:10, 16:19, 18:16, 20:12, 20:15, 20:17, 21:5, 22:19, 23:19, 25:6, 25:12, 25:19, 26:15, 27:3, 28:7, 30:13, 35:7, 36:5, 36:6, 37:1, 37:15, 37:17, 38:1, 40:17, 40:18, 41:3, 41:7, 41:19, 42:11, 42:17, 43:5, 43:6, 43:14, 44:3, 51:3, 51:9, 51:10, 51:14, 59:8, 63:3, 65:13, 68:4, 70:6, 81:4, 81:17, 91:18, 95:1, 95:3, 99:7, 100:2, 101:4, 107:13, 110:10, 110:14, 111:3, 112:1, 112:3, 112:6,</p>
<b>Q</b>				
<p><b>qualifications</b> [1] - 90:16</p> <p><b>quality</b> [12] - 18:17, 21:9, 25:6, 27:4, 32:18, 61:2, 61:16, 99:7, 110:15, 137:5, 192:17, 195:19</p> <p><b>quandary</b> [1] - 79:3</p> <p><b>quarters</b> [3] - 127:3, 127:4, 127:5</p> <p><b>questioning</b> [1] - 162:9</p> <p><b>questions</b> [17] - 3:14, 5:4, 5:6, 5:19, 10:11, 10:14, 14:10, 52:15, 69:11, 165:8, 165:13, 171:9, 180:18, 187:2, 187:17, 189:10, 189:12</p> <p><b>quick</b> [1] - 119:15</p> <p><b>quite</b> [5] - 86:5, 90:12, 98:16, 150:1, 162:6</p>				
<b>R</b>				
<p><b>RAFFERTY</b> [2] - 120:10, 121:6</p> <p><b>raise</b> [2] - 185:3, 190:12</p> <p><b>raised</b> [4] - 10:4, 76:4,</p>				

<p>112:16, 116:8, 131:16, 141:5, 142:15, 143:4, 144:1, 146:16, 147:9, 148:13, 158:3, 161:5, 161:15, 161:16, 162:11, 167:10, 172:7, 176:1, 176:3, 176:4, 179:14, 181:19, 186:15, 187:11, 187:18, 188:2, 193:12, 202:5</p> <p><b>realm</b> [3] - 5:15, 24:12, 83:1</p> <p><b>Realty</b> [1] - 4:6</p> <p><b>REASON</b> [6] - 204:9, 204:10, 204:11, 204:12, 204:13, 204:14</p> <p><b>reason</b> [5] - 133:16, 148:11, 156:5, 179:13, 204:7</p> <p><b>reasonable</b> [2] - 74:10, 132:16</p> <p><b>reasonably</b> [1] - 112:6</p> <p><b>reasons</b> [4] - 20:17, 138:17, 140:7, 159:2</p> <p><b>rebooting</b> [1] - 63:12</p> <p><b>receive</b> [1] - 42:10</p> <p><b>recess</b> [1] - 137:12</p> <p><b>recognizable</b> [1] - 54:11</p> <p><b>recognized</b> [1] - 116:3</p> <p><b>recommend</b> [4] - 23:18, 91:5, 159:18, 189:9</p> <p><b>recommendation</b> [5] - 48:5, 48:15, 69:4, 160:3, 187:11</p> <p><b>recommendations</b> [7] - 2:6, 8:12, 8:14, 9:4, 9:13, 71:4, 198:18</p> <p><b>recommended</b> [6] - 20:2, 24:2, 47:4, 69:6, 137:19, 138:8</p> <p><b>record</b> [3] - 100:17, 204:17, 205:7</p> <p><b>RECORD</b> [1] - 1:18</p> <p><b>recreation</b> [1] - 82:7</p> <p><b>rectangle</b> [1] - 102:4</p> <p><b>red</b> [1] - 114:11</p> <p><b>Redevelopment</b> [2] - 35:3, 36:15</p> <p><b>redevelopment</b> [1] - 88:13</p>	<p><b>reduce</b> [2] - 85:15, 85:16</p> <p><b>reduced</b> [2] - 20:10, 94:2</p> <p><b>reduces</b> [2] - 31:13</p> <p><b>reduction</b> [1] - 85:19</p> <p><b>refer</b> [2] - 78:12, 136:9</p> <p><b>referred</b> [1] - 118:2</p> <p><b>regard</b> [5] - 3:8, 3:9, 53:9, 56:1, 56:6</p> <p><b>regarding</b> [2] - 50:5, 147:18</p> <p><b>region</b> [1] - 129:18</p> <p><b>regular</b> [1] - 155:3</p> <p><b>regulation</b> [1] - 135:2</p> <p><b>regulations</b> [1] - 199:17</p> <p><b>reinforcing</b> [1] - 83:9</p> <p><b>reiterate</b> [1] - 100:16</p> <p><b>reiterating</b> [1] - 134:17</p> <p><b>relate</b> [1] - 55:9</p> <p><b>related</b> [2] - 11:9, 173:9</p> <p><b>relates</b> [1] - 155:9</p> <p><b>relationship</b> [4] - 21:10, 27:6, 53:19, 67:2</p> <p><b>relationships</b> [1] - 51:7</p> <p><b>relative</b> [1] - 174:6</p> <p><b>relatively</b> [2] - 37:16, 40:11</p> <p><b>relevant</b> [1] - 37:6</p> <p><b>remain</b> [2] - 32:6, 197:12</p> <p><b>remarkably</b> [1] - 151:13</p> <p><b>remember</b> [4] - 41:5, 42:5, 43:3, 136:18</p> <p><b>remembered</b> [1] - 147:7</p> <p><b>remembers</b> [1] - 120:4</p> <p><b>remind</b> [4] - 19:19, 176:15, 177:14, 199:2</p> <p><b>reminder</b> [1] - 3:17</p> <p><b>remiss</b> [2] - 98:12, 160:3</p> <p><b>rent</b> [2] - 149:5, 161:6</p> <p><b>rental</b> [1] - 38:9</p> <p><b>renting</b> [1] - 185:15</p> <p><b>rents</b> [1] - 38:9</p> <p><b>repeating</b> [1] - 187:8</p> <p><b>REPORTER</b> [1] - 205:18</p> <p><b>Reporter</b> [2] - 205:5, 205:13</p> <p><b>REPORTERS</b> [1] -</p>	<p>1:17</p> <p><b>representations</b> [1] - 27:17</p> <p><b>represents</b> [1] - 68:1</p> <p><b>REPRODUCTION</b> [1] - 205:17</p> <p><b>require</b> [4] - 127:15, 138:11, 183:6, 192:17</p> <p><b>required</b> [9] - 16:6, 16:16, 46:1, 53:8, 55:4, 56:19, 79:5, 119:19, 123:19</p> <p><b>requirement</b> [14] - 9:8, 10:15, 16:1, 16:13, 20:4, 21:18, 23:11, 23:13, 23:19, 30:8, 31:15, 49:11, 50:16, 85:15</p> <p><b>requirements</b> [36] - 9:2, 9:7, 9:9, 11:3, 15:18, 17:12, 21:17, 22:13, 26:6, 34:7, 37:8, 37:11, 37:13, 44:6, 44:15, 48:11, 50:13, 51:19, 52:4, 55:19, 82:17, 85:2, 101:9, 103:7, 103:10, 107:11, 107:17, 108:1, 127:17, 129:5, 132:15, 139:15, 186:11, 191:18</p> <p><b>requires</b> [2] - 128:6, 138:12</p> <p><b>requiring</b> [4] - 34:9, 35:12, 43:18, 145:3</p> <p><b>Research</b> [3] - 14:14, 86:2, 118:1</p> <p><b>research</b> [2] - 68:3, 152:9</p> <p><b>resident</b> [1] - 144:3</p> <p><b>residential</b> [22] - 11:19, 18:13, 20:6, 20:9, 37:5, 41:18, 42:4, 42:12, 43:15, 44:19, 49:5, 57:16, 57:18, 58:5, 61:5, 84:13, 98:15, 141:16, 178:15, 184:9, 185:12, 196:10</p> <p><b>residents</b> [6] - 51:11, 51:12, 98:14, 105:6, 110:19, 160:8</p> <p><b>resides</b> [1] - 136:7</p> <p><b>residual</b> [1] - 15:6</p> <p><b>resolve</b> [1] - 71:8</p> <p><b>resources</b> [2] - 13:18, 173:12</p> <p><b>respect</b> [1] - 172:17</p>	<p><b>RESPECT</b> [1] - 205:17</p> <p><b>respond</b> [2] - 113:4, 186:3</p> <p><b>response</b> [4] - 76:1, 193:5, 196:9</p> <p><b>responsibility</b> [1] - 173:1</p> <p><b>rest</b> [11] - 25:18, 80:19, 82:9, 116:13, 136:7, 136:8, 141:2, 141:9, 168:16, 177:17, 178:2</p> <p><b>restaurants</b> [1] - 189:4</p> <p><b>restriction</b> [3] - 34:10, 81:12, 164:2</p> <p><b>restrictions</b> [2] - 75:5, 188:14</p> <p><b>resubmit</b> [1] - 19:18</p> <p><b>result</b> [7] - 16:4, 30:12, 70:15, 100:18, 101:13, 103:7, 114:7</p> <p><b>resulted</b> [1] - 16:11</p> <p><b>results</b> [1] - 166:5</p> <p><b>retail</b> [8] - 19:8, 42:17, 83:8, 83:9, 188:12, 188:15, 188:18, 189:3</p> <p><b>retain</b> [4] - 9:5, 45:10, 101:1, 136:6</p> <p><b>return</b> [2] - 35:8, 35:9</p> <p><b>reveals</b> [2] - 161:12, 161:13</p> <p><b>review</b> [14] - 10:7, 10:13, 16:3, 16:7, 17:8, 19:10, 23:1, 23:2, 25:15, 47:7, 47:8, 49:16, 52:6, 135:4</p> <p><b>reviewed</b> [1] - 135:14</p> <p><b>revisiting</b> [3] - 140:10, 140:11, 140:13</p> <p><b>RFI</b> [1] - 115:19</p> <p><b>RFP</b> [5] - 96:5, 96:19, 101:6, 115:15, 188:5</p> <p><b>RFQ</b> [2] - 96:5, 115:15</p> <p><b>rhombus</b> [3] - 118:18, 194:12, 194:13</p> <p><b>rich</b> [2] - 151:16, 158:17</p> <p><b>right-hand</b> [1] - 124:7</p> <p><b>ringing</b> [1] - 126:15</p> <p><b>ripping</b> [1] - 152:1</p> <p><b>rising</b> [3] - 86:18, 87:14, 179:15</p> <p><b>river</b> [1] - 93:9</p> <p><b>riverfront</b> [1] - 119:15</p>	<p><b>road</b> [2] - 79:3, 81:3</p> <p><b>roadways</b> [2] - 6:5, 99:9</p> <p><b>Roberts</b> [2] - 1:14, 7:13</p> <p><b>ROBERTS</b> [33] - 7:12, 7:19, 32:3, 38:6, 38:10, 38:13, 39:3, 39:8, 58:13, 67:16, 73:14, 74:2, 75:13, 77:18, 78:10, 78:19, 79:9, 80:14, 82:1, 100:14, 102:17, 103:1, 124:12, 124:17, 126:13, 127:12, 134:16, 184:4, 186:2, 190:3, 191:11, 193:5, 202:1</p> <p><b>role</b> [4] - 6:13, 25:10, 25:13, 82:16</p> <p><b>roof</b> [2] - 99:10, 193:4</p> <p><b>rooftop</b> [3] - 6:6, 64:9, 64:16</p> <p><b>Room</b> [1] - 1:6</p> <p><b>room</b> [2] - 154:18, 186:6</p> <p><b>roommates</b> [2] - 149:1, 158:8</p> <p><b>rough</b> [1] - 125:17</p> <p><b>roughly</b> [3] - 96:19, 142:4, 162:17</p> <p><b>roundtable</b> [2] - 4:19, 70:9</p> <p><b>route</b> [1] - 89:16</p> <p><b>Route</b> [1] - 148:9</p> <p><b>rules</b> [1] - 139:3</p> <p><b>running</b> [1] - 151:1</p> <p><b>RUSSELL</b> [35] - 57:15, 58:2, 58:7, 58:12, 63:14, 79:13, 79:18, 81:7, 83:2, 89:11, 89:15, 90:1, 90:4, 90:8, 101:18, 102:19, 123:1, 125:10, 127:3, 131:17, 132:4, 149:12, 149:13, 150:7, 178:1, 178:8, 182:15, 183:1, 184:3, 192:11, 195:11, 197:8, 197:14, 199:2, 199:16</p> <p><b>Russell</b> [1] - 1:9</p>
<b>S</b>				
			<p><b>sacs</b> [1] - 59:14</p> <p><b>sad</b> [1] - 176:12</p> <p><b>safe</b> [2] - 60:11, 105:8</p>	

<p><b>sake</b> [1] - 141:14  <b>salary</b> [1] - 150:15  <b>sale</b> [1] - 177:3  <b>SAME</b> [1] - 205:17  <b>satisfied</b> [1] - 183:4  <b>saves</b> [1] - 175:11  <b>saw</b> [1] - 111:4  <b>scale</b> [3] - 55:7, 56:15, 60:6  <b>scaling</b> [1] - 127:7  <b>scenario</b> [1] - 134:3  <b>scenarios</b> [1] - 124:6  <b>scheduling</b> [1] - 3:15  <b>scheme</b> [6] - 12:4, 12:17, 14:2, 31:2, 31:4, 125:2  <b>schemes</b> [3] - 15:1, 102:2, 102:5  <b>school</b> [4] - 148:6, 158:19, 168:12  <b>science</b> [1] - 66:7  <b>scope</b> [3] - 167:4, 167:7, 188:4  <b>sculpture</b> [1] - 65:18  <b>seamlessness</b> [3] - 61:10, 67:4, 67:11  <b>Sears</b> [2] - 93:6, 93:16  <b>seasonal</b> [1] - 66:16  <b>second</b> [6] - 8:16, 23:6, 45:14, 104:3, 108:14, 202:19  <b>Second</b> [1] - 1:6  <b>section</b> [6] - 32:6, 87:15, 121:1, 178:13, 178:16, 190:4  <b>security</b> [6] - 101:10, 103:7, 104:7, 127:17, 128:7, 129:4  <b>see</b> [32] - 7:4, 14:14, 27:11, 29:12, 30:12, 31:8, 31:16, 32:4, 32:11, 34:5, 39:2, 63:6, 71:11, 81:6, 82:8, 83:6, 99:11, 111:11, 127:8, 127:19, 133:18, 134:8, 134:10, 134:13, 143:5, 145:9, 149:18, 154:12, 162:12, 181:1, 191:19, 195:13  <b>seem</b> [2] - 18:8, 60:18  <b>segregated</b> [1] - 106:19  <b>segue</b> [1] - 98:19  <b>selected</b> [3] - 13:12, 115:7, 116:4  <b>self</b> [2] - 98:8, 152:17</p>	<p><b>self-interest</b> [1] - 98:8  <b>self-sufficient</b> [1] - 152:17  <b>sell</b> [1] - 177:4  <b>selling</b> [1] - 136:2  <b>Senator</b> [1] - 151:12  <b>send</b> [3] - 157:5, 188:7, 189:10  <b>sending</b> [1] - 96:15  <b>Senior</b> [1] - 151:12  <b>seniors</b> [1] - 19:4  <b>sense</b> [8] - 23:16, 156:18, 158:15, 159:15, 167:14, 167:18, 168:17, 192:8  <b>sensitive</b> [1] - 55:7  <b>sent</b> [3] - 9:15, 33:5, 67:18  <b>separate</b> [4] - 12:8, 138:6, 140:19, 141:1  <b>separation</b> [4] - 30:16, 31:1, 31:10, 57:3  <b>sequencing</b> [1] - 120:11  <b>series</b> [1] - 15:1  <b>serve</b> [2] - 80:15, 81:4  <b>served</b> [1] - 154:13  <b>service</b> [2] - 80:2, 81:3  <b>services</b> [1] - 34:18  <b>servicing</b> [1] - 55:12  <b>set</b> [19] - 6:9, 6:15, 10:9, 17:12, 18:1, 21:16, 21:17, 22:2, 68:7, 90:11, 91:12, 106:13, 133:19, 139:4, 163:8, 173:19, 180:16, 205:6, 205:8  <b>setbacks</b> [1] - 57:3  <b>sets</b> [1] - 133:6  <b>setting</b> [3] - 22:6, 129:11, 173:17  <b>seven</b> [4] - 23:13, 57:9, 57:10, 172:9  <b>several</b> [1] - 88:6  <b>shackle</b> [2] - 169:9, 170:3  <b>shades</b> [1] - 104:19  <b>shadow</b> [1] - 56:8  <b>shape</b> [2] - 103:9, 103:11  <b>share</b> [2] - 99:4, 149:4  <b>shared</b> [5] - 80:3, 81:3, 88:19, 104:5, 104:11  <b>SHEET</b> [1] - 204:1  <b>Sheet</b> [2] - 204:3,</p>	<p>204:7  <b>sheet</b> [1] - 204:7  <b>shift</b> [1] - 33:1  <b>shining</b> [1] - 94:14  <b>shipping</b> [1] - 151:15  <b>shops</b> [2] - 83:5, 189:4  <b>short</b> [2] - 137:12, 162:1  <b>Shorthand</b> [2] - 205:5, 205:13  <b>shot</b> [1] - 94:7  <b>show</b> [10] - 14:5, 19:17, 26:13, 28:1, 28:13, 83:4, 103:15, 175:5, 203:2  <b>showed</b> [3] - 43:7, 164:8, 164:9  <b>showing</b> [2] - 18:11, 36:16  <b>shown</b> [1] - 98:5  <b>shows</b> [1] - 12:9  <b>shrinking</b> [2] - 161:13, 161:14  <b>shut</b> [1] - 128:9  <b>shy</b> [1] - 12:5  <b>side</b> [6] - 68:5, 76:6, 104:18, 105:12, 122:6, 163:13  <b>sidewalk</b> [1] - 130:5  <b>sidewalks</b> [1] - 64:19  <b>sight</b> [1] - 183:16  <b>sign</b> [1] - 94:14  <b>Sign</b> [1] - 204:7  <b>SIGNATURE</b> [1] - 204:1  <b>significant</b> [14] - 21:3, 24:17, 35:1, 37:1, 37:18, 43:4, 44:3, 60:16, 91:19, 98:7, 130:4, 134:5, 164:7  <b>similar</b> [3] - 5:5, 12:19, 30:10  <b>simple</b> [6] - 83:17, 110:14, 137:18, 141:8, 147:5, 155:19  <b>simplicity</b> [1] - 109:5  <b>simplify</b> [2] - 143:10, 186:7  <b>simply</b> [6] - 15:15, 18:12, 72:5, 72:7, 107:8, 139:14  <b>single</b> [5] - 19:3, 87:3, 155:6, 158:10, 179:16  <b>singles</b> [2] - 149:7, 153:19  <b>sit</b> [1] - 137:13  <b>site</b> [94] - 3:10, 5:8, 8:7, 8:17, 12:2,</p>	<p>14:13, 14:17, 15:5, 15:13, 17:5, 20:7, 20:18, 21:2, 22:7, 23:1, 23:12, 25:19, 26:11, 27:5, 28:16, 39:10, 41:2, 41:6, 41:12, 41:14, 53:10, 53:11, 54:2, 54:13, 55:2, 57:1, 59:11, 59:13, 60:17, 61:4, 61:18, 62:16, 63:4, 63:6, 63:7, 65:12, 65:16, 66:19, 74:19, 84:9, 85:10, 89:13, 91:15, 93:11, 99:16, 99:18, 101:8, 101:10, 101:15, 103:12, 103:13, 110:16, 114:14, 114:16, 116:13, 117:3, 118:5, 118:8, 118:19, 120:15, 121:1, 122:11, 123:12, 123:13, 124:9, 124:15, 124:16, 126:3, 126:4, 126:15, 128:12, 132:10, 133:18, 135:3, 135:11, 138:16, 139:9, 139:11, 143:6, 155:13, 173:13, 174:7, 175:4, 175:7, 196:10  <b>sites</b> [3] - 18:12, 18:13, 60:9  <b>sitting</b> [2] - 123:2, 125:4  <b>situated</b> [1] - 11:15  <b>situation</b> [4] - 138:16, 168:18, 169:6, 172:12  <b>situations</b> [1] - 149:17  <b>six</b> [7] - 23:11, 30:4, 30:9, 91:7, 100:12, 126:15, 154:4  <b>six-plus</b> [1] - 30:4  <b>Sixth</b> [3] - 89:6, 122:3, 123:8  <b>sizable</b> [1] - 36:4  <b>size</b> [20] - 20:19, 21:5, 21:17, 29:9, 52:11, 103:9, 103:11, 116:17, 124:15, 126:8, 126:17, 127:1, 127:9, 140:5, 153:15, 154:1, 155:3, 163:10, 163:12, 188:13  <b>sizes</b> [3] - 49:14,</p>	<p>146:14, 160:17  <b>skeptical</b> [1] - 153:16  <b>sketch</b> [1] - 175:3  <b>sky</b> [2] - 118:8, 118:10  <b>slate</b> [2] - 112:4, 112:6  <b>sleeve</b> [1] - 91:3  <b>slice</b> [3] - 161:11, 163:2, 164:14  <b>slide</b> [6] - 14:15, 14:16, 41:16, 47:11, 51:14, 183:17  <b>slightly</b> [3] - 14:17, 98:1, 183:19  <b>small</b> [4] - 62:4, 100:1, 136:6, 164:6  <b>smaller</b> [4] - 14:17, 31:6, 100:1, 194:16  <b>smallish</b> [1] - 155:5  <b>smartest</b> [1] - 152:10  <b>snapshot</b> [1] - 68:1  <b>snow</b> [1] - 105:14  <b>so...</b> [1] - 201:15  <b>soapbox</b> [1] - 176:2  <b>social</b> [2] - 66:13, 160:13  <b>society</b> [1] - 173:4  <b>solar</b> [1] - 64:4  <b>sold</b> [1] - 151:6  <b>solutions</b> [1] - 62:18  <b>someone</b> [4] - 3:13, 118:17, 157:9, 201:9  <b>sometime</b> [2] - 154:8, 166:11  <b>somewhat</b> [4] - 26:8, 35:16, 84:15, 93:4  <b>son</b> [1] - 181:17  <b>sore</b> [1] - 130:1  <b>sorry</b> [4] - 32:3, 174:16, 182:13, 190:3  <b>sort</b> [70] - 8:2, 8:16, 12:13, 14:1, 14:7, 14:15, 15:4, 16:19, 17:9, 17:14, 21:15, 23:9, 23:16, 27:4, 28:12, 29:5, 29:9, 34:3, 35:11, 36:12, 37:7, 39:12, 53:6, 53:11, 53:12, 53:17, 54:1, 54:2, 55:3, 55:10, 55:17, 55:18, 56:2, 56:11, 57:3, 57:5, 60:4, 60:6, 61:7, 61:13, 65:5, 65:7, 65:15, 66:1, 66:6, 66:8, 67:10, 98:8, 105:6, 106:2, 107:9, 111:13, 112:9, 118:6, 119:3,</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>128:6, 130:1, 136:16, 139:2, 140:16, 144:7, 149:5, 150:18, 151:18, 152:14, 158:6, 163:6, 165:9, 191:2, 192:3</p> <p><b>sorts</b> [1] - 109:10</p> <p><b>sound</b> [2] - 73:10, 176:2</p> <p><b>southeast</b> [1] - 104:18</p> <p><b>space</b> [186] - 5:10, 5:13, 5:18, 6:1, 6:2, 6:3, 6:6, 6:11, 9:10, 10:11, 10:14, 12:3, 15:19, 16:12, 16:16, 19:6, 20:11, 20:17, 21:3, 21:10, 22:10, 23:10, 23:12, 24:1, 24:8, 24:11, 24:19, 25:7, 25:11, 25:13, 25:16, 25:17, 25:19, 26:5, 26:17, 27:15, 28:15, 28:17, 30:2, 30:5, 30:8, 30:9, 30:11, 31:5, 31:6, 31:13, 31:17, 32:19, 42:15, 51:7, 52:4, 53:12, 53:18, 57:5, 61:14, 62:6, 62:9, 64:5, 64:10, 64:16, 65:3, 65:7, 65:12, 66:2, 67:2, 67:3, 67:7, 70:18, 71:17, 73:4, 73:5, 73:7, 73:8, 73:9, 73:17, 73:19, 74:3, 74:4, 74:6, 74:12, 74:14, 75:1, 75:2, 75:11, 75:12, 75:13, 75:16, 75:17, 76:15, 76:17, 76:19, 77:5, 77:15, 78:12, 79:5, 79:6, 80:16, 81:5, 82:3, 82:5, 82:6, 82:14, 82:16, 85:13, 85:14, 86:1, 86:4, 86:5, 86:8, 86:12, 87:4, 87:9, 88:5, 88:8, 88:10, 88:14, 88:15, 88:17, 88:18, 89:1, 91:9, 91:17, 92:1, 92:2, 92:8, 92:13, 93:13, 93:19, 94:2, 94:10, 95:6, 97:16, 97:17, 98:7, 98:13, 99:13, 100:7, 102:3, 104:4, 104:9, 104:11, 105:3, 105:4, 105:14, 105:19, 106:6,</p>	<p>106:7, 106:10, 108:14, 109:14, 110:3, 110:12, 110:15, 111:3, 111:5, 111:10, 114:18, 119:16, 119:18, 120:3, 123:19, 124:4, 127:13, 127:15, 127:16, 128:2, 128:3, 135:10, 159:13, 170:12, 171:1, 191:15, 192:15, 192:18, 193:7, 193:11, 194:7, 194:13, 196:18</p> <p><b>spaces</b> [18] - 12:19, 13:5, 15:7, 16:18, 24:17, 24:18, 56:14, 61:11, 61:16, 62:4, 62:5, 64:6, 80:15, 81:10, 86:6, 89:4, 104:13, 104:17</p> <p><b>spacing</b> [2] - 56:9, 56:18</p> <p><b>speaking</b> [3] - 99:2, 121:13, 125:12</p> <p><b>speaks</b> [2] - 55:2, 108:17</p> <p><b>special</b> [3] - 119:7, 119:9, 187:14</p> <p><b>Specialist</b> [1] - 109:9</p> <p><b>specific</b> [1] - 8:13</p> <p><b>specifically</b> [3] - 30:3, 50:6, 82:12</p> <p><b>specifics</b> [1] - 197:9</p> <p><b>specified</b> [1] - 163:16</p> <p><b>spectacular</b> [4] - 93:11, 94:11, 111:18, 111:19</p> <p><b>spectrum</b> [2] - 153:14, 153:15</p> <p><b>speed</b> [1] - 8:9</p> <p><b>spend</b> [1] - 26:4</p> <p><b>spine</b> [1] - 65:12</p> <p><b>spoken</b> [2] - 113:17, 114:1</p> <p><b>spot</b> [2] - 132:9, 160:5</p> <p><b>sprawling</b> [1] - 92:9</p> <p><b>spring</b> [1] - 96:19</p> <p><b>spur</b> [1] - 91:1</p> <p><b>Square</b> [36] - 2:6, 4:2, 8:8, 8:11, 13:7, 14:2, 21:9, 26:8, 26:9, 27:13, 30:18, 37:3, 37:4, 37:6, 41:7, 41:18, 42:13, 43:11, 53:16, 54:15, 55:11, 56:12, 59:1, 59:9, 60:12, 61:12,</p>	<p>64:1, 65:5, 65:16, 65:19, 66:8, 86:3, 112:11, 175:4, 189:5, 191:6</p> <p><b>square</b> [17] - 12:5, 28:5, 34:19, 35:5, 39:5, 40:9, 45:19, 49:12, 84:1, 92:5, 172:2, 172:5, 176:17, 179:2, 183:13, 184:7, 184:8</p> <p><b>SS</b> [1] - 205:3</p> <p><b>Staff</b> [1] - 1:13</p> <p><b>staff</b> [12] - 3:7, 72:17, 76:6, 107:14, 113:19, 135:15, 137:19, 138:8, 165:7, 180:13, 195:16, 202:9</p> <p><b>stage</b> [2] - 17:7, 17:8</p> <p><b>standards</b> [2] - 24:6, 127:14</p> <p><b>standing</b> [1] - 152:6</p> <p><b>standpoint</b> [1] - 75:6</p> <p><b>start</b> [5] - 7:10, 7:16, 43:2, 107:18, 120:16</p> <p><b>started</b> [7] - 25:9, 26:11, 111:13, 145:6, 150:17, 166:15, 199:5</p> <p><b>starting</b> [2] - 27:19, 146:8</p> <p><b>starts</b> [1] - 37:14</p> <p><b>startup</b> [1] - 147:14</p> <p><b>state</b> [3] - 161:13, 175:11, 186:16</p> <p><b>State</b> [1] - 93:7</p> <p><b>statement(s)</b> [1] - 204:17</p> <p><b>stay</b> [1] - 33:1</p> <p><b>stayed</b> [1] - 13:9</p> <p><b>staying</b> [1] - 157:11</p> <p><b>STENOGRAPHER</b> [1] - 125:12</p> <p><b>step</b> [8] - 18:16, 43:3, 50:15, 56:16, 56:17, 68:11, 172:11, 174:8</p> <p><b>steps</b> [2] - 7:3, 160:12</p> <p><b>Steve</b> [5] - 137:10, 137:15, 192:15, 196:9, 197:14</p> <p><b>Steve's</b> [2] - 153:9, 156:4</p> <p><b>Steven</b> [1] - 1:9</p> <p><b>STEVEN</b> [35] - 38:5, 38:7, 38:11, 39:2, 39:7, 100:4, 106:14, 107:2, 116:10,</p>	<p>116:15, 117:14, 131:11, 132:13, 135:17, 136:14, 137:17, 150:4, 167:7, 170:8, 176:7, 181:4, 181:13, 183:3, 183:12, 184:2, 184:10, 186:1, 190:5, 190:13, 195:3, 195:7, 196:7, 197:1, 200:16, 201:5</p> <p><b>sticking</b> [1] - 130:1</p> <p><b>still</b> [15] - 9:14, 36:2, 38:2, 43:10, 45:10, 45:11, 47:6, 49:2, 68:8, 100:6, 118:6, 121:9, 133:10, 153:12</p> <p><b>stipulating</b> [1] - 118:14</p> <p><b>stitching</b> [1] - 54:18</p> <p><b>stock</b> [3] - 146:17, 159:15, 162:15</p> <p><b>stone</b> [1] - 91:12</p> <p><b>storage</b> [1] - 51:8</p> <p><b>stories</b> [10] - 57:8, 57:9, 84:10, 84:14, 84:18, 85:17, 85:18, 87:5, 93:17</p> <p><b>story</b> [2] - 92:9, 93:5</p> <p><b>straightforward</b> [1] - 144:2</p> <p><b>strange</b> [2] - 109:16, 120:5</p> <p><b>strategic</b> [1] - 65:9</p> <p><b>straw</b> [1] - 191:19</p> <p><b>Street</b> [22] - 59:3, 88:15, 89:6, 89:8, 89:10, 89:11, 89:12, 94:9, 121:18, 122:3, 122:16, 123:5, 123:6, 123:8, 123:18, 148:9, 150:16, 155:1, 172:16, 176:16, 184:7, 200:15</p> <p><b>street</b> [10] - 29:2, 29:6, 60:11, 80:7, 81:4, 88:15, 89:5, 128:18, 151:5, 154:1</p> <p><b>streets</b> [10] - 16:18, 29:4, 29:5, 56:15, 60:8, 80:2, 83:3, 83:4, 83:7, 110:5</p> <p><b>streetscape</b> [1] - 13:3</p> <p><b>strengthens</b> [1] - 54:12</p> <p><b>stretch</b> [1] - 173:11</p> <p><b>strict</b> [2] - 9:7, 62:17</p>	<p><b>strictly</b> [3] - 135:1, 186:13, 193:15</p> <p><b>strip</b> [1] - 194:14</p> <p><b>strolling</b> [1] - 118:7</p> <p><b>strong</b> [5] - 40:19, 45:12, 56:13, 63:3, 108:4</p> <p><b>stronger</b> [3] - 13:3, 19:9, 42:11</p> <p><b>strongly</b> [4] - 11:12, 29:1, 40:13, 98:16</p> <p><b>struck</b> [1] - 99:1</p> <p><b>structure</b> [1] - 53:17</p> <p><b>structured</b> [2] - 40:8, 135:10</p> <p><b>structures</b> [1] - 4:14</p> <p><b>struggle</b> [1] - 77:2</p> <p><b>STUART</b> [9] - 90:6, 117:19, 136:16, 164:18, 167:4, 169:12, 188:4, 190:17, 200:14</p> <p><b>Stuart</b> [4] - 1:14, 68:4, 69:19, 168:16</p> <p><b>stuck</b> [1] - 103:12</p> <p><b>students</b> [7] - 148:1, 148:2, 148:12, 148:19, 158:7, 163:4</p> <p><b>studied</b> [2] - 57:2, 85:6</p> <p><b>studies</b> [5] - 83:4, 84:14, 84:17, 152:11, 186:19</p> <p><b>studios</b> [1] - 146:18</p> <p><b>study</b> [26] - 8:11, 9:4, 12:14, 12:15, 13:2, 13:5, 26:10, 40:18, 41:1, 47:5, 47:12, 48:5, 48:15, 53:2, 114:3, 156:13, 156:16, 165:4, 166:5, 166:9, 167:10, 168:16, 187:8, 187:12, 188:1, 198:4</p> <p><b>studying</b> [1] - 155:10</p> <p><b>stuff</b> [2] - 99:7, 99:8</p> <p><b>stupid</b> [1] - 175:12</p> <p><b>style</b> [1] - 59:15</p> <p><b>subareas</b> [1] - 8:15</p> <p><b>subject</b> [4] - 72:14, 81:1, 135:2, 164:2</p> <p><b>submit</b> [2] - 69:5, 71:4</p> <p><b>subscribe</b> [1] - 204:16</p> <p><b>subsequent</b> [1] - 17:7</p> <p><b>subset</b> [1] - 161:14</p> <p><b>subsidize</b> [5] - 46:14, 177:18, 178:11, 178:13, 183:14</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p><b>subsidized</b> [6] - 164:15, 177:11, 178:16, 185:4, 185:9, 185:11</p> <p><b>subsidy</b> [2] - 178:5, 183:2</p> <p><b>substantial</b> [2] - 44:6, 103:18</p> <p><b>substantially</b> [1] - 154:9</p> <p><b>substantive</b> [2] - 183:7</p> <p><b>subtle</b> [1] - 18:8</p> <p><b>suburban</b> [3] - 59:15, 81:12, 81:15</p> <p><b>successful</b> [2] - 64:12, 64:16</p> <p><b>suffering</b> [2] - 105:13, 159:1</p> <p><b>sufficient</b> [1] - 152:17</p> <p><b>sufficiently</b> [1] - 140:18</p> <p><b>suggest</b> [4] - 69:13, 73:6, 118:3, 192:12</p> <p><b>suggested</b> [3] - 9:17, 63:19, 112:12</p> <p><b>suggesting</b> [2] - 193:7, 193:19</p> <p><b>suggestion</b> [3] - 63:18, 86:15, 140:9</p> <p><b>summarization</b> [1] - 137:8</p> <p><b>summarizes</b> [1] - 67:13</p> <p><b>summarizing</b> [1] - 10:5</p> <p><b>summary</b> [2] - 33:14, 51:15</p> <p><b>summer</b> [2] - 148:4, 166:16</p> <p><b>sunlight</b> [1] - 63:8</p> <p><b>sunny</b> [2] - 104:18, 105:12</p> <p><b>super</b> [1] - 14:2</p> <p><b>supply</b> [1] - 155:12</p> <p><b>support</b> [3] - 4:16, 33:12, 41:3</p> <p><b>supportable</b> [1] - 38:15</p> <p><b>supporting</b> [2] - 42:14, 42:16</p> <p><b>supports</b> [1] - 39:4</p> <p><b>surface</b> [3] - 82:9, 82:14, 118:9</p> <p><b>surrounded</b> [2] - 92:7, 105:6</p> <p><b>surrounding</b> [2] - 54:14, 59:18</p> <p><b>survey</b> [1] - 146:4</p> <p><b>survive</b> [1] - 185:17</p> <p><b>Suzannah</b> [13] - 1:15,</p>	<p>11:7, 18:2, 23:4, 32:16, 52:2, 52:7, 52:13, 53:1, 57:6, 68:2, 69:19, 73:2</p> <p><b>SUZANNAH</b> [9] - 52:19, 57:10, 57:14, 57:19, 58:19, 59:6, 64:3, 89:14, 89:19</p> <p><b>Suzannah's</b> [1] - 91:2</p> <p><b>synthesizes</b> [1] - 54:5</p> <p><b>system</b> [10] - 16:18, 23:10, 25:10, 25:13, 26:1, 29:2, 75:3, 79:6, 159:1, 195:12</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>T</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>table</b> [2] - 71:10, 72:15</p> <p><b>tags</b> [1] - 86:8</p> <p><b>tall</b> [8] - 6:12, 31:7, 55:9, 58:18, 84:10, 84:19, 87:5, 87:13</p> <p><b>taller</b> [6] - 19:16, 30:19, 55:17, 56:16, 59:2, 87:17</p> <p><b>tallest</b> [3] - 58:11, 58:13, 87:16</p> <p><b>tax</b> [1] - 175:10</p> <p><b>taxes</b> [2] - 149:9, 175:12</p> <p><b>teachers</b> [1] - 168:13</p> <p><b>Team</b> [1] - 113:19</p> <p><b>team</b> [2] - 114:4, 165:6</p> <p><b>Team's</b> [1] - 12:13</p> <p><b>technical</b> [2] - 109:16, 135:17</p> <p><b>technology</b> [1] - 66:7</p> <p><b>Ted</b> [5] - 111:19, 160:14, 168:5, 168:17, 190:17</p> <p><b>ten</b> [11] - 57:13, 57:14, 57:19, 58:2, 84:10, 84:18, 85:16, 85:17, 91:17, 158:15, 179:5</p> <p><b>ten-stories</b> [1] - 85:17</p> <p><b>tenant</b> [2] - 161:1, 161:2</p> <p><b>tenants</b> [1] - 98:10</p> <p><b>tend</b> [4] - 81:12, 81:13, 131:17, 138:14</p> <p><b>tends</b> [1] - 105:5</p> <p><b>term</b> [2] - 51:13, 78:7</p> <p><b>terms</b> [32] - 12:17, 19:5, 21:14, 22:17, 23:3, 25:16, 29:7, 33:18, 42:6, 46:19, 48:19, 51:4, 51:5,</p>	<p>52:3, 52:9, 53:7, 74:19, 91:19, 95:19, 96:1, 96:4, 102:13, 114:12, 118:8, 118:9, 153:7, 160:10, 165:1, 191:8, 191:16, 192:4</p> <p><b>terraces</b> [1] - 99:10</p> <p><b>terrific</b> [2] - 118:17, 137:3</p> <p><b>testing</b> [1] - 124:6</p> <p><b>text</b> [3] - 9:16, 64:15, 68:7</p> <p><b>Thacher</b> [1] - 1:11</p> <p><b>THACHER</b> [4] - 7:6, 7:11, 7:18, 80:4</p> <p><b>THE</b> [8] - 1:2, 1:18, 125:12, 128:15, 205:16, 205:17, 205:18</p> <p><b>themselves</b> [3] - 28:4, 92:5, 99:18</p> <p><b>THEODORE</b> [60] - 3:3, 57:6, 57:12, 57:17, 58:4, 58:10, 59:5, 69:17, 72:18, 75:7, 75:15, 76:3, 79:17, 90:3, 91:8, 97:5, 97:10, 100:5, 106:17, 119:12, 124:2, 125:6, 130:19, 131:3, 134:15, 136:15, 137:7, 137:13, 144:13, 147:3, 149:12, 155:17, 156:2, 165:18, 166:7, 166:14, 166:19, 171:12, 176:13, 177:16, 178:6, 179:4, 179:9, 180:10, 181:7, 181:16, 182:8, 182:13, 182:18, 188:8, 190:8, 191:7, 197:16, 198:15, 201:18, 202:4, 202:10, 202:15, 202:19, 203:3</p> <p><b>Theodore</b> [1] - 1:8</p> <p><b>theoretical</b> [1] - 154:12</p> <p><b>therefor</b> [1] - 204:7</p> <p><b>therefore</b> [2] - 148:15, 172:3</p> <p><b>they've</b> [5] - 50:7, 100:17, 101:3, 176:6</p> <p><b>thinking</b> [18] - 6:12, 71:11, 86:19, 95:4, 110:9, 112:15,</p>	<p>115:3, 116:9, 149:14, 149:16, 155:15, 163:15, 163:19, 165:8, 180:14, 181:3, 182:5, 192:16</p> <p><b>third</b> [4] - 106:4, 164:13</p> <p><b>Third</b> [6] - 94:9, 105:10, 105:11, 121:18, 122:12, 123:8</p> <p><b>THIS</b> [1] - 205:16</p> <p><b>thoughts</b> [7] - 63:11, 112:19, 113:5, 114:19, 144:12, 144:17, 198:6</p> <p><b>thousand</b> [12] - 41:9, 41:11, 41:13, 44:11, 44:12, 63:19, 70:7, 93:5, 111:15, 147:11, 201:11</p> <p><b>thousand-story</b> [1] - 93:5</p> <p><b>three</b> [32] - 12:5, 40:9, 50:16, 52:11, 101:1, 103:15, 124:18, 124:19, 125:19, 126:6, 127:3, 127:4, 127:5, 145:4, 148:17, 149:4, 150:10, 153:17, 153:19, 157:11, 157:15, 158:3, 158:5, 158:7, 162:10, 162:17, 163:4, 171:16, 172:4, 179:12, 199:11, 201:11</p> <p><b>three-bedroom</b> [6] - 50:16, 52:11, 145:4, 153:17, 157:11, 158:5</p> <p><b>three-family</b> [1] - 157:15</p> <p><b>three-tier</b> [1] - 199:11</p> <p><b>threshold</b> [1] - 73:2</p> <p><b>thrilled</b> [1] - 182:15</p> <p><b>throughout</b> [10] - 28:16, 49:9, 49:10, 61:3, 65:4, 66:2, 66:16, 66:18, 174:4</p> <p><b>throwing</b> [1] - 166:1</p> <p><b>thumb</b> [1] - 130:1</p> <p><b>Thursday</b> [1] - 13:11</p> <p><b>tier</b> [5] - 23:10, 195:11, 199:11, 199:12, 199:13</p> <p><b>TIFFANY</b> [4] - 7:6, 7:11, 7:18, 80:4</p> <p><b>Tiffany</b> [1] - 1:11</p>	<p><b>timing</b> [1] - 96:1</p> <p><b>tiny</b> [1] - 164:14</p> <p><b>TO</b> [1] - 205:17</p> <p><b>today</b> [3] - 91:11, 128:13, 131:19</p> <p><b>together</b> [14] - 13:19, 14:8, 17:1, 26:19, 30:15, 33:14, 41:15, 41:16, 54:3, 54:18, 89:3, 106:9, 126:14, 175:15</p> <p><b>tomorrow</b> [1] - 133:8</p> <p><b>tongue</b> [1] - 93:4</p> <p><b>tonight</b> [3] - 67:19, 69:15, 71:13</p> <p><b>took</b> [1] - 36:8</p> <p><b>tools</b> [1] - 162:6</p> <p><b>top</b> [1] - 87:6</p> <p><b>topics</b> [2] - 165:4, 190:10</p> <p><b>toss</b> [1] - 180:13</p> <p><b>total</b> [9] - 31:16, 46:19, 84:2, 126:12, 145:16, 156:11, 169:10, 181:9, 185:4</p> <p><b>totally</b> [2] - 76:19, 171:16</p> <p><b>touch</b> [1] - 19:12</p> <p><b>touched</b> [1] - 189:19</p> <p><b>tough</b> [2] - 129:8, 132:9</p> <p><b>towards</b> [1] - 195:16</p> <p><b>tower</b> [3] - 56:18, 87:4, 92:7</p> <p><b>Tower</b> [2] - 93:6, 93:16</p> <p><b>towers</b> [1] - 86:17</p> <p><b>towns</b> [1] - 81:13</p> <p><b>track</b> [2] - 126:5, 156:6</p> <p><b>trade</b> [1] - 95:3</p> <p><b>tradeoffs</b> [1] - 71:3</p> <p><b>trades</b> [1] - 200:2</p> <p><b>traditional</b> [1] - 110:8</p> <p><b>transaction</b> [3] - 34:15, 34:16, 134:4</p> <p><b>transcript</b> [4] - 204:2, 204:6, 204:15, 204:16</p> <p><b>TRANSCRIPT</b> [1] - 205:17</p> <p><b>transcriptionist</b> [1] - 129:13</p> <p><b>transferred</b> [1] - 172:1</p> <p><b>transformed</b> [1] - 114:7</p> <p><b>transforms</b> [1] - 89:9</p> <p><b>transparency</b> [1] - 61:9</p>
--	---	--	---	--



<p><b>treated</b> [1] - 12:7  <b>treating</b> [1] - 73:12  <b>tremendous</b> [2] - 70:1, 70:2  <b>trends</b> [2] - 167:3, 167:6  <b>trial</b> [1] - 130:4  <b>tried</b> [7] - 11:4, 33:13, 40:1, 40:2, 128:12, 163:11, 186:10  <b>truck</b> [1] - 132:6  <b>trucks</b> [1] - 151:3  <b>true</b> [7] - 22:5, 26:1, 74:5, 133:9, 176:4, 199:15, 205:7  <b>truly</b> [5] - 24:12, 78:3, 99:13, 115:8, 156:5  <b>Trust</b> [4] - 46:2, 46:7, 47:3, 165:7  <b>trust</b> [2] - 4:15, 4:16  <b>try</b> [12] - 26:11, 30:18, 73:14, 79:1, 88:3, 100:16, 117:5, 119:8, 133:5, 137:17, 159:3  <b>trying</b> [26] - 20:18, 23:16, 27:14, 28:1, 42:11, 43:5, 78:17, 81:14, 83:11, 83:17, 86:10, 90:11, 112:1, 115:13, 118:12, 119:3, 133:3, 133:5, 146:10, 160:8, 165:9, 166:2, 170:4, 170:5, 173:1, 192:17  <b>Tuesday</b> [1] - 1:4  <b>turn</b> [5] - 6:19, 46:8, 52:12, 69:16, 136:11  <b>turned</b> [2] - 46:7, 124:1  <b>TV</b> [1] - 152:12  <b>twelve</b> [4] - 58:1, 58:2, 58:9, 84:18  <b>Twining</b> [1] - 4:8  <b>two</b> [24] - 10:6, 23:10, 85:5, 85:6, 92:9, 101:18, 113:4, 117:19, 138:1, 138:6, 147:4, 154:15, 155:1, 162:16, 163:5, 163:6, 179:15, 179:16, 180:4, 180:6, 195:11, 201:10  <b>two-story</b> [1] - 92:9  <b>two-tier</b> [2] - 23:10, 195:11  <b>type</b> [3] - 24:9, 55:14,</p>	<p>55:18  <b>types</b> [8] - 15:3, 18:19, 50:10, 73:19, 153:1, 187:1, 188:14, 188:16  <b>typical</b> [2] - 33:17, 172:3</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>U</b></p> <p><b>ultimate</b> [2] - 71:2, 107:12  <b>ultimately</b> [4] - 16:7, 69:1, 71:19, 149:15  <b>unable</b> [1] - 151:19  <b>unbridled</b> [1] - 112:3  <b>unclear</b> [1] - 109:17  <b>under</b> [8] - 44:1, 44:5, 44:14, 47:3, 73:18, 122:7, 191:3, 199:6  <b>UNDER</b> [1] - 205:17  <b>underpriced</b> [1] - 150:7  <b>undersigned</b> [1] - 205:5  <b>understood</b> [1] - 182:2  <b>undertook</b> [1] - 54:7  <b>underway</b> [1] - 130:4  <b>uniformly</b> [1] - 85:4  <b>unique</b> [10] - 64:11, 138:16, 138:17, 140:7, 140:19, 168:18, 169:6, 172:11, 187:14  <b>unit</b> [9] - 18:19, 49:14, 50:10, 145:2, 145:9, 146:12, 146:14, 155:3, 183:8  <b>units</b> [42] - 41:9, 41:11, 41:13, 42:8, 44:11, 44:12, 44:14, 44:15, 45:4, 45:10, 49:13, 50:8, 50:12, 50:17, 51:2, 51:5, 51:9, 52:11, 140:6, 145:4, 145:17, 146:10, 153:12, 154:1, 155:5, 156:11, 158:5, 162:14, 163:9, 163:12, 164:1, 164:5, 171:6, 172:2, 172:5, 172:7, 177:10, 181:10, 183:8, 185:4, 185:9, 185:11  <b>University</b> [1] - 55:14  <b>unknown</b> [2] - 38:1, 169:10  <b>UNLESS</b> [1] - 205:17</p>	<p><b>unless</b> [4] - 3:13, 106:2, 157:13, 169:1  <b>unlimited</b> [1] - 168:1  <b>unmet</b> [1] - 153:13  <b>unnecessarily</b> [2] - 169:9, 170:4  <b>unusual</b> [1] - 69:4  <b>up</b> [63] - 2:6, 5:2, 8:9, 15:8, 15:11, 22:2, 27:14, 34:5, 40:7, 44:11, 44:13, 48:17, 50:6, 50:8, 56:16, 58:5, 62:19, 71:19, 75:8, 75:9, 79:13, 83:15, 86:15, 87:15, 90:2, 91:3, 92:10, 94:6, 95:1, 98:6, 101:13, 109:18, 111:14, 114:6, 114:10, 121:5, 121:17, 124:6, 136:1, 142:16, 143:16, 144:14, 145:14, 145:19, 147:19, 150:13, 157:2, 159:17, 160:1, 160:14, 160:15, 161:4, 163:13, 164:19, 165:15, 170:18, 172:11, 174:8, 183:17, 184:3, 186:17, 195:8, 196:12  <b>Update</b> [1] - 2:3  <b>update</b> [1] - 3:15  <b>updated</b> [3] - 51:19, 52:4, 52:6  <b>updating</b> [1] - 47:18  <b>upfront</b> [1] - 35:7  <b>upgrade</b> [1] - 122:17  <b>upgraded</b> [1] - 123:5  <b>upper</b> [3] - 85:5, 124:7, 142:19  <b>upscale</b> [1] - 188:18  <b>upzoning</b> [3] - 139:9, 139:17, 140:1  <b>urban</b> [13] - 10:10, 11:9, 14:3, 15:5, 30:17, 51:17, 53:17, 54:14, 59:19, 82:18, 88:12, 111:3, 121:4  <b>urbanistic</b> [1] - 15:7  <b>usable</b> [2] - 82:4, 110:2  <b>useful</b> [3] - 75:19, 111:9, 180:16  <b>uses</b> [12] - 11:18, 12:18, 15:3, 15:6, 15:7, 16:11, 16:19,</p>	<p>20:6, 20:8, 20:9, 61:4, 110:17</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>V</b></p> <p><b>valuable</b> [1] - 185:16  <b>value</b> [20] - 33:8, 33:11, 36:10, 36:19, 37:2, 37:9, 37:15, 37:17, 37:19, 38:8, 38:15, 39:6, 39:17, 40:9, 42:2, 77:13, 99:13, 115:5, 136:19, 174:4  <b>values</b> [2] - 72:4, 133:1  <b>variability</b> [1] - 36:18  <b>variable</b> [3] - 35:17, 35:18, 35:19  <b>variance</b> [1] - 60:6  <b>variation</b> [4] - 29:15, 31:9, 31:17, 55:5  <b>variations</b> [3] - 32:14, 37:18, 193:14  <b>varied</b> [1] - 90:12  <b>variety</b> [3] - 62:5, 159:4  <b>various</b> [1] - 74:4  <b>vary</b> [3] - 36:2, 84:15, 199:19  <b>vehicle</b> [1] - 130:9  <b>vehicles</b> [1] - 128:7  <b>vehicular</b> [2] - 29:7, 80:8  <b>version</b> [4] - 12:9, 12:11, 28:14, 30:1  <b>versus</b> [9] - 22:17, 42:4, 71:17, 71:18, 77:3, 93:14, 104:4, 104:14  <b>Vice</b> [1] - 1:8  <b>view</b> [3] - 63:7, 70:10, 91:6  <b>views</b> [1] - 55:10  <b>virtue</b> [1] - 181:13  <b>visible</b> [2] - 77:12, 78:3  <b>vision</b> [12] - 11:17, 54:5, 114:2, 114:13, 116:1, 116:7, 117:1, 117:4, 117:12, 131:19, 132:1, 152:3  <b>visions</b> [1] - 53:11  <b>visual</b> [2] - 63:3, 64:19  <b>Volpe</b> [43] - 2:6, 3:9, 4:19, 5:8, 8:6, 12:2, 12:7, 17:5, 41:2, 41:6, 41:12, 41:14, 50:7, 53:9, 54:13,</p>	<p>66:19, 70:13, 84:2, 91:14, 91:18, 113:6, 113:9, 114:4, 115:17, 117:5, 120:7, 120:13, 120:15, 120:16, 120:18, 121:1, 121:13, 124:9, 126:3, 126:18, 128:12, 132:9, 134:1, 135:1, 136:7, 136:10, 136:18  <b>Volpe's</b> [2] - 116:2, 127:9  <b>volume</b> [1] - 204:6  <b>vote</b> [2] - 69:2, 96:14  <b>voted</b> [1] - 97:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>W</b></p> <p><b>wage</b> [1] - 179:14  <b>wait</b> [2] - 107:9, 107:12  <b>waiting</b> [2] - 153:11, 162:13  <b>walk</b> [4] - 7:2, 72:8, 128:12, 128:15  <b>walked</b> [1] - 111:7  <b>walking</b> [1] - 105:10  <b>walkway</b> [2] - 75:10, 75:16, 122:4  <b>walkways</b> [1] - 80:2  <b>wall</b> [1] - 166:2  <b>wants</b> [5] - 70:14, 100:9, 136:18, 163:2, 180:18  <b>War</b> [1] - 154:6  <b>war</b> [1] - 154:8  <b>wasted</b> [1] - 105:15  <b>ways</b> [14] - 5:1, 15:12, 46:5, 65:7, 65:15, 66:1, 76:6, 85:11, 99:17, 114:8, 133:13, 152:18, 175:14  <b>website</b> [2] - 188:5, 188:6  <b>week</b> [2] - 3:18, 3:19  <b>weekends</b> [2] - 42:19, 66:15  <b>welcome</b> [2] - 3:4, 94:12  <b>whatnot</b> [1] - 148:3  <b>whereas</b> [4] - 105:8, 134:3, 166:3, 178:13  <b>WHEREOF</b> [1] - 205:8  <b>whole</b> [9] - 17:2, 42:13, 78:11, 92:10, 109:16, 125:2, 143:10, 174:5,</p>
---	---	--	---	--

<p>177:9  <b>wholistic</b> [1] - 135:14  <b>wide</b> [1] - 160:16  <b>wife</b> [1] - 148:18  <b>willing</b> [3] - 113:16,  121:15, 171:4  <b>willpower</b> [1] - 16:10  <b>wind</b> [3] - 56:8, 64:7  <b>window</b> [1] - 94:14  <b>winner</b> [1] - 13:12  <b>winter</b> [1] - 105:14  <b>wintertime</b> [1] - 106:2  <b>wise</b> [1] - 72:14  <b>wish</b> [4] - 3:16,  140:17, 143:9,  169:4  <b>WITNESS</b> [1] - 205:8  <b>wonder</b> [1] - 191:18  <b>wondered</b> [1] -  105:16  <b>wonderful</b> [3] - 119:2,  119:4, 133:19  <b>wondering</b> [1] - 84:19  <b>word</b> [1] - 99:3  <b>words</b> [1] - 111:19  <b>workers</b> [2] - 19:3,  110:19  <b>works</b> [6] - 49:4,  96:13, 141:13,  141:19, 175:5,  188:19  <b>World</b> [1] - 154:6  <b>world</b> [4] - 92:18,  152:9, 152:11,  154:7  <b>worry</b> [1] - 145:18  <b>worth</b> [2] - 150:4,  163:15  <b>wow</b> [1] - 112:15  <b>write</b> [2] - 87:1,  199:16  <b>written</b> [1] - 90:16  <b>www.reportersinc.</b>  <b>com</b> [1] - 1:19</p>	<p>155:8, 186:14,  199:7  <b>yellow</b> [1] - 11:19  <b>yesterday</b> [6] - 15:11,  70:6, 121:14, 125:7,  131:4, 189:6  <b>yesterday's</b> [1] -  63:11  <b>York</b> [3] - 173:5,  173:9, 174:17  <b>young</b> [2] - 146:5,  150:9</p>
<b>Y</b>	<b>Z</b>
<p><b>yard</b> [2] - 161:19,  201:3  <b>year</b> [11] - 97:2, 97:4,  97:5, 97:9, 97:13,  115:14, 121:7,  150:14, 175:8,  200:2, 200:4  <b>years</b> [14] - 35:18,  66:16, 122:7,  138:10, 149:19,  150:10, 151:4,  151:10, 154:3,  154:16, 154:18,</p>	<p><b>Zarnetske</b> [1] -  129:18  <b>Zelinski</b> [2] - 205:4,  205:12  <b>zone</b> [1] - 88:13  <b>zoning</b> [13] - 2:5, 2:6,  4:13, 9:16, 21:16,  45:16, 46:6, 46:13,  47:5, 68:7, 138:7,  138:13, 141:7  <b>Zoning</b> [53] - 4:8, 5:8,  7:4, 8:5, 8:14, 8:16,  8:19, 9:6, 10:7,  10:17, 11:6, 11:14,  14:18, 14:19, 15:9,  15:12, 15:14, 17:6,  17:17, 19:15, 21:14,  21:15, 23:9, 24:7,  33:2, 33:16, 44:17,  48:10, 55:2, 64:15,  68:14, 70:12, 73:18,  74:17, 77:19, 81:10,  87:1, 96:7, 96:9,  97:9, 109:4, 109:7,  109:9, 116:6,  116:12, 134:19,  135:5, 138:4, 139:1,  144:18, 163:17,  186:7, 193:16  <b>zoom</b> [1] - 14:10</p>